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Abstract

This mixed-methods study examined the impact of teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs and instructional practices when teaching English Language Learners (ELLs). The researcher utilized an integrated mixed-methods design. Quantitative and qualitative data were sequentially collected, concurrently analyzed, and triangulated. First, quantitative data were gathered with Research Question 1: To what extent and in what manner do teachers’ self-efficacy (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management), and instructional strategies (student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance feedback) predict teachers’ adaptive instruction in K-12 classrooms that include ELLs? A sample of 126 experienced K-12 Connecticut educators completed (a) a demographic survey, (b) a teachers’ self-efficacy survey and (c) a classroom strategy scale. A stepwise multilinear regression procedure determined that (a) academic performance feedback, (b) efficacy in student engagement, (c) student-directed instruction, and (d) direct instruction significantly correlated with adaptive instruction. Second, qualitative data were obtained from ten participants (from the quantitative sample), who self-rated as having high self-efficacy and classroom strategy use. Research Question 2 inquired: For K-12 teachers with high self-efficacy and frequent usage of a variety of instructional strategies, how are these strategies used to support English Language Learners? Specific strategies and adaptive
instruction using a culturally relevant pedagogy, technology, and appropriate feedback were identified. The triangulated results revealed that when leadership provided professional learning, an inclusive curriculum, and collaborative time, it positively impacted teachers’ self-efficacy to instruct English Language Learners.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Currently, one out of every 10 students in the United States is an English Language Learner (Hussar & Bailey, 2020). English Language Learners (ELLs) are students who “participate in language assistance programs to help ensure that they attain English proficiency and meet the same academic achievement standards that all students are expected to meet” (McFarland et al., 2018, p. 70). As a result of their increasing numbers in the student population, educators must have the proper support for this growing constituency.

Despite their cognitive strengths, ELLs are more likely to be identified for special education, less likely to be enrolled in gifted programs, and less likely to graduate from high school (Chu, 2013; Kanno & Cromley, 2015; Murphy, 2014). Moreover, ELLs are often misidentified for special education and “pulled from general education classrooms to spend time in special education working on ‘deficits’ that really aren’t deficits at all but rather the process of language acquisition” (Gottschalk, 2019, p. 144). Harper and de Jong (2004) contend that there is a widespread misperception that ELLs require “just good teaching” (p. 152). Turgut et al., concur stating that it is necessary to dispel this misunderstanding because “unlike their native English speaking peers, ELLs must learn academic content in the different subject areas (e.g., math, science, history) and simultaneously develop proficiency in the English language in mainstream classrooms” (p. 293). Accordingly, instructional changes are necessary to remedy educational inadequacies for ELLs (August, 2018; Turgut et al., 2019).

To close the achievement gap, it is important that educators who are teaching English Language Learners, adapt their instruction to their students’ unique characteristics while attending to their linguistic needs (Samson & Collins, 2012; Waxman, 1985). Since exceptional teachers familiarize themselves with their students’ strengths and challenges while flexibly
adjusting their instruction to the students (Darling-Hammond, 2016; Snow, 1980), these teaching characteristics should be applied to this population of learners, as well. ELL backgrounds are often distinct due to dissimilarities in their first or native language educational background language areas of proficiency (oral, listening, reading, and writing) and cultural experiences (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017). When teachers use adaptive instruction, they flexibly respond to their students’ learning needs and adapt their teaching with modifications and accommodations (Reddy & Dudek, 2014). This requires a level of self-efficacy and knowledge of strategies that can be adapted to instruction when working with ELLs (Paneque & Barbetta, 2006).

Research has shown that teachers with high instructional self-efficacy have more positive relationships with their students, implement classroom management, and provide more challenging assignments than teachers with low instructional self-efficacy (Summers et al., 2017). Self-efficacy (SE) refers to “How well one can execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situations” (Bandura, 1982, p. 122). Teachers’ self-efficacy describes “teachers’ belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated” (Guskey & Passaro, 1994, p. 4). When teachers believe they can influence the outcome of events in their classrooms, it improves their motivation, lesson planning, classroom management, mastery-orientation, and perseverance (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001a). These classroom practices positively affect student achievement (Hatti, 2012; Marzano, 2003; Snow, 2002; Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004). Therefore, as classroom teachers welcome an increasing number of linguistically diverse students, teaching with a high sense of self-efficacy may advance ELL academic achievement. ELL training is particularly important in the context of teaching ELLs because many instructors
exhibit a lack of confidence when teaching linguistically diverse students (Lucas et al., 2015). Teachers’ self-efficacy and instructional practices can be improved with effective professional learning and coaching (Kraft et al., 2018). Moreover, Kraft et al. described coaches as individuals who “observe teachers’ instruction and provide feedback to help them improve.” The authors specify that “coaching is intended to be individualized, time-intensive, sustained over the course of a semester or year, context-specific, and focused on discrete skills. (p. 3).

Professional Learning (PL) can prepare teachers to adopt culturally relevant teaching strategies, “a pedagogy that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 20). Since ELLs come from culturally diverse backgrounds, it is imperative for teachers to understand their cultural heritages, beliefs, traditions, and values to effectively advance ELL cognitive development (Villegas, 2018). The needs of ELLs are so intertwined with their cultural background that the United States Department of Education also refers to ELLs as Culturally Linguistically Diverse (CLD) students (Gonzalez et al., 2011).

Rationale for Selecting the Topic

As the multilingual student population increases, the need to provide all students with high-quality, student-centered, learning opportunities becomes increasingly important (Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004). The United States Department of Education (2018) specifies that ELLs are students between the ages 3 and 21, who were born outside the United States speak a native language other than English, and who have scored below the State's English proficient level in speaking, reading, writing, or comprehension. The academic community has extensively explored that these dual language learners have cognitive strengths such as an increased attention span, task-switching, creativity, problem solving abilities, working memory, and cognitive
flexibility (Bialystok, Craik & Luk, 2012; Martin-Rhee & Bialystok, 2008; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017; Prior & MacWhinney, 2010). Despite these strengths, an achievement gap between ELLs and non-ELLs has persisted for the past two decades (McFarland et al., 2018; Saunders & Marcelletti, 2013).

In the historic case, Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974), the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that all learners, regardless of origin or language, are legally entitled to an equal and appropriate education. However, statistics spanning over two decades have demonstrated that ELLs continually underperform academically in comparison to other students (Saunders & Marcelletti, 2013). Educators would like to address this achievement gap but need adequate instructional supports (Calderón et al., 2011). All teachers are responsible for the progress of these students and the provision of differentiated instruction for those who are mainstreamed into their classrooms. Legislation, such as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110) and the subsequent, Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-95) have been put in place to ensure that educators address all students’ academic needs, including ELLs (United States Department of Education, 2017).

Meanwhile, The United States Department of Education (USDE) states that it is committed to educate all students to be globally and culturally competent individuals including people who are globally and culturally competent are proficient in at least two languages; aware of the differences that exist between cultures; critical and creative thinkers, who can understand diverse perspectives; and able to operate at a professional level in intercultural and international contexts. (USDE, 2018, p. 3)

Moreover, teachers are obligated to demonstrate adequate yearly progress in the areas of reading and math (Title I) and Annual Measurable Objectives (Title III) for their ELLs.
However, legislation alone will not improve the outcomes for ELL students; it is the way that these policies are implemented by practitioners at every level that will make the difference. However, little research has been conducted to identify teachers' self-efficacy beliefs in the instruction of ELLs (Santibañez & Gándara, 2018). The present study was used to investigate the instructional practices, such as culturally relevant teaching, that teachers with high self-efficacy use to promote the academic success of their English Language Learners.

**Statement of the Problem**

Although ELLs can accomplish academic and social success when they are provided instruction that supports their linguistic and cultural needs, there has been a disparity in academic achievement that occurs in every grade level and spans more than 40 years (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2018; McFarland et al. 2018; Murphy, 2014; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017). As diverse student populations expand, and more ELLs are placed in the mainstream classroom setting, it has become increasingly apparent that instructors need to teach ELLs using appropriate supports to eliminate their academic gaps (Hussar & Bailey, 2020). Unfortunately, research indicates that many teachers are not receiving the “essential standards, knowledge, and skills that general education teachers ought to possess in order to provide effective instruction to ELLs placed in their classroom” (Samson & Collins, 2012, p. 2). In addition, teachers have self-reported large gaps in their ELL preparation, professional learning, and support (Hansen-Thomas et. al., 2016; Lucas et al., 2015; Prahlad et al., 2017; Santibañez & Gándara, 2018). Furthermore, teachers have indicated that they lack the self-efficacy to impact student learning for linguistically diverse students and often cannot recognize students’ actual abilities (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001a; Van Roekel, 2011).
To compound this problem, one-third of ELLs have not achieved English proficiency within the expected six-year time span (Prahlad et al., 2017). As a result, many ELLs have been reclassified as Long-Term English Learners or LTELs. Research shows that LTELs require a different set of educational approaches than newly identified ELLs, and proper teacher education can prevent this cycle of ELLs becoming LTELs (Olsen, 2014). Yet, historically, professional learning has offered minimal guidance to staff regarding the instruction of ELLs, and perceptions are often grounded in deficit thinking” (Olvera, 2015, p. 78).

The lack of teachers’ ELL professional learning and teachers’ beliefs in their ability to instruct the growing population of ELLs in mainstream classrooms may be contributing to the lack of teachers’ self-efficacy to instruct ELLs and non-ELLS (Gandara et al., 2005; Loeb2014). Frank Pajares counseled that someone’s beliefs, or “an individual’s judgement of the truth or falsity of a proposition,” have a major influence on an educator’s instructional practice and consequently on learner outcomes (1992, p. 316). Research indicated that preservice teachers did not feel they were adequately prepared to teach ELLs (Siwatu, 2011; Walker et al., 2004). Additionally, surveys have revealed that even experienced teachers identify a need for increased ELL professional learning (McGraw Hill & Morning Consultant, 2019, Prahlad, et al., 2017). However, there has been little research that focuses specifically on mainstream teachers’ self-efficacy and strategy development when working with ELL student populations in the U.S. (Borg & Al-Busaidi, 2012). This present investigation was developed to explore the overall self-efficacy beliefs and the strategies that teachers with high self-efficacy are using to support ELL instruction.
Significance of the Research

If teachers lack the self-efficacy to deliver culturally relevant instruction, linguistically diverse students may not receive the instructional supports needed to foster academic achievement. Implementing effective instruction for ELL students can minimize the number of special education referrals and academic misplacement for this growing population (August & Shanahan, 2010). Little research has focused specifically on teachers’ self-efficacy for ELL student populations (Chu, 2013; Pajares, 1992). Teacher self-efficacy needs to be examined to ensure that teachers believe and have confidence in their ability to teach using relevant instruction for the culturally and linguistically diverse students in the classroom setting (Chu, 2013, Harry & Klingner, 2014, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001b).

This research will advance teachers’ awareness of their self-efficacy when implementing appropriate instruction for ELLs. This knowledge supports teachers in their efforts to address the need to promote ELL academic success and close the achievement gap (Calderón et al., 2011). Additionally, this information expands a consciousness regarding teachers’ ELL beliefs, as well as the strategies that teachers are successfully implementing. Since there is a link between classroom practices and student learning (Hattie, 2012), providing teachers with ELL instructional strategies may assist student learning, minimize multicultural intolerances, and lessen the achievement gap between ELLs and non-ELLs.

Description of Potential Benefits of the Research

For decades, researchers have examined the relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and student achievement, concluding that teachers with high teacher self-efficacy have students who have higher student achievement scores than teachers with low self-efficacy (Armor et al., 1976; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Hattie, 2012; Rotter, 1966; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy &
Hoy, 1998; Woolfolk Hoy & Spero, 2005; Zee & Koomen, 2016). It is well documented that there is a persistent student achievement gap with the growing ELL student population (Murphy, 2014; NASEM, 2017; McFarland et al., 2018) yet teachers feel unprepared to teach ELLs (Reeves, 2006; Santibañez & Gándara, 2018). Concurrently, few researchers have investigated the application of specific instructional strategies that teachers with high self-efficacy use to advance the achievement of English Language Learners (Mojavezi & Tamiz, 2012).

The purpose of the present study was to examine the self-efficacy beliefs and instructional practices of K-12 teachers who instruct English Language Learners in order to provide research-based suggestions to enhance ELL achievement. To build an ELL instructional knowledge base for mainstream teachers, “we must listen to the voices of experienced teachers” (De Oliveira & Yough, 2015, p.13). This examination sought to benefit the educational community by providing additional information about the types of adaptive instructional strategies (i.e., student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance feedback) used by teachers with high self-efficacy in K-12 inclusive classrooms having ELLs, to improve instruction to positively impact ELL student performance.

**Brief Definition of Key Terms**

The following important terms are defined to aid readability for the purpose of this research study.

1. **Academic Performance Feedback** is an instructional strategy that refers to “how teachers monitor students’ understanding of the material and provide feedback on their understanding. These strategies assess students’ thinking and encourage students to examine their own thought processes. Teachers guide students’ understanding by
encouraging students, affirming appropriate application of the material, and correcting misperceptions” (Reddy & Dudek, 2014, p. 74).

2. **Adaptive Instruction** is a teaching strategy that refers to how teachers use strategies “to respond to their students’ learning needs while teaching. These practices reflect teacher flexibility and responsiveness to students’ needs, as well as methods of differentiated instruction” (Reddy & Dudek, 2014, p. 74).

3. **Culture** is a term defined by the National Education Association (2007) as “the sum total of experiences, knowledge, skills, beliefs, values, and interests represented by the diversity of students and adults in our schools. The dimensions of diversity include race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, language, culture, religion, mental and physical ability, class, and immigration status” (p. 2).

4. **Culturally Relevant Teaching (CRT)** is an educational pedagogy that “empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes” in all facets of learning to improve student achievement (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 20).

5. **Direct Instruction** is a model of teaching that “teachers use to deliver academic content or convey information to students. These practices include direct instruction techniques, modeling, identifying, and summarizing” (Reddy & Dudek, 2014, p. 74).

6. **Efficacy in Classroom Management** refers to teachers’ efficacy to manage disruptive behavior, to get students back on task working and to set up classroom routines and procedures using “strategies aimed at increasing or encouraging desirable student responses through praise, encouragement, attention, and rewards” (Tschannen-Moran,
It is one of three types of efficacies measured in the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) assessment.

7. **Efficacy in Instructional Strategies** refers to teachers’ efficacy and willingness to implement and adapt strategies and instructional techniques in order to meet students’ learning objectives. Strategies include using clear expectations, alternative explanations, appropriate challenges, questioning, differentiation, and alternative explanations (Tschanne-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001a). It is one of three efficacy scales measured using the TSES survey.

8. **Efficacy in Student Engagement** describes teachers’ efficacy to actively engage students by using motivational strategies to increase interest, value learning, assist families, foster creativity, and encourage students to believe in their abilities (Tschanne-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001a). It is one of three efficacy scales measured using the TSES survey.

9. **English Language Learners (ELLs)** are students who “participate in a language assistance program to help ensure that they attain English proficiency and meet the same academic content and achievement standards that all students are expected to meet” (Hussar et al., 2020, p. 36). The United States Department of Education (2018) specifies that ELLs are students, between the ages 3 and 21, born outside the United States who speak a native language other than English and who have scored below the State's English proficient level in speaking, reading, writing, or comprehension (2018). “The Linguistic Standard selected for Connecticut is measured by the LAS Links Assessment” (Connecticut State Department of Education, 2019, par 1).
10. **Experienced Teachers** are teachers who have taught for many years and are no longer considered novice teachers. Most research identifies experienced teachers as having five or more years of classroom experience (Rodriguez & McKay, 2010). In this study, experienced teachers are referred to as educators who taught for a minimum of five years.

11. **Individual Education Plan (IEP)** is “an individually tailored statement describing an educational plan for each learner with exceptionalities” (Gargulio & Bouck, 2021, p. 43). It is an educational procedural plan or program for a pre K-12 student with specific disabilities.

12. **Professional Development (PD)** is a method that schools use to improve teachers’ learning and skills. “It is often associated with one-time workshops, seminars, or lectures, and is typically a one-size-fits all approach” (Scherff, 2018, para.2).

13. **Professional Learning (PL)** is instruction for teachers that is “interactive, sustained, and customized to teachers’ needs” (Scherff, 2018, para. 2).

14. **Promotes Students’ Thinking** is an indicator describing the targeted outcome of strategies teacher use for “stimulating students’ metacognitive and higher order thinking abilities. They encourage students’ metacognitive and higher order thinking abilities. They encourage students’ to critically think about the lesson material (why/how analysis), generate new ideas, and examine their own thought processes” (Reddy, Dudek, Fabiano, & Peters, 2015, p. 519).

15. **Section 504, The Rehabilitation Act of 1973** is a federal civil rights law. It protects and provides services for individuals with disabilities who do not require specialized individualized instruction (Gargulio & Bouck, 2021).
16. **Self-Efficacy (SE)** refers to “how well one can execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situations” (Bandura, 1982, p. 122).

17. **Student-Directed Instruction** is an instructional approach in which teachers use strategies “to actively engage students in the learning process. These practices encompass constructivist and hands-on instructional techniques, linking lesson content to prior learning, personal experiences, and cooperative learning” (Reddy & Dudek, 2014, p. 74).

18. **Teachers of English as a Second Language (TESOL)** are educators whose primary responsibility is to teach ELLs. Additionally, ESL stands for English as a Second Language and these educators are also referred to as ESL teachers (USDE, 2017).

19. **Teachers’ Self-Efficacy** describes educators’ “belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated” (Guskey & Passaro, 1994, p. 4).

20. **Teacher's Experience** is characterized by an educator’s proficiency that is gained over time and enhances teachers’ understanding and abilities (Rice, 2010). In this study, teachers’ experience was measured in the number of years he or she taught.

21. **Zone of Proximal Development** was defined by Lev Vygotsky (1978) as the optimal learning opportunity or “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 86).
Overview of the Methodology

An integrated mixed methods design was used to gather data to examine the perceptions of self-efficacy and strategy use among teachers of English Language Learners in general education classrooms. Although this mixed methods design practice is a unique approach, several respected researchers support the application of this method where appropriate (Bryman, 2006; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Fetters et al., 2013). In this study, quantitative and qualitative data were collected consecutively, then the data were analyzed separately, and finally data were triangulated.

The initial quantitative data collection process provided a means for the researcher to establish a qualitative sample of 10 participants having high self-efficacy and frequency of classroom strategy use. Subsequently, the quantitative and qualitative data were independently analyzed. John Creswell and Vicki Plano Clark (2011) explained that a parallel analysis is intuitive and efficient and has the advantage that “Each type of data can be collected and analyzed separately and independently, using the techniques traditionally associated with each data type” (p. 78). Lastly, the data were triangulated.

The integrated mixed methods design provided a clear framework to delineate the quantitative data collection which were guided by the research questions:

Research Question 1: To what extent and in what manner do the subscales of teachers’ self-efficacy (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management), and instructional strategies (student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance feedback) predict teachers’ adaptive instruction for educators who teach in K-12 classroom settings that include English Language Learners?
Research Question 2: What instructional strategies do K-12 teachers with high self-efficacy use to support English Language Learners?

For Research Question 1, interval data were collected from two surveys delivered to participants online. The investigation’s quantitative sample included 126 K-12 Connecticut public school educators, who taught ELLs for five or more years.

Research Question 1 included seven predictor variables: (a) efficacy in student engagement; (b) efficacy in instructional strategies; (c) efficacy in classroom management; (d) student-directed instruction; (e) direct instruction; (f) promotion of student thinking; and (g) academic performance; as well as one criterion variable, adaptive instruction. Data were analyzed using a multiple regression procedure that represented a correlational design. Quantitative data were used to determine the 10 participants with sum of the highest mean scores on two of the surveys, which measured teacher self-efficacy and strategy use. These individuals were invited to participate in the qualitative research.

Research Question 2 provided, “well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of human processes” that were collected using semi-structured interviews to inform the quantitative findings (Miles et al., 2014, p. 4). Once the data were collected, quantitative analysis was employed with a “series of cumulative coding cycles and reflective analytic memoing” (p. 8). Next, primary classifications were established for theory generation (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Initial descriptive codes, in the form of electronic tags or labels, were assigned to represent a class of phenomena to segments of text, followed by pattern codes to represent patterned thematic data (Miles et al., 2014). Finally, the researcher used a triangulated research technique and employed qualitative data to inform quantitative data and to strengthen the validity of the results and enhance the accuracy of the study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017; Wu, 2011).
Instrumentation and Data Collection Tools

Data were collected using four data gathering tools: (a) a demographic survey to identify characteristics of participants (Appendix A), (b) the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) short form (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001a) to measure teachers’ self-efficacy, (c) the Classroom Strategy Scale -Teacher Form, Instructional Scale (CSS-T IS; Reddy et al., 2016) to measure the frequency level of teachers’ perceived use of specific instructional strategies in the classroom setting, and (d) semi-structured interviews to gather qualitative data regarding teachers’ ELL instructional practices, strategies, and supports (Appendix B).

The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale

The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001a) has three reliable subscales which measure a teachers’ self-efficacy in the areas of student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. Student engagement refers to the teacher’s perceived efficacy to involve and motivate students while they are being taught. The instructional strategies pertain to the instructor’s perception of his or her capability with implementing instructional strategies in a classroom setting. Classroom management relates to an educator’s individual belief in his or her capacity to manage classroom procedures: to manage student behavior; and to keep students on task, organized, and orderly. Each subscale was determined by calculating the mean from the responses. The TSES combined score was used in this study and calculated based on the total mean of all items for each teacher.

Classroom Strategy Scale for Teachers: Instructional Scale

The CSS-T Instructional Scale (Reddy & Dudek, 2016) has five dimensions: (a) adaptive instruction, (b) student-directed instruction, (c) direct instruction, (d) promotes student thinking, and (e) academic performance feedback. Adaptive instruction refers to how teachers use
strategies “to respond to their students’ learning needs while teaching. These practices reflect teacher flexibility and responsiveness to students’ needs, as well as methods of differentiated instruction” (Reddy & Dudek, 2014, p. 74). Student-directed instruction includes “strategies teachers use to actively engage students in the learning process.” Direct instruction refers to “strategies teachers use to deliver academic content or convey information to students” and includes modeling, identifying, and summarizing. The dimension, promotes student thinking, relates to the strategies that teachers use “to activate students’ thinking about the lesson material and examine their own thought processes,” and academic performance feedback represents, “strategies teachers use to provide specific feedback to their students’ on their understanding of the material” (Reddy & Dudek, 2016, pp. 7-9).

**Theoretical Framework**

To better understand how self-efficacy may impact teacher behavior and ELL student performance, a focused review of self-efficacy as the theoretical context is presented. Creswell and Plano Clark suggest, “prior to designing a mixed methods study, researchers need to consider more than whether their research problems or questions are best suited for mixed methods” (2011, p. 8). Specifically, the experts counsel that additional exploration should be conducted about the underlying theory, history, and assumptions that support the researched subject matter (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). With that in mind, the following theoretical framework of self-efficacy, as well as some historical background and teacher preparation assumptions, are presented to better justify, predict, and comprehend this investigation.

**The Importance of Teachers’ Self-Efficacy Beliefs**

Albert Bandura (1993) theorized that self-conceptions, such as Self-efficacy (SE), or the perception of oneself as able to achieve an objective, impact an individual’s ability to accomplish
a task. In the context of teachers, the author conjectured that self-efficacy empowers teachers to believe in their ability to impart new knowledge to learners. He postulated that when individuals have higher levels of self-efficacy, they are more motivated and demonstrate increased perseverance in challenging environments. This theory suggests that when teachers have a higher degree of confidence in their abilities to teach ELLs, their classroom practices will improve.

Frank Pajares expanded on Bandura’s self-efficacy theory and focused on a teacher’s belief system or “judgement of the truth or falsity of a proposition” (1992, p. 316). The author contended that beliefs are one of the most influential factors that shape a teacher’s behavior. He wrote that teachers’ levels of self-efficacy are driven more by their belief in their teaching abilities than in their actual capabilities, and beliefs are formed early in life but can be altered. A teacher’s belief system guides his or her attitude and interpretation regarding educational issues that include race, culture, society, and even families. This in turn determines their behavior. He conjectured that the relationship and overlapping connections of teachers’ beliefs to other beliefs can be especially challenging to infer and measure. Like Bandura, Pajares explained that self-efficacy affects a teacher’s motivation, commitment, perseverance, and choices in challenging environments, which improves learner outcomes (Pajares, 1992). His notions imply that by improving teachers’ beliefs, educators will be better equipped to teach ELLs and have a higher self-efficacy to impact the English Language Learners in their classes.

Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, and Hoy (2001a) recognized the role of teachers’ efficacy in motivating and managing students and the impact that teachers’ self-efficacy has on student achievement. These same authors conducted a meta-analysis of “all sources dated between 1974 and 1997 that used the term ‘teacher efficacy’” (1998, p. 3). The authors indicated a need to measure teachers’ self-efficacy and beliefs, and its role on instructional practices. They
created the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) based on Bandura’s theoretical construct and the empirical research to form an assessment tool that teachers could use to rate their levels of efficacy.

Teachers’ self-efficacy to manage disruptive behavior, included traits such as getting students redirected to achieve on task learning, setting up classroom routines and procedures, and using “strategies aimed at increasing or encouraging desirable student responses through praise, encouragement, attention, and rewards (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998, p.11).

