Exemplary Teachers of English Language Learners: A Knowledge Base

Author Info:

Courtney Clayton is an Assistant Professor in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Mary Washington, Fredericksburg, VA.

Correspondence regarding this manuscript should be addressed to Courtney Clayton, Department of Curriculum & Instruction, Trinkle Hall 217, University of Mary Washington, 1301 College Avenue, Fredericksburg, VA 22401. Ph: 540-654-1360. Email: cclayton@umw.edu

Abstract

The number of English language learners (ELLs) in schools continues to rise. However, statistics reveal that the majority of classroom teachers have no training in working with ELLs (NCES, 2011). Because of this, it is critical to understand how teachers can be successfully prepared to teach ELLs. Through in-depth inquiry, this study explored what kinds of knowledge four exemplary teachers of ELLs had, how they gained that knowledge, and how the knowledge was influenced by the context in which they taught– bilingual or monolingual. A knowledge base for what it takes to be a successful teacher of ELLs is presented.

The number of English language learners (ELLs) in public schools in the United States continues to rise. Between 1980 and 2009, this number rose from 4.7 million to 11.2 million, or from ten to 21 percent (NCES, 2011). However, national statistics reveal that the majority of classroom teachers have little to no training in working with ELLs (NCES, 2011). Therefore, though teachers will increasingly be faced with teaching ELLs in their classrooms, most will be unprepared to deliver effective instruction to these students. In addition, many states have done away with bilingual programs aimed at instructing ELLs in both English and their native languages in favor of English-only models (Proposition 227, California Secretary of State, 1998; Proposition 203, Arizona Secretary of State, 2000; General Laws of Massachusetts, 2002), which has meant that more ELLs are now being fully incorporated into English-only programs leaving teachers feeling overwhelmed by how to best educate these students (Palmer & Garcia, 2000; Stritikus & Garcia, 2000).

In light of this, it is critical to understand how teachers can be successfully prepared to teach ELLs. While there is research on effective practices for ELLs (August & Shannahan, 2006; Coyne, Kame'enui & Carnine, 2011; Echevarria, Short & Vogt, 2007; Tellez & Waxman, 2006), little research has been done examining the knowledge base of successful teachers of ELLs which includes what they actually do in their classrooms, how they learned to do what they do, and what has influenced and facilitated their success. In addition, there has been limited research looking at the role context – bilingual or monolingual - plays in teachers working with ELLs (Garcia, 1991; Tikunoff, 1983).

Through in-depth inquiry with exemplary teachers of ELLs across bilingual and monolingual contexts, this study explored what kinds of knowledge these teachers had in order to successfully work with ELLs, how they gained that knowledge, and how the knowledge was influenced by the context in which teachers worked – bilingual or monolingual. A knowledge base for what it takes to be a successful teacher of ELLs specifically, is presented.

Theoretical Framework

The current study was grounded in the framework developed by Bransford, Darling-Hammond and LePage (2005) for understanding teacher knowledge. Their framework had three intersecting components: 1) knowledge of learners and their development within social contexts, 2) knowledge of subject matter and curriculum goals in light of the social purposes of education, and 3) knowledge of teaching in light of the content and learners to be taught, as informed by assessment and supported by classroom environments. With regard to the knowledge of teaching component, one area that was focused upon was the teaching of diverse learners. Part of the process in learning how to teach diverse learners, they argued, was understanding and reaching out to children who have a wide range of life experiences, behaviors and beliefs. It means understanding that "individuals' world views are not universal but are greatly influenced by their gender, race, ethnicity and social-class background" (p.36). Under this category of "diverse learners" are ELLs; however, ELLs have particular needs in terms of language development beyond what other diverse learners may need, and this was not specifically addressed in the Bransford model. Therefore, in the current study, the knowledge base necessary for teaching ELLs was studied in depth. As Lucas and Grinberg (2008) argue, "It is time

that we stop subsuming the preparation of classroom teachers to teach English language learners within more general considerations of the preparation of teachers for diverse populations" (p. 606). In addition, this study addressed the role of context, as described by Bransford et. al. (2005), in examining the knowledge base of successful teachers of ELLs.

Review of the Literature

Teacher Knowledge

The role of teacher knowledge and how it has been defined are important to the current study since it focused on what exemplary teachers of ELLs know about teaching these students, and how they developed this knowledge. Teacher knowledge has been defined in multiple ways by scholars (e.g. Clandinin & Connelly, 1995; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Shulman, 1987). Grimmett & MacKinnon (1992) argued that teacher knowledge is gained through experience. It comes in what they called "craft knowledge" (p. 387). They said that craft knowledge was a "form of professional expertise... [representing] the construction of situated, learner-focused, procedural and content-related pedagogical knowledge through deliberate action" (p. 393).

Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) extended this work on teacher knowledge by describing three types of knowledge that teachers can bring to bear on their practice, 1) knowledge-for-practice, 2) knowledge-in-practice, and 3) knowledge-of-practice. Knowledge-for-practice was defined as that "given" to teachers by university-based researchers, knowledge-in-practice was embedded in teachers' practice and their reflections on their practice, and knowledge-of-practice was defined as the knowledge gained by teachers when they treat their own classrooms as sites for "intentional investigation" (p. 250).

For this research study, teachers' knowledge-in-practice, or "craft knowledge", and teachers' knowledge-of-practice were emphasized. I observed exemplary teachers' practices of teaching ELLs, and then I interviewed them about why they did what they did. They, and I, used their classrooms for the "intentional investigation" described by Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999), and we worked together to construct a knowledge base for what it takes to be an exemplary teacher of ELLs.

Understanding Exemplary Teachers

Several researchers have studied the differences between novice and expert teachers (e.g. Berliner, 1994; Porter & Brophy, 1988; Taylor, Pressley & Parson, 2000). Common findings include: 1) experts set priorities, plan, and have goals, 2) experts communicate to their students what is expected of them and why, 3) experts are knowledgeable about their students, 4) experts monitor students' understanding by offering regular appropriate feedback, and 5) experts are reflective and thoughtful about their practice.

While specific practices of exemplary teachers have been the subject of research (e.g. Allington & Johnson, 2000; Block & Mangieri, 2003; McDermott & Rothenberg, 2000), only two studies have focused specifically on effective teachers of ELLs (Garcia, 1991; Tikunoff, 1983). Research on exemplary teachers in general found that these teachers: 1) demonstrated a caring attitude towards and genuine respect for their students, 2) had the traits of perseverance, dedication and enthusiasm, 3) used strategies to actively engage students in the learning process, such as cooperative learning and hands-on activities, 4) reflected often on their practice, 5) demonstrated

culturally relevant teaching, described as knowing the students' lives outside of the boundaries of the classroom walls, and 5) used that knowledge to scaffold students' understanding of curriculum content. Additionally, findings from the Garcia (1991) and Tikunoff (1983) studies on effective teachers of ELLs specifically, showed that these teachers: 1) mediated instruction of ELLs using both the students' native language, Spanish, and English, often alternating between the two for clarification, 2) felt that being bilingual and bicultural would enrich their students' lives, and 3) considered knowing a second language to be an asset.