**Improved Culturally Relevant Teaching**

Behavioral and cultural norms are different for ELLs and Non-ELLs, and the instructional strategies that should be used with ELLs must consider the different cultures of these students. The National Education Association (NEA) defines culture as “. . . the sum total of one’s experiences, knowledge, skills, beliefs, values, language, and interests” (NEA, 2007, p. 2). Banks (2008), Ladson-Billings (1995a), Ford (1998), and Gay (2000) conducted research on minority student achievement and determined that student education is optimal when teachers embrace instruction that includes students’ cultural backgrounds, social norms, traditions, language, histories, and beliefs.

Banks was a pioneer for multicultural education and recognized the need for cultural instruction and curricular reform since the 1960’s. During the civil rights movement, he closely examined the American education system and cautioned that when schools fail to recognize ethnic minority students’ cultural and racial needs, educators are behaving in a racist way (1973). To preserve minority and majority groups cultural differences, Banks suggested that educators adopt a culturally relevant teaching (1989). For example, Banks and Banks counseled educators to adopt “an equity pedagogy or teaching strategies and classroom environments that help
students from diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural group attain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to function effectively within, and create and perpetuate, a just, humane, and democratic society” (McGee, Banks, & Banks, 1995, p. 152).

Similarly, Ladson-Billings asserts that educators should adopt culturally responsive teaching to validate and empower culturally diverse student populations. According to Ladson-Billings, a culturally responsive teaching philosophy includes three components: the student must achieve academic success, maintain their cultural identity, and become skilled at interacting with the other students in the existing classroom culture (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 160).

**Culturally Responsive Environments**

A study by Ford (1998) examined two decades of empirical studies with a focus on minority students and found that culturally diverse students have been underrepresented in gifted education and overrepresented in special education. According to Ford, educators have historically and unintentionally adopted a screening process which has favored monocultural learners. Ford recommends that educators shed the monocultural deficit model and replace it with culturally relevant teaching to support the expanding population of culturally linguistically diverse students (Ford, 2014; Ford & Grantham, 2003). Ford also warns educators about being “color blind” or not seeing cultural differences, and she advises educators to recognize cultural similarities and give prominence to cultural differences (2014). Like Ladson-Billings, Ford concludes that educators need to create culturally responsive environments that recognize cultural similarities while giving prominence to cultural differences.

Unfortunately, many teachers lack CRT self-efficacy (Siwatu, 2011). When teaching culturally linguistic diverse student populations, preservice teachers were found to have higher levels of culturally linguistic confidence when implementing general teaching tasks and less
confidence using culturally relevant instructional responsibilities. Siwatu’s examination revealed that preservice educators, lacked specific culturally relevant strategies and instruction. His research concluded that teachers would benefit from increased exposure to culturally relevant teaching practices from teacher educators, to increase culturally relevant teaching self-efficacy (Siwatu, 2011). As general education teachers include higher numbers of ELLs in their mainstream classrooms, educators necessitate increased ELL training and CRT instruction to improve the academic capabilities of this growing population.

**Improved Teacher Preparation**

Research demonstrates that few teachers feel adequately trained to facilitate proper ELL instruction (Reeves, 2006; Santibañez & Gándara, 2018). Although numerous English Language Learner teaching approaches have been developed for use in the elementary and secondary general education classroom (i.e., Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol [SIOP], Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach, and Sheltered Content-Based Immersion Programs), effective ELL instructional strategies and coaching do not always reach the teaching staff (Samson & Collins 2012, p. 8). A metanalysis conducted by Lucas, Villegas, and Martin, (2015) complemented these studies and described how teacher enhanced preparation is necessary because teachers who have received English Language Learner training have more positive experiences than those who have not received training. Further investigation by Celozzi(2017) provided evidence that teachers were empowered by professional learning because staff felt an increased capacity to provide for ELL student needs; assess English Language Learners; collaborate with colleagues; access ELL resources; and consequently, experienced a decreased frustration. Unfortunately, numerous teachers do not feel prepared to teach English Language
Learners or address the challenges involved in teaching them, therefore, they prefer not to have them in their classes (Walker et al., 2004).

**Summary of Chapter 1**

This chapter presented a foundational basis for this investigation. Included in this chapter were an explanation of the researcher’s rationale for selecting the topic, a statement of the problem, significance of this research, and the potential benefit of this study. In addition, Chapter 1 provided the reader with key terms, an overview of the methodology and instrumentation, as well as a theoretical basis. Each section identified is addressed in more detail in the subsequent chapters.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The organization of Chapter 2 includes a contextual, historical, and theoretical background, as well as, a detailed literature synopsis relevant to this investigation. Past research is identified and critically assessed to analyze the impact of teacher self-efficacy beliefs on instructional practices for English Language Learners.

Historical Background

Federal, state, and local laws have impacted teacher accountability to guarantee that ELLs are provided with an equal and high-quality education (Table 1). Since the Civil Rights Act (1964) and subsequent Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), federal policy has prohibited “discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin” and mandates that all students have a right to an equal education. Consequently, teachers are responsible for ensuring that English Language Learners are presented with a high-quality academic education to advance English proficiency.
Table 1

**ELL Federal Laws**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Laws</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights Act, Public Law 88-352</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Prohibited discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act Public Law 89-10</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Provided federal funding to elementary and secondary students who were living at the poverty level in order to close the achievement gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Child Left Behind Act, Public Law 107-110</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Demanded increased accountability for ELLs (adequate yearly progress monitoring).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law 114-95</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Initiated ELL proficiency accountability for all schools and districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to 1964, teachers of ELLs were expected to help these students assimilate into the public school system and adapt the best way they could. Initially, teachers were not required to change grade level expectations or provide additional behavioral or remedial support for ELLs. However, as the number of ELLs increased in U.S. schools, concerns for English Language Learner academic performance grew. The 1967 Bilingual Education Act (BEA) was the first federal legislation that changed the focus of educators, from simply providing ELLs with an equal education to one that provided these students with an educational environment that
supported cultural diversity. The BEA, also called Title VII, required educators to provide an environment for English Language Learners to achieve at the level of their non-ELL peers. This landmark legislation was a catalyst to subsequent ELL laws, curriculum change, the impetus for culturally relevant teaching, and staff training to improve English Language Learner instruction. The BEA was revised four times with the reauthorization acts of 1974, 1978, 1984, and 1988. Each successive BEA reauthorization increased federal funding to provide additional ELL educational programs with more specific ELL program guidelines, targeted ELL curriculum, ELL teacher training, and the creation of family involvement programs. With the additional funding, however, teacher demands, and accountability expanded. In addition, the number of ELLs who qualified for educational support and special needs provisions also increased due to the changing English Language Learner guidelines, which also imposed additional responsibility on educators.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB; Public Law 107-110) and Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA Public Law 114-95) continued to create a substantial shift toward English Language Learner instructional accountability, coupled with high-stakes student testing. For the first time, this law shifted the focus of ELLs’ educational progress to general education teachers. Additionally, ESSA legislation specified a standardized state accountability framework to include English Language Learner identification criteria and the stipulation that English Language Learner student achievement would be included as an indicator of school quality (2015). Moreover, these laws stipulate that when ELLs meet the Fluent English Proficient (FEP) criteria, they are to be monitored for an additional two years (NCLB, 2001).

Current legislation mandates that educators provide ELLs with “language instruction curriculum that is tied to scientifically based research on teaching Limited English Proficient
(LEP) children and that has been demonstrated to be effective” (NCLB, 2001, Section 3301(b)(6). English Language Learners are no longer confined to bilingual classrooms. They are taught by a combination of general education teachers, English Language Learner specialists, and special education teachers. Although federal responsibility has been put in place with general guidelines to ensure that all teachers are responsible for the achievement of English Language Learners, the law does not recommend specific educational English Language Learner programs or professional learning. In addition, Samson and Collins from the Center for American Progress (2012) argued, “To date, there has been relatively little attention paid to the essential standards, knowledge, and skills that general education teachers ought to possess in order to provide effective instruction to English Language Learners placed in their classroom” (p. 1). There has been little or no training for teachers to prepare staff to teach English Language Learners, and to recognize if an English Language Learner is functioning or achieving in a typical way (Samson & Collins, 2012). Without proper training, teachers do not know how to provide ELLs the services and supports that they need, and their lack of self-efficacy to teach ELLs is causing educators to disproportionately recommend ELLs to special education as having learning disabilities (Sullivan, 2011).

On the surface, ELL linguistic abilities can be deceptive because English Language Learners often have multiple linguistic competencies, such as contrasting, listening, speaking, reading, and writing proficiencies (August & Shanahan, 2010; Samson & Collins, 2012). For example, staff members typically observe a disparity between the development of ELLs’ day-to-day conversational ability, which takes six months to two years to master, in contrast to an ELL’s academic proficiency, which can take up to seven years to achieve grade level competency (Cummins, 2000). These differences are further complicated by students’ first language.
background, as well as, the transferability of the student’s native language and culture. Consequently, without training, an ELL may mistakenly appear to have an intellectual disability to an untrained or inexperienced mainstream teacher. Unfortunately, deficits in the use of the English language can mask intellectual capacity for potential gifted behaviors (Renzulli & Brandon, 2017). Furthermore, the way an English Language Learner is instructed to support his or her needs is a crucial factor in developing English Language Learner capacity. As previously noted, teachers with greater self-efficacy have demonstrated higher student outcomes and have provided more supportive and encouraging classroom environments (Hattie, 2012; Marzano, 2003; Snow, 2002; Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004). Consequently, teachers with high self-efficacy are less likely to refer their ELLs to special education (Paneque & Barbeta, 2006).

Appropriate ELL instruction is necessary to close the achievement gap, because when ELLs are provided the proper scaffolding and linguistic support, they can succeed (NASEM, 2017). However, at some point when ELLs are reclassified as the result of testing (the LAS Links assessment) and they are no longer identified as needing linguistic services, they are reclassified as non-ELL, and they transition to the general education setting instruction. Kim and Herman (2012) explain, “Reclassification is the point when ELL students are expected to fully function in mainstream classrooms, without any further special English language development (ELD) instructional services or assessment accommodations” (p. 1). Consequently, the authors explain that there exists a “tension between assuring that students have sufficient English language proficiency (ELP) to be successful in mainstream classrooms and avoiding the potential negative consequences of protracted ELL status [that] creates an essential dilemma in determining the optimal time for ELL reclassification” (p. 1). However, students who have passed the ELL exit criteria and have been reclassified still necessitate a smooth transition from
their ELL status because they may experience “separation from longstanding friendships, a feeling of otherness, self-esteem and confidence issues, a need to catch up in content areas, and a potential lack of scaffolded instruction” (Raiche, 2010, p. 44).

Also, many English Language Learners have been administered native language proficiency assessments, which were intended for monolingual students’ assessments. Consequently, over the past 20 years a disproportionate number of ELLs have been referred to special education (Sullivan, 2011). Once English Language Learners are referred to special education, they are often caught up in the educational assessment process (Gay, 2001). Macswan and Rolstad (2006) argue that assessments may mislead educators about ELL abilities, and inappropriately qualify English Language Learners who manifest many of the same characteristics as a student with a learning disability. Language minority students often become improperly categorized as having a wide range of cognitive deficits when, in fact, language is separate and distinctive from other intellectual abilities (Macswan & Rolstad, 2006). Moreover, qualifying assessments have been primarily normed using English-speaking students. A close examination indicates that English Language Learner abilities need to allow for how time processing and orthographic proficiency affects ELL scores (Marinelli, et al., 2014).

As an increasing number of English Language Learners are being qualified for special education services, the question emerges regarding how much ELL instruction is being provided to ELLs by special education staff (Ford, 2012; Miranda et al., 2019). Paneque and Barbetta’s (2006) research reveals that special education teachers also self-report low self-efficacy when instructing English Language Learners. In a self-efficacy assessment administered to 200 special education teachers who taught in inclusive English Language Learner settings, the teachers scored low in their English Language Learner self-efficacy and ability to instruct, provide
language support, and use school resources to support English Language Learners. Whether English Language Learners are in a general education classroom or receiving special education services, teachers need high self-efficacy to provide high-quality instructional supports to raise English Language Learners’ achievement.

The following literature examination was organized around the theory of self-efficacy, in which this study is grounded, and studies that pertained to the impact of teacher self-efficacy beliefs on instructional practices for English Language Learners. Table 2 provides the reader with a detailed thematic review of topics from literature that support this study’s investigation. (a) social cognitive theory, (b) teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs and instructional practices, (c) teachers’ ELL professional education (d) teachers’ self-efficacy and culturally relevant teaching, (e) teaching experience and qualification, and (f) teachers’ self-efficacy and teaching ELLs.
### Table 2

**Literature Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Focus</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Cognitive Theory</td>
<td>Lev Vygotsky (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Pajares (1996, 2002a, 2002b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and</td>
<td>The Rand Corporation (Armor et al., 1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Practices</td>
<td>Megan Tschannen-Moran and Denise Johnson (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hattie (2003, 2009, 2012), and Hatti and Gregory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donoghue (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Poulou, Linda Reddy, and Christopher Dudek (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marjolein Zee and Helma Koomen (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tschannen-Moran and Peggy McMaster (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alla Kudelich (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kamau Siwatu (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience and Qualification</td>
<td>Tschannen-Moran and Anita Woolfolk Hoy (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne Podolsky, Linda Darling-Hammond, Christopher Doss, and Sean Reardon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and</td>
<td>Aydin Yücesan Durgunoğlu and Trudie Hughes (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching English Language Learners</td>
<td>Ivonne Estrella (2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Cognitive Theory

Learning theories assist researchers’ “focus and describe the process of learning” (Driscoll, 1994, p.25). Social cognitive theory is grounded in the premise that the learner constructs knowledge and solves problems through “collaborative learning and problem scaffolding” (p. 393). Lev Vygotsky’s (1978) and Albert Bandura’s (2002) social cognitive theories are applicable to both the educator, as an individual who is learning to instruct ELLs, as well as the ELLs who are learning to apply language in the social educational setting. In addition, both theorists recognized that cultural context plays a role in a learner’s cognitive development. Additionally, Frank Pajares (1996) expanded on Bandura’s educational theories, stating that a teachers’ belief system impacts instructional self-efficacy and student achievement.

Vygotsky and the Zone of Proximal Development

Lev Vygotsky, a Russian psychologist, espoused that social cognitive learning depends on a learner’s zone of proximal development. This zone is described as proximal because the learner will potentially be able to solve and practice new skills with the aided guidance of social collaboration and scaffolded attempts. Moreover, Vygotsky stated that learning is also shaped by the cultural environment and that every child’s learning functions “first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level” (1978, p. 57). Optimal cognitive learning occurs when the learner is not able to independently perform a task; however, with the guidance of a more knowledgeable person (adult or knowledgeable peer), the learner can advance his or her abilities. Within the learning environment, social learning theory provides the opportunities for teachers and ELLs to develop and practice potential competencies.
Bandura and Self-Efficacy

Similarly, Albert Bandura’s social cognitive theory, also referred to as social cognitive theory, asserted that individuals learn or construct knowledge by observing others, imitating, and modeling in social interactions within their environment (2002b). Bandura explained that this learning occurs through an internal cognitive process and reciprocal determinism which is made up of three factors: behavior, environment, and personal factors that contribute to a reciprocal relationship. Learning is impacted by behavioral factors such as a task’s complexity, skill, and duration. Additionally, Bandura stressed that all learners have unique personality factors which contribute to their learning, such as, cognition, motivation, disposition, and self-efficacy. Moreover, the environment affects a person’s learning depending on the situation, model(s), roles, and relationships. Bandura counseled that the environment for human development necessitates a “cross-cultural theoretical generalizability” (p. 271). In particular, educators must consider “the basic issue of whether there is a universal human nature, or many human natures spawned by diverse cultural milieus” (p. 271). To achieve this, Bandura proposed that educators acquire the core belief that that they can advocate and be agents for individuals with diverse cultural backgrounds (2002b).

A key component of social constructivist theory is Bandura’s self-efficacy theory. It states that self-efficacy influences a teacher’s personal agency. Bandura purported that when one believes that they can achieve an objective, this belief significantly impacts the individual’s ability to accomplish the target (2006). He described four main sources of self-efficacy: (a) mastery of experiences, (b) vicarious learning, (c) verbal persuasion, and (d) psychological states. Furthermore, Bandura argued that these four primary sources can “alter the level and strength of self-efficacy” (Bandura, 1977, p. 1). The first source, mastery of experiences, also
called performance accomplishments, occurs when a person experiences a positive consequence from an associated task. Bandura claimed that successful experiences strengthen a person’s task-related expectations. Similarly, self-efficacy can be impacted by watching another individual successfully accomplish a task; this type of self-efficacy is known as *vicarious learning*. A vicarious social experience occurs when a learner watches a comparable role model achieve a desired task-related result and imagines they can replicate the modeled behavior. Likewise, self-efficacy can be promoted with *verbal persuasion*, or when an influential, knowledgeable person, such as a parent, teacher, role model, or good friend, verbally suggests or coaxes another into believing they can achieve a goal. Lastly, Bandura theorizes that a person’s *physiological state or emotional arousal* can impact self-efficacy. A state of anxiety, fear, or apprehension is more likely to cause a person to feel inept and avoidant, in contrast to a relaxed state of mind which will be more likely to generate a more positive and persistent approach (Bandura, 1977).

Bandura identified Teacher Self-Efficacy (TSE) as a part of social constructivist theory, which empowers teachers to believe in their ability to impart new knowledge to learners. When educators have higher levels of self-efficacy, they are more motivated, demonstrate increased perseverance in challenging environments, and demonstrate higher levels of resilience (Bandura, 1993). Consequently, high teacher self-efficacy beliefs generate an increase in student motivation and achievement (Bandura, 1997). This study’s relationship to Bandura’s self-efficacy theory is important to this investigation because it impacts ELL learner outcomes. In this research, teachers with high self-efficacy were interviewed in relation to the strategies they used with English Language Learners.

An awareness of social learning theory and self-efficacy primarily stemmed from Bandura’s infamous Bobo Doll experiments, in which he demonstrated how individuals learn by
observing, imitating, and modeling others (Bandura et al., 1961). The preliminary Bobo doll probe involved 72 preschool participants with an equal distribution of boys and girls, some of whom were exposed to observing violent behavior toward a Bobo doll. Children who either watched an adult perform aggressive actions, or observed a movie that modeled aggressive behavior, were more likely to mimic follow-up aggressive conduct toward a Bobo doll during a subsequent 20 minute activity. Years later, Bandura confirmed comparable outcomes with slightly older participants and the inclusion of rewards and punishments for aggressive behaviors (Bandura, 1963; Bandura et al., 1961). In the context of his Cognitive Social Learning Theory and Bobo doll findings, Bandura postulated that humans can be influenced to learn new behaviors, beneficial or undesirable, by witnessing others in social environments (1986).

Additionally, the theoretical foundation of self-efficacy, grounded in social learning theory, and its ability to affect change was established by Bandura with Adams (1977). They hypothesized that fear is a source of low self-efficacy and subsequently avoidance, and that self-efficacy can be strengthened with verbal persuasion and vicarious experiences. Using a quasi-experimental design with a population of 10 snake phobic adults, Bandura and Adams conducted a series of 29 performance tasks and exposed the control group to snakes with factual evidence of reasons they should not be afraid. Both groups were introduced to a sequence of events involving snakes that was coupled with coping and relaxation coaching. The group that observed other adults holding a snake without fear made significant progress. The researchers reported that subjects became desensitized to their snake phobia when exposed to similar threats 94% of the time and 76% of the time with dissimilar threats. The subjects who observed another person hold a snake became desensitized to the threat because of social modeling and peer coaching. The authors concluded, “The findings of the microanalysis of the process of change during the course
of participant modeling not only lend further support for the social learning theory but provide a basis for comparing the predictive value of behavior and perceived efficacy” (p. 304). Their research is important to education because it speaks to the fact that self-efficacy is not an innate ability that educators can strengthen on their own; rather, self-efficacy is developed with purposeful actions such as modeling, vicarious experiences, and verbal persuasion.

The concept of self-efficacy expanded to numerous fields, including education. Bandura believed that self-efficacy was domain specific, and he counseled educators about the importance of teachers’ cognitive development and its impact on student learning. In relation to teachers’ self-efficacy, he asserted that teachers’ beliefs in their personal efficacy to motivate and promote learning affect the types of learning environments they create and the level of academic progress their students achieve” (1993, p. 117). Bandura expounded that teacher self-efficacy is impacted by the quality and degree of student learning and that “the task of creating environments conducive to learning rests heavily on the talents and self-efficacy of teachers” (1995, p. 19). He maintained, “. . . a person with the same knowledge and skills may perform poorly, adequately, or extraordinarily depending on fluctuations in self-efficacy thinking” (1993, p. 119).

In 2006, a Guide for Constructing Self-Efficacy Scales was published by Bandura to measure self-efficacy and “perceived capability to produce given attainments” (2006, p. 319). Mindful of the unique and varied make-up of individuals, a guide was created with an emphasis on specificity when measuring self-efficacy. A person could be highly self-efficacious in some areas of expertise but lacking self-efficacy in areas without proficiency. Therefore, Bandura advocated that teachers’ self-efficacy scales should be individualized to measure specific teacher functioning tasks, as well as to identify patterns of strengths and limitations in perceived
capability. “This type of refined assessment not only increases predictiveness but provides guidelines for tailoring programs to individual needs” (p. 310).

Bandura (1993) suggested that an individual’s interest, self-regulation and experience in a subject or area of concentration affected a person’s underlying belief as to whether or not he or she could accomplish a task; moreover, if that goal were to be measured, it was important that the assessor provide a range to evaluate a person’s connection to his or her ability and level of control to achieve a task. Since Bandura’s (2006) introduction of the idea of measuring “domain specific” tasks, educational researchers have focused on students’ ability to self-organize and self-regulate in the educational environment and educators’ impact in influencing student beliefs and capabilities (p. 307).

Like Vygotsky (1978), Bandura (2002b) purported that social cognitive theory should be considered in a cultural context. He stated that culture shapes both the individual and the learning community. Individual learning is influenced by one’s cultural beliefs, morality, and agency, which impacts how a learner approaches a learning task. For example, the cultural context can determine whether a learner thinks in “self-enhancing or self-debilitating ways” (Bandura, 2002b, p. 284). In addition, Bandura purported that as society becomes increasingly global, cultural values affect members of associated social groups. Bandura counseled that socio-cultural learning should be flexible, recognizing each learner’s cultural individuality, without presuming cultural generalizations. Moreover, Bandura more recently has advocated that electronic technology can provide adaptive learning, global awareness, and social learning, and produces positive reinforcement which can build efficacy (2002b).
Pajares, Self-Efficacy, and Teacher Beliefs

The work of Pajares (1996) extended Bandura’s social self-efficacy theory in the realm of education, and Pajares emphasized the impact of teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs on student learning. Like his predecessor, he argued that the measurement of self-efficacy must be specific (1986), rather than generalized, to increase the precision and authenticity of the self-efficacy domain being measured (Britner & Pajares, 2006). Consequently, the research interest migrated to self-efficacy in relation to grade level, subject area, age level, and gender. In 2002, Pajares published a metanalysis entitled *Gender and Perceived Self-Efficacy in Self-Regulated Learning* (2002a), in which he examined self-efficacy beliefs and regulated learning. The investigation established that gender informed academic self-efficacy beliefs, and that student’s utilization of self-regulation strategies were affected by social influences such as cultural, social, and peer expectations. The author noted,

. . . gender differences are often found in students’ academic self-efficacy and in their self-efficacy to employ self-regulatory strategies, although these differences may be the function of factors such as previous achievement, exposure to course content, response biases, measurement practices, or gender orientation beliefs. (Pajares. 2002a, p. 120)

Pajares’ initial research was collaboratively conducted with Shari Britner (2006) to evaluate if science self-efficacy predicts science achievement. The investigators assessed 319 grades 5-8 students (155 boys, 164 girls) in a midwestern, public middle school and found significant correlations “between mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasions, physiological arousal, and self-efficacy” (p. 485). Furthermore, the data showed that only mastery experiences significantly predicted science self-efficacy (Britner & Pajares, 2006). The
findings suggested that gender played a role in self-efficacy since “girls reported stronger science self-efficacy than did boys” (p. 485).

Pajares (2002b) reasoned that teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs impacted students’ self-efficacy beliefs, and he researched the literature and synthesized his findings. He concluded that teachers’ self-efficacy fosters student achievement and students’ achievement beliefs across various areas and levels. He expanded this rationale, stating that self-efficacy was “contagious,” which is to say that students can easily “catch” a teacher’s own sense of confidence (2005, p. 339). Pajares’ research found a relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and self-confidence and student achievement. In other words, self-confident teachers create self-confident students, and conversely, unconfident teachers generate apprehensive students. (Pajares, 1996). Like Bandura, Pajares also believed that teachers’ self-efficacy is crucial because it impacts the development of student progress and influences teachers’ performance, determination, and instructional judgement in the academic setting (1996, 2002b).

Teacher Self-Efficacy and Instructional Practice

Teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs have been shown to be an important variable in teacher effectiveness because educators with high self-efficacy are more likely to employ effective instructional strategies (Armor et al., 1976; Bandura, 1997, Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Catherine Snow (2002) explained that instructional strategies are well-defined approaches that teachers use to target specific skills, achieve explicit goals, and advance students’ cognitive abilities.

The Rand Corporation: Self-Efficacy and Quality Instruction

Over 40 years ago, a seminal survey conducted by the Rand Corporation, an outside research group, identified the positive influences that teachers’ self-efficacy had on teachers’
instructional practices and student achievement (Armor et al., 1976). The Los Angeles Board of Education hired Rand to investigate the factors that influenced reading scores in inner city schools, defined as having diverse populations with a minimum of 80% minority students. The study included 20 elementary schools, which demonstrated constant, high-test score reading gains in Los Angeles from Spring 1972 through Fall 1975. Like previous studies, the Rand investigation determined that student attendance, health status, and demographic influences such as family income, race, and prior reading scores impacted students’ reading scores. However, unlike prior studies, this inquiry revealed a significant relationship between teacher actions and student reading achievement. Teachers with positive self-efficacy factors were associated with students having high reading achievement. Significant self-efficacy factors included teacher training, parent-teacher communication, instructional flexibility, collaboration and consultation with reading teachers, and classroom management practices (Armor et al., 1976). The Rand report was a catalyst for future teacher self-efficacy research studies and teacher self-efficacy’s ability to impact educational gains. Although the Rand results alerted both the public and researchers to the importance of teachers’ self-efficacy and teacher quality for student achievement, it was not until Bandura’s (2006) seminal work, A Guide for Constructing Self-Efficacy Scales, was published, that researchers could quantitatively capture the level of an individuals’ self-efficacy with a reliable instrument.

**Tschannen-Moran: Measuring Teachers’ Self-Efficacy**

efficacy as having three constructs, including instructional self-efficacy, engagement self-efficacy, and classroom management self-efficacy. Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy and Hoy maintained that a new assessment was necessary and created The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), as previously described. They expanded Bandura’s self-efficacy construct and claimed, “that a valid measure of teacher efficacy must assess both personal competence and an analysis of the task in terms of the resources and constraints in particular teaching contexts” (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001a, p. 795). Subsequently, Megan Tschannen-Moran and Denise Johnson (2011) conducted a study analyzing teacher self-efficacy and the use of instructional practices for both teaching in general and when teaching literacy. Tschannen-Moran and Johnson utilized two self-efficacy assessments: The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy for Literacy Instruction (TSELI) which they also authored. The TSELI assessed not only teacher self-efficacy in general, but also literacy specific areas such as self-efficacy for writing instruction, oral reading, and “the ability to make use of students’ prior knowledge in reading tasks” (p. 755). The study employed a purposeful sample of 648 teacher-participants recruited from 20 elementary schools and 6 middle schools from Virginia, Kansas, and Arkansas.

The research of Tschannen-Moran and Denise Johnson (2011) concluded that teachers’ self-efficacy for literacy instruction was moderately related to teachers’ overall sense of efficacy for teaching ($r = .61, p < .01$; p. 757). Teacher self-efficacy in general, as well as for teaching literacy, was most influenced by the quality of a teacher’s university preparation, level of education, school level, resources available, and teachers’ sense of efficacy for instructional strategies and for student engagement. In this study, they found variances in teacher self-efficacy for teaching in general, and specifically when teaching literacy. The authors explained, “The
moderate correlations between these variables suggest that teachers with stronger self-efficacy for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management also tend to feel more capable of delivering literacy instruction” (p. 760). These research outcomes had important implications for this study’s investigation, specifically the relationship of teachers’ self-efficacy for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management, and their self-efficacy when delivering instruction and instructional strategies for English Language Learners.

**Marzano: Research Based Instructional Strategies**

Building on the premise that teachers’ self-efficacy influences teachers’ instructional practices, some scholars recognized that the nature of instructional practice had an impact on student learning. Researcher Robert Marzano (1998) conducted a metanalysis of more than 100,000 research studies and concluded that teachers could improve the quality of their instruction and augment student achievement by using research-based strategies. Marzano suggested that teachers should apply instructional strategies as a tool to accelerate learning, and that teachers should consider the learner when choosing research-based strategies to improve their instruction. Marzano counseled, “The effectiveness of a strategy depends in part on the current achievement level of a student, in part on the skill and thoughtfulness with which a teacher applies the strategy” (Marzano et al., 2000, p. 5).

**Hattie: Strategy Use for ELLs**

Concerning English Language Learners, John Hattie and Nola Purdie (1996) noticed that culturally diverse students utilized instructional learning strategies in distinctive ways, depending on their cultural settings and backgrounds. A cross-cultural comparison was conducted to analyze strategy usage by three groups of high school students: Australian learners in Austria, Japanese students in Japan, and Japanese students in Australian schools. The investigation
revealed that students’ cultural environments influenced how students applied distinct learning strategies. Japanese students in Japan utilized memory strategies with significantly higher frequency than Australian students in Austria. Interestingly, the Japanese students used numerous similar strategies in both localities. Japanese students in Japan applied memory strategies with significantly more regularity than the Japanese students in Austria (Purdie & Hattie, 1996). These implications indicated that cultural experiences influence students’ usage of learning strategies and that English Language Learners’ cultural backgrounds and learning contexts are important to consider when teachers apply learning strategy approaches.

**Hattie: Teachers and Learning Strategies**

Hattie (2003) determined that teachers with high self-efficacy had the most powerful influence on student learning, which had a reciprocal effect, and produced higher teacher self-efficacy. Curious about what efficacious teachers were doing in the classroom, Hatti synthesized over 500,000 studies and examined traits that distinguished expert teachers from less competent, experienced teachers. Teachers’ influence created the highest impact on student learning, such as the use of immediate feedback ($d = 1.13$), quality instruction ($d = 1.00$), direct instruction ($d = .82$), remediation ($d = .65$), classroom environment ($d = .56$). Hattie’s research inspired a desire to know more, and he theorized that “like expertise in teaching, we need a deeper representation of excellence in teachers, a greater challenge and commitment to recognizing excellence, and a coherent, integrated, high level of deep understanding about teacher expertise” (p. 16).

Subsequently, Hattie investigated the application of instructional strategies that highly impacted learner success, regardless of a teacher’s environment, student make-up, and student challenges. In a 2009 study that examined over 800 metanalyses and 50,000 research studies that spanned over 15 years of literature, the researcher concluded that teachers’ actions have the
potential to create positive student achievement or visible learning techniques. Hattie scrutinized strategy learning effect sizes in relation to student achievement and ranked them by effect size \((d > 0)\), or in other words, by the degree that the strategy demonstrated a positive effect on learning. Hatti systematically ordered the strategy learning effect sizes; however, he counseled educators to utilize his *Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies* (2009) as a starting point for teaching decisions because each learner, learning task, and setting is unique and varied. Nevertheless, Hattie points out that the hinge-point strategies or effect sizes greater than 0.40 should be analyzed more closely because strategies having \(\geq 0.40\) effect sizes have demonstrated up to one year’s student growth when applied effectively. Three years later, the researcher analyzed an additional 1200 studies, and the results confirmed comparable teaching strategy effect sizes (2012). The researcher presented his ranked learning outcome effect sizes, with a message of caution. The effect sizes should not be considered in isolation, and of the power of the effect sizes is evident when teachers make their own instruction visible and metacognitively analyze their own teaching (2009, 2012). In 2016, Hatti analyzed an additional 228 studies in a metanalysis about learning strategies with Gregory Donoghue. The authors established “three phases of learning (surface, deep and transfer)” and that the effectiveness of strategy use depends on when the strategy is implemented (2016, p. 1). The authors claimed that “the failure to change strategies in new situations has been described as the tyranny of success” (p. 11). Different strategies are most powerful at various stages of the learning cycle. These findings suggested that teacher judgement and adaptability is a crucial component when considering student achievement.
Poulou, Reddy, and Dudek: Self-Efficacy and Classroom Practices

Maria Poulou, Linda Reddy, and Christopher Dudek (2019) purport that observing and examining teacher practices are important factors when considering student achievement. The authors contended that although there are many studies about teacher self-efficacy, there have been limited studies linking teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs with actual classroom practices (p. 27-28). To address their assertion, the investigators observed 58 in-service teachers in 17 urban schools in Greece. The examiners measured perceived and actual instructional and behavioral management strategy efficacy with the Classroom Strategies Assessment System (CSAS, Reddy et al., 2015), a teacher classroom observation instrument. In this study, the educators first self-reported three areas of self-efficacy: (a) instructional; (b) classroom management; and (c) student engagement self-efficacies. Then the researchers analyzed the potential difference between teachers’ self-reported efficacy and actual application of the three efficacy domains. The results revealed that the CSAS scores for the classroom management and student engagement aligned with teachers’ perceptions. However, significant differences were found between self-reported use of instructional strategies and actual instructional strategies observed. These findings implied that although teachers may feel efficacious about using classroom management strategies, they may not make use of these strategies in actual classroom situations. The results of this study also suggested that instructional coaches may assist teachers with an awareness of the relationship of their instructional self-efficacy beliefs and their actual implementation of classroom practices.

Zee and Koomen: Teachers’ Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Instructing ELLs

Recently, Marjolein Zee and Helma Koomen (2016) analyzed teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs and the impact on teachers’ instructional classroom practices, as well as their influence on ELL achievement. The researchers conducted a metanalysis of 165 quantitative studies spanning
over 40 years to scrutinize the effects of teacher self-efficacy pertaining to quality of classroom processes, students’ academic adjustment, and teachers’ psychological well-being” and included preservice and current teachers, across all grade levels (p. 982). The findings established overall, wide-ranging themes, linking teacher self-efficacy and students’ achievement and motivation. Specifically, 27 of the 165 teacher self-efficacy studies provided general information about teachers’ classroom practices, rather than precise strategies. Their metaanalysis revealed positive relationships between teacher self-efficacy and “students’ academic adjustment, patterns of teacher behavior and practices related to classroom quality” and a lack of teachers’ self-efficacy was associated with teacher burnout characteristics (p. 981). Furthermore, Zee and Koomen questioned the validity of many of the previous teacher self-efficacy studies and suggested that future researchers focus on larger population sizes and increase research methodology rigor.

The evidence of Zee and Koomen’s study substantiated that teachers’ self-efficacy is germane to instructional quality including classroom processes, students’ adjustment, and teachers’ well-being. However, the authors noted disappointment in the quality of the research they examined and advocated for increased theoretical elaboration and empirical substantiation to move the field of education forward. The authors appealed to future researchers to investigate teacher self-efficacy studies with more in-depth, diverse, and varied investigation of educators with reliable data about the impact of teacher self-efficacy and the use of instructional strategies. As a result of their investigation, Zee and Koomen recommended that to improve teachers’ self-efficacy with English Language Learners, professional development must be provided that includes appropriate instructional strategies (2016).
There is a considerable amount of research that has signposted the importance of professional education and its impact on teachers’ self-efficacy (Donnell & Gettinger, 2015; Fackler & Malmberg, 2016; Pas et al., 2012; Yoo, 2016). However, as student classroom populations continue to include increased numbers of English Language Learners, findings show that teachers’ self-efficacy and readiness to teach ELLs is especially impacted by professional learning (Celozzi, 2017; Santibañez, & Gándara, 2018). The following research by Jenelle Reeves (2002), Tschannen-Moran and Peggie McMaster (2009), Elfers et al., and Alla Kudelich (2018) reveals the necessity for improved, high-quality, ongoing ELL professional learning and supports to enhance teachers’ (including experienced teachers) self-efficacy to successfully instruct English language learners. In this study, professional learning is distinguished from professional development. Both refer to a method that schools use to improve teachers’ learning and skills. However, professional development (PD) “is often associated with one-time workshops, seminars, or lectures, and is typically a one-size-fits all approach” (Scherff, 2018, para. 2). In contrast, professional learning (PL) refers to teacher instruction that is “interactive, sustained, and customized to teachers' needs” (Sheriff, 2018, para. 2).

Reeves: ELL Professional Learning and Teacher Experience

Jennelle Reeves (2002) noticed that many staff members need ELL training and conducted a study of 279 high subject area mainstream teachers using a 38 item survey and four follow-up case studies. She examined teachers’ attitudes and perceptions about ELLs. Teachers held a “neutral to slightly positive attitude toward English Language Learner inclusion, a somewhat positive attitude toward coursework modification, [and] a neutral attitude toward professional development for working with English Language Learners” (Reeves, 2006, p. 130).
The inquiry disclosed that numerous general education teachers held fallacies about how English Language Learners learn. For example, “Two misconceptions were evident (a) English Language Learners should be able to acquire English within two years and (b) English Language Learners should avoid using their native language as they acquire English” (p. 138). The investigation demonstrated that many mainstream educators held views that conflicted with current research findings about ELLs’ linguistic acquisition. Reeves’ study suggested that staff would benefit by professional learning, including more experienced staff who believed that they knew how to teach English Language Learners (2002).

**Tschannen-Moran and McMaster: Quality of Professional Learning**

In line with these perspectives, a study conducted by Tschannen-Moran and Peggie McMaster (2009) suggested that just not any professional learning is effective. Tschannen-Moran and McMaster conducted a quasi-experimental study with a sample of 93 primary teachers ($n = 93$ primary teachers) in nine schools using a self-efficacy survey that measured teacher self-efficacy beliefs regarding the implementation of a new teaching strategy using four different types of professional learning styles. Tschannen-Moran and McMaster counseled educators counseled educators that “of the most interesting and important reasons for scholars and school leaders to pay attention to teachers’ self-efficacy is the role it plays in teachers’ implementation of new teaching strategies presented through professional development” (2009, p. 232). Tschannen-Moran and McMaster’s study found that teacher self-efficacy and the type of professional learning provided made a difference. Although four models of professional learning were made available to teachers, with a blend of verbal persuasion and vicarious experiences, only the one that supplemented coaching within the teacher’s classroom and provided follow-up coaching conferences demonstrated significant teacher self-efficacy increases.
The aim of Tschannen-Moran and McMaster’s (2009) study substantiated what prior investigations revealed that “researchers examining teacher attitudes toward the implementation of new instructional practices have frequently found teachers’ self-efficacy to be among the most powerful influences on receptivity to change” (p. 231). Tschannen-Moran and McMaster’s findings implied that when professional learning is supplemented with classroom coaching in an authentic environment, it presented the teacher-learner an opportunity to transfer learned skills in a genuine, non-threatening environment with an expert, and as a result, advanced teacher self-efficacy. The authors concluded that maximum professional learning occurs in an environment that provided an unthreatening, realistic opportunity to support teachers, and therefore, build teacher self-efficacy. Tschannen-Moran and McMaster appealed to future researchers to contemplate “how such self-efficacy is enough to sustain the self-confidence needed to take on the risks inherent in change, and how much is too much, leading to complacency and an immunity to change” (2009, p. 244). The authors indicated that the PL environment may be an important consideration. Moreover, Tschannen-Moran and McMaster raised a critical question which had important implications for researchers; they questioned the how much teacher English Language Learner professional learning was necessary to sustain and advance teachers’ self-efficacy to improve English Language Learner academic achievement (2009).

**Elfers, Lucero, Stritikus, and Knapp: An ELL Support System Model**

Considering the considerable evidence that schools and districts are struggling to support staff with adequate ELL professional development, Ana Elfers, Audrey Lucero, Tom Stritikus, and Michael Knapp (2013) investigated optimal ways to support teachers of ELLs. The authors qualitatively analyzed four districts with supportive school-wide ELL climates. The sample included 12 schools and different grade levels, having varying ELL demographics. The authors
conducted staff interviews, classroom observations, and a review of district documents. The investigation queried the needs of classroom teachers who work with ELLs and “what teachers, educational specialists, instructional assistants, and leaders in such settings believed they needed to better serve ELL students” (p. 160). Their findings led to an ELL support system model that included: (a) professional learning, (b) specialized staff, (c) appropriate instructional resources, (d) an ELL collegial community, (e) school and district leadership, (f) high-quality ELL instruction, and (g) ELL leadership initiatives. It was found that a vital ELL philosophy was needed by leadership to ensure that all staff felt a mutual responsibility to instruct this diverse population. General educators prospered when supported by the collaborative efforts of school and district administrators, program coordinators, and specialists. An efficient ELL system of supports was described by the authors.

. . . intentional and differentiated efforts focused on the continuous improvement of teacher and student learning. ELL-specific supports for classroom teachers may be situated at a variety of levels (e.g., state, district, and school). These supports can go a long way toward building teachers’ confidence and encouraging ongoing learning, thus enabling educators to do their best work in guiding the learning of ELL students. (p. 170) However, Elfers et al., also detected that many educators are not prepared for the educational challenges that ELLs require; therefore, a supportive system builds teacher capacity. Ongoing, consistent, high-quality professional learning, which is reinforced by leadership at all levels, will improve teachers of ELLs instruction. They noted, however, the ability to support teachers who work with ELLs was inherently more difficult at the secondary level because of “pedagogical and content challenges” (p. 172). The Elfers et al., study highlighted the value of creating an ELL teacher system of support, which incorporates professional learning, specialized
staff, instructional resources, a collegial community, multi-leveled leadership supports and initiatives, and a culturally diverse curriculum, to foster the implementation of instructional practices for teachers of ELLs.

**Kudelich: Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and Adequate ELL Professional Learning**

The concept of teachers’ self-efficacy was also examined by Alla Kudelich (2018) in the context of teachers’ perceived value of in-service ELL professional learning. A qualitative study explored two research questions: “How do teachers describe their self-efficacy experiences while teaching English Language Learner students?” and “How do English Language Learner teachers describe the value of teacher training and its influence on their self-efficacy?” (p. 176). Ten of the 13 elementary teacher participants in New York State reported that they had received no prior English Language Learner training. Additionally, 12 of the 13 participants found English Language Learner professional learning beneficial and that PL positively impacted their self-efficacy when teaching English Language Learners.

**Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and Culturally Relevant Teaching**

The United States Department of Education recognized the interconnected relationship between students’ backgrounds and their ability to learn, resulting in the recommendation that teachers use a culturally responsive pedagogy (2017). Geneva Gay claimed that the fundamental aim of culturally responsive pedagogy is to empower ethnically diverse students through academic success, cultural affiliation, and personal efficacy (2000, p. 111). Educational specialists such as James Banks, Gloria Ladson-Billings, Donna Ford, Geneva Gay, and Kamau Oginga Siwatu acknowledged the need for future research in this area and the importance to implement a culturally responsive teaching pedagogy (2011). Although instruction that uses a culturally responsive teaching pedagogy has been referred to by numerous titles, such as multi-
cultural teaching (Banks 1993), culturally responsive instruction (Ford, 1998), culturally relevant teaching (Gay, 2000), and culturally responsive teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1995), educational leaders agree that the implementation of culturally relevant teaching is central to closing the English Language Learner achievement gap.

**Banks: Beliefs, Attitudes, and Self-Concepts**

Banks (1984) conducted an influential, exploratory study of the beliefs, attitudes, and self-concepts of 64 Black, middle-class families \( (n = 111 \text{ subjects}) \) that had school-aged children in nine predominantly White Northwest suburbs. The researcher wanted to learn if the Black families had become bicultural in their beliefs; consequently,” he focused his investigation on “how concepts and theories related to assimilation, pluralism, biculturalism, and marginality could help explain the attitudes and behavior of Black suburbanites" (pp. 2-3). To understand the social and emotional status of middle-class Black families living in a predominately White neighborhood, Banks created and administered a questionnaire, which he used to measure pluralism, assimilation, and marginality (1984). Each scale was defined within the instrument: Pluralism is “the extent to which Blacks are committed to the perpetuation of their ethnic culture and to the survival of ethnic institution” (p. 6). Assimilation is “the process by which ethnic groups such as Blacks acquire attitudes, behaviors, and other cultural components of the mainstream society” (p. 6). Marginality occurs when a person with bicultural identity is not given full societal status, privileges, or power of either culture because of his or her multiple cultural identities. Marginal people were described as those that “remain alienated from both the majority and minority community and are structurally excluded from mainstream society and institutions” (p. 3). He asserted that marginal individuals, who are on the edge of both cultures, have difficulty fitting into either society. A survey was administered to the Black Families,
“Pearson correlations were performed to determine how each of the behavior and attitude variables were intercorrelated” (p. 19). As expected, School Attitudes correlated significantly and positively with Neighborhood Attitudes ($r = .63; p = .001$) and approached significance with Structural Assimilation ($r = .15; p = .06$). However, it was not significantly related to school participation, as had been hypothesized (p. 16).

When considering Banks’ research in the context of education, this analysis suggests that characteristics within different cultures, in this case Black and White, can elicit negative feelings and cause bicultural families to feel marginalized or alienated from participating in the mainstream culture’s activities. Evaluation demonstrated that when Black and White people attempted to live bicultural lives, “. . . most of the intercorrelations of the assimilationist and pluralist variables indicate the problems and difficulties of trying to participate in two cultural settings and to live a bicultural life” (Banks, 1984, p. 25). Findings revealed a significant, a negative correlation between the assimilation and pluralist variables. “The more positive the subjects in this study felt about Blacks and the more active they were in the Black community the more negative they felt toward the predominantly White institutions in which they participated on a daily basis” (p. 24). The reverse situation also applied, “The more positive the parents in this study felt toward their predominantly White communities and the more active they were in them, the less pluralist they were in both attitudes and beliefs” (p. 24).

Bank’s research (1984) trailblazed the social and psychological relationship of bicultural individuals, and he concluded that his study contributed to “the possibility for successful bicultural functioning within Black and White worlds” (p. 24). For the next 60 years, Banks continued to advocate for culturally responsive instructional reform, so educators would empower, rather than marginalize, bicultural students and their families. Banks encouraged
educators to integrate multicultural content into every subject to build diverse knowledge, diminish prejudice, foster equity, and empower diversity (1993).

**Ladson-Billings: Culturally Relevant Teaching**

Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995) coined the term *Culturally Relevant Teaching*, a pedagogy that reflects the view that cultural and language differences are a strength that empower all students and advance academic achievement. Ladson-Billings hypothesized that highly effective teachers “insert culture into education, instead of education into culture” (1995, p. 159). Also, Ladson-Billings conjectured, “teachers who are prepared to help students become culturally competent are themselves culturally competent. They know enough about students’ cultural and individual life circumstances to be able to communicate well with them” (2001, p. 97). The researcher’s goal was to “document the practice of highly effective teachers of African American students” (2007, p. 179). According to Ladson-Billings, “By drawing on the wisdom of practice of experienced and respected teachers, I attempted to build a profile of effective practice that might be usable in teacher preparation and professional development” (2007, p. 179). During the initial investigation, she probed over 200 parents, principals, and colleagues to foster a “community nomination” of participants (2007, p. 181). After Ladson-Billings analyzed the collective findings of the community, she selected eight elementary teachers (5 African American and 3 Caucasian). Subsequently, ethnographic interviews consisting of 11 questions were conducted. Then, from September 1989 to June 1991, she observed each teacher approximately 30 times, for an average of one time a week. Each observation lasted approximately 90 minutes to two hours in length. Visits were audiotaped, and field notes were recorded, and post-observational conference meetings were held with each teacher. Ladson-
Billings visited two of the teachers an additional 20 sessions to provide in-depth studies (2009, p. 185).

Additionally, a partnership with teacher participants and Ladson-Billings determined “a collective interpretation and analysis of the data from the research” (2009, p. 186). The educators assisted the researcher to cooperatively construct a culturally relevant and assimilationist teaching practice model and supplemented it with a 5-point Likert scale. The inquiry indicated that all the teachers, although quite different, had some characteristics in common. Exemplary teachers exhibited a sense of self-determinism, respected students’ home cultures, and prepared minority students to “understand the world as it is and equip them to change it for the better” (2009, p. 152). Overall, model teachers used culturally relevant teaching to collectively advance their students academically, which resulted in improved test scores. Ladson-Billings concluded that these teachers were highly effective because they adopted culturally relevant teaching practices and nurtured their students’ cultural competence while they

- maintain[ed] fluid student-teacher relationships;
- demonstrate[ed] a connectedness with students;
- develop[ed] a community of learners; and
- encourage[ed] students to learn collaboratively and to be responsible for one another. (1995, p. 480)

A second qualitative study by Ladson-Billings followed 14 years later (2009), and she chose eight new teachers (one African American, one Latina, and six European Americans) to participate in her study. The subsequent analysis was analogous to the first investigation; however, the student population and teacher population included enhanced diversity. Observations revealed, “all eight teachers had a strong focus on student learning, developing
cultural competence, and cultivating a sociopolitical awareness in their students” (p. xi). Her investigations confirmed that exemplary teachers supported and embraced the contributions of students from various cultural backgrounds. Ladson-Billings believed that to bring about social change in society, all teachers need to learn about what these successful teachers were doing in the classroom. Ladson-Billings established that culturally relevant teaching improved the learning outcome for all students, not just isolated races, and suggested that teachers receive increased culturally relevant teaching teacher training and professional development (1995a, 2009).