Effective Practices for ELLs

Researches have identified a common set of effective instructional practices for ELLs, including: 1) providing opportunities for meaningful use of new vocabulary, 2) presenting ideas in both oral and written form, 3) paraphrasing students' remarks and gently encouraging them to expand on their responses, and 4) including questions and activities that require elaborated responses in English so that students can practice expressing their ideas (e.g. Coleman & Goldenberg, 2010; Tellez & Waxman, 2007; Vaughn, Mathes, Linan-Thompson, Cirino, Carlson, Pollard-Durodola, Cardenas-Hagan & Francis, 2006). Echevarria, Short & Vogt (2007) have established a model of instruction aimed specifically at working with ELLs. Their method, the SIOP model (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol), provides educators with a comprehensive model for planning and implementing lessons that help ELLs access curriculum content and build language skills.

Methodology

This research set out to examine the backgrounds, beliefs, training and practices of successful teachers of ELLs across contexts – monolingual and bilingual. As such, a multiple, exemplary case study design was appropriate (Yin, 1993). I used constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2000; Glaser & Strauss, 1967) as my method of inquiry. Charmaz (2000) described constructivist grounded theory as "[assuming] the relativism of multiple social realities, [recognizing] the mutual creation of knowledge by the viewer and the viewed, and [aiming] toward interpretive understanding of subjects' meaning" (p. 510). In this study, I and the teachers were mutually constructing a theory of what it takes to be an effective teacher of ELLs; and, how the contexts in which they taught affected their instruction of these students.

Settings

Since one of the goals of the study was to look at the effects of program context on the exemplary teachers and their practices, the study took place at schools with bilingual and monolingual programs, all of which were in the same district. The bilingual program was the only one offered in that particular district. The district was located in an outlying suburb of a major city in the Northeastern part of the United States. Approximately 4,500 students were enrolled in the district. In one of the schools with a monolingual program, meaning all instruction was done in English, the Parker School (all school names are pseudonyms), the percentage of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students was 5.9%. In the second monolingual program, the Washington School, the percentage of LEP students was 12.1%. In the bilingual program, the Lycee School, where instruction was done in both

English and French, the percentage of LEP students was 15%.

Program contexts.

In the bilingual program, all of the students were instructed in both French and English. Students entering the program in Kindergarten receive 90% of their instruction in French and 10% of their instruction in English. Students in Kindergarten are both native-French and native-English speakers. Upon entering first grade, students receive 70% of their instruction in French and 30% of their instruction in English. In second grade, students spend 60% of their time in French, and 40% of their time in English. By third grade, students are instructed 50% of their time in English and 50% of their time in French, and this continues through fifth grade. English-as-a-second language (ESL) instruction was provided for students from Kindergarten through grade five using a "pull out model", meaning ELLs were removed from the classroom approximately 2 to 3 times per week for small group instruction. There were three ESL teachers on staff to serve the ELL students.

In both monolingual programs, all instruction was in English. ESL teachers at all schools used a "pull out" model for working with ELLs, meaning the ELLs were removed from the classroom and instructed in a small-group setting with the ESL teacher. ESL instruction happened approximately 2-3 times per week in each setting for a period of approximately 45 minutes.

Recruitment

The superintendent of an outlying district of a major city was contacted via mail in November of 2005 describing the study and what would be required of the teachers should they agree to participate. In January 2006, principals and administrators in the district were contacted via mail with information about the study. Specifically, the principals and administrators were asked to recommend teachers who were successful at teaching ELLs. The criteria given to the principals and administrators for nomination were: 1) that the teachers had to have been teaching for a minimum of five years, based upon the findings of research on experts and novices (Berliner, 1994) and on exemplary teachers (Allington & Johnston, 2000; Block & Mangieri, 2003), which indicates the important role of experience in developing expertise, and 2) that the nominees' ELLs had to have shown significant progress in their language development in past years on measures used by the school to determine academic progress. These measures included standardized testing scores on state-mandated assessments and holistic writing scores based on the school and district writing prompts given at the beginning and end of the year to all ELL students. However, more criteria were not provided since the major goal of the study was to develop a theory using a constructivist grounded theory design
The principals and administrators who felt they had teachers who could qualify for the study were asked to fill out questionnaires to explain their choices for nominees in detail using a "Qualities of Exemplary Teaching Data Collection Form" (see Appendix A), based on the research done by Block & Mangieri (2003) who collected extensive data on exemplary teachers of literacy. Though the process of nomination can be problematic in selection of participants, research has shown that validity can be maintained by carefully constructing the instruments used to collect the nominations (Allington & Johnson, 2000; Block & Mangieri, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1994).

Three teachers were nominated from monolingual classrooms: one from Parker School, and two from Washington School. Since the two nominated from Washington School were both first-grade teachers, I decided to choose the teacher whose ELLs had shown greater progress on the school's assessments. Two teachers were nominated by the principal from the bilingual program, and both were chosen in order have two cases who taught in bilingual classrooms and two cases from monolingual classrooms.

Participants

The two teachers from the bilingual program were Rose and Kate (all names are pseudonyms). Rose was a third-grade teacher who had been teaching for over 25 years. She was native-English-speaking, and though not fluent in French, she had a working knowledge of the language through her 25 years of teaching in the bilingual program.

Kate was a fifth-grade teacher who had been teaching for a total of 16 years. It was her third year teaching fifth grade in the bilingual program. She had previously been a middle-school ESL teacher and a high school history teacher. She was fluent in French. During the year of the study, there were four ELL students in Rose's classroom and six ELL students in Kate's classroom. All of the ELL students were French-speakers.

The two teachers from the monolingual programs were Jane and Liz. Jane was a first grade teacher at the Washington School who had been teaching for six years. She had a working knowledge of Spanish, but she said that she did not consider herself fluent in the language. There were six ELL students in her classroom during the year of this study. Four were Spanish-speaking, one was Swedish-speaking and one was Chinse-speaking.

The second teacher, Liz had been teaching for 12 years. She had been both a second- and third-grade teacher, and during the study, she was teaching second grade. She did not consider herself fluent in any language other than English, though she said she had some understanding of Spanish having studied the language in high school. There were five ELL students in her classroom during the year of the study. Three were Spanish-speaking and two were Japanese-speaking.

Data Collection

Data were collected over a period of a full school year (see Table 1). A variety of data were collected including principal questionnaires, interviews with the teachers, observations, stimulated recall sessions, and one end-of-the-year focus group with all four teachers. I did "cluster visits" where I observed three lessons in one week in each teachers' classroom. This way, I was able to see lessons from particular units in various subject areas, allowing for breadth in terms of content areas, and depth of instruction of key ideas and themes across these content areas. Each lesson observed was between 60 and 90 minutes.

Data were collected in seven stages: Stage 1) teacher interviews prior to the beginning of the school year to explore teachers' backgrounds and preparation for teaching, which were tape-recorded and then transcribed by the researcher (Appendix B). The interview questions included ones about the teachers' attitudes towards working with ELLs, what challenges they felt they faced in teaching ELLs, and whether or not they felt it was better for ELLs to be educated in bilingual or monolingual programs and why.

Questions also focused on whether or not they knew how to speak another language, and if they did, how they had learned to do so. In addition, all teachers were asked about where they had grown up and why they had decided to go into teaching.