**Gay: A Culturally Responsive Pedagogical Shift**

Geneva Gay (2002) advocated that educator should use an increased sense of *culturally responsive teaching* by adopting a pedagogical paradigm shift to advance minority achievement. She explained that the culturally responsive teaching approach “instructionally supports students’ personal and cultural strengths, their intellectual capabilities, and their prior accomplishments” (2000, p. 24). To support this theory, Gay conducted a metasynthesis that included 52 empirical studies related to culturally responsive teaching practices in grades K-12. Gay’s findings indicated that teachers need to build their own cultural knowledge base to incorporate it into classroom instruction. “Even without being consciously aware of it, culture determines how [educators] think, believe, and behave” (pp. 8-9). Because culturally responsive teaching improves the educational outcomes for ELLs, efforts to improve teacher training should include diversity. Culturally responsive teaching includes instruction that incorporates students’ cultural differences within daily instruction while nurturing and promoting student differences as strengths (Gay, 2010). Culturally Relevant Teaching includes “the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make
learning more relevant and effective . . . It teaches to and through strengths of these students. It is culturally validating and affirming” (Gay, 2010, p. 29).

**Siwatu: Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy**

Investigations, which were conducted properly and efficaciously, by Kamau Siwatu (2011) responded to studies that called for educator training to deliver culturally relevant teaching. He recognized Bandura’s social learning cognitive theory and that “teacher educators should also nurture prospective teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy beliefs” (p. 360). As a result, Siwatu conducted sequential, explanatory, mixed methods research to investigate teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy forming experiences and explored the following research questions:

(a) What is the nature of preservice teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy beliefs?

(b) What types of culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy forming experiences have preservice teachers encountered during their teacher education program?

(c) How do preservice teachers describe the influence that these self-efficacy forming experiences had on the development of their culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy beliefs? (p. 361)

In phase two, Siwatu conducted semi-structured, face-to-face interviews which were tape-recorded and were 30-55 minutes in length. The participants included eight ($n = 8$) consenting individuals who yielded the highest Culturally Relevant Teaching Self-Efficacy (CRTSE) scores. The eight preservice teachers consisted of six females and two males, who ranged in age from 20-23 years. The second phase generated qualitative themes that revealed the reason teachers felt preservice teachers had few experiences with culturally diverse populations,
both in their classes or personally. Siwatu explained that “the interviews uncovered reasons why preservice teachers in this study were less self-efficacious in their abilities to work and communicate with ELLs” (p. 366). Siwatu suggested that preservice teachers receive training in specific culturally relevant teaching strategies. Participants shared that CRTSE scale specific skills for teaching culturally diverse student populations, especially ELLs, were not covered in their preparatory teacher coursework. Moreover, teachers mentioned that they lacked the opportunities to practice being a culturally responsive teacher. Siwatu linked his research to the importance of Bandura’s mastery and vicarious experiences, noting that preservice teachers lacked modeling and experience to build their culturally relevant teaching self-efficacy. Siwatu recommended, “For most preservice teachers, opportunities to practice or observe culturally responsive teaching would ideally occur during their field experiences situated in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms” (p. 366). Implications from this research support the need for teachers’ experiential learning with culturally diverse populations. By strengthening teacher education to include CRT strategies and vicarious CRT experiences, teacher CRTSE will strengthen, which in turn, may advance the learning of culturally diverse student populations.

**Teaching Experience and Qualification**

**Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy: Teaching Experience**

Building on Bandura’s philosophy, Megan Tschannen-Moran and Anita Woolfolk Hoy (2007) hypothesized that career teachers who had more practice, or worked more years, would accrue added mastery experiences and consequently acquire higher teacher self-efficacy. To evaluate this premise, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy administered the Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) assessment to 255 teacher graduates, 170 females and 85 males, three state universities. The researchers invited a diverse sample of teachers with 1 to 29 years of teaching
experience, 21 to 57 years old. The sample represented a variety of ethnicities: 215 Caucasians, 22 African Americans, 3 Latinos/Latinas, 2 Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders, and 5 participants who identified as other. The investigative process included three data analysis phases: (a) the administration and examination of the TSES; (b) a correlational analysis to examine teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs; and (c) a multiple regression analysis to scrutinize the differential impacts. Their investigation concluded that more experienced teachers have somewhat higher self-efficacy beliefs than inexperienced teachers.

Data from the first phase, which analyzed TSES t-test values, confirmed Tschannen-Moran & Hoy’s suppositions (2007). Career teachers self-rated higher on overall self-efficacy (7.61 versus 7.03) scales. Student Engagement, the third subscale, did not reveal a significant difference between the two groups. Subsequently, correlational research was used to explore relationships between teacher self-efficacy of novice and more experienced teachers. Variables included school characteristics, teacher demographics, school resources, verbal persuasion, and mastery experiences. Analyses revealed that school characteristics, demographic data, and verbal persuasion variables were not predictors of teacher self-efficacy beliefs. However, teacher school level and teacher self-efficacy were significantly related for novice teachers ($r = .21$). Also, teacher resources were more strongly related for novice teachers ($r = .32$) than career teachers ($r = .17$). Mastery experience and teacher self-efficacy were found to be only moderately related for both novice and career teachers, ($r = .46$ and $r = .36$, respectively); however, novice teachers presented a stronger correlation. Analysis showed that career teachers associated positive job performance with support from administrators and colleagues whereas novice teachers received support from parents and the community (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).
Lastly, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy utilized a hierarchical regression model to examine the sources of teacher self-efficacy for novice teachers \((n = 74)\) and career teachers \((n = 181)\). Predictor variables were sequentially added: (a) demographic variables (gender, race, and years of experience); (b) context variables (school level and setting, resource support) (c) verbal persuasion variables (interpersonal support of administrator, colleagues, parents, and community) and (d) mastery experience rating (satisfaction with performance). The hierarchical regression analysis revealed statistically significant amounts of variance for novice teachers. “The \(R^2\) increased from .02 to .49 with the addition of subsequent sets of variables, and the \(F\) statistic became statistically significant with the addition of verbal persuasion” (p. 952).

Important influencers affecting the verbal persuasion for novice teachers were resource support \((\beta = .49)\) and interpersonal support from colleagues \((\beta = .32)\). The fourth group, mastery experience, also revealed significant predictor variables, specifically, “Community Support \((\beta = .38)\) and Satisfaction with Performance \((\beta = .47; p = .951)\). Interestingly, when the demographic variable was analyzed by itself, there was no significant variance for teachers’ self-efficacy; however, with the addition of the successive predictor variables, “Thirty-one percent of the variance in novice teachers’ sense of efficacy was explained with the combination of demographic, context, and verbal persuasion variables, and 49% of the variance for novice teachers was explained when mastery experiences were added” (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007, p. 952).

In contrast, the hierarchical regression data for career teachers showed less variance for career teachers than for novice teachers. With the addition of the second set of context variables (school level and setting, resource support), \(R^2\) increased from .02 to .19 with only the School Level Taught variable presenting significance \((\beta = .21)\). The variable School Level Taught
continued “to be the only variable to make a significant independent contribution even when the set of verbal persuasion variables was added” (p. 952). Subsequently, “the addition of mastery experience (satisfaction with performance) made a significant independent contribution to explaining the variance in TSES (beta = .26)” (p. 952). Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy explained that their research revealed that novice and career teachers’ self-efficacy demonstrated patterns. Both novice and career teachers were most impacted by mastery experience. However, the researchers found dissimilar patterns of self-efficacy for novice and career teachers; specifically, verbal persuasion and resources were more likely to impact a novice teacher’s self-efficacy whereas more experienced teachers had higher levels of efficacy for their use of instructional strategies and implementation of classroom management.

**Podolsky et al.: Teacher Qualification**

A recent study by Anne Podolsky, Linda Darling-Hammond, Christopher Doss, and Sean Reardon (2019) discovered that teacher qualification is the *most* important factor predicting student achievement. The authors examined California districts that were consistently able to achieve higher than expected academic success in school regions with challenging socio-economic and demographic features. Student achievement was determined by district-level mathematics and English language arts (ELA) and results from state assessments. The authors conducted a quantitative analysis investigation, which showed a positive relationship to teachers’ qualification and strong negative relationship with less qualified teachers (especially interns, temporary staff, teachers with wavers or emergency permits). The study’s conclusion, which took into consideration socioeconomic status, determined that a major predictor of student achievement is the preparedness of teachers (2019).
Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and Teaching English Language Learners

Although educators may be efficacious when teaching in general, Bandura emphasized that self-efficacy is domain specific, hence the importance of teacher training for specialized instructional areas (1977). In a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) survey, it was found that almost half of the teachers that worked with an English Language Learner, received less than eight hours of PL about the instruction of ELLs (NCES, 2020).

Durgunoğlu and Hughes: Professional Learning for Teachers of ELLs

More recently, Aydin Yücesan Durgunoğlu and Trudie Hughes (2010) researched 62 preservice high school teachers on their self-efficacy, attitude and feelings of preparation when teaching ELLs at a midwestern university in the United States. The Durgunoğlu and Hughes study was completed in two stages, a survey of 62 preservice teachers and four teacher follow-up observations. Overall, the teachers reported their ELL coursework instruction was good in theory, but in the classroom, what they had learned was not supportive, authentic, or practical when they were teaching. When Durgunoğlu and Hughes observed teachers in the classroom setting they noticed that mentoring teachers were poorly prepared to guide the new teachers, and the mentors provided little ELL modeling, support, or authentic interaction with ELLs. Overall, Durgunoğlu and Hughes found undesirable themes during their observations of new teachers’ instruction with ELLs: (a) neglect, (b) a lack of peer support, and (c) an absence of mentoring by supervising teachers.

Estrella: Teachers’ Self-Efficacy When Teaching ELLs

Ivonne Estrella (2016) investigated teachers’ self-efficacy when teaching English Language Learners in mainstream classrooms. Estrella used a self-created instrument, the English Language Learner Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (ETSS), which confirmed that in-service
teachers reported higher levels of self-efficacy than preservice teachers and they conducted a three-phase investigation: phase I utilized the authors’ ETSS assessment to research teacher self-efficacy in relation to English Language Learners using two different samples, phase II applied linear regression analysis to investigate the variables that predicted teacher self-efficacy, and phase III compared in-serve and preservice teacher self-efficacy. In the last phase of Estrella’s investigation, data showed a difference in the type of training programs that benefited in-service teachers and preservice teachers. Significant predictors of in-service teacher self-efficacy were graduate hours and diversity training while language and diversity courses were significant predictors for preservice teachers. These results suggested that ELL achievement outcomes could be improved by tailoring teacher training programs and by initially measuring teachers’ areas of self-efficacy “to facilitate positive student-teacher relationships which ultimately can improve the academic outcomes of ELLs” (2016, p. iii).

**Summary of Chapter 2**

This literature review presented a historical background, the theoretical foundation of social cognitive theory, and teachers’ self-efficacy and instructional practices. In particular, the literature highlighted the importance of culturally relevant teaching. It is noteworthy that most of the research regarding the impact of teacher self-efficacy beliefs on instructional practices for English Language Learners has primarily been conducted with preservice teachers, and most of the related investigations were conducted over 10 years ago. The lack of existing current literature in relation to teacher self-efficacy and its impact on instructional practices for English Language Learners highlighted the necessity for this investigation. Additionally, current research continues to appeal for ELL Instruction in higher education settings of colleges and universities,
as well as, in professional development offerings for the grades PK-12 levels within districts, schools, and classrooms.

The literature regarding Tschannen-Moran and Hoy’s (2001b, 2007) research was essential to this investigation because these scholars authored the TSES instrument, as well as investigated interrelated areas common to this study. Moreover, the researchers were motivated to specify the participant population, years’ experience working with English Language Learners, because the literature indicated that additional experience also increased teacher self-efficacy, and likewise increased the probability that instructional strategy application for students would improve English Language Learner achievement. Similarly, the literature pertaining to Poulou, Reddy, and Dudek (2019) was key to this investigation because it highlighted a pedagogical shift from analyzing student data in isolation to the impact of teachers’ instructional practices and student learning. Also, Linda Reddy and Christopher Dudek’s (2016) instrument, the Classroom Strategy Scale for Teachers (CSS-T), was utilized in this study to collect data regarding teachers’ self-rating of their instructional practices.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research was to examine the influence of teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs and instructional practices among educators who teach English Language Learners in the general education classrooms. To explore these objectives, a mixed methods design, which included the collection, analysis, and synthesis of quantitative and qualitative data to draw conclusions was utilized. Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) recommended that a mixed methods design is best suited for research to describe an initial database and explain what the data means.

To provide the reader with credibility, Chapter 3 commences with the researcher positionality, followed by the research questions. Also provided is a detailed explanation of the methodology used while conducting the study, including: (a) setting, (b) procedures, (c) research design, (d) sampling, (e) participants, (f) quantitative methodology, (g) qualitative methodology, (h) triangulation methodology, (i) timeline, (j) internal and external threats to the study, (k) trustworthiness, (l) ethics statement, and (m) chapter conclusion. The researcher investigated the following processes from December 2018 to June 2021.

Researcher Positionality

The researcher is a student in the Instructional Leadership Doctoral Program at Western Connecticut State University (WCSU) Danbury, Connecticut. She received her Intermediate Administration certification at WCSU; Certificate of Advanced Studies in Literacy at Sacred Heart University; and earned both a master’s degree in Special Education and bachelor’s degree in Liberal Arts with a concentration in business and qualitative analysis at Fairfield University. She transitioned into the field of public education after creating and advancing a small computer software business while volunteering as an educational parent advocate.
The researcher’s 13 years of classroom experience included eight years as a language arts teacher and literacy coach, and five years as a special education teacher in the public-school setting. In addition to her classroom involvement, the researcher was an English Language Learner chairperson, clinical literacy adjunct professor, literacy volunteer, staff developer, and data team coordinator. As a remedial reading specialist in western central Connecticut, the researcher’s responsibilities included advancing reading abilities for students who scored below benchmark on district reading assessments in grades 2-12. Concurrently, the researcher collaborated with educators by coaching and providing classroom-based demonstrations and PL in the classroom. While collaborating with adult learners in diverse settings (urban and suburban) and various grade levels (pre-K to graduate level) it came to the researcher’s attention that both novice, as well as experienced teachers, as well as experienced teachers, frequently requested English Language Learner instructional guidance and strategy suggestions with respect to teaching multilingual students. At the same time, the number of English Language Learners, in urban and suburban settings across all grade levels, was increasing each year. While providing literacy instruction, the researcher noticed that many students who required reading intervention were also English Language Learners. As an English Language Learner facilitator, the researcher’s responsibilities including the following:

- administration of the required English language proficiency assessments (The Language Assessment Scales or LAS Links (Data Recognition Corporation, 2021),

- student achievement,
• coordination of before and after school English Language Learner student tutoring (sponsored by a Connecticut State Department of Education Immigrant Children and Youth Education Grant),
• facilitation of supplementary parent workshops,
• supervision of summative tests to report ongoing growth in proficiency,
• development of English Language Learner support schedules,
• coaching English Language Learner strategy instruction to teachers

The researcher observed that teachers who appeared to have higher levels of self-efficacy when teaching English Language Learners were more likely to apply research-based strategies to advance English Language Learner student learning. Based on personal experience and the research, which has demonstrated that teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs about teacher effectiveness and improved student achievement, coincided with a growing English Language Learner student population, this topic became an area of interest for this researcher. Since the researcher was the primary data collector, it is acknowledged that prior experience as a classroom coach and interest in this topic had the potential to influence existing predispositions. To avoid research bias, interviews were recorded and professionally transcribed, data were triangulated, and a confirmability audit was conducted.

Research Questions

Quantitative Research Question 1

The first research question examined, To what extent and in what manner do the subscales of teachers’ self-efficacy (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management), and instructional strategies (student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance
feedback) predict teachers’ adaptive instruction for educators who teach in K-12 classroom settings that include English Language Learners?

The non-directional hypothesis for Research Question 1 stated that the subscales of teachers’ self-efficacy (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management) and instructional strategies (student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance feedback) will significantly predict teachers’ adaptive instruction for educators who teach in K-12 classroom settings that include English Language Learners.

Qualitative Research Question 2

For K-12 teachers with high self-efficacy and frequent usage of a variety of instructional strategies, how are these strategies used to support English Language Learners?

Setting

The present study occurred in multiple counties located in the northeast portion of the U.S. The region has a mix of urban, suburban, and rural school districts (DataUSA, 2020). The area is considered affluent, with mean property values of $435,000 in comparison to the national mean property values of $230,000 (DataUSA, 2020). Although the region ranks among one of the wealthiest in the country, there are also less affluent residential areas as well, which are demonstrated by the Gini Index of Inequality Coefficient, a statistical measure of income discrepancy. The Gini indicator exposes an income disparity index of .54 for this region, which is higher than the national value of .48 (U.S. Census, 2019).

The racial/ethnic demographics of this region consist of approximately 85% White or Caucasian, 5.8% Latino/Hispanic, 4.5% Asian, 2% Black or African American, and 2.7% two or more races (United States Census Bureau, 2019). Almost 22% of the inhabitants have reported
that they were born outside the United States. Additionally, numerous households speak a second language, where 16% of the residents speak Spanish, 2% Portuguese, and over 1.2% of the residents speak Chinese, Mandarin, or Cantonese (DemographicsNow, 2019).

This region has over 300 primary and secondary schools, of which 67% are public and 33% are private institutions. Student teacher ratios are favorably lower, 14 pupils per teacher, in comparison to the national average, which is 17 students per educator. (Towncharts, 2020)

Graduation rates are high with approximately 90% of students graduating high school, and 49% of students completing post-secondary education (NCES, 2021). Additionally, there are over 40 colleges and universities in the area, of which 11 provide post graduate education.

**Procedures**

Prior to initiating the investigation, the researcher obtained permission to conduct the research from numerous sources, such as, the survey instrument authors, Institutional Review Board (IRB), as well as educational administrators (higher institution department heads, public school superintendents, and principals). First, permission was obtained from the authors in October 2019 to use the survey instruments and electronically administer the survey instruments. Subsequently, the researcher obtained IRB consent, on June 20, 2019. Following the IRB approval, the researcher gained access to the target population by requesting permission from two sources, higher institution department chairpersons and public school administrators (refer to Appendix C for a letter introducing the study). Permission was granted verbally or in writing before the research was conducted. Additional IRB extensions were granted in May 2020 and May 2021 to extend the timeline for the study.
Research Design

Integrated Mixed Methods Design

A mixed methods research design allowed the researcher to “persuasively and rigorously collect and analyze data based on the research questions” (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017, p. 5). This research utilized an integrated design, which was linked by its methods (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Fetters et al., 2013). Two traditional models were integrated: sequential explanatory and convergent parallel mixed methods designs (Figure 1).

Figure 1

*Integrated Mixed Methods Design*

Although traditional mixed methods research designs such as exploratory sequential, explanatory sequential, and parallel convergent designs can provide researchers with foundational rigor based on previous studies, they may not be a true representation of a researcher’s actual practice and may require modification in order to “gain a comprehensive understanding” (Fetters et al., 2013; p. 2145). To garner a sample population with high credentials and still concurrently analyze the data, this distinctive approach was applied. Initially, the researcher collected quantitative data using three surveys, and utilized the results to select a qualitative sample. Next, qualitative interview data were collected. Subsequently, the researcher
separately and concurrently analyzed quantitative and qualitative data. Finally, the data were triangulated. Figure 2 provides a detailed visual model of the integrated mixed methods design procedures and products.
**Figure 2**

*Integrated Mixed Methods Procedures and Products*

**Integrated Mixed Methods Design**

**QUAN Procedures & Products**

**Data Collection:**
- Administered a web-based survey having two Likert scale instruments, and a 20-item demographic survey
- Numeric, nominal, interval level data
- 203 surveys downloaded into a spreadsheet
- Calculated survey scores

**Data Analysis:**
- Demographic Data Calculated
- Quant data cleansed for missing data
- Assumptions Determined: linearity, homoscedasticity, normality, multivariate outliers reviewed
- Correlations determined using SPSS
- QUAN Generalizations of the numeric results determined

**QUAL Procedures & Products**

**Data Collection:**
- Purposeful sampling - Interviewed 10 Participants having the highest summative self-efficacy total score and strategy scale scores from the electronic qualitative surveys.
- Utilized an 11 item semi-structured interview questions based on lit review and QUAN instrument variables.

**Data Analysis:**
- Ten audio recordings
- Ten transcripts
- Deductive and Inductive Coding applied with HyperRESEARCH software
- Created thick, rich descriptions
- Coded interview data
- Detailed descriptions about phenomena

**QUAN and QUAL data were evaluated. Themes and subthemes resulted.**

**TRIANGULATION**
Quantitative Design

This investigation used a quantitative correlational design “to clarify and understand important phenomena by identifying the degree of the relationship among variables” (Fraenkel, Wallen, Hyun, 2012, p. 332). The factors related to teachers’ SE beliefs and the relationship between teachers’ strategy used in the classroom were utilized to predict adaptive instruction.

Qualitative Design

As described by Merriam (2002), “The key to understanding qualitative research lies with the idea that meaning is socially constructed by individuals in interaction with their world” (p. 3). The researcher used a basic qualitative research design to gain natural, humanistic, real-world insights and interpretations about the instructional strategies that K-12 teachers with high self-efficacy use to support English Language Learners (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015).

Sampling

Purposeful Sampling

Jack Fraenkel, Norman Wallen, and Helen Hyun (2012) explain that “based on previous knowledge of a population and the specific purpose of the research, investigators use personal judgement to select a sample” (p. 100). Cognizant of the literature findings, which indicated that teachers with more experience and higher educational qualifications have higher self-efficacy, the researcher established guidelines to recruit participants with high self-efficacy and strategy use. Creswell and Plano Clark suggest that when “participants are purposefully chosen to be different in the first place, then their views will reflect this difference and provide a good qualitative study when the intent is to provide a complex picture of the phenomenon” (2011, p. 174). Considering this objective, the researcher established criteria in order to intentionally select participants with specific experiences and specialized knowledge to fully answer the research
queries. Criteria included educators who (a) had five years of experience teaching English Language Learners (i.e., in the general education, special education, small group settings, and English Language Learner settings), (b) taught English Language Learners within the past 10 years, and (c) held a graduate degree or were currently pursuing a graduate degree. The criteria conditions were established to include individuals with ELL knowledge and experience to collect germane, rich data relative to the research topic (Meyers et al., 2006).

Purposeful sampling was also adopted for the qualitative sample to exemplify characteristics of the subgroup of interest (Patton, 1990). Ten participants from the quantitative sample, who self-rated as having high self-efficacy and classroom strategy use, were purposefully selected to be interviewed.

Convenience Sampling

The researcher also utilized a convenience sampling procedure to include educators within the geographic proximity of the researcher due to time and monetary considerations.

Participants: Quantitative

Participant Selection Process

Permission to participate in the study was requested from administrators at five public schools and three university graduate programs (doctoral and master’s degrees) located in multiple counties in one northeastern state. Subsequently, administrators at each of these public schools and two of the universities agreed to participate in the study. After receiving consent, the researcher emailed designated administrators an attached letter of invitation to participate, which included applicant criteria, a participant consent form, and an electronic survey link (Appendix E).
Invitations to prospective participants were distributed through the educator’s school of employment or higher education institution email and the invitation letter included an attached electronic link. SurveyMonkey (2020), an online survey software, was used to create, send, and collect participant data. Contributors received letters of invitation in their emails, which allowed them to individually and privately, accept, consent, and complete the online survey. Teachers had the choice to abstain from participation or withdraw from the survey at any time. The applicants also had the ability to begin the survey at a convenient time and location due to the survey online link capability, which was accessible for a three-month time span. Each potential participant’s involvement was contingent on their electronic signature of the consent form. If participants consented **and met the criteria, their data were subsequently collected using the SurveyMonkey software. The consent form included two parts: (a) consent to participate in the quantitative online survey and (b) permission to be contacted to participate in a follow-up interview by the researcher. When the participant finished all the questions, the researcher downloaded the responses and calculated the mean scores in Excel. The process did not allow for multiple tests by the same individual using the same device. The online questionnaire was comprised of 65 questions, which took respondents an average of 10 minutes to complete.

**Population and Sample Participants**

The expected response rate, or the number of participants who received the email and completed the survey was 7.5% in contrast to a typical response rate of 35% (Baruch & Holton, 2008). In this investigation, a total of 1330 educators who worked in these districts or were enrolled in graduate programs were invited to participate in the study. To enhance the generalization of subject characteristics, a description of this sample includes gender, age, ethnicity, level of education, classroom setting, and number of languages spoken, a researcher
created, detailed participant demographic questionnaire was designed (Appendix A). Also, refer to Table 3 for specific information about the accessible population and resulting sample size.

Table 3

*Frequencies for Population and Sample Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessible Population</th>
<th>Returned Surveys</th>
<th>Completed Surveys</th>
<th>Met all Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>203 (15.26)</td>
<td>183 (13.76)</td>
<td>126 (9.47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Fifty-seven participants who completed the surveys were excluded because they did not meet all criteria for the study.

Participant characteristics in the quantitative sample were reasonably balanced regarding grade level, with a representation of 66 elementary and 60 secondary educators. Racial/ethnic status features (Table 4) were similar to the national average, according to the U.S. National Center Education Statistics (NCES, 2018). Additional demographic data are located in Table 5.

Table 4

*Participant Racial/Ethnic Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Sample n</th>
<th>Sample %</th>
<th>U.S. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>84.92</td>
<td>79.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Say</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *Slight difference in calculation due to rounding.
## Table 5

### Participant Demographics for Quantitative Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Sample N</th>
<th>Sample %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Not to Say</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Candidate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Year</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * Other indicates a combination of degrees, such as a masters plus 30 credits, dual graduate level degrees, or a masters plus TESOL.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Educator</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventionist (Reading, Math, Speech)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language or World Language</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5 Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area (ELA, Math, Science, S.S., Tech Ed.)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist (Art, Music, Library, Health/Gym)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Retired, Substitute)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Languages Spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Setting (K-5)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area and Specialist Classrooms</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Teaching Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or More</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>88.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Current Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lived in Another Country</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>23.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>48.41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All participants held advanced degrees such as graduate level, sixth year, doctorate, or combinations of degrees, or enrolled in a master’s program. Participants also indicated a variety of responses regarding their training to instruct ELLs (Table 6). Comments regarding PL indicated a wide range of the quality ELL instruction that was received from “extensive Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol training” to “minimal training.” According to the Center for Applied Linguistics (2018), “The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model is a research-based and validated instructional model that has proven effective in addressing the academic needs of English learners throughout the United States.”
## Table 6

**Teachers’ ELL Professional Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of ELL Instruction</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sample %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELL or TSOL Certification</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Classes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Course Content</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Professional Learning or Professional Development</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * Two participants clarified that they received SIOP training at their schools.

**Two participants stated “other” to explain that they received on-the-job experience (with a co-taught class having an ELL specialist or employed by a global education company that tutored ELL students).

### Qualitative

After the quantitative data results were collected, these data were utilized to determine the qualitative teacher sample. Total scores on the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001a) and CSS-T IS (Redding, Dudek, Fabiano, & Peters, 2016) were computed and participants having the highest sum scores on the two surveys were examined. Persons with whom the researcher had personal or professional contact were not considered for participation. Additionally, candidates with high scores who did not consent to a follow-up interview could not be included in the study. Table 7 includes the scores used for selection. Refer to the following tables for additional information about the qualitative sample: (a) TSES subscale scores (Table 8); (b) CSS-T subscale scores (Table 9); and demographic information (Table 10).
Table 7

*TSES and CSS-T Composite Scores Used to Select Interview Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant*</th>
<th>TSES Total Mean</th>
<th>CSS-T Total Mean</th>
<th>Composite Score**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grace Pacelli</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>197.00</td>
<td>305.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena Hendricks</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>203.00</td>
<td>303.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Oakley</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>194.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabelle Xavier</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>197.00</td>
<td>299.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Ribas</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>198.00</td>
<td>297.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasmine Winters</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>189.00</td>
<td>293.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Vowels</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Pacillo</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>176.00</td>
<td>277.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinton Hanson</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>177.00</td>
<td>273.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haylie Pricken</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>173.00</td>
<td>272.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Sample Mean, n = 10</td>
<td>101.50</td>
<td>189.40</td>
<td>290.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group Mean, n = 126</td>
<td>84.99</td>
<td>171.99</td>
<td>256.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *Pseudonym. **For each participant, a total mean was calculated across subscales for the TSES and then for the CSS-T. These means were summed to form a composite value. The resulting interview participants are the highest 16% of the 126 participants. Five participants did not consent to follow-up interviews, and 5 participants had a professional connection with the researcher and, therefore, were not selected.
Table 8

Qualitative Participants’ Mean TSES Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant*</th>
<th>Student Engagement</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Classroom Management</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grace Pacelli</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Oakley</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasmine Winters</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabelle Xavier</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Pacillo</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Vowels</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena Hendricks</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Ribas</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haylie Pricken</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinton Hanson</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Sample Mean, n = 10</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group Mean, n = 126</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Pseudonym
Table 9

*Interview Participants’ Mean CSS-T Subscale Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Adaptive Instruction</th>
<th>Student-Directed Instruction</th>
<th>Direct Instruction</th>
<th>Promotes Student Thinking</th>
<th>Academic Performance Feedback</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helena Hendricks</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Ribas</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Pacelli</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabelle Xavier</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Oakley</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Vowels</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasmine Winters</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinton Hanson</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Pacillo</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haylie Pricken</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Sample Mean, (n = 10)</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group Mean, (n = 126)</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Candidate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Positions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5 Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area Teacher (Math, Science, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventionist (Reading, Math, Speech)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language or World Language</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Teacher (Music, Art, PE/ Health)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages Spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in Another Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Setting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Teaching Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsequently, a purposeful sampling of 10 teachers was established. Selected, consenting individuals were invited in March 2020 to participate in semi-structured, interviews. Applicants were emailed to verify their continued willingness to be interviewed and mutually convenient times were arranged. The purpose of the selection method was to ensure that the interviews were
conducted with participants having high self-efficacy and classroom strategy use. When all of the qualitative and quantitative data were collected, the remaining data analysis was conducted separately and simultaneously.

Instrumentation and Data Collection Tools

The instruments used in this study were: (a) a demographic survey, (b) Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) short form (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001a), (c) Classroom Strategy Scale for Teachers (CSS-T IS; Reddy et al., 2016), and (d) Interview protocol. Using an online Survey Monkey Pro software, the researcher collected survey responses that were systematically downloaded into Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The online survey process provided an easy, confidential, and efficient way for respondents to complete the three questionnaires. Survey completion time was approximately 10 minutes. The responses were downloaded into spreadsheets; afterwards, subscale means were calculated, and data were analyzed.

Demographic Survey

The purpose of the demographic survey was to identify participants’ attributes. A 20-item researcher created demographic survey (Appendix A) was completed by each adult participant at the start of the study. The demographic survey included multiple choice and short answer questions relating to each participant’s current age, ethnicity, gender identity, highest level of education, teaching position, number of languages spoken, educational background, ELL PL, teacher experience, classroom setting, and time and residence outside the United States. Based on the literature findings, the researcher included teachers’ experience in the demographic survey. Teachers’ experience was measured in the number of years that they taught. All teachers
having had a minimum of five years of experience with ELLs were selected to be a part of the study.

**Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale**

Quantitative data were gathered using the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) created by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001a). The TSES, based on Bandura’s SE theory, is an instrument that measures teachers’ self-efficacy self-perception, especially when faced with difficult situations. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001b) field evaluated their TSES instrument with 410 teacher participants from three universities and included a range of teaching levels (elementary, middle, and high school), experience (1 to 57 years) and ethnicity groups (European American, African American, Latino, and Asian American). The TSES has a unidimensional 9-point Likert scale, which requests the respondent to rate their own abilities from 1 (nothing) to 9 (a great deal). Their study concluded that the TSES instrument has high total reliability for both the long form, 24 items, \( r = .94 \) and short form, 12 items, \( r = .90 \). Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001b) recommended that the long form be used with preservice teachers to attain a stronger factor structure (2001a). This investigator’s sample did not include preservice teachers; therefore, the short form was utilized.

**Subscales**

The TSES has three efficacy subscales: student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management. Efficacy in student engagement describes teachers’ efficacy to actively engage students by using motivational strategies to increase interest, value learning, assist families, foster creativity, and encourage students to believe in their abilities (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001a). Efficacy in instructional strategies refers to teachers’ efficacy and willingness to implement and adapt strategies and instructional
techniques in order to meet students’ learning objectives. Strategies include using clear expectations, alternative explanations, appropriate challenges, questioning, differentiation, and alternative explanations (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001a). Efficacy in classroom management refers to teachers’ efficacy to manage disruptive behavior, get students back on task working and, to set up classroom routines and procedures using “strategies aimed at increasing or encouraging desirable student responses through praise, encouragement, attention, and rewards” (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy & Hoy, 1998, p. 11).

Reliability and Validity

Reliability. The researcher utilized the instrument’s three subscale items in Research Question 1, which have good subscale alpha reliability, with (a) engagement scale $r = .81$; (b) instructional scale $r = .86$; and (c) classroom management scale $r = .86$ (Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A., 2001a).

Validity. To determine construct validity, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy (2001b) assessed the correlation of the TSES instrument with the Rand assessment ($r = .18$ and $r = .53, p < .01$) and Gibson and Dembo Teacher Efficacy Scale ($r = .64$ and $r = .16, p < .001$) (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001b). Construct validity positively related to the Rand items ($r = .35$ and $r = .28; p < .01$) and the Rand’s general teacher efficacy factor ($r = .65, p < .01$; and $r = .13; p < .05$); and personal teaching efficacy factor ($r = .12; p < .05$; and $r = .65; p < .01$) (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001b).

Scoring Procedure

In this study, the TSES short form was utilized to determine teachers’ total teaching self-efficacy, as well as their subscale scores for each TSES efficacy subscales. The data are scored by adhering to the instrument procedures and criteria. Tschannen Moran & Woolfolk Hoy
(2001a; 2001b) recommend calculating the mean scores for each subscale (Table 11). Consequently, the items are grouped, and means are calculated.

**Table 11**

*TSES Short Form Subscale Scoring Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSES Short Form Instrument</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy in Instructional Practices</td>
<td>2, 4, 7, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy in Student Engagement</td>
<td>5, 9, 10, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy in Classroom Management</td>
<td>1, 3, 6, 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The authors suggested the above item groupings to calculate the mean subscale scores (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001A).

**Classroom Strategy Scale for Teachers**

The Classroom Strategy Scale for Teacher -Form (CSS-T) is an instrument created by Linda Reddy and her colleagues (2016) that assesses teachers’ self-perceptions of their ability to use empirically based instructional and behavioral management strategies in the classroom (Reddy, Dudek, Rualo, & Fabiano, 2016). The CSS-T consists of two domains, an Instructional Strategy (IS) Scale and a Behavioral Management Scale (BMS). Reddy, Fabiano, and Peters defined the CSS-T Instructional Strategy and Behavioral Management scales.

**Subscale**

The Instructional Scale assesses a combination of two skills: (a) instructional methods, which is “How classroom instruction occurs;” and (b) academic monitoring feedback, which is “How teachers monitor students’ understanding of the material and provide feedback on their understanding” (2015, p. 519). The authors define the Behavioral Management Scale as a total of (a) Proactive Methods, which are “strategies teachers use to promote positive behaviors in the classroom and reduce the likelihood of negative behaviors” and (b) Behavior Feedback, which is,
“How teachers respond to students appropriate and inappropriate behaviors.” In addition, the CSS-T’s two domains, IS and BMS, include five dimensions: (a) adaptive instruction, (b) student-directed instruction, (c) direct instruction, (e) promotes student thinking, and (f) academic performance feedback (Appendix D). These five dimensions were variables in this study.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability. An initial report established internal consistency, test–retest reliability, and construct validity with 293 classrooms in 73 elementary schools (Reddy, Dudek, Fabiano, & Peters, 2015). Preliminary CSS-T Instructional Strategy and Behavioral Management total scales were determined to have excellent internal consistency reliability, with Cronbach alpha coefficients of .93 and .94, respectively.

A test-retest analysis was conducted with 60 of the original classrooms, which included a sample population of 317 subjects (n = 317), across two to three weeks, resulting in adequate coefficients for the IS Total scales (r = .84, Redding et al., p. 527).

Validity. Linda Reddy, Christopher Dudek, Angelique Rualoa, and Gregory Fabiano (2016) investigated CSS-T concurrent validity with The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), a highly regarded and established instrument used to measure overall classroom quality (Pianta et al., 2008). The CLASS has three domains, which were similar to the CSS-T (emotional support, classroom organization, and instructional support), as well as 10 comparable dimensions (positive climate, negative climate, teacher sensitivity, regard for student perspectives, behavior management, productivity, instructional learning formats, concept development, quality of feedback, and language modeling). The concurrent validity results of the CLASS and CSS-T revealed modest, yet significant, correlations (Reddy, Dudek, Rualo, & Fabiano, 2016).
To measure concurrent validity of the CSS-T’s aforementioned five dimensions, the authors conducted a correlational analysis with a sample of 126 kindergarten through Grade 5 general education teachers and measured the frequency and discrepancy scores with the CLASS scores. A correlational relationship between the CSS-T and CLASS had some conceptually similar domains. The CSS-T demonstrated several statistically significant results with the CLASS Domains and dimensions, with some of the IS frequency scales indicating positive relationships to specific CLASS domains and dimensions. For example, the authors concluded that “The IS Total scale, Instructional Methods composite scale, Instructional Delivery subscale, as well as Academic Monitoring/Feedback composite and Promotes Students’ Thinking subscales were positively correlated with the CLASS Classroom Organization domain and Behavior Management dimension” (Reddy et al., 2016, p. 272).

In addition, “The Instructional Methods composite scale and Instructional Delivery subscale were positively correlated with the CLASS Instructional Learning Formats dimension” (Reddy et al., 2016, p. 272). The authors provided information for the concurrent validity with correlations ranging from .05 to .27. The most important correlations between the CSS-T IS and the CLASS frequency scores were Instructional Delivery and Instructional Learning ($r = .24$) and Instructional Methods and Instructional Learning ($r = .19$).

**Scoring Procedures**

Mean scores are calculated for the CSS-T Instructional Strategy domain’s five dimensions: (a) adaptive instruction, (b) student-directed instruction, (c) direct instruction, (d) promotion of student thinking, and (e) academic performance. As previously mentioned, Reddy and Dudek (2016) provided the researcher permission to use one domain of their Classroom Strategy Assessment System instrument, the Instructional Scale, and to modify the directions
As a result, the researcher grouped and scored the question items on a spreadsheet as specified by the authors (Table 12).

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSS-T (IS) Dimensions</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Instruction</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-directed Instruction</td>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed Instruction</td>
<td>10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of Student Thinking</td>
<td>18-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance</td>
<td>24-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview Protocol (Qualitative Data Collection Tool)**

A semi-structured interview protocol was created to gather rich, descriptive data from 10 participants regarding their personal experiences and instructional practices. In October 2018, 11 open-ended queries were formed using the literature. Appendix B illustrates the rationale for the research questions and corresponding constructs. Several of the interview questions were framed using key instructional practice components from the Classroom Strategy Scale for Teachers assessment. In this way the researcher hoped to expand on the quantitative responses of experienced teachers’ instructional practices who work with English Language Learners.

“Qualitative methods [were] used to obtain the intricate details about phenomena such as feelings, thought processes, and emotions that are difficult to extract or learn about through more conventional methods” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 11). Inquiries initiated with general questions such as “What English Language Learner professional learning have you and the staff received?” Questions concluded with more abstract, complex inquiries about teacher’s English Language Learner instructional practices, such as, “How do you plan for explicit instructional supports to
meet the needs of struggling English Language Learners?” (Saldaña, 2016). The interview protocol was reviewed by committee members, Dr. Pauline Goolkasian and Dr. Helena Nitowski.

**Data Analysis Process**

**Quantitative Research Question 1**

**Data Preparation**

The process of quantitative data preparation included downloading the SurveyMonkey data into a spreadsheet. The participants answered the demographic survey in categorical format, and the information was coded and tabulated. To prepare the survey instrument data for analysis, the data were screened and cleaned. First, variable scores were reviewed to ensure that values were within the range of possibilities. IBM’s Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to analyze the data. It included descriptive statistics summary and provided minimum and maximum values, as well as the number of valid and missing cases. Next, data were scrutinized to find extra spaces, and/ or typographical errors. Subsequently, all data errors were corrected or deleted.

**Data Screening**

To ensure the integrity of the data, the data were screened prior to coding and data analysis. Data screening was used to ensure that the participants met the established criteria.

**Data Coding**

SurveyMonkey responses were downloaded as a collection of primary source numbers and characters. Codes, or short words, were assigned to the raw data to give it meaning. There was no reverse coding. Afterwards a comprehensive codebook was systematically established to describe the arrangement of the codes and deliver a summary (Appendix F). The codes provided
a method to acquire descriptive statistics, such as how many males and females, for categorical variables (Fraenkel et al., 2012). A participant code identification (ID) number was assigned to protect the privacy of individuals in the study. For consistency, each respondent’s 11-digit identification number assigned when taking the survey was also preserved in the data spreadsheet. All collected data were methodically and accurately recorded to ensure precise, accurate conclusions.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Nominal and interval data were collected from the demographic survey and analyzed using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics, a mathematical technique for organizing and summarizing a set of numerical data, was used to elucidate characteristics of participants (Gall et al., 2007).

**Multilinear Regression**

Research Question 1 was guided by the quantitative inquiry. The dependent variable was adaptive instruction and predictor variables of each subscale of teachers’ self-efficacy (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management), and each subscale of instructional strategies (student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance feedback) listed in Table 13. The dependent and independent variables were represented by interval level data.
A nonexperimental, correlational research model was used “to clarify and understand important phenomena by identifying the degree of the relationship among variables” (Frankel et al., 2012, p. 332). A multilinear regression was used to analyze the interval data from the survey instruments to identify the extent to which the set of independent variables predicted teachers’ adaptive instruction (Meyers et al., 2006). A stepwise multiple linear regression (MLR) procedure was used in which the researcher entered the seven predictor variables at the same time into the regression equation. Meyers et al. (2006) explain, “In a stepwise multiple regression, independent variables are added to the equation if they make a statistically significant contribution to the regression equation” (p. 216). Next, the researcher analyzed the relationship between the criterion variable and predictor variables in two ways. It was employed to measure the strength and relationship of each predictor variable that correlated with the criterion variable, and to “look at how well all [the] predictor variables together predict the outcome variable” (Muijs, 2011, p. 172). The effect size magnitudes and directions were analyzed to support the interpretation of the MLR results (Meyers et al., 2006).
Qualitative Research Question 2

Research Question 2 guided the qualitative research process. The researcher examined factors that related to classroom teachers’ strategy use when teaching English Language Learners.

Data Collection

From March 2020 to April 2020, 10 individual meetings were personally conducted. Although the first interview was conducted as a face-to-face meeting, subsequent interviews were completed by telephone due to the coronavirus pandemic outbreak, which created an international public health concern. The interviews required approximately one hour each, and participant discussions were audio recorded and transcribed to ensure accuracy.

Qualitative data from the interviewing process were used to provide a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions to “. . . preserve chronological flow, see precisely which events led to which consequences, and derive fruitful explanations” (Miles et al., 2014, p. 1). A structural coding application was employed using a blend of coding applications. As described by Saldaña, “A code in qualitative inquiry is most often a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data” (2016, p. 4).

Coding

To establish themes, a blend of structural coding with a two-cycle coding process was used. Saldaña (2016) suggests that structural coding is appropriate for semi-structured interviews to “label and index” the data. This method was selected because it provided the researcher with an initial process of assigning preliminary codes to the interview questions, which were created using definitions from the CSS-T survey instrument. Using a structural coding process, “Each
discrete question and its associated probes are assigned a code that is then applied or linked to the question and subsequent response text in each data file” (Namey et al., 2008, p. 140). Structural coding “acts as a labeling and indexing device, allowing researchers to quickly access data likely to be relevant to a particular analysis from a larger data set” (Namey et al., 2008, p. 141).

**Data Analysis**

Next, the researcher cleaned the interview transcripts, conducted first cycle coding, second cycle coding, and synthesized the themes (Figure 3). The first cycle coding process was a blend of linking appropriate text to structural codes and then assigning emergent labels to interview responses. Additional emergent labels were established at the textual level, and the researcher created summative statements, by line and/or by paragraph, within the interview transcripts. During the second cycle coding, the researcher established pattern coding or “the category label that identifies similarly coded data” (Saldaña, 2016, p. 235). Initial codes were scrutinized, and basic patterns of frequency, sequence, similarities, and differences were established.

**Figure 3**

*Qualitative Data Analysis*

![Triangulation Methodology](image)

Subsequently, data were triangulated using a four-step progression: (a) quantitative results were summarized, (b) qualitative results were summarized, (c) data were jointly analyzed
for codes and themes, and (d) data were triangulated and convergence and divergence were explained (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017; Miles et al., 2014). The researcher triangulated the data and utilized the survey analysis, interviews, and a reflexive journal to strengthen the validity of the results and enhance the accuracy of the study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017). The mixed methods diagram in Figure 1 illustrated the progression leading to triangulation: (a) QUAN and QUAL results were sequentially collected and summarized; b) QUAN and QUAL data were analyzed independently and separately; and (c) QUAN and QUAL data were analyzed for codes and themes; d) QUAN and QUAL data were triangulated, and convergent themes were explained (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017).
Timeline

The research study time frame occurred from December 2018 with the initiation of a written proposal to a detailed explanation of the outcomes in May 2021 (Table 14). A demographic survey and open-ended survey were also created in December 2018. After permission was obtained from the IRB in June 2019, the researcher acquired authorization from Connecticut universities and public school districts to recruit participants. Data were collected between September 2019 to April 2020 of the investigation. During this time, the researcher gathered the survey data, as well as interviewed 10 participants. Subsequently, the quantitative and qualitative data were coded concurrently, and the responses analyzed and organized from May 2020 to September 2020. IRB extensions were sought and granted in June 2020 and May 2021. The researcher wrote the findings from April 2020 to June 2021.
### Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal was written</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Permission was obtained from the authors</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-ended survey was created</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal was sent to Committee Members for Review</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal was defended and IRB approval was obtained</td>
<td>April - June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator permissions were obtained</td>
<td>June - September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited Participants</td>
<td>September 2019 - February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB Amendment was requested and obtained</td>
<td>October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyed Participants</td>
<td>September 2019 - March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewed Participants</td>
<td>March 2020 – April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed Survey Coding and Analysis</td>
<td>May 2020 – Sept 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB Extension was Granted</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzed Data</td>
<td>May 2020 – Aug 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB Extension was Granted</td>
<td>May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote Findings</td>
<td>April 2020 - June 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethics Statement

Jack Fraenkel, Norman Wallen and Helen Hyun (2012) advised researchers to conduct a study using methods that protect participants from harm, safeguard confidentiality of research data and ensure honesty. Western Connecticut State University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) granted approval for the study in June 2019, which assured that the study was safe and ethical for human participants. This research followed ethical precautions and adhered to The American Education Research Association’s (2002) code of ethics to ensure honest, ethical, objective, and respectful procedures to reduce participant harm and capitalize on research benefits (AERA, 2002). Additional precautions were implemented to obtain electronic
confidentiality and informed consent (Leach et al., 2015). All electronic data obtained from participants on a system/computer/file that was not connected to any CSU system. The researcher ensured that personal data of participants remained securely private by storing data on an external hard drive.

A letter of permission was obtained from universities and school districts, given to the researcher’s major advisor, and a copy of the letter was included with the IRB application. All participants were assured, in writing that their participation in the study was completely voluntary, free from coercion, and anonymous (appendices D-E). The researcher avoided intentional physical and psychological harm to all participants. The researcher did not disclose identifiable sensitive information and, contextual identifiers were removed from the data to ensure complete confidentiality for every research participant.

To confirm the findings of the study, dependability and confirmability audits were conducted by the researcher’s primary advisors, Marcia A. B. Delcourt, Ph.D., and Pauline E. Goolkasian, Ed.D.

**Summary of Chapter 3**

This chapter presented a detailed account of the methodology used by the researcher to gather information about the research setting, educators, instruments, sampling procedures, research design, and data collection procedures. Also, to foster researcher credibility and trustworthiness, the chapter supplied a researcher biography, a plan to maximize trustworthiness and minimize threats, and a statement of ethics and confidentiality. Chapter 4 provides a comprehensive analysis and explanation of the data collected.
CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter describes the analysis of the data gathered, which showed how teachers’ self-efficacy and adaptive instruction impacted the instructional practices that influence positive teaching outcomes for English Language Learners (ELLs). Aligned with this intent, the chapter is presented in the following sections: (a) a quantitative analysis and results, (b) qualitative data analysis and results, and (c) the triangulation of the data.

Quantitative Analysis and Results

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 addressed: To what extent and in what manner do the subscales of teachers’ self-efficacy (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management), and instructional strategies (student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance feedback) predict teachers’ adaptive instruction for educators who teach in K-12 classroom settings that include English Language Learners?

The non-directional hypothesis for Research Question 1 stated that the predictor variables (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, efficacy in classroom management, student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance feedback) will significantly predict teachers’ adaptive instruction for educators who teach in K-12 classroom settings that include English Language Learners. There were seven predictor variables (a) efficacy in student engagement, (b) efficacy in instructional strategies, (c) efficacy in classroom management (d) student-directed instruction, (e) direct instruction, (f) promotion of student thinking, and (g) academic performance feedback, and one criterion variable, adaptive instruction.
**Quantitative Data Analysis**

The researcher analyzed the data using a computer Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, IBM Corporation, 2017). To make valid conclusions from the data, the key assumptions of multilinear regression were evaluated using SPSS software (Osborn & Waters, 2002).

**The Assumptions**

Every statistical analysis has expectations that need to be met in order for the evaluation to be authentic and genuine. “When these assumptions are not met the results may not be trustworthy, resulting in a Type I or Type II error, or over- or under-estimation of significance or effect sizes” (Osborne & Waters, 2002, p. 1). A multilinear regression requires that the variable relationships follow a rational selection. The regression procedure provides the optimal projection when each IV is strongly correlated with the DV, but uncorrelated with other IVs (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018). In this study the regression assumptions performed included checking for outliers and testing for the assumptions of (a) normality, (b) linearity, (c) homoscedasticity, and (d) independence, and (e) multicollinearity (Meyers et al., 2006).