Stage 2) one cluster visit in each teacher's classroom during their instruction, observing three lessons for each teacher, for a total of twelve lessons. Teachers were audio-recorded using a digital recorder with a wireless microphone the teachers clipped on their shirts while I took field notes to cross-reference these with the audio-recordings. For the field notes, I used a two-column observation protocol (Appendix C). Stage 3) stimulated, audio-recorded recall sessions with each teacher of the observed lessons, during which I took field notes (Appendix D). During the recall sessions, I played the audiotape and stopped it at various intervals to ask questions such as, what were you thinking here when you said that?, or Why did you have your students work in that way? In addition, I would ask the same set of questions each time about their objectives for the lessons, including the planning they did, whether or not they felt the ELLs had understood the objectives of the lesson and why, the assessments they used and why, and any other thoughts they had about how the lesson went.

Stage 4) second teacher interviews to review initial coding and reflect on the initial findings, which were also audio-recorded and during which I took field notes. During this stage, I had created a visual for the participants called "emerging theory of exemplary teaching of ELLs", which included the main categories of "teacher attitude", "background experience" and "classroom practices" with details beneath each category. I asked the teachers to comment on what I had found. My major questions had to do with what they thought of each category and the details supporting that category.
Stage 5) second round of cluster visits, stimulated recall sessions, and discussion of coding and emerging theory, Stage 6) final round of cluster visits, recall sessions and discussion of coding and emerging theory, and Stage 7) focus group to member check emerging theory and reflect upon what it means to be an exemplary teacher of ELLs . During the focus group, the session was audio-recorded and video-recorded, and I asked the teachers four main questions. These were: 1) If you had to prepare a teacher to work with ELLs, what would be the key things you would say you need to know and why?, 2) You teach in different kinds of programs, would you talk about the impact of these programs on your own teaching of ELLs and on the students themselves?, 3) What do you think about teachers' knowledge of students' first language in relation to teaching English to them, do you think it helps or not and why?, and 4) What about the support services in place at your schools for ELLs? Which are helpful for you and for them?

Data Analysis

Data analysis was done in eleven stages (see Table 2). Using constructivist grounded theory, I was analyzing data all the way along the process of collecting data. I had long conversations with the teachers about the data I had collected and my interpretations of the data. I noted what the teachers felt needed to be adjusted and/or expanded upon after each meeting with them, and what they thought was very consistent in terms of how they would interpret the data and who they were as teachers. In this way, as Charmaz (2000) indicated, the teachers and I constructed a knowledge base together of what it takes to

be an exemplary teacher of ELLs and how program context affected their teaching. In addition, I created frequency tables, as indicated in Table 2, for each teacher to show which practices occurred most often among teachers, which occurred more frequently in one context, and which occurred less frequently and then discussed these tables with each teacher during recall sessions and in the final focus group (Appendix E).

Results

The teachers in the study and I identified commonalities across teachers, suggesting a knowledge base of what it takes to be an exemplary teacher of ELLs. These commonalities included four overlapping areas: 1) teachers' knowledge of ELLs, 2) linguistic content knowledge, 3) specific background experiences, and 4) key dispositions.

Teachers' Knowledge of ELL Students

The teachers in this study stressed the importance of "knowing" the ELL students in their class. The areas of knowledge they identified as crucial were: 1) information about their ELLs' previous schooling, 2) what language(s) they spoke at home, 3) the best way to communicate with their students' families, and 4) specific cultural details such as family expectations.

For example, related to the importance of learning about students' prior schooling, Liz realized that that she needed to provide additional information about colonial times for one of her ELL students from Japan. Most of her other students had grown up in the area learning about the American Revolution, whereas this ELL student had no such background knowledge. In understanding this about her student, Liz was able to effectively provide enough background information for the ELL student for him to be able to successfully participate in the unit and lessons.

Jane stated the importance of knowing ELL students' backgrounds in terms of understanding family expectations. She pointed out that she had to learn to communicate solely with a Chinese-speaking ELL student's father when there was any behavioral issue since this was the expectation within that particular student's culture.

Linguistic Content Knowledge

The second area of commonality among the teachers was their linguistic content knowledge (LCK). In all cases, the teachers in this study knew the challenges their ELLs would face in terms of content, and the language within that content. LCK is based on Shulman's (1987) definition of "pedagogical content knowledge" which he defined as "representing the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems or issues are organized, represented and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction" (pp. 15-16). Linguistic content knowledge is distinct from pedagogical content knowledge in that LCK refers to the language needed for ELLs to access content, or "academic language".

The teachers in this study focused specifically on "academic language"; that is, not just on the conversational language that is commonly acquired quickly, but rather, the academic language that is required for students to be successful in school. Cummins (1981) referred to this as the difference between "BICS", basic interpersonal communication skills, or social language, and "CALP", cognitive academic language proficiency", or academic language. Academic language is context-

reduced in nature, and it is a variable that often hinders the academic achievement of ELLs (Fillmore & Snow, 2000; Schleppegrell, 2004). The teachers' LCK was revealed through analyzing data related to their planning and preparation as well as their in-class practices.

Preparation and planning.

The teachers' LCK was demonstrated in their planning and preparation in the following ways: 1) adjusting expectations, 2) expanding ELL students' repertoires for writing, and 3) creating language objectives.

Adjusting expectations.

It is important in defining this category to emphasize that these exemplary teachers did not *water down* curriculum to support their ELLs. Rather, they anticipated what might be particularly difficult for ELLs in terms of language and planned their instruction accordingly. The teachers' adjustments reflected their knowledge of what beginning ELLs would need and what those with more exposure and practice in English would be able to do.

Kate discussed adjusting expectations for her ELLs for a family history project while at the same time not watering down the curriculum. The students in her class all needed to interview a family member. However, she knew from experience that question formation was particularly difficult for her ELL students. Therefore, she scaffolded the assignment for them by providing the correct framing for questions they would need to ask. Her ELL students were doing the same assignment as the other fifth grade students, but with more specific language support planned for and provided by Kate. She said:

Formation of questions is a big issue for ELL students. It's something they always have trouble with, so I provide the frames they need. ELL kids don't necessarily ask that many questions when they're learning language because they tend to be more absorbing of the language and asked to respond to questions rather than formulating them..But with every lesson, the objective for the class as a whole is still the objective for the ELL students...because I'm trying to keep them progressing the way other fifth graders are progressing (second recall session).

Expanding ELL students' repertories for writing.

LCK in the teacher's preparation and planning was also revealed in their focus on expanding their ELLs' repertoires for effective writing. Through careful planning, teachers expanded these repertories in several ways: 1) developing their ELLs' word choice in descriptive writing; 2) helping the ELLs incorporate key content area words into their writing; and 3) aiding ELLs to understand the benefit of planning before writing.

For example, in a writing lesson I observed Jane doing with her first graders, she wanted ELLs to use more sophisticated words to describe objects. She explained in this excerpt how what she called "backwards description" helped build her ELLs' descriptive vocabulary. She explained backwards description as her or a student describing an object and having the other students in the class, especially the ELL students, guess what it was first, then brainstorm additional adjectives to describe the object, and then having the students write the description afterwards. She said:
I have found backwards description to be a way to help ELLs expand upon their

[academic language]. As a newer ELL, you have a limited vocabulary in English, so it can be really difficult to describe something. [Backwards description] is very good for ELLs because they get to hear a lot of different vocabulary before they have to start writing their own descriptions. It gives them more of a foundation to work from (second interview).

Specific language objectives.

The teachers in this study wrote both content and language objectives. These language objectives were more specific language goals for each lesson or unit. To create language objectives for a particular lesson or unit, teachers would make explicit the language demands of the content they needed to teach, and they worked to be sure to focus upon this particular language in their planning so that the ELLs could participate successfully in the lessons.

For example, when Jane was planning a unit on estimation with her first graders, she decided to focus on connecting similar language from other content to aid the ELLs in understanding the word "estimating" in math. To do so, she related the words "prediction" from language arts and "hypothesis" from science to help clarify the idea of estimation in math. Though this benefitted all students, Jane had used these words as specific language objectives for her ELLs. She said,

Relating estimating to what they already knew would not only help all students, but especially the ELLs. I feel like I have to constantly reinforce the language for the ELLs. They can have a hard time with some of these terms, like estimation, so I try to use words they know, like "predicting" to help them understand this new language. (third recall session).

In-class practices.

Teachers' LCK was also revealed through their in-class practices. Two specific practices were: 1) explicitness, and 2) use of ELL students' first language (L1).

***Explicitness*.**

All four teachers were explicit with their ELLs about language errors in their writing and how to correct them. Kate demonstrated explicitness in her teaching. The example below comes from a recall session where Kate talks about the way in which she worked with an ELL student to correct errors in verb tense. Kate emphasized the need to repeat rules in an explicit way in order for the ELLs to eventually be able to correct the errors in their work on their own:

[Helene] made a question with "did" and then used the past tense. That's an extremely common mistake with [ELLs]. I've explained the rule to her at this point multiple times, and she's still doing it, but I just keep correcting her and waiting for it to settle in. And then in her writing journal, if I see the same mistake, I'll circle it and then on the bottom of the page I'll write it out correctly so that when she is writing again, she can look back to remind herself how to fix it (second recall session).

Another example of explicitness comes from Jane. The following excerpt is from my notes during an observation where students were working on their descriptive writing. Here she is working with [Rodrigo], one of her ELLs who is writing about his dinosaur. She works with [Rodrigo] on formulating sentences and correctly using plural forms by using explicit questioning techniques with him:

She goes over to [Rodrigo] to work with him. She helps him formulate his sentences correctly by asking him questions about what he is writing. She helps by writing the sentences directly on the paper. She helps

him with the plural of colors by asking him if there are 1 or 2 colors, and that we put "s" when it has more than one (field notes, second cluster visit).

Use of students' L1.

Using ELL students' L1 demonstrated the teachers' LCK; however, only teachers in the bilingual context used ELLs' L1. Teachers in the bilingual context used the ELLs' native language for support in the following ways: 1) giving translations of words or phrases to clarify concepts, 2) comparing structures in the students' native language to English, 3) providing ELLs with the opportunity to do their writing in their native language.

In an example from Kate's class, she was presenting a social studies lesson in which she was talking with the students about how we learn history. She was doing this as a way to introduce the idea of primary and secondary sources. In this excerpt, Kate is talking to an ELL student, [Helene], who had arrived about a month before this lesson with limited English. This is an example of using ELL students' first language vocabulary to clarify concepts in English, and of allowing ELL students to compose their thoughts and ideas in their native language. Kate says to [Helene]:
What other ways can you learn about history? How do we learn about history? How have you learned history? In your life? (to Helene). Dans ta vie (wait time)….(Helene answers in French)…ok? so write "in class"…and what in class in particular do we learn about history?…where the facts, where the ideas come from…from a book?...Or a teacher? Comment tu apprends l'histoire? D'ou ca vient? (Helene then responds in French)…from your ancestors ? ok, write that down. Do you understand this question? ... Tu comprends?...Then jot down some ideas if you have any ideas…dans cent ans…how could you learn about life in 2007…Comment tu peux apprendre des choses sur maintenant s'il n'est pas des textes d'histoire?...that's sort of the idea, c'est l'idee. Ok?

Specific Background Experiences

Teachers' background experiences that seemed to be influential in the teachers' success with ELLs were: 1) learning a second language, 2) being immersed in a culture other than their own, and 3) years of teaching.

Learning a second language.

All of the teachers in the study expressed that through the experience of learning a second language, whether through school, such as for college requirements (Rose, Jane and Liz), or as part of living abroad later in life (Kate), they were better able to relate to the ELLs' challenges in learning English.

For example, Kate moved to Africa in 1994 with her husband and two small children. They moved to the Cote d'Ivoire, and it was there that she learned to speak French. She did not speak a word of French before she moved there. She said she learned the language by studying it herself and then having to "use it in real life". She emphasized that she had to learn to speak French "not necessarily because she chose to, but because she had to". In speaking with Kate in the two interviews, she was adamant about the fact that her needing to learn a second language was very influential on her attitudes towards working with ELLs and on her ability to teach them effectively. She talked extensively during these interviews about her years in Africa struggling to learn a second language, and how this experience sensitized her to what her ELLs might be

going through when trying to learn English. She talked about "getting upset and exhausted" when trying to communicate in French at the beginning, and that she knew her ELLs felt the same way.

Being immersed in a culture other than their own.

Another background experience that seemed to be influential on these teachers' effectiveness working with ELLs was that of being immersed in a culture other than their own, whether as children or as adults. The teachers articulated that these experiences had positively impacted their work with ELLs in several ways: 1) that they welcomed diversity in their lives and classroom, 2) that they had experienced what it was like to be "the other" and therefore understood what ELLs might be experiencing as "the other" in the classroom, and 3) that they had learned to value differences in people and particularly in their students.

During my first interview with Jane about her background, she described growing up in a diverse community. She felt that this experience not only influenced her ability to teach ELLs, but also her desire to do so. She said:

I lived in a very diverse community growing up, and we had a lot of [ELL children] in our community. So I think I feel like I've always wanted to work with [ELLs] and been used to that in some way. It's what I'm accustomed to. Growing up in my community was really positive for me. I think it made me realize that if [ELLs] are having a difficult time, it's natural. I don't say things like "why can't they learn English?", or "they're not trying to learn", or "why doesn't that family speak English". I like the diversity – it makes things more interesting, so I think I have always felt that way.

In addition, Liz talked about her experience being "the other" when she had traveled abroad to Germany, and she didn't speak the language. She said this had helped her develop empathy for what the ELLs might be going through when they first came to the country not speaking any English. She talked about getting lost on the train in Germany, and how frightening it was for her when she couldn't speak the language and communicate about where she needed to go. She said: "I think if had been thrown into a German school when I was over there, I think I'd be floored. I think it would be so difficult and scary" (second interview).

Jane expressed this sense of "fear" of not knowing the language when she was traveling abroad as well and how this helped her relate to her ELLs. "I think traveling abroad is a really good experience if you are going to be working with [ELLs]. You get a sense of what it is like for [ELLs]. *I was literally afraid* when I didn't understand what people were saying. So I think it kind of gives you that feeling internally of what the trepidation may be like for an [ELL] in your classroom" (second interview).

Years of teaching experience.

All of the teachers in the study had over seven years of teaching experience. These years of teaching experience appeared to have influenced their work with ELLs in the following ways: 1) understanding ELLs' general language development, 2) developing a comfort level in terms of not having a fear or lack of confidence in working with ELLs, 3) developing a "repertoire" of effective strategies for working with ELLs, and 4) understanding that the ELLs in their class were "their

responsibility", not just the ELL teachers' responsibility.