**Checking the Outliers.** Initial “preparatory data analyses [were] conducted to locate and correct problems in a data set prior to a main analysis” (Fidell & Tabachnick, 2003, p. 115). To detect for the presence of outliers, the researcher utilized the Mahalanobis assessment in SPSS. The Mahalanobis distance analysis produced the extreme values output, which was evaluated with a chi-square criterion value of 24.322, seven degrees of freedom, and \( p < .001 \) (Meyers et al., 2006, p. 673). Because none of the Mahalanobis distance values equaled or exceeded this chi-square criterion, the researcher concluded that there were no multivariate outliers (Table 15).
Table 15

*Extreme Values for Mahalanobis Distance Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahalanobis Distance</th>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.99545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.99042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.98986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.98807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.98666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, when analyzing the histograms, Barbara Tabachnick and Linda Fidell (2018) explained that cases that have standardized scores greater than “3.29 (p < .001, two-tailed test) are potential outliers,” and cases are analyzed to consider if the data should be transformed or altered by removing the data (p. 107). One variable had two outliers that were analyzed using an electronic spreadsheet and found to have participant z scores higher than the 3.29 cut-off criteria, as illustrated in Table 16.

Table 16

*Identified Outlier Z-Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Participant Mean</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Outlier Z-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance Feedback</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>-3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance Feedback</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>-3.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although “outlier (univariate or bivariate) removal is straightforward in most statistical software. . . . it is not always desirable to remove outliers” (Osborne & Waters, 2002, p. 1). Jason Osborne and Elaine Walters counseled that by removing outliers, it “can improve normality, but complicate the interpretation of the results, and should be used deliberately and in an informed manner” (Osborne & Waters, 2002, p. 1). Moreover, Tabachnick and Fidell clarified that “transformations are undertaken both to improve normality of distributions and to pull univariate outliers closer to the center of a distribution, thereby reducing their impact” (p. 108). Cohen et al., (2003) counseled researchers that outliers, which are not very extreme and constitute less than 2% of the sample size, may be considered a justification for retention. Since the outliers did not impact normality and distribution and they represented less than two percent of the sample size, the need for a transformation of data did not validate the removal of participant data, and the outliers remained as a part of the research study. The following assumptions of normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, independence, and multicollinearity further supported the researcher’s decision to retain the outliers and proceed with the regression evaluation.

**Normality.** A normal distribution presumes that data are applicable to the general population and can be observed graphically. When analyzing the errors of prediction on a scatterplot, the distributed data “should reveal a pileup of residuals in the center of the plot at each value of predicted score and a normal distribution of residuals trailing off symmetrically from the center” (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018, p. 161). Another useful test for normality, is the P-P plot, also called a probability-probability plot, as the two data sets are charted to determine if the two data sets agree. The linear graph shown in Figure 4 displays plotted expected values, which are on and very close to the expected sloping line. Andy Fields (2013) explained, “If values fall on the diagonal of the plot, then the variable is normally distributed; however, when
the data sag consistently above or below the diagonal points are S-shaped, the problem is skewness” (p. 182).

Figure 4

Probability Plot of Regression Standardized Residual for Adaptive Instruction

![Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual](image)

The following histograms (Figures 5-11) illustrate that the expected values and observed values were closely related and demonstrated a normal distribution (Field, 2013). Thus, the data supports normality and does not violate the normality assumption.
Figure 5

*Histogram: Participant Frequency Responses for Efficacy in Student Engagement*

![Histogram of Efficacy in Student Engagement]

Figure 6

*Histogram: Participant Frequency Count Responses for Efficacy in Instructional Strategies*

![Histogram of Efficacy in Instructional Strategies]
Figure 7

*Histogram: Participant Frequency Responses for Efficacy in Classroom Management*
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Figure 8

*Histogram: Participant Frequency Responses for Adaptive Instruction*
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Figure 9

*Histogram: Participant Frequency Responses for Student-Directed Instruction*

![Histogram for Student-Directed Instruction](image_url)

- Mean = 5.43
- Std Dev = 1.20
- N = 320

Figure 10

*Participant Frequency Count Responses for Promotes Student Thinking*

![Histogram for Promotes Student Thinking](image_url)

- Mean = 6.68
- Std Dev = 0.97
- N = 126
Linearity. Partial regression scatterplots did not reveal any nonlinear relationships (Figures 12-18). The data demonstrated a linear relationship between the dependent value and the independent variables (Pallant, 2016, p. 162). The dependent variable, adaptive instruction, and seven independent variable interactions (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management), and each subscale of instructional strategies (student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance feedback) illustrated linearity.
Figure 12

Partial Regression Scatterplot for Efficacy in Student Engagement

Figure 13

Partial Regression Scatterplot for Efficacy in Instructional Strategies
Figure 14

Partial Regression Scatterplot for Efficacy in Classroom Management

Figure 15

Partial Regression Scatterplot for Direct Instruction
Figure 16

Partial Regression Scatterplot for Student-Directed Instruction

Figure 17

Partial Regression Scatterplot for Promotes Student Thinking
Figure 18

Partial Regression Scatterplot for Academic Performance Feedback

Homoscedasticity. The assumption of homoscedasticity was examined to determine that the variance of error items was comparable across the independent variables. This assumption can be validated with a “visual examination of a plot of the standardized residuals (the errors) by the regression standardized predicted value” (Osborn & Waters, 2002, p. 4). In Figure 19, the scatterplot of standardized residuals illustrated a statistical dispersion, having an overall, slight rectangular shape, which suggested that heteroscedasticity was present (Meyers et al., 2006). Therefore, the regression assumption necessitating an absence of homoscedasticity among variables was met.
**Independence.** Another key multilinear regression supposition is that the residuals are independent of each other. In this study, the independence assumption was conducted with the Durbin-Watson Independent of Observations. “The associated Durbin-Watson statistic is a measure of autocorrelation of errors over the sequence of cases, and if significant indicates nonindependence of errors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018). Andy Field specified, “The residual terms should be uncorrelated, a value of 2. Values less than 1 or greater than 3 are of concern” (Field, 2013, p. 311). In this study, the upper and lower bounds for the critical values for the Durbin-Watson statistic were established, and the value of 1.80, indicated that the independence assumption was met (Table 17).
Table 17

Durbin-Watson Independence of Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$F$ Change</th>
<th>$df_1$</th>
<th>$df_2$</th>
<th>Sig. $F$</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The Independence Assumption value of 1.80 has been met (Field, 2013).

**Multicollinearity.** In a regression, the absence of multicollinearity is also an important assumption for valid outcomes. “Collinearity is a condition that exists when two predictors correlate very strongly” (Meyers et al., 2006, p. 180). When independent variables measure the same characteristic, or are highly correlated, they can falsify or distort the results of the multiple regression study. To ensure that two or more of the individual predictors in this study were not correlated, the independent variables were analyzed. Since the recommended guidelines for determining the presence of multicollinearity consist of tolerance values of .01 or less, and “variance inflation factor (VIF) values greater than 10,” the correlation levels in this study, listed on Table 18, were within the ranges; therefore, the assumption of a lack of multicollinearity was recognized (Meyers et al., 2006, p. 212). None of the Tolerance values were less than .01 and all VIF values were less than 10 (Pallant, 2016).
Table 18

*Absence of Multicollinearity for Research Question 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Student Engagement</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Classroom Management</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Directed Instruction</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Students' Thinking</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The correlation levels in this study were within the appropriate range tolerance levels greater than 0.10 and VIF values less than 10 and validated the assumption of a lack of multicollinearity.

**Assumptions Met.** Requisite regression assumptions of (a) normality, (b) linearity, (c) homoscedasticity, and (d) independence and (e) multicollinearity were met and indicated no violations to the regression expectations.

**Quantitative Statistical Analysis**

**Bivariate Correlation Coefficient Analysis.** A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the strength and direction of the linear relationships between each pair of variables, where coefficients between .10 and .29 represented a small effect size, coefficients between .30 and .49 denoted a moderate effect size, and coefficients greater than .50 denoted a large effect size (Cohen, 1988). The correlations were based on an a priori alpha value of 0.05 with the sample of 126 participants.
Quantitative Results

Research Question 1

Multiple Linear Regression

After the preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity, the researcher conducted a stepwise multilinear regression and prepared a table of descriptive statistics “to classify and summarize [the] numerical data” (Hinkle, et al., 2003, p. xx). The means, standard deviations (SD), minimum and maximum scores, and values of skewness and kurtosis for each variable are presented in Table 19.

Table 19

Descriptive Statistics for Research Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>-0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>-0.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Instruction</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.532</td>
<td>-0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Directed Instruction</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-0.642</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Students’ Thinking</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.456</td>
<td>0.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance Feedback</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.456</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stepwise Regression Results

The stepwise statistical method was conducted, which automatically selected the significant variables that contributed to predicting adaptive instruction. The stepwise method
served to reduce variable uncertainty when conducting exploratory data analysis (Agostinelli, 2002; Bakk & Vermunt, 2016; Thayer, 2002). Jerome Thayer (2002) elaborates,

As variables are found to be good predictors in different models, the different prediction characteristics of the variables in the various models can be used to recognize how the variables function as predictors and can be used to develop a theory or models that can be assessed with further research. (p. 3)

In this study, the stepwise multi-linear regression procedure was conducted to examine the variance in the model of the seven predictor variables: (a) efficacy in student engagement, (b) efficacy in instructional strategies, (c) efficacy in classroom management, (d) student-directed instruction, (e) direct instruction, (f) promotion of student thinking, and (g) academic performance, with the criterion variable of adaptive instruction. The process individually entered each predictor variable into the regression equation. Step-by-step, the process determined the predictor variables that contributed to the prediction equation. If the p values were below the threshold, statistical criteria of $p < 0.05$, the predictor candidate variable was removed until only significant predictors remained. The variables of teachers’ experience, efficacy in instructional strategies, efficacy in classroom management, and promotion of student thinking did not have a significant impact on the model’s ability to predict the criterion variable, adaptive instruction. Adding each predictor in the stepwise procedure resulted in better predictive accuracy. As a result, the variance in the model as significantly predicted by the four variables of academic performance feedback, efficacy in student engagement, student-directed instruction, and direct instruction (Table 20 and Table 21).
Table 20

Pearson Correlations for Instructional Strategies and Teachers’ Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Adaptive Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Student-Directed Instruction</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Direct Instruction</td>
<td>.481**</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Promotes Students’ Thinking</td>
<td>.473**</td>
<td>.438**</td>
<td>.507**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Academic Performance Feedback</td>
<td>.491**</td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>.552**</td>
<td>.560**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Student Engagement</td>
<td>.435**</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>.320**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>.388**</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td>.575**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Classroom Management</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>.213*</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td>.601**</td>
<td>.639**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 21

Multiple Regression ANOVA Summary for Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Regression</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.962</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>34.42</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45.39</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Regression</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.429</td>
<td>29.93</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30.53</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45.39</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Regression</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.851</td>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>27.83</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45.39</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Regression</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.822</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45.39</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Adaptive Instruction  
b. Predictors: Academic Performance Feedback  
c. Predictors: Academic Performance Feedback, Efficacy in Student Engagement  
d. Predictors: Academic Performance Feedback, Efficacy in Student Engagement, Student-Directed Instruction  
e. Predictors: Academic Performance Feedback, Efficacy in Student Engagement, Student-Directed Instruction, Direct Instruction  

Note. This table shows that the explanatory variables had a statistically significant association with adaptive instruction and had a p-value of 0.001 (p < .05), which illustrated that the model accounted for a statistically significant amount of the variance in the outcome.
A significant linear regression was calculated to predict adaptive instruction based on teachers’ efficacy in student engagement, and the instructional strategies of student-directed instruction, direct instruction, and academic performance feedback. The model was significant, \( F(4,121) = 22.36, p \leq .001 \) with an \( R^2 \) of .42. Together, the variables in the model explained 42% of the variation in adaptive instruction. The effect size was large (Cohen, 1988), based on a multiple correlation of .652 (Table 22). Adaptive instruction was equal to teachers’ efficacy in student engagement (IV1) + student-directed instruction (IV2) + direct instruction (IV3), + academic performance feedback (IV4).

**Table 22**

*Model Summary of Variables Predicting Adaptive Instruction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Adjusted ( R^2 )</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change in ( R^2 )</th>
<th>( F ) Change</th>
<th>( df_1 )</th>
<th>( df_2 )</th>
<th>Sig. ( F )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.491(^a)</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>39.497</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.572(^b)</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>15.694</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.622(^c)</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>11.822</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.652(^d)</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>8.043</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a. \) Predictors: Academic Performance Feedback  
\( b. \) Predictors: Academic Performance Feedback, Efficacy in Student Engagement  
\( c. \) Predictors: Academic Performance Feedback, Efficacy in Student Engagement, Student-Directed Instruction  
\( d. \) Predictors: Academic Performance Feedback, Efficacy in Student Engagement, Student-Directed Instruction, Direct Instruction

*Note.* There was a moderately high correlation, \( R = .65 \).
The non-directional hypothesis for Research Question 1, there will be a significant relationship between the predictor variables (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, efficacy in classroom management, student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance feedback) would significantly predict teachers’ adaptive instruction for educators who teach in K-12 classroom settings that include English Language Learners was accepted, and the null hypothesis was rejected ($p \leq .05$).

In the final model of the stepwise regression, there were three excluded variables, which did not collectively predict adaptive instruction: (a) promotes students’ thinking, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management (Table 23).
Table 23

Research Question 1: Stepwise Regression Excluded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-Directed Instruction</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>3.502</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>3.355</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Students' Thinking</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>3.169</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Student Engagement</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>3.962</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>3.492</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Classroom Management</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>1.759</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student-Directed Instruction</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>3.438</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>3.437</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Students' Thinking</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>2.628</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>1.695</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Classroom Management</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-0.486</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>2.836</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Students' Thinking</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>1.698</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Classroom Management</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The sample included 126 participants (n = 126).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Promotes Students' Thinking</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>1.379</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy in Classroom Management</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The sample included 126 participants ($n = 126$).
In the final model, academic performance feedback, efficacy in student engagement, student-directed instruction, and direct instruction significantly contributed to the prediction of adaptive instruction \((p \geq .05)\) while the variables teachers’ experience and the efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and promotion of student thinking did not. As the significant predictors increased, adaptive instruction increased. The final step included the following predictors: academic performance feedback, efficacy in student engagement, student-directed instruction, and direct instruction (Table 24).
Table 24

Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Variables (Coefficients Table)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.914</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>6.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.988</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>5.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>3.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.280</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>4.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>3.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>3.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>2.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>3.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>2.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>2.836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Adaptive Instruction
The significant variables that collectively and positively correlated with adaptive instruction included: (a) academic performance feedback (beta = .197, \( p < .05 \)), efficacy in student engagement (beta = .289, \( p < .001 \)), (c) student-directed instruction (beta = .212, \( p < .05 \)), and (d) direct instruction (beta = .240, \( p < .05 \)). These results suggested that educators who used adaptive instruction that aligned with students’ backgrounds, talents, interests, and performances also provided students with academic performance feedback (Wang, 1980; Waxman et. al., 1995). Additionally, these instructors had higher efficacy in student engagement, increased efficacy to actively involve their students, as well as more frequently used the instructional strategies of student-directed instruction, and direct instruction. The combined strategies used, in order of magnitude, included:

(a) academic performance feedback - strategies such as monitoring students’ progress, delivering student feedback, acknowledging work accuracy, correcting student misunderstandings, and promoting metacognitive awareness (Reddy & Dudek, 2014).

(b) efficacy in student engagement - teachers actively involve students using motivational strategies (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001A)

(c) student-directed instruction - constructivist activities such applying personal experiences, as connecting content to prior learning, hands-on activities, and cooperative learning to involve students in the learning process.

(d) direct instruction - techniques such as modeling, identifying, and summarizing to promote student learning (Reddy & Dudek, 2014).

**Quantitative Reliability and Confirmability**

Reliability or consistency of the data was achieved with inter-rater examination to ensure rigorous quantitative rigor. Inter-rater reliability, “a type of reliability that examines whether
observers are consistent with one another,” was conducted, and the data results were consistent (Salkind, 2014, p. 466). Marcia A. B. Delcourt, PhD, a Professor of Education and Educational Psychology at Western Connecticut State University, as well as a committee member for this investigation, reviewed the data and verified the assumptions of the regression and stepwise regression with corresponding outcomes. Additionally, Marcia A. B. Delcourt conducted a confirmability audit of the quantitative procedures, and reviewed the survey instruments, quantitative data collection procedures, electronic resources, spreadsheets, de-identified raw data, and records.

**Qualitative Analysis and Results**

The qualitative portion of this investigation utilized data garnered from semi-structured interviews.

**Research Question 2**

The research question was: What instructional strategies do K-12 teachers with high self-efficacy use to support English Language Learners? To address this research question, the researcher asked 10 qualitative sample participants to verbally articulate their strategy use with English Language Learners in their classrooms.

**Qualitative Data Collected**

The researcher created a database to safeguard the qualitative data, and participants were assigned pseudonyms to protect confidentiality. Interviews were recorded with the Otter 2.0 speech-to-text transcription application, which provided live transcription note-taking (Otter.ai, 2020). The audio files were converted to raw text files, which were cleaned by the researcher. For example, timestamps, names, and identifying information were removed or substituted with pseudonyms. Unfamiliar terms and abbreviations, such as IEPs (Individual Education Plans) and
ELLs (English Language Learner), were specified. Subsequently, files were uploaded to HyperRESEARCH 4.0, a qualitative analysis software which enabled the researcher to implement initial coding and secondary coding, as well as data analysis and theory building. At the onset, participant case codes were assigned to each interview file, and the researcher created an initial codebook with codes that were defined by adding descriptions. Additional codes were formed as interviewees addressed additional concepts, and the researcher maintained a codebook (Appendix F).

**Participants**

The demographic information regarding the participants was explained in Chapter 3. The participants were assigned pseudonyms (Table 25).

**Table 25**

*Qualitative Participants: Pseudonyms and Instructional Positions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants (Pseudonyms)</th>
<th>Instructional Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grace Pacelli</td>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haylie Pricken</td>
<td>ESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena Hendricks</td>
<td>ELL Co-teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabelle Xavier</td>
<td>ELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Pacillo</td>
<td>PE and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Vowels</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Ribas</td>
<td>Bilingual Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Oakley</td>
<td>Grade 5 English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinton Hanson</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasmine Winters</td>
<td>TSOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview Data**

The duration of the interviews ranged from 50 minutes to 90 minutes. The first interview was conducted in-person, before the COVID pandemic began shutting down schools. The
remaining nine interviews were conducted as tele-interviews. All participants were provided the option to interview with Zoom but preferred to talk on the phone. Consent to audio record and transcribe the interviews was granted from each participant before the interview process was initiated.

**Coding Process**

The researcher implemented Saldaña’s (2016) “Code to Theory Model” and streamlined codes into categories, then subthemes, and finally into themes (p.12). Saldaña explained that the process “progresses from the particular to the general by predicting patterns of what may be observed and what may happen in similar present and future contexts” (p. 13). Initially, a combination of deductive and inductive coding was utilized. A deductive code list was created “from the conceptual framework, list of research questions, hypotheses, problem areas, and /or key variables that the researcher [brought] to the study” (Miles et al., 2014, p. 81). Ten a priori codes with emerging subcodes were created after the researcher reviewed the literature (Table 2 and Appendix G). Thematic coding was employed from the initial list and the researcher-identified words and passages of text into categories. Gibbs (2007) explained that this thematic process “captures something of the spirit of what is involved in linking sections of text with thematic ideas that reveal the person's experience of the world” (p. 3).

**First Cycle Coding**

The researcher used deductive coding, a top down process, and established 116 preliminary codes using theoretical vocabulary from the research questions and the open-ended interviews (Saldaña, 2016). The initial codes were grouped and cross-linked to the corresponding case codes or participants. Once familiar with the data, the researcher reviewed the transcripts a second time. Then line-by-line, inductive descriptive codes and in vivo codes, were added to
obtain meaningful insights from the participants. Subsequently, a code map was generated, and the codes were collapsed and merged.

**Second Cycle Coding**

In the second cycle coding processes, codes were refined, and clustered. Patterns, and categories emerged, which set the stage for further analysis and the drawing of conclusions. The HyperRESEARCH software enabled the researcher to view a code synthesized thematic map and word cloud visualization. Output was generated via the Report Builder, which was utilized by the researcher to thematically classify the data.

**Categories and Themes**

As the researcher continued to refine the codes, patterns emerged. Subsequently, categories, subthemes, and themes were established. Rossman and Rallis (2003) make clear that there is a distinct difference between categories and themes. A category [is] “a word or phrase describing some segment of your data that is explicit, whereas a theme is a phrase or sentence describing more subtle and tacit processes” (as cited in Saldaña, 2013, p. 282). Appendix H illustrates the researcher’s codes, categories, subthemes and themes. The researcher streamlined the 108 second cycle codes into 60 categories, then 14 subthemes, which resulted in four themes.

**Qualitative Themes**

The following section details the four themes that resulted from the qualitative frequency analysis for Research Question 2. Theme 1, strategy instruction, consists of specific strategies that educators used (i.e., adaptive instruction, direct instruction, student-directed instruction, and academic performance feedback). Theme 2 contains the foundational requirements necessary to implement effective ELL instruction, including the following: social-emotional well-being, appropriate referrals; and ongoing instruction for ELLs; as well as, teaching self-efficacy and
confidence level for instructing ELLs were necessary. Theme 3 includes the crucial role that leadership had in creating a conducive atmosphere for teachers to implement these strategies, such as PL, an inclusive curriculum and time to collaborate with their peers. Lastly, Theme 4 is comprised of instructional applications such as culturally relevant teaching, technology, and an affective filter to advance teachers’ instruction when teaching ELLs. The detailed list of theme and subtheme frequencies found in Table 26 and Appendix H substantiate the 4 themes and 14 subthemes.

Table 26

Qualitative Theme and Subtheme Frequency Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strategy Instruction</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>Adaptive Instruction</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Directed Instruction</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Performance Feedback</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Foundational Requirement</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Appropriate Referrals</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social-Emotional Well-being</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher SE to Instruct ELLs</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing Instruction</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Time</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive Curriculum</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instructional Application</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Culturally Relevant Teaching</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Affective Filter</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Theme 1: Strategy Instruction**

Teachers utilized ELL strategies and applied them based on the student’s need and the required task. No one type of strategy instruction worked in all settings for all students. Top strategies included the following: (a) adaptive instruction, (b) direct instruction, (c) student-directed instruction, and (d) providing academic performance feedback to support English Language Learners. Yasmine Winters emphasized, “Instructional strategies must be meaningful, because one strategy, does not fit all, and this applies to every English learner, and every student for that matter.” Although the educators spoke of numerous types of strategies that they used to support English Language Learners, the most prominently used approaches are detailed in Table 27.
### Theme 1: Instructional Strategies Used to Support ELLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Strategy Definitions</th>
<th>Participants’ Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Instruction</td>
<td>This teaching strategy refers to “how educators respond to their students’ learning needs while teaching. These methods reflect a teacher’s flexibility and responsiveness to students’ needs, as well as methods of differentiated instruction” (Reddy &amp; Dudek, 2014, p. 74).</td>
<td>Linguistic Ability Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Background Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence Simplification Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior and New Knowledge Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>These practices include “direct instruction techniques, modeling, identifying, and summarizing” (Reddy &amp; Dudek, 2014, p. 74).</td>
<td>Teacher-Directed Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Break Down the Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clearly Defined Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Color Technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Directed Instruction</td>
<td>These practices encompass “constructivist and hands-on instructional techniques, linking lesson content to prior learning, personal experiences, and cooperative learning” (Reddy &amp; Dudek, 2014, p. 74).</td>
<td>Project-Based Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hands-On Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Advocating Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance Feedback</td>
<td>“Teachers guide students’ understanding by encouraging students, affirming appropriate application of the material, and correcting misperceptions” (Reddy &amp; Dudek, 2014, p. 74).</td>
<td>Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gestures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adaptive Instruction

Reddy and Dudek (2014) defined adaptive instruction as how educators “respond to their students’ learning needs while teaching” (p. 74). It is a teaching procedure that differentiates, modifies, and adapts instruction; therefore it accompanies other instructional strategies. Participants identified that their students needed day-to-day instruction to be differentiated and that adaptive instruction was an instructional necessity. Helena Hendricks explained, “It’s what you do in the moment when you know that the student is in need of another avenue to travel down in order to get clear and concise information.” Yasmine Winters recounted, “I am noticing in a student’s classwork, as they’re completing the classwork, subsequent pull-out lessons or re-teaching. I’ll use what’s happening in the classroom, and the areas where students need improvement, as follow-up lessons.” The sections which follow indicate some of the ways that participants report having adapted their instruction.

Linguistic Ability Application. Haylie Pricken emphasized that she adapts instruction using a student’s language assessment proficiency level, or LAS level (Laslinks.com). “For a level one, a student should be given basic vocabulary and words with visuals.” She further noted that for students who achieved LAS level 2 results, she provides “answer frames, word boxes and short sentence starters.” Whereas for ELLS for students attaining a LAS level 3, she “might provide a student with a few words to get started or just the main idea with a suggestion on how to proceed.” Similarly, Isabelle Xavier explained that a student’s LAS level assists with planning her instructional approach.

The lower-level ELLs benefit best from of a diagram with pictures and labels, and the upper-level ELLs benefit from structured meaning based passages that are chunked into
sections for what they were expected to read, so they could get the gist of the reading without being bombarded with all kinds of language.