Liz spoke specifically to this notion of responsibility during my second interview with her when we were discussing how her years of teaching ELLs might have impacted her work with these students. She said:
The way I look at it, you're responsible for the development and the growth of the [ELL] child in the classroom, and then I feel like the ELL teachers support what I'm doing in the classroom. It's my responsibility, and I'm being supported by the ELL teacher, and with that I need to advocate for the student. That if they need more support, you get it, and if you think they need less support, and you want more time with the child in the classroom, that I'm advocating that, for what's best for the children.

What is important to stress here, however, was that it was not just the years of teaching that had positively affected these teachers' ability to work with ELLs. It seemed to be their capacity to *reflect* on their working with ELLs over the years that positively affected their ability to teach them. The teachers talked about reflecting on such things as what worked in their lessons and what did not in relation to their ELLs.

Key Dispositions

All four teachers in this study had commonalities in dispositions. Dispositions in this case are defined as tendencies "to exhibit frequently, consciously, and voluntarily a pattern of behavior that is directed to a broad goal" (Katz, 1993, p. 1). The commonalities were: 1) sensitivity, 2) encouragement, 3) positive attitude toward teaching ELLs and, 4) humor about themselves.

Sensitivity.

In all cases, the teachers in this study demonstrated sensitivity towards their ELLs. Sensitivity is defined as the teachers' insight into the psychological and emotional needs of their ELLs. In my two interviews with Rose, she spoke often about these needs. It was clear from our conversations that she thought teachers needed to know how difficult it can be for ELLs when they first arrive. In our first interview, she said:
Sometimes you get [ELL students] who are not happy to be here. Those are the ones who can be really resistant. It can take those kids the whole first year to get comfortable, and it can be miserable for them. They miss everything that is "home", so you can't push it. But you have to support them. Let them know that the next day will be better. You have to consider every day that if they do something in English, it's great; and that gradually, they will succeed (first interview)

Encouragement.

I defined this category as one in which the teachers were able to urge their students on by using words to motivate them, such as "great," "wow," "keep it going," "nice job," among others. In this example from Liz, she is having students read their examples of transitional words and phrases, and she is highlighting on of her ELL's work and encouraging her with words:
[Tomika], you started yours off nicely. Do you want to share it? Great, go ahead. (Tomiko reads the beginning of her story). Good word choice (Tomiko continues reading). Love it!! Love it, and I like [Tomika] did something a little different, she almost told the story from an outside point of view, so very interesting! Great job! (second observation, second cluster visit).

Positive attitude.

The teachers in this study never considered the ELLs in their classrooms to be a burden. The teachers saw having these students as an opportunity to improve their own teaching by trying out different techniques, using flexibility within their lessons, and constantly rethinking units and lessons with ELLs' needs in mind. Kate talked about how ELLs had positively affected her own growth in terms of always wanting to improve her teaching. She said, "Every year I'll think of something that I think I can do a little bit better for [the ELLs], and I'll make a change to make it better" (first interview).

Humor.

The teachers all had senses of humor about themselves which was an endearing quality. I could see that although they were extremely thoughtful and planned when it came to effectively working with ELLs, they also found humor in their failures and successes with these students. They demonstrated the importance of using humor, even at the expense of looking pretty silly, to help their ELLs feel more relaxed in the classroom. I often observed the ELLs, as well as other students in the teachers' classrooms, laughing with the teachers and enjoying themselves. Below, Kate described using humor as a "magnet" for her ELL students

I think [humor] keeps the ELL kids paying attention. I think it attracts them to try to listen to my class more. You know, if the [ELL students] sense that there's something funny going on, they're gonna be more likely to try to want to join into that stream than if I'm just sort of a teacher sitting up there in a very serious dry way. I don't think there's going to be much of a magnet for them to be attracted to trying to follow along (second recall session)

Role of Contexts

The results from this study suggest that teaching in a bilingual context was a more positive experience for the teachers and the ELLs. In terms of the experience for teachers, those in the bilingual context felt it was "easier" for them in terms of instruction. Teachers in both contexts agreed that there were more testing pressures on teachers in the monolingual context; and, that teachers in the bilingual context had an advantage in more quickly determining whether or not ELLs had learning disabilities.

With regard to the experiences of ELLs, teachers in the bilingual context perceived ELLs feeling their first language (L1) was valued, and that ELLs felt less stress overall in the bilingual context.

Ease of instruction.

Kate mentioned several times during the interviews, recall sessions and focus group that she felt it would be harder for her if she needed to teach ELLs in a program where she could not use or did not know ELLs' L1. The best example of this is a quote from the focus group. She said simply:
It makes teaching [ELLs] at our school a lot easier because we have the hook with knowing students' [L1], whereas if you had a multi-language situation [like in the monolingual programs] and you're trying to teach speakers of all types of languages, it would be much harder.

Rose echoed this sentiment during my second interview with her. She said:

It's more difficult for teachers in a monolingual system. I mean, I don't have to

know four languages, I just have to know one. In a monolingual setting you really have to work harder to make sure the ELLs understand. It's never a problem here because you have all the other kids in the class who speak [ELLs' L1]. I think that makes it easier for us.

Testing pressures.

When I asked Liz the question during our first interview about what she thought teachers needed to know to teacher ELLs effectively, she said that they needed to be prepared for the pressures of standardized testing. She talked about how difficult this was for her and for the ELLs in her class since they were required to take the math portion of the state-mandated assessments, even if the ELLs had only just arrived to the school without speaking any English. ELLs in the bilingual program did not have to take these same state-mandated assessments.

Ability to identify learning disabilities.

Jane and Liz expressed in our interviews that not knowing the ELLs' L1 nor having someone readily available to translate put them and the ELL child at a disadvantage. They could not always effectively identify whether an ELL was struggling due to not understanding English or due to a learning disability. In the bilingual program, assessments were available in both French and English, and there was a French learning specialist at the school as well. Therefore, any learning issues could be quickly identified and addressed, providing the ELL with appropriate supports in his or her L1.

Value of L1.

The teachers in the bilingual program felt that having a bilingual program sent a message to the ELLs that their L1 was valued. During our first interview, Kate said, "When [ELLs] first language is used for instruction, it empowers them rather than making them feel like their [L1] is something to be gotten rid of". Rose also felt that the bilingual program showed the value of ELLs' first language and of being bilingual. In our first interview, she said: "I think at our school we recognize that the child's [L1] has value. I think that's very important. If the child knows his [L1] is valued, and important, and looked upon as something positive, then that makes them feel better about themselves, and they perform better. The see that we are making them bilingual, not trying to make them monolingual".

ELLs' stress levels.

There was the perception by all of the teachers that the ELLs in the bilingual program did not feel as much stress as they would if they had to learn English in a monolingual program. When I asked them in the focus group about how they thought the program they taught in affected their teaching and the students, Kate said that because they knew French, it was like "a piece of driftwood to hold onto" for the ELLs. In other words, it wasn't a "sink or swim" situation .

Liz also spoke about how much more quickly she thought her ELL students could adjust if they could use their L1 consistently like in the bilingual program. She said: "I know it's a challenge for [Atsuko] that no one speaks Japanese here. Whereas if everyone were speaking Japanese and could speak Japanese, that it would be easier for him. I think he would feel more comfortable".

Discussion and Implications

In 2005, Bransford, Darling-Hammond and LePage developed a framework to codify a knowledge base for teaching. Their framework included three intersecting areas of knowledge: knowledge of learners and their development within social contexts, knowledge of subject matter and curriculum goals, and knowledge of teaching in light of the content and learners to be taught. The theory developed from the current study for the knowledge needed to become an effective teacher of ELLs (Figure 1) modifies the three areas by Bransford et. al. and adds two additional areas. The modified areas are: 1) knowledge of ELLs (from knowledge of learners and their development) and 2) linguistic content knowledge (from knowledge of subject matter). The two additional areas are: 1) specific background experiences, and 2) key dispositions. In the next section, I will discuss how each modified area and new area relates to current research as well as the implications of these findings.

Knowledge of ELLs

Knowledge of students in effective classrooms for ELLs requires more than just theories of learning and development and the effects of social context on learning (Bransford, et. al., 2005). Knowledge of ELLs speaks specifically to the kinds of information teachers need to gather about their ELLs in order for effective instruction to occur. When teachers do not make attempts to find out about their ELL students' cultures, this can negatively impact teachers' perceptions of their ELLs and potentially negatively impact their ELLs' learning (Echevarria et al., 2007; Huss-Keeler, 1997; Rueda, August, & Goldenberg, 2006).

Teachers can easily be informed about ELLs' background knowledge using guides such as the one provided by Brisk and Harrington (2007) called "Protocol to gather information about learners" (p. 211). Their guide provides teachers with the kinds of questions to ask students' families and to ELLs to get information about their schooling experiences, attitudes about learning English and being in this country, and other personality traits.

Linguistic Content Knowledge

The second category in the theory suggests that effective teachers of ELLs need knowledge of the specific language demands of the content they need to teach. This differs from the Bransford et al. (2005) model in that they emphasized teachers having subject matter knowledge, but they did not discuss the importance of teachers understanding the language demands of the subject matter. Current research suggests that teachers must be able to understand the language-specific demands of content in order to anticipate what language might be problematic for ELLs (Brisk, 2006; Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2007; Fillmore & Snow, 2000; Schleppegrell, 2004; Tellez & Waxman, 2005; Valdes, Bunch, Snow, Lee, & Matos, 2005). Fillmore and Snow (2000) maintain that with the increasing numbers of ELLs in classrooms, "today's teachers need a thorough understanding of how language figures in education," and that, "too few teachers . . . understand the challenges inherent in learning to speak and read Standard English" (pp. 1-2). In essence, teaching content includes teaching the language required to understand that content.

Specific Background Experiences

The third category suggests that the teachers in the study were effective due to certain background experiences. These experiences were learning a second language and being immersed in cultures different from their own. The role learning a second language in effectively teaching ELLs is consistent with current literature (Baca & Escamilla, 2005; Hyatt & Beigy; Nieto & Rolon, 1997). It seems to "giv[e] [teachers] insight into the language and learning process and the experiences of their students" (Lucas & Grinberg, 2008, p. 611). Youngs & Youngs (2001), in a study of 143 teachers, found that teachers who had completed one or more years of foreign language classes in high school or college were "significantly more positive about teaching [ELL] students than were teachers who had not taken any foreign language classes" (p. 110).

In addition, Youngs & Youngs (2001) found that classroom teachers who had lived or taught outside of the U.S. had significantly more positive attitudes towards working with ELLs than those lacking such experiences. However, of note, they found that simply traveling abroad did not affect attitudes– that it was the importance of an extended period of time that seemed to matter. However, findings from this study suggest that even a shorter period of time did make a positive difference for these teachers.

Key Dispositions

The importance of teachers having certain types of dispositions has been placed at the forefront of teacher education by organizations such as NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2007). The types of dispositions defined as important for teachers to have are in line with the kinds of dispositions found of the effective teachers in this study. For example, NCATE's Standard 1 requires that: Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate...professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. In order to meet the target for "professional dispositions", teacher candidates must "demonstrate classroom behaviors that create caring and supportive learning environments and encourage self-directed learning by all students" (NCATE, 2007).

Part of this notion of a "caring and supportive environment" could be linked to the teachers in this study's use of encouragement. As suggested in research on second language acquisition, motivation can be a critical element to successfully acquiring a second language (Gass & Selinker, 2001; Krashen, 1982; Lightbown & Spada, 1999; Skehan, 1989). In fact, it appears to be the second strongest predictor of success behind aptitude.

In addition, all of the teachers in the study had affirming, positive attitudes towards working with ELLs. This is consistent with research on culturally responsive teaching which emphasizes the critical role teachers' positive attitudes towards their students' and cultures plays in these students' success (deJong & Harper, 2005; Delpit, 2002; Maxwell-Jolly & Gandara, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). "Teachers who view linguistic diversity and bilingualism as resources rather than deficiencies are also more likely to recognize that limited proficiency in English is not equated with limited ability to learn" (Lucas & Grinberg, 20008, p. 613).

Conclusion and Future Directions

A knowledge base necessary to become an effective teacher of ELLs has been posited

here. This knowledge base includes the four overlapping areas of: 1) teachers' knowledge of ELLs, 2) linguistic content knowledge, 3) specific background experiences, and 4) key dispositions. Though limited in sample size, findings from this study reflect current research suggesting that teacher preparation programs must take these areas into account in order to better prepare teachers to work with ELLs (deJong & Harper, 2005; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Tellez & Waxman, 2006). The preparation could take the form of mentors who are particularly effective at working with ELLs, guided experiences interacting with a linguistically-diverse community, explicit instruction in language structures in English, and identifying and building on ELLs' prior knowledge. In addition, findings from this study suggest that teachers in the bilingual program found identifying learning difficulties easier, and perceived that ELLs felt that their language was valued because they were learning through their L1 in addition to English. This suggests that rather than eliminating bilingual programs, consideration should be given to how these programs can help both ELLs and their teachers.

The importance of background experiences and dispositions to effective teaching of ELL students are ones in which more research would be necessary. It would be useful to determine if other effective teachers of ELL students have and the kinds of dispositions of the teachers in this study. In this way, it may be possible to determine if there should be certain requirements of teachers who are going to work with ELL students, such as knowing how to be encouraging and caring towards ELL students. Finally, if ELL students are to succeed in classrooms, regardless of the type of program, further research into the knowledge bases of successful teachers of ELLs is critical.

References

Allington, R. L., & Johnston, P. H. (2000). What do we know about effective fourth grade teachers and their classrooms? Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

August, D. & Shannahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Reading Panel on language-minority children and youth.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Baca, L, & Escamilla, K. (2005). Educating teachers about language. In C.T. Adger, C.E. Snow, & D. Christian (eds.), *What teachers need to know about language*, 71-84. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Berliner, D. C. (1994). Expertise: The wonder of exemplary performances. In J. N. Mangieri & C. C. Block (Eds.), *Creating powerful thinking in teachers and students: Diverse perspectives* (pp. 161-186). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Block, C. C., & Mangieri, J. (2003). *Exemplary literacy teachers: Promoting success for all children in grades K-5*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Bransford, J., Darling-Hammond, L., & LePage, P. (2005). Introduction. In L. Darling- Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 1-39). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Brisk, M. & Harrington, M. M. (2007). *Literacy and bilingualism: A handbook for ALL teachers (2nd ed).* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 509-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. In A. Iran-Nejad & C.D. Pearson (Eds.). *Review of research in education* (pp. 249-305).