**Inquiry Strategy.** Educators personalized their instruction using an inquiry approach. They described this strategy as a useful method to evaluate a student’s understanding and then adjust instruction where it was needed. Grace Pacelli explained, “You can see if they understand it just by the way they answer the questioning.” Grace Pacelli added, the questioning strategy helps the ELL to clarify their language, “engage, and to look deeper.” Haylee clarified, “I will sit close to the student to whisper to them and ask questions to see if their understanding translated correctly.” Yasmine Winters suggested that when an ELL seems confused by the teacher inquiry, a good strategy is to “ask a similar question” and then reteach if necessary. Isabelle Xavier remarked that, particularly in reading, educators typically ask questions at the end. She suggested that when we teach ELLs, we should ask questions throughout the learning. She counseled,

> Teachers of ELLs should focus on the prior and the during part. I usually have little stops with doing stuff, and we talk about what does that mean. If it is a literature class, ask what is happening to the character, why did the character react this way, and what is happening here.

**Background Knowledge.** Educators shared the critical necessity of understanding each student’s background so that instruction can be adapted accordingly. Yasmine Winters contended that it is our duty to “level the playing field” by providing students with background information. She asserted, “One of the main differences in teaching ELLs and native English-speaking students is the background that they come to us [with], no matter what the grade level.” Moreover, the participants maintained that no matter where an ELL is born, even if it is in the United States, the family’s educational or literacy level plays a role. Isabelle Xavier emphasized,
“There are some ELLs that have not been schooled, and they are going to school for the first time.” She added, “I start by modifying my curriculum because sometimes the curriculum is built up on the prior level on the prior grade.” Also, Isabelle Xavier stated that if a “Social Studies class objective was to debate about the Presidential election, before I go to the target, I have to make sure the students have the background knowledge.”

Haylie Pricken asserted, “If an English learner who just came here from Korea needs to understand what a cranberry bog is, that student has every right to learn what a non-English learner is learning about.” To accomplish this, Haylie Pricken advised, “Have a video of what a cranberry bog looks like and bringing in actual cranberries so they can see what a cranberry looks like.” However, Olga Ribas clarified that although she often reviews basic skills to build background knowledge, at other times, “I might not know something an ELL knows. Sometimes students know quite a bit and are experts.” Likewise, Nora Vowels said that, sometimes, our ELLs “know things that we don’t, and there is an opportunity begging to happen.” She explained, “I try to pick a couple of children's songs that an ELL would know from their native country, such as counting songs, singing games in their language, and …then I use the ELL as my resident expert.”

Alternatively, Nathan Pacillo described that he delves into a student’s background knowledge by meeting with them privately. This provides his ELLs with an opportunity to tell him about their personal experiences, so he can personalize their lessons. He clarified,

I start talking and ask them, [and ask] Hey, have you talked about health before? Like, did you have a kind of class like this in your country? I give them a list of our topics and ask them, have you engaged with any of these topics before? Have you been or have you used any of these things before?
**Sentence Simplification.** Six participants reported that they adapted their instruction with sentence and text simplification approaches. Haylie Pricken stated,

I used a sentence simplification strategy: What I did was I kept simple sentences and then I left prepositions out of other sentences. I made sure it was always subject verb, direct object format. I paid attention to the syntax of every sentence, and I added extra visuals even more than what Newsela had originally had. And then I adapted the writing prompt because writing prompts are linguistically very challenging.

Yasmine Winters added a critical simplification strategy requirement, “One of my tasks, is to simplify the language without simplifying content.” Alternatively, Quinton Hanson simplified sentences utilizing a more comprehensive method. He said, “I use sentence starters and revise documents in such a way that it also explains. I'll modify a document completely differently for ELLs, and they get different ones so it's a lot easier to understand, with easier terms.”

**Prior Knowledge and New Learning.** Yasmine Winters indicated that an educator can be “be more mindful” about presenting new information and adding upon what the student already knows, after a teacher learns about an ELL’s background. She explained, “I link previous learning to new learning ... because it allows the student to kind of skim [for] an idea.” Olga Ribas also emphasized that an ELL’s known, native vocabulary, will assist in the second language vocabulary acquisition. Likewise, Isabelle Xavier noticed that reading proficiencies build from what a student knows in one language to another. Isabelle emphasized, “In my opinion, you only learn to read once in any language. You are going to transfer all those skills that you have learned to your second language.” She compared linking the knowledge to an example, “Once you really learn to read well, you can pour all that into your second glass. Your
second glass is going to be fuller quicker.” For instance, Isabelle Xavier recollected that a high school student had “zero English . . . and a particularly good educational background.” As a result, “she learned English fast. We were able to focus more heavily on content because she was educated.” This was a common theme among the participants. Additionally, Olga Ribas said, “when I am teaching, I always want to find out words or things that connect them to where they're coming from, so that I can integrate it in my lessons.” She explained, “We utilize words that are similar in Spanish and English, or Portuguese and English, so that our students use them at school to understand the instructions that they are reading.” Also, educators applied their ELLs’ content area knowledge to future instruction. For example, Isabelle Xavier elaborated, “ELLs come to high school with some background knowledge about photosynthesis from elementary or middle school, but when it gets into the and whole photosynthesis cycle, it’s a little bit more cumbersome for the ELL to grasp.” She explained once a teacher is aware of what a student knows, the teacher can then link the new learning and prepare students for what the rest of the class is expected to understand. In essence, the participants recognized that tapping into what ELLs know, and building on that knowledge, makes a positive impact.

**Linguistic Support.** Adapting instruction with linguistic support strategies varied among the participants. Nathan Pacillo provided a “synonym” approach as well as the use of visuals to enhance students’ linguistic capabilities. He recommended using new words with familiar words to enhance language comprehension. Whereas Olga Ribas explained that she uses lexical cognates, or words that have a common language origin. She added that although all her students are ELLs, she attends to their different linguistic levels and assesses the students differently depending on their linguistic capability. Olga Ribas stated that because ELLs are processing two
or more languages, it is very important to provide them with “extra time” to respond. She specified,

We provide sufficient waiting time for something they are thinking and they're translating in their brain because they need a little bit of extra time to express what they're trying to. Especially when they are new to the country, allowing them to speak in their own language.

**Direct Instruction**

Direct instruction, or instruction that “teachers use to deliver academic content or convey information to students” (Reddy & Dudek, 2014, p. 74), was used by all the participants as an introductory instructional strategy. They noted that in many cases when they assumed that an ELL understood a task, the student really needed an explanation but were either afraid to inquire or did not know how to verbalize their question. In general, the participants noticed that when they provided teacher-directed lessons, pre-taught vocabulary, visuals, clear tasks, and broke down the learning, ELL students were more likely to comprehend the educational objective.

**Teacher-Directed Approach.** The educators recounted that they initiated the learning with a teacher-directed instructional approach, which included explicit modeling, vocabulary, and visuals. Teachers typically used this method when teaching a new skill or concept, and then guided the learners through an activity designed to assess if the concept or skill was mastered. Isabelle Xavier recounted that in her youth, one of her instructors provided her with direct instruction, and now she applies the same direct method for her students. She recalled,

I was lucky, because when I learned to English as a second language, I had a teacher that I will never forget because if I was not understanding, she modeled and explained it. . . .
remember one time, she got up on top of the desk to model a preposition, it was something on top of something.

Olga Ribas explained that the strategies she uses for her teacher-directed instruction, depends “on the level where they are.” For a student who scored a level one or two on the LAS assessment, “I probably give them a give them a chart to answer the question.” However, she added, “For the more advanced, I just tell them, “Okay, show me step one, two and three, without a chart. So, it depends on the levels where they are.”

**Vocabulary.** All 10 participants reported that they provided pre-taught vocabulary and described a variety of approaches. Olga Ribas said, “I start picking up what important [mathematical] vocabulary my ELLs need, so they will be able to understand, present the content, learn the content, and solve the problems.” Quinton Hanson “set up words on Quizlet, which helps them understand terms, with a picture and across the board it is good for all students.” He also explained, “Sometimes, I'll highlight the terms and underline it in a document. Often, I give the ELLs a different definition of the vocabulary terms.” He added, “Sometimes I modify the vocabulary so that it is defined for them, and I provide sentence starters after the questions.” He exemplified, “Right now, we are learning about Native Americans, and we put pictures of a Native American being surrounded by someone, to give them an idea of what surrounded means.” Similarly, Nathan Pacillo presented the ELLs with a vocabulary sheet with the definitions so his students could talk about the vocabulary words. “Then they engage with vocabulary, with the peers that they want to work with in the classroom.” Alternatively, Haylie Pricken pre-teaches vocabulary in a pull-out setting and described the advantages, “When an ELL is in the classroom, and the teacher is teaching something in the lesson, the student is better able to connect a lesson that was pre-taught in the pull-out setting.” Haylie observed, “They
seemed more confident because the ELLs actually partake in the discussions, and they seem to understand more what is happening [in the classroom].”

**Visuals.** Participants described how ELLs tend to process auditory information at a slower pace, and that using visual information was a valuable supplemental strategy to increase comprehension. Helena Hendricks explained, “If the ELL was reading a textbook in a reading class and . . . his or her native language is not English, we would work with vocabulary charts that have pictorial connections.” Isabelle Xavier suggested that educators should differentiate the type of visual by the ELL’s level (LAS Links). For students at lower levels, teachers should provide diagrams, pictures and labels as a prereading strategy. Whereas for higher level ELLs, teachers should provide “a movie because it is easier to put words to pictures.” Likewise, Olga Ribas used math visuals. She described,

> One of the best strategies I found for my students is to draw the chips to represent what they were working on with adding and subtracting. Using that kind of visual and even doing it themselves, I found was beneficial for my students to help them remember.

Yasmine Winters asserted, “Providing visuals is a game changer!” But she clarified that it is important to provide several illustrations to make sure the learner does not misunderstand the image. She said, “Sometimes, we provide a visual, but there can be a lot of misinterpretation within the visual if we are only providing one.” She explained, “What I like to do with the visuals, depending on the word or the concept that we are clarifying, is to provide examples and pictures of the actual word and provide examples and pictures of what it is not.”

**Break Down the Learning.** Another strategy is to scaffold the learning objective with incremental steps. Isabelle Xavier specified phases of direct instruction that she adopted for her ELLs. She recounted, “So, we just broke everything down, step-by-step, with pictures, and even
arrows going from one side to the other because reading the directions was a difficult task for this student.” Then Isabelle Xavier described how this had a positive influence on student learning, “After breaking it all down and doing [it] the actual way, and doing all that, the student was able to proceed by accumulating the results.” Similarly, Grace Pacelli explained that “the approach has to be broken down into smaller chunks that are understandable and digestible at the student’s level.” Additionally, Olga Ribas described, “I provided space, lines, and charts tables for them to process the work and to better understand what they’re doing.” Olga Ribas added, “I teach them note-taking to look at the process, step-by-step unfolding techniques to try to find patterns of how to process the information and solve the problems.” In general, participants described the benefits of delivering instruction in meaningful, manageable segments because it helped ELLs grasp the information better.

**Clearly Defined Tasks.** Interviewees described that since ELLs require explicit instructions and techniques, they modeled clearly defined tasks before requiring ELLs to work on an assignment. Olivia Oakley explained, “I would have made sure the ELL understood what their task was, and [I would] be clear on what they must do, not just assume they know what to do.” Olga Ribas conveyed, “I identify what is the content that I want them to learn and then what is the language objective, and based on that, I use different supplementary material like graphics and visuals.” Helena Hendricks elaborated, “I use a specific learning activity that is modified in such a way that the content stays the same but is not as difficult to interpret.” Helena Hendricks detailed, “I use manipulatives to demonstrate the math or the wording.” Olivia Oakley also related that she often “shows them a final product.” The clarification strategy was critical because ELLs have a wide range of background knowledge and abilities; and therefore, they require individualized, clearly, identified learning objectives.
**Color Technique.** The educators utilized color to classify concepts, which was especially useful for comparing, and contrasting ideas. Yasmine Winters said, “We color code, so the sentence colors match the word bank colors.” She explained that the strategy provides learners an opportunity to categorize and retrieve terminology, and it can be used with markers, as well as colorful flashcards. Yasmine Winters also clarified that using color provides ELLs with “some autonomy in how to begin a sentence within a paragraph by using the color-coded phrases or words within a word bank.” To extend this strategy to higher level ELLs, Yasmine Winters teaches her ELLs to categorize paragraphs, main ideas, transition words, and supporting ideas. Likewise, Haylie Pricken narrated that when her ELLs had been required to take notes in a while watching a video, “I gave them answer frames, sentence starters and a color-coded organizer to help them with the writing part of it because the task was broken up.” She clarified, “We color code the sentence starter, the sentence frame, or the paragraph frame, based on the level of the student.” Grace Pacelli suggested that when working with strategies such as applying color, it is important to teach one strategy at a time until the learner becomes comfortable and understands why they are using it because “sometimes a teacher-focus on everything [all at once], including vocabulary, comprehension, culture, color, motivation, and interest with our ELLs. Yasmine Winters advised that it is important to “explain what it means and what to think about” when teaching any strategy.

**Student-Directed Instruction**

Interviewees described that student-directed instruction was an integral component to advance ELL learning. It provided constructivist, hands-on learning that linked the instructional content to students’ prior knowledge, personal experiences, and engaged ELLs in cooperative learning with their peers (Reddy & Dudek, 2014). Educators elaborated that student-directed
instruction increased independence and accountability while reinforcing skills in a social setting. Student-directed instructional strategies included project-based learning, peer partnerships, hands-on activities, a self-advocating approach and collaborative learning.

**Project-Based Learning.** Instructors planned projects to support their ELLs’ objectives and they linked tasks to relevant subject matter and interests. Nathan Pacillo’s students developed healthy meals, and Nora Vowel’s students presented musical ensembles and dances. The projects had clear expectations because the projects were accompanied by detailed rubrics. Also, formative assessments assisted the teachers in grading the projects based on students’ capabilities and LAS Levels. Some of the participants explained that they included the community in their projects to create a realistic application of students’ learning goals. Isabelle Xavier’s students “complete community projects, buy ingredients at local markets, spend time with senior citizens, and help kids with homework as part of their grade.” Additionally, Olga Ribas’ projects integrate collaboration within the Latino community, to develop “authentic leadership skills.”

**Peer Partnerships.** Similarly, the educators discussed the benefits of peer partners, where one student helps the ELL, without making the ELL feel dominated. Quinton Hanson stated, “I will give them verbal feedback with one person translating for another, so they can hear what I’m saying.” He added, “ELLs seem to understand how their peers interpret your directions better than the teacher language directions.” Similarly, Olivia Oakley explained that she would frequently form partnerships for one of her ELLs, “because just having conversations with somebody his age versus me” was valuable. Olga Ribas explained that recently she requested peers to work with her two new ELLs from the Arab region and India. “I didn't know that it was going to be so challenging, but my students knew somebody with their same background.”
Quinton also found it beneficial when classmates spoke the same language and assisted each other, as a result, he highly recommended ELL peer partnerships.

**Hands-on Activities.** Educators advocated that ELLs benefited from practicing new skills with hands-on activities or projects. Haylie Pricken suggested, “I think one of the best ways to enhance ELL comprehension is to have them perform and participate in activities. The more they can do it, the better.” Isabelle Xavier explained, “Unless science is really done hands-on, it’s difficult for ELLs to understand.” The participants described specific, various, hands-on experiences. Haylie Pricken’s students created rap songs, then sang and acted out their multiplication facts to rap music. Nora Vowels described that “so much of what I do in my classes is hands-on, and she explained that students learn music better by actually practicing an instrument rather than watching. Grace Pacelli recounted that she collaboratively instructs with other teachers featuring hands-on stations. She stated, “Each one of us would take an aspect to teach, and we would move, and the kids would move.”

**Self-Advocating Approach.** Educators provided students with opportunities to apply their new learning through a process of self-advocating and self-monitoring. Nathan Pacillo explained, “A lot of an ELLs success is based on self-advocacy and getting students to have some kind of verbal, written, sign or signal to get the teachers attention when they understand the material.” Nathan Pacillo described that the most useful strategy he has witnessed an ELL teacher show his students: “The teachers were developing communication strategies to help strategies to help students speak up when they were and when they were not understanding something.” Haylie Pricken asserted, “Self-advocating has to be taught.” She counsels her ELLs, “It is okay not to know because your teachers will be better able to help you.” She emphasized
that rehearsing self-advocacy skills is part of the process, “We set it up in my room, and practice, and then I help the ELLs apply self-advocacy skills in their classrooms.”

**Collaborative Learning.** Nathan Pacillo is a proponent of collaborative learning in groups. He explained, “To be honest with you, a lot of the things that we do in class are interactive.” He reasoned, “My ELL students do not want to be verbally involved in class. A lot of times the ELL students do not want to participate.” As a helpful strategy, he adopts a collaborative learning approach and explained “The ELL’s verbal presentation piece is not as big, but they are doing a lot more on the research component, [so] I make sure I give them extra credit for that.” He explained that the classroom social environment assisted ELLs learn vocabulary, while building their confidence. Olivia Oakley depicted an example of how an ELL was supported by her classmates in a positive social group approach:

I put Sunni (pseudonym) with this good group of kids. We do a lot of group work, and we will go around the room and each table must share their answers. The students are supposed to rotate who shares, but her group is very good on making sure when it is her turn, she has to say the answer that she is supposed to say. This way it is not me putting her on the spot. It is her peers, and they are not doing it in a mean way. They are like, hey, it is your turn, and they have not written down what she is supposed to say, and she says it

Participants consistently remarked that student-directed peer-learning partnerships were extremely beneficial for English Language Learners because these approaches offered the ELLs a low stress opportunity to practice teacher-directed strategies and gain confidence to practice skills while developing their English competencies. Also, small group-based discussions and projects provided a setting, which encouraged the ELLs to take risks. In addition, class peers
provided language models, emotional support, and fostered needed friendships. Olga Ribas added, it is helpful to “provide opportunities for interaction, so they are mindful, mostly working in pairs or small groups.”

**Academic Performance Feedback**

As identified by Reddy and Dudek (2014), teachers applied academic performance feedback to monitor students’ progress, deliver student feedback, acknowledge work accuracy, correct student misunderstandings, and promote metacognitive awareness. The participants described that after they provided instruction, they delivered academic performance feedback, using a variety of approaches, such as conferring, goal setting, providing student recognition mastery learning, gesturing, and using digital feedback. Concurrent with each of the following recommendations, educators stressed the importance of allowing for adequate processing time.

**Conferences.** Regular conferences with students that tailored instruction to meet their individual needs was reported to establish a trusting relationship between the educators and their ELLs while encouraging ELLs to take risks and have powerful, deep conversations. Yasmine Winters explained that when conferring with ELLs, teachers should start with a clear purpose, inform instruction, and provide the student with feedback on their understanding. She stated, “It provides instantaneous data, because the more immediate the feedback, the better.” She reflected, “The more forethought you put in it, the smoother it goes.” Nathan Pacillo elaborated, “If a student does not get the information, I will sit with them as they do their edits.” Isabelle Xavier said, “I try to guide them by really focusing on giving specific feedback as to how they have done with a particular task.” Haylie Pricken recommended conferring with students using journaling because “it is a non-threatening way to learn about her students and get ELLs to learn.” She added that it is an additional way “to recognize and celebrate student growth.” Olga
Ribas stated it was simpler for her to meet with her students when she had “12 to 15 students.” However, she reported that it was harder this year, “I have five classes with about 30 students.” Although most of the educators reported that they met with the students in the classroom, half of the participants also had conferences with their ELLs individually, not in front of their peers. Yasmine Winters found “that pulling students out of class, or the “pull-out” model, is easier for the ELL.”

**Goal Setting.** In general, the participants felt that setting realistic goals guided ELLs in a positive way. Isabelle Xavier reasoned, “Failing grades is [sic] not beneficial for an ELL.” She added, “The goal is practically the same for all ELLs, to get them to achieve and do the best they can do at any level.” Grace Pacelli emphasized that it is essential to simplify what the ELL needs to accomplish because there are so many requests, such as, “the daily objective, their language objective, as well [as] an ELL language objective.”

Some participants referred to goal setting in relation to students with disabilities. In particular, some educators referenced Individual Education Plans (IEP) for Pre-K through 12 and Section 504 Rehabilitation Act of 1973 Act, a Civil Rights Law. The IEP is “an individually tailored statement describing an educational plan for each learner with exceptionalities” (Gargulio & Bouck, 2021, p.43). It is an educational procedural plan or program for Pre-K students with specific disabilities. Similarly, the 504 plan, is a Federal Civil Rights law. It protects and provides services for individuals with disabilities who do not require specialized individualized instruction (Gargulio & Bouck, 2021). Both plans provide modifications to the environment, so individuals with disabilities may receive necessary services.

Nathan Pacillo mentioned that teachers of ELLs also have to be conscientious about students’ IEP and Section 504 goals. Olga Ribas counseled that “the starting point is to consider
the student’s levels of English proficiency, make modifications, and plan meaningful goals.”

Isabelle Xavier suggested, “Initially, teachers of ELLs need to establish goals with the students.” She recommended, “Rubrics help students know ahead of time what the expectation is.” Also, she added, “It provides ELLs with great feedback on their performance.” Olga Ribas concurred but cautioned, “Often rubrics are given to the ELLs in the regular classroom, but they can be harsh for the ELLs. So, we need to think about the interpretation of that rubric.” Olga Ribas concluded, “I usually modify the rubrics that they receive in class.”

**Gestures.** Nathan Pacillo explained that when the typical strategies do not work and the instructor does not have students or teachers who can translate for an ELL, it can cause an “impasse” and “you need to rely on gesturing and other forms of communication.” Olga Ribas added that with the gesturing she “speaks slowly, using a lot of repetition.” Additionally, some participants described how gesturing was utilized to provide visual student feedback. Yasmine Winters described, “We have little cards that are red and green signals that the student can use with us while the lesson is going on or during independent work.” Whereas Nora Vowels recalled,

I use a 1-2-3-4 feedback to see if the kids understand or get what I am teaching. I say put up one finger if you do not understand, and two fingers if you need help, three fingers if you got it, and four fingers if you could teach someone else.

Academic performance feedback with reciprocal gesturing provided the participants nonverbal feedback with their ELLs in a covert manner, so they did not have to single out the students.

**Student Recognition.** Teachers discussed the value of focusing on students’ personal assets instead of mistakes. Nathan Pacillo reflected, “A lot of the time, we want to look and say what students can't they do.” Olga Ribas cautioned that educators have to be careful and find the
positive, especially at the high school level; otherwise, “you have students floundering from one teacher to the other teacher.” Helena Hendricks explained that it is beneficial to recognize ELL achievements, so they do not get discouraged. She noticed “that the ELLs are the most driven and attentive and hardworking individuals because they have not only the learning but their circumstances to deal with.” Also, Nathan Pacillo recommended, “Instead of saying an ELL student cannot do something, such as they cannot speak well and they are not very good at formal language, look at what is the ELL good at and then have the student do that.” Nora Vowels recommended that educators should give “ELLs a wide variety of areas to shine, and a wide variety of ways to show intelligence, other than through just verbal intelligence.” She suggested recognizing ELL achievements in art and music instruction because these areas can provide ELLs a chance to excel. She also indicated that since “music is a universal language, once ELLs decode the language, they're able to do just as well as anybody else. No matter what language they speak.”

Mastery Learning. Empowering ELLs to strive for educational achievement with specific clear objectives was a philosophy shared by the majority of the participants. Isabelle Xavier described that this provides a way that “the student can still feel that he or she is valued for what they can do at that point, and not measure over time what they cannot do.” Olga Ribas tells her students, “We're not trying to finish first. We’re trying to learn how to do this correctly, and how to provide the best quality of work that you can provide, so you can be successful.” Likewise, Nathan Pacillo described a “learning for mastery” practice that he uses to enable ELLs to celebrate their achievements. He explained, “I give them the opportunity to resubmit the assignment,” so the ELLs can be successful. Nathan Pacillo concluded that by providing an ELL with an opportunity to make work up, without losing credit, it presents the “ELL the ability to
take more chances and take more risks in terms of demonstrating their knowledge. I see a lot of fuel from those students, and the ELLs are a lot more active in class.”

**Digital Feedback.** Digital feedback was reported to be a proactive way to provide students with immediate, independent, performance feedback. Isabelle Xavier explained, “Using technology is great ELL student feedback, and it does not necessarily have to be a one-to-one with a teacher or with students.” Her students use programs that provide practice and feedback by “clicking and dragging pictures.” Whereas Helena Hendricks explained that her students use digital feedback to reflect on their reading and writing fluencies. She narrated,

One way we monitor the students and give them feedback is to record their reading or their writing in English. Then we translate it so that they can see what they read or wrote. That not saying that everything should be done in two languages, but it can help the ELLs get a foothold on what is going on. Those kinds of dual models can be an important link to guide the student to reflect on his or her learning objectives.

Additionally, participants described online, interactive reading programs or platforms, which provided their ELLs with immediate feedback on their reading and vocabulary comprehension. Grace Pacelli utilized programs which teach English and deliver an immediate progress report. She said, “It gives a score along with how the ELL student is interacting with the text.” Similarly, Isabelle Xavier uses some “great internet sites because the readings can be prepared at different levels, low to high.” She explained that the students take an online quiz, which provides them with explanations for their correct and incorrect answers.