Coleman, R. & Goldenberg, C. (2010). What does the research say about effective practices for English Learners? Part III: Promoting literacy development. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 46*(3), 106-11.

Coyne, M., Kame'enui, E. & Carnine, D. (2011). Effective teaching strategies that accommodate diverse learners (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ.

deJong, E. & Harper, C. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-Language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Spring.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2007). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Facella, M. A., Rampino, K. M., & Shea, E. K. (2005). Effective teaching strategies for English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 29*(1), 209-221.

Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. (2000). *What teachers need to know about language* (No. ED-99-CO-0008). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Garcia, E. (1991). Effective instruction for language minority students: The teacher. *Journal of Education, 173*(2), 130-141.
Garcia, E., & Curry-Rodriguez, J. (2000). The education of limited English proficient students in California schools: An assessment of the influence of Proposition 227 on selected districts and schools. *Bilingual Research Journal, 24*(1 & 2), 15-35.

Graves, A. W., Gersten, R., & Haager, D. (2004). Literacy instruction in multiple-language first-grade classrooms: Linking student outcomes to observed instructional practice. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 19*(4), 262- 272

Grimmett, P. & MacKinnon, A. (1992). Craft knowledge and the education of teachers. In *Review of research in education* (vol. 18, pp. 385-456). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Hyatt, D.E. & Beigy, A. (1999). Making the most of unknown language experience: Pathways for reflective teacher development. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 25*(1), 31-40.

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

Lucas, T. (2005). Fostering a commitment to social justice through service learning: Hopes, plans, and realities in a teacher education course. In N.M. Michelli & D.L. Keiser (eds.), *Education for democracy and social justice* (pp. 167-188). New York: Routledge.

Lucas, T. & Grinberg, J. (2008). Responding to the linguistic reality of mainstream classrooms: Preparing all teachers to work with English language learners. In Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman-Nemser, S., McIntyre, D.J. & Demers, K.E. (Eds.). *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, 3rd Edition*. (pp. 606-636). New York, NY: Routledge

Mathes, P.G., Pollard-Durodola, S. D., Cardenas-Hagan, E., Linan-Thompson, S., & Vaughn, S. (2007). Teaching struggling readers who are native Spanish speakers: What do we know? *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools, 38,* 260-271.

McDermott, P.C. & Rothenberg, J.J. (2000). *The characteristics of effective teachers in high poverty schools – Triangulating our data.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Miles, M. B., & A. M. Huberman (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D. & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(2), 132-141.

Palmer, D.K. & Garcia, E. (2000). Voices from the field: Bilingual educators speak candidly about Proposition 227. *Bilingual Research Journal, 24*(1&2), 169-178.

Porter, A. C., & Brophy, J. (1988). Synthesis of research on good teaching: Insights from the work of the institute for research on teaching. *Educational Leadership, 45*(8), 74-85.

Reyes, L. L. (1992). Challenging venerable assumptions: Literacy instruction for linguistically different students. *Harvard Educational Review, 62*(4), 427-446.

Ruddell, R. B. (1997). Researching the influential literacy teacher: Characteristics, beliefs, strategies, and new research directions. In C. K. Kinzer, K. A. Hinchman, & D. J. Lue (Eds.), *Inquiries in literacy theory and practice: 46th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 37-53). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Rueda, R. S., August, D,. & Goldenberg, C. (2006). The sociocultural context in which children acquire literacy. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children.* Erlbaum Associates.

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

Shanahan, T., & Beck, I. (2006). Effective literacy teaching for English Language Learners. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth* (pp. 415-488). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stritikus, T. & Garcia, E. (2000). Education of limited English proficient students in California schools: An assessment of the influence of Proposition 227 on selected teachers and classrooms. *Bilingual Research Journal, 24*(1&2), 75-85.

Taylor, B. M., Pressley, M., & Pearson, D. (2000*). Effective teachers and schools: Trends across recent studies.* Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Tellez, K., & Waxman, H. C. (2005). *Effective professional development programs for teachers of English Language Learners.* Retrieved July 19, 2008, from www.temple.edu/lss

Tellez, K. & Waxman, H.C. (Eds). (2006). *Preparing quality educators for English language learners.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Tikunoff, W. J. (1983). *Compatibility of the SBIF features with other research on instruction for LEP students* (Research/Technical No. SBIF-83-R.9/10). San Francisco: Far West Lab for Educational Research and Development.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2011). *The Condition of Education 2011* (NCES 2011-033).

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

Vaughn, S., Mathes, P., Linan-Thompson, S., Cirino, P., Carlson, C., Pollard-Durodola,S., Cardenas-Hagan, E. & Francis, D. (2006). Effectiveness of an English intervention for first-grade English language learners at risk for reading problems. *The Elementary School Journal, 107*(2), 153-180.

Villegas, A.M. & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Wiggins, R. A., & Follo, F. (1999) Development of knowledge, attitudes, and commitment to teach diverse student populations. *Journal of Teacher Education* v. 50 no. 2 (March/April) p. 94-105.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6,* 323-346.

Youngs, C. S. & Youngs, G.A. (2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes toward ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 97-120.

Zwiers, J. (2008). *Building academic language: Essential practices for content classrooms, grades 5-12.* San Francisco: Jossey -Bass.

TABLE 1
Data Collection Timeline

Table1
Data Collection Timeline

Types of Data	Aug06	Sept06	Oct06	Nov06	Dec06	Jan07	Feb07	Mar07	Apr07	May07	June07
Interviews	x						x				
Observations		x	x		x	x		x	x		
Recall Sessions				x			x			x	
Field Notes/ Memos	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Focus Group											x

Table 2
Data Analysis Stages and Descriptions

Stage 1: Memoing	Memoing was done while transcribing all observations, interviews and recall sessions. During this process, initial themes and patterns among the data were noted. Memos began with simple words and phrases, such as "compassion", "laughter", "questioning ELLs", "slow and deliberate speed when talking", etc. A time stamp was placed next to each phrase or word.
Stage 2: Open Coding	Initial coding, or open coding (Strauss & Corbin), was done while memoing. The open codes were not placed into more specific categories until second round of observations and recall sessions were completed.
Stage 3: Data Display	After transcribing the second round of observations and recall sessions, data were categorized into larger themes and ideas and put into a data display (Miles and Huberman, 1994).
Stage 4: Initial Frequency Tables	Under each category in the initial data display, instances from the time-stamped data were plugged in to note the frequency of occurrences.
Stage 5: Initial Diagrams	Visuals were created called "emerging theory of exemplary teaching of ELLs" and "contextual influences on teaching ELLs" and presented to the teachers for input/comment.
Stage 6: Refining Theory	New data from recall sessions, interviews with teachers, and observations were used to refine theory. Codes were refined for teacher practices to include "preparation and planning", "in-class practices" and "observable attitudes towards ELLs".
Stage 7: Focus Group	All teachers met together at end of the school year to member-check the refined theory of what it takes to be an exemplary teacher of ELLs.
Stage 8: Line by Line Axial Coding	Line by line analysis of each teacher's interviews and field notes during the interviews looking for any additional details about their background experiences that may have influenced their successful teaching of ELLs.
Stage 9: Nvivo Analysis	To further examine practices the teachers used, all data was entered into Nvivo and tree codes were developed for the main categories of "preparation and planning", "in-class practices" and "observable attitudes". Sub-codes were added under each main code such as "use of visuals" under in-class practices". Coding reports were run for each code indicating the sentences, phrases or words that fell under each sub-code for each teacher.
Stage 10: Final Frequency Tables	After analyzing the coding reports, frequency tables were made (Appendix E) using main categories and sub-codes for each teacher to show which practices occurred most often among teachers, which occurred more frequently in one context, and which occurred less frequently.

Appendix A

Qualities of Exemplary Teaching, Data Collection Form

Directions: The purpose of this study is to identify the qualities possessed and regularly exhibited by exemplary teachers of English language learners. You have been selected because of your expertise as a supervisor of these teachers. The information of the first page will remain confidential. The answers that you provide will be analyzed anonymously by the researcher. When all data have been tallied, the researcher will ask you to confirm the accuracy of the data and to change findings that were interpreted inaccurately.

Part 1

Name _____

Title _____

School District _____

Address _____

City, State, Zip Code _____

Phone number _____

Email _____

Fax _____

Number of years of supervisory experience _____

Number of years at current position _____

Grade levels that you supervise _____

Name and grade level of the teacher you are nominating _____

Part II

Reflect on whom you have identified as an exemplary teacher of English language learners. Select the two most important behaviors that distinguish this exemplary teacher in his or her abilities to teach English language learners. State two characteristics that make this teacher effective at teaching English language learners at his/her particular grade level. These characteristics are the one that you most credit this teacher's success in teaching English language learners. Your descriptions can be written in a global, all-inclusive format or can be written in a more specific manner. Please write your responses below:

Appendix B
First Interview Protocol

Question	Designed to Find Out….
Where are you from?	Teacher background; put teacher at ease
How long have you been teaching?	Teacher background; specific information
What was your first teaching job?	Teacher background; reflect on past experiences
Why did you go into teaching?	Teacher background; motivation
Do you know how to speak another language? If so, how did you learn it?	Teacher background
What has been your training in working with English language learners?	Teacher background; specific information on studied population
How many ELLs have you had in your classes over the years?	Teacher background; specific information on studied population
What kinds of strategies do you use with the ELLs in your classroom? Are they different from what you use with your regular mainstream students?	Teaching methods; specific information on studied population
Can you give me some examples of what strategies you use to teach language specifically?	Teaching methods; specific information on language teaching
Have you been trained to teach language specifically?	Teaching methods; specific information on language teaching
How do you think ELL students acquire English? Do you have a theory of second language acquisition?	Teacher knowledge; reflection on language theory
How do you feel about have ELLs in your classroom?	Teacher understanding; reflection on specific population
Have your feelings changed about these students over the years? If so, how have your feelings changed?	Teacher understanding; reflection/inquiry on specific population
What are some of the biggest challenges you have faced in teaching ELLs? Have these challenges changed over the years?	Challenges teachers face in each setting
Have you received additional support in teaching ELLs? If so, what kind of support have you been given?	Challenges teachers face; kind of support that is in place in each setting; teacher training
Are there any kinds of services you feel the ELL students in your classroom should be getting that they are not getting?	Teacher support/challenges; information on studied population
What are some of the biggest successes you have had in teaching ELLs?	Teacher background; successes teachers have had with studied population
What would you say teachers need to know in order to teach ELLs successfully?	Specific information on teaching studied population

How would you say your setting of a bilingual/monolingual English immersion environment influences how you teach ELLs?	Contextual influences on teaching ELLs
How do you feel about bilingual education?	Teacher attitudes
Do you feel it is better for ELL students to be educated in English only immersion or have a bilingual education? Why?	Teacher attitudes
How do you feel it might be for the ELL students in your class to be learning English?	Teacher attitudes
What do you think makes you so effective in working with ELLs?	Teacher beliefs; teacher inquiry
Are there other teachers in the school who you think are effective at working with ELLs? Why do you think they are effective?	Teacher beliefs; teacher inquiry
What is your relationship with the parents of the ELL students in your classroom? Do you communicate with them? If so, how?	Teacher attitudes; information on studied population
Do you feel that the ELL parents are involved in their students' education? How or how are they not?	Teacher attitudes; information on studied population
What are some of the biggest challenges the ELL students in your classrooms face?	Challenges in each setting
How do you help them with these challenges?	Challenges in each setting; teacher training
What else do you feel is important to know about your working with ELLs?	Additional information; teacher reflection
Are there other things you would like to talk about with regard to your teaching ELLs that we haven't addressed yet?	Additional information; teacher reflection

Appendix C
Simulated Recall Session Protocol

Teacher Name:
School:
Lesson Recalled:
Date of Lesson:
Today's Date:
Time:

*Notes were typed in as the teacher recalled the lesson. Recall session followed this general outline.

What was your objective for the lesson?	
Why did you use this particular strategy?	
What aspect of language were you hoping to teach in this lesson?	
What was the target for the ELL students during this lesson?	
Can you tell me what you were thinking when you began the lesson?	
What was the procedure that you were going through in your mind?	
Why did you have your students work in this way? (group or individual work)	
Did you feel that the students understood the lesson?	
What tools did you use for assessment?	
What challenges do you feel the ELL students had during this lesson?	
Did you feel that the lesson went well? Why or why not?	

Appendix D
Observation Protocol

Teacher Name:
School:
Date:
Lesson Observed:
Location:
Time:

Action Observed	Interpretation

Appendix E

Number of Occurrences: Preparation and Planning

Categories	Kate bilingual context	Rose bilingual context	Liz monolingual context	Jane monolingual context
A. Preparation/Planning				
1. Use of themes/units	42	41	27	27
2. Making connections among concepts	53	44	33	51
3. Knowledge of students	93	96	106	101
4. Adjusting expectations	72	85	68	71
5. Grouping/pairing (in planning phase of lesson)	28	27	22	28
6. Comfortable environment	38	48	37	25
7. Focus on academic language[b]	63	50	121	99
8. Language objectives[b]	66	66	119	98
9. Word rich environment[b]	45	44	79	90
10. Organization[a]	64	57	123	89
11. Exemplars/models[a]	44	39	76	40

[a]Occurrences that were higher for Liz

[b]Occurrences that were much higher in certain contexts

Number of Occurernces: In-class Practices

Categories	Kate bilingual context	Rose bilingual context	Liz monolingual context	Jane monolingual context
B. In-class Practices (during lessons)				
1. Use of visuals[a]	62	71	60	69
2. Explicitness[a]	66	73	88	77
3. Frequent check-ins with ELL students[a]	94	74	105	81
4. Use of first language[b]	49	32	6	8
5. Repetition of key vocabulary and phrases[b]	64	52	119	86
6. Routines[b]	18	15	59	55
7. Prompting/coaching[c]	76	83	162	90
8. Use of exemplars/models[c]	63	56	93	42
9. Wait time	35	47	43	37
10. Gestures	11	10	0	4
11. Rephrasing	31	32	22	30
12. Making connections	37	42	50	50
13. Slow speech	21	29	35	19
14. Humor	26	27	15	13
15. Grouping	27	22	32	22
16. Selective about corrections in writing	16	19	16	22

[a]Occurrences that were the highest for all teachers
[b]Occurrences that were higher in certain contexts
[c]Occurrences that were higher for Liz