**Theme 2: Foundational Requirements**

Bandura’s social-emotional theory (1977) and Pajares’ belief system (1996) highlighted the impact of a person’s psychological state and beliefs on their learning. The qualitative sample
participants considered the underlying, foundational, precursory components that educators need to address in order to ensure ELL achievement. At the outset, an instructor requires a strong sense of efficacy to teach ELLs because it influences their performance, determination, and instructional decision-making. In particular, the participants discussed their comfort level when instructing ELLs in the general education setting and the provisions which could improve their students’ comfort levels. Additional foundational instructional requirements that participants revealed were the importance of providing social-emotional well-being, and appropriate referrals for ELLs, as well as a teachers’ self-efficacy and comfort level in instructing ELLs.

**Social-Emotional Well-Being**

Participants also described the importance of establishing an ELL’s social-emotional well-being prior to launching into instruction. Haylie Pricken recommended that educators need to “consider the anxiety that the kids might be feeling coming to a different country and learning a whole other culture.” She added, “[ELLs] want to fit in and make friends! Meanwhile, they are learning the language and learning the academic content. It is a lot on these kids!” The participants described how they promoted their ELLs’ psychological welfare, including family involvement, strong student-teacher relationships, healthy student-peers relationships, and a focus on student strengths.

**Family Dynamic Sensitivity.** The participants explained that it was crucial to understand every ELL’s homelife because it is not always apparent. Olga Ribas said, “When you understand the family dynamic, you can also understand a lot of the struggles they're going through and that can help you [take it] in consideration when you're teaching them and when you see they're struggling.” Isabelle Xavier proffered, “Unfortunately a lot of kids that come from other
countries start to feel that their culture and language is not valued. So, we should be constantly bending over backwards to do the total opposite.”

Grace Pacelli taught an ELL who went to church every night and did not have time for homework, and she informed the pupil, “You have to take time for your homework!” However, Grace Pacelli reflected, “It highlights that we have to be aware of cultural values because some of these parents are from cultural backgrounds that believe in praying all night because it's going to help them.” Likewise, one of Helena Hendricks’s students, spoke only Italian. She also described how important it was to empathize with the student’s social-emotional needs because there was a “quite different scenario within the family setting.” Helena Hendricks recalled,

Her family actually lived in two communities. They lived here, and they left, and the parents would travel back and forth and so forth. She had older siblings who spoke more English than she did because she started off her education in Italian schools, whereas her siblings began their education when they were back here in an English school. I remember doing a lesson with the recipes with fractions using some of the recipes that she was able to understand from her tradition and background.

Isabelle Xavier remembered instructing students from Laos and Cambodia who had never been to school before and did not know how to relate to the other students. She advised, “You must take their backgrounds and the countries they come from in consideration, even before you start to design or plan, or even worry about instruction.”

**Positive Family Interactions.** When supporting an ELL’s social-emotional well-being, it is crucial to form positive family relations. Olga Ribas said that “when you establish positive family communication with the parents, you learn more about the child and about their needs.”
Quinton Hanson explained that most of his ELLs’ parents want to be collaborative with educators, but initially they just want to know if their child is well-mannered. He explained,

After knowing if their child is respectful, then then want to know if their kid is passing. The Spanish and Portuguese parents want their child to be courteous; that's a big thing that parents are concerned about. And, afterwards, we all get emails from parents. What can I do? Is there anything we can do at home, or what should he be looking at to maybe improve his grade?

Olga Ribas also noticed that “The ELL parents also struggle a lot emotionally because they have to get used to the educational system, and it is not easy.” Yasmine Winters recommended that we should invite families to share their cultures because “this is one of the ways in which we may begin conversations, and keep the conversations going, about different cultures different countries while keeping the goodness that these students bring to our school and our classroom.” Participants explained that ELLs feel proud when their families come to school to recognize their accomplishments. Each year, Isabelle Xavier’s school invites families to celebrate her students’ research projects, which are accompanied by traditional foods. Haylie Pricken school builds family rapport with a fun international event, “In the beginning of the year, we had a night where the parents brought in foods and flags with [sic] different cultures.” The students also presented a show with “South Sudan [sic] kids, Chinese acrobats, martial arts, and animals.” Overall, the participants found that creating strong family relationships accompanied by student-centered festivities inadvertently reinforced ELLs’ social-emotional well-being.

**Student-Teacher Relationships.** When teachers built positive, respectful student-teacher ELL relationships, it helped ELLs cope with challenging situations. The educators discussed their ELL students who had felt isolated and who had difficulty communicating with others. To
build constructive interactions, teachers learned about their ELLs’ interests, experiences, cultures, and strengths. Helena Hendricks said, “While they're part of your classroom, you want them to be as successful as possible, and you realize the challenges that they're facing as individuals.”

In particular, focusing on ELL strengths and inserting ELL experiences into lessons was reported to be a powerful way to build ELL student-teacher relationships, as well as confidence. Nora Vowels stated, “The ELL students are a fountain of knowledge. Use them as the expert!” Isabelle Xavier also noted that many ELL students have “particularly good educational backgrounds” and consequently will acquire English quickly because they “learn like a sponge.” Helena Hendricks said, “Usually, the ELLs are the most driven and attentive and hardworking individuals, . . . but sometimes, the ELLs need you to be there for them.” Isabelle Xavier elaborated, “To be honest with you, I have even stayed after school to help students use some of the instructional strategies. If the ELL is getting stuck on something that has just happened in another class, they need you.” Moreover, Nora noted, “Teachers of the arts forge relationships with ELLs that last over their time in a building and develop a link that can be a very powerful one for ELLs.” This occurs because the arts teachers work with the students over several years in the same school building.

**Student-Peer Connections.** ELLs also need to develop peer connections, so they do feel isolated and alone. Participants described how most ELLs initially went through a period where quietly withdrew, and the staff facilitated social interactions which ultimately helped them academically. Haylie Pricken explained that she created social-emotional lessons with the social worker “to build ELLs’ confidence and friendships.” Nathan Pacillo assured, “ELLs can make close relationships with other kids, and this way, if they do not understand something, an ELL
can just pop his or her head over and say to another kid, hey, I do not understand what is happening.”

**Social-Emotional Programs.** Some schools promoted ELLs’ social-emotional growth with social-emotional programs. Four of the participants said their districts supported social-emotional learning during morning meetings, using the *Responsive Classroom* instructional approach, which is “designed to create safe, joyful, and engaging classroom communities for both students and teachers” (Center for Responsive Schools, 2021). Helena Hendricks elaborated,

> We have students share a part of who they are and where they're from. It is the easiest way for some of the ELL students to acclimate because of the social element, to be a part of the classroom, and if their verbal connections are limited, they can bring other artifacts, pictures, or things that they do want to share to let everyone know who they are and fit in the classroom mode.

Social-emotional programs and morning activities assisted educators in establishing a classroom environment that fostered positive ELL relationships with their classmates.

**Appropriate Referrals**

**Special Education.** Participants examined the process of referring their students for special services to receive academic support that they felt their ELLs needed. Only one participant reported that appropriate referrals were taking place in her district. Haylie Pricken said, “My district is doing great things with English learners.” In contrast, the other nine educators discussed how their districts would benefit from additional ELL support, both for the students and the staff. Helena Henricks described, “We have one TESOL person who covers at least three schools, two elementary, and one middle school . . . But it is the reality that we deal
with, and we don't have many teachers that are dually certified.” Additionally, nine of the educators self-reported not enough ELL training to prepare them to make appropriate ELL referrals. In general, participants speculated that a shortage of ELL coaches and support staff may promote special education referrals because the educators recognize that their ELL students need more support.

**ELL Training and Referrals.** Educators discussed how their ELLs needs were similar to that of their students with IEPs. Many educators explained that they teach ELLs who have language delays that are similar to their those of their students who have IEPs. Olivia Oakley explained, “I do for the ELLs what I do for students who have 504s and IEPs.” Olivia recounted that when she first taught ELLs, she didn’t know about the silent period and mistook it for a processing issue because she did not have enough ELL training. She recalled that the student ended up being referred to special education and qualified for speech services. Now she recognizes that “ELLs usually have a silent period before they begin talking, which makes . . . [their learning needs] hard to understand.”

**Routine Referrals.** There was a disagreement among the participants as to whether ELLs should be referred to special education or receive a 504 plan in order to provide adequate support so the ELLs could be successful. Grace Pacelli reported, “We have a high population of special education [students] who are ELLs.” Grace advocated, “We need to work with the leadership to share our expertise to help these ELL students, so they don’t end up in special education or reading [intervention] when they were exited from ELL because of testing.” However, several educators who taught in districts with few ELLs described that their ELLs were routinely referred to specialists or provided an IEP to receive adequate services. Nathan Pacillo reported, “Basically, in our district if a student is an English language learner, they are given an IEP or 504
for speech or reading support.” He speculated, “ELLs need support, and there is no reason that they should not have 504 and IEP supports with measurable goals and objectives.”

**Distinct ELL Needs.** Conversely, other participants discussed that ELL needs and support should be recognized as distinct and separate from special education. They regarded it as unsuitable to support an ELL with IEPs. Nora Vowels said, “I don’t believe in lumping the ELLs with Sped (special education) kids just because they struggle.” Similarly, Quinton Hanson described ELLs as requiring ELL support, not students with specific disabilities, and contended that “the issue is their language barrier!” He stressed, “Once they get it, and they fly with it, they become somebody. Top students!” Quinton Hanson determined, “Their language doesn't mean they're not as academically intelligent as other kids because some of them can be phenomenally great students. Once they get it explained to them, it’s like a light bulb going off in the kid’s head.”

**Academic Services.** Some participants speculated that a lack of support staff may be promoting special education referrals because the educators recognize that their ELL students are not closing the achievement gap. Two of the teachers suggested that leadership could group ELL students in the same classes to receive needed services. Olivia Oakley stated that ELL support services are sporadic now. She reasoned that if the students were grouped together “they would receive more support because then an ELL support teacher would not have to be spread throughout a building.” Quinton Hanson clarified that if leadership clustered ELLs, “we could have appropriately leveled group discussions.”

**Ongoing Instruction**

**Dismissed ELL Instruction.** The participants asserted that when ELLs were reclassified, or exited from ELL services, they still noticed a need for ongoing ELL instruction that was
generally left unfulfilled. The Connecticut State Department of Education specifies that ELLs who meet the language proficiency standards should be progress monitored for an additional two years. In this study, participants indicated that when ELLs were reclassified, teachers were often not notified of their continuing needs, and these students were not being provided ongoing ELL instructional strategies that the students still required. Grace Pacelli explained, “There is this gray area when students are dismissed from ELL [programs with] no services, and if they need support then where do they place them?” She added, “I see students who are not ELLs anymore but are bilingual or have passed the test and still need help. How do you advocate for them?” She proposed, “We need to work with the leadership to help these ELL students, so they don’t end up in special education or reading when they exited from ELL because of testing.”

**Exited ELL Support.** Isabelle Xavier explained that she teaches many students who were formerly classified as ELLs and were dismissed from support because benchmark testing indicated that they need some reading and writing intervention. “So I am dealing more with kids that were sort of exited out of language classes, and supposedly at a [LAS Links] level five.” Isabelle was referring to the State of Connecticut criteria, which determines if a student is ready to exit from ELL services. An ELL achieves the linguistic exit standard with LAS Links mastery scores, which are an “Overall Level 4 or 5 AND reading score of 4 or higher AND writing score of 4 or higher” (Connecticut State Department of Education, 2019, par. 1).

Grace Pacelli noticed that, as a reading specialist, she sees a pattern with ELLs who were reclassified and previously did not need reading services. She described,

If a classroom teacher notices the former ELL is struggling and points out to the ELL department chair that there is a problem, then the student gets a reading assessment and, of course, they [sic] receive support if the student qualifies.
**Ongoing Instruction for Reclassified ELLs.** Only two of the 10 participants described that their districts planned for ongoing ELL instruction once an ELL reached English proficiency. Yasmine Winters explained the process in her district:

The ELLs are monitored, even after they achieve. Let us say a student scored a five, which is a top assessment score at the end of the year. By law, they still need to be monitored for two more years. And sometimes that LAS LINKS score can be a little fictitious, and they still need some support to bridge the gaps between when they actually are let go from that intense ELL instruction that they had gotten every day to the more academic support they need. This year I am more of that support person.

Other participants were unclear if their district had a plan for ongoing support but did not think there was one in place. They expressed that they would value having a list of students exited from ELL services because many times they found out accidently when reviewing the students’ files. The educators reasoned that knowing the names of the students who were reclassified could help provide ongoing ELL instructional strategies in the classroom. For example, Haylie Pricken clarified, “Teachers need to be cognizant of what they are saying and how it could literally be understood and translated. ELLs, especially, are confused by idioms and things that are more abstract.” Grace Pacelli stated, “If we take a student out of ELL because we don't think it’s a language issue. [However,] because they're struggling so much with core subjects, the student ends up in remediation.” Overall, the participants reported that reclassified ELLs necessitated ongoing instruction.
Teachers’ Self-Efficacy to Instruct ELLs

As indicated in the literature review, a person’s self-efficacy considerations have been recognized as context specific (Bandura, 1977). When considering the following teacher participant comfort levels, it is important to review that the qualitative sample teacher participants were purposefully selected from quantitative sample because they had the highest self-efficacy and strategy use self-ratings for all learners. These educators discussed their specific comfort level when teaching ELLs. Subsequently, the participants articulated areas that would make them feel even more confident when instructing their ELLs.

ELL Teaching Self-Efficacy. Interestingly, of the 10 interviewees who were asked to identify their comfort level teaching ELLs on a 1 to 10 scale, with 1 rated as the lowest and 10 the highest, two teachers rated themselves between a 5-6, five teachers appraised themselves between a 7-8.5, and two teachers regarded themselves between 9-10. Two participants who expressed the most comfort teaching ELLs had the most training and experience because they had degrees in this area and were ELL specialists. A bilingual teacher indicated that her confidence in teaching her ELLs was elevated because she immerses her students in the culture, community, and the school, which she believed to have had a positive impact. The other participant, who self-rated as a 10, explained that she is an ELL, and she is most comfortable when teaching ELLs.

Participants discussed ways to improve their ELL instructional comfort levels. For example, they considered incorporating the following provisions as an approach to enhancing their ELL instructional comfort levels: additional PL, increased culturally relevant instruction, knowledge of foreign languages, increased availability and assistance of TESOL/ELL teachers,
collaboration with specialists, increased ELL building advocacy, and additional staff with ELL student background. Quinton Hanson asserted,

Teachers’ self-confidence and attitude and viewpoint affect how they teach the English language learners. I see teachers come in who have no confidence and fall flat on their face. Right. And I'm like, how are you teaching eighth graders? Remember you're smarter than them!

**Teacher Self-Efficacy and Coaching.** As described by Kraft et al. (2018), when teachers work with ELL coaches they receive “individualized, time intensive, sustained over the course of a semester or year, context-specific, and . . . discrete skills” (Kraft et al., 2018, p. 4). Participants described how coaching improved their confidence level for working with ELLs. On multiple grade levels, the educators described the benefits of learning in a non-threatening environment and the importance of having a level of trust. They explained that the coaching process needed to be gentle, non-threatening, ongoing, and supportive. Some of the participants were coaches and others had been coached.

Isabelle Xavier noticed that when she coached, teachers’ self-confidence improved after they tried implementing strategies that were successful. She described,

I saw a class starting off with this particular article the teacher wanted the kids to read, and half of the class was lost. So, it wasn't just like my student that I was supporting, but also the others. So, I gently spoke to the teacher, and said, hey I noticed they don't have the vocabulary. I asked, next time [do] you think we could team teach, and you could let me do some things? So, we did a vocabulary game [and] we broke down the vocab. When they went back to the article, they were able to understand it better.
Grace Pacelli described the benefits of working with an ELL coach while teaching ELLs because “the ELL coach would teach different strategies if we were having trouble.” Grace Pacelli added, when “we were trying to get the ELLs to digest high level text, [the coaches] would model and give you strategies and explain which strategy to use.” However, two of the participants reported that they had not received ELL coaching and would be grateful if they could have it. Nora Vowels said, “I can’t say that I have had any other ELL training except some coaching by a reading teacher.” Olivia Oakley said, “I do not know what I need to know to help my ELLs without ELL support staff.”

Theme 3: Leadership

An extensively discussed topic was the critical importance of leadership support in the areas of (a) professional learning, b) an inclusive curriculum, and (c) time to collaborate. Also, this section concludes with additional suggestions from the participants with respect to leadership’s role in providing staff with support.

Professional Learning

The amount and quality of PL made a difference in teachers’ perceived ability to deliver effective strategy instruction for their ELLs. Educators who received ongoing, high-quality PL, praised their leadership. The educators attributed professional learning to their ELL instructional competence and appropriate strategy performance. Participants who did not receive PL spoke about how they required training whereas participants who received extensive preparation described copious strategy suggestions.

Amount of Professional Learning. Haylie Pricken said she felt empowered to teach ELLs a variety of strategies as well as coach other staff members due to her ongoing and extensive PL. She praised her supervisor because she educated the entire staff to teach ELLs, and
she “developed the ELL Department, and we now have a TESOL teacher in every building. I think it is wonderful, and I think our school system can be a model for other school systems.” Similarly, Quinton Hanson enthusiastically stated, “Leadership makes a difference in receiving ELL professional development. It definitely does!” He explained, “I received the ELL professional development I needed, collaborate with other staff members to help the ELLs, and have the leadership support I require. I appreciate it! It is the right thing and I’m in the right place.”

In contrast, Olivia Oakley reported a lack of PL, and said, “I need more ELL professional learning for my ELL students, but right now there is not any, and it does not seem like a priority.” Helena Hendricks also indicated that she would like her leadership to provide increased ELL instruction, “I haven’t had a great deal of that because our school does not have a high number of ELLs.” Nathan Pacillo surmised that districts that have a less diverse population may provide less PL. However, he pointed out, “Even if there are three kids in a school of 1800, who need ELL support, those kids are going to have interactions with teachers.” He asserted, “Leadership needs to provide all teachers, including content area teachers, with professional learning to develop strategies to best interact with ELLs.” Moreover, he emphasized that every staff member should be provided with detailed information about their English Language Learners, particularly LAS Levels, IEPs and Section 504 information.

Additionally, many of the participants discussed that they needed their leadership to provide ELL training because they received minimal ELL instruction when enrolled in their higher education courses. Grace Pacelli reflected, “Oh my gosh, I've been in school for a long time! But I think my professional learning from my undergraduate studies covered just the ELL basics!” Olivia Oakley mentioned that even if her graduate coursework had provided ELL
instruction, her schooling was long ago, and not current. Similarly, Nora Vowels recalled, “I didn’t get any professional learning in college because I went to college between 1975 and 1979, and we were more focused on special education.” Nathan Pacillo reflected that although his education was recent, his ELL knowledge is minimal: “I have been through a master’s in special education, a sixth year, and currently studying instruction in Educational Leadership, and I still do not feel comfortable talking about the terminology of English Language Learners.” Isabelle Xavier remarked, “At the colleges and universities, there is very minimal ELL training.” She suggested, “There needs to be more ELL training in every educational area, accompanied by an opportunity to observe, because observation is immensely powerful.” Isabelle Xavier asserted that “because the higher education level has not provided enough ELL instruction to date, long-term professional learning needs to be supported at the district level.” Additionally, she counseled, that if staff does not have ELL instruction in their district, then “teachers need to advocate for professional learning and promote their own learning or teach oneself.”

**Quality of Professional Learning.** Isabelle Xavier discussed how the quality of PL is just as important as the quantity, stating that “ELL professional development could be wonderful, but it must be done a little differently. It should be probably done through a coaching model, where people taking that workshop will be requested to try it, and not let it die.” She added,

Sometimes the problem with professional learning is that unless you have a coach, somebody who checks up on you and somebody that supports you, it is easy to forget or not learn to use in your instructional practice. Teachers and coaches can team up with and give each other feedback; that is the most powerful part, and that is the part we leave outside professional development.
Haylie Pricken described the quality of her PL as exceptional and discussed how it impacted the entire district. She said, “I am in the most collaborative district that I have seen. I think it is incredible because it helps the ELLs learn.” She reflected that her leadership helped the district’s teaching philosophy and “even included working on a plan for working on implicit bias.” She explained that the staff was taught that even if they do not realize it, due to our background or comfort levels, we as educators may be judging our ELLs with a level of prejudice. She also noted that her PL demonstrated how to ask an ELL, a “higher-level question that is cognitively high, yet ask it for a different linguistic level.” Moreover, she commended the quality of her ELL instruction because it educated the staff about “how to make the kids feel welcome and calm.” She also elaborated that it provided a high level of feedback, and recounted “I would try it out, write about it, and reflect, and then the next week, learn something else.”

Likewise, Yasmine Winters described a high level of leadership collaboration and the strengths of quality professional development and collaboration. Her district’s PL included grant money, which enabled staff to travel to other localities. Yasmine Winters explained that when traveling to the South, she and her co-workers had “the biggest wow moment” because they witnessed an “entire district's teachers that were dually certified.” Moreover, she added that “the entire district was able to implement the six goals of Educational Equity and School Reform.” Yasmine Winters was referring to the global educational goals created by the United Nations Educational Equity and School Reform Committee or UNESCO in 2000 whose mission is to lead global quality education (UNESCO, 2020). Yasmine Winters concluded that “leadership’s role has a different role than a coach.” She marveled at how her leadership transformed her district’s ELL instruction. Moreover, she speculated that the quality of ELL professional learning can be enhanced by replicating the efforts of successful districts.
Grace Pacelli commented that when leadership provides ongoing, high-quality PL, it helps students by mitigating the likelihood of improperly being referrals for special services. She stated, “Many one-shot professional developments could be improved by listening to the needs of the staff in order to meet the needs of ELL students. Sometimes it’s leadership experience that provides that.” She determined, “To best help ELLs, we need leadership to instill a philosophy about teaching that will foster confidence in the staff that will allow an open dialogue on their own needs and the support they need.”

**Collaborative Time**

All 10 participants discussed the essential impact that their leadership had on allocating staff time in their schedules to effectively plan, brainstorm, and meet with other staff members to optimally provide ELLs with well thought-out instruction. Participants appreciated collaborative time with coaches, staff, and families.

**Coaches.** The participants examined coaching, either how they valued their time with their ELL coaches or how they wished leadership would arrange for them to receive ELL instructional coaching. Since three of the participants were ELL coaches, those participants discussed the benefits of leadership’s involvement from the coaching perspective. Helena Hendricks stated, “We are very fortunate in our school system that we have an English language learner teacher that is available.” She added, “I use a great deal of support from the ELL teacher who, on occasion, will be us within class time to support whatever instruction is going [on]” Quinton Hanson explained, “Sometimes we’ll get [the ELL] coach to join our discussion, and the coach will comment if an ELL can or can’t conjugate a term. We try make modifications to make text more understandable with less complex vocabulary.” Nathan Pacillo revealed that he would like more coaching but collaborated with staff members instead. He said, “I think we have ELL
district support, but we have a school-based support because of the fact that the actual ELL population is so low in our district.” Nora Vowels also indicated that she would be grateful to collaborate with coaches because she would like “the time and the ability to know who I'm getting in my classrooms.” Also, Nora added that she would like coaches to teach her “techniques to better teach ELLs. I’m doing basically shoot in the dark, seat of my pants things to try and engage kids.”

Yasmine Winters, Haylie Pricken, and Isabelle Xavier were ELL coaches at the time of the study, and each of the participants said that they appreciated the collaborative time with staff. Yasmine Winters thought that coaching time afforded her the opportunity to “let the teachers know what their ELLs are practicing.” Haylie Pricken explained that she assists her teachers with her collaborative time. She described, “When I coach teachers, I often adapt texts. To help teachers of ELLs that are new, I bring them ideas for their mini lessons, or what they put out on anchor charts for kids.”

Alternatively, Isabelle Xavier discussed when leadership does not provide collaborative time, the PL is not as effective. She explained, “So, you can go to a conference, you can spend whatever thousand dollars, you bring it back, but ELL training needs practice and a coach.” She recollected,

I have observed that many people learn at a workshop, then they share and provide a workshop. So now they are providing a workshop during this full day or half day, or after school. But then what are we doing with that. It is sometimes like it is dead unless [leadership] really sets up a way, and I call it coaching model, where you have the person who really has the knowledge of those strategies and you team that person up with
another person or several people, and really allow for that learning for the adult to practice that learning from that professional development.

In general, the three ELL coaches suggested that leaders should schedule time for staff and ELL coaches to meet, so the ELL specialists could deliver ongoing PL, align instructional efforts, and recommend useful strategies to enhance ELL achievement.

**Staff.** Educators reported that they felt increased effectiveness when instructing ELLs and when their leadership provided them time to collaborate with other staff members collectively to apply their PL. Nathan Pacillo explained that he experienced an improved productivity when his leadership facilitated collaborative time with his peers because he has “never worked with specific ELL support in our school.” He noted, “My ELL support has been from my ELL student’s guidance counselor, our speech people, and other people who work with this student.” Likewise, Quinton Hanson described how his leadership provided him time to meet with his colleagues to modify class materials for ELLs. He stated, “Each week, we read through the documents we will use that week and discuss if we think an ELL will understand the terms.” Olga Ribas detailed how she worked directly with teachers, during her common planning time. She specified,

> When I work with teachers, we sit down together, talk about the progress or lack of progress that our kids are having, and we look at the regular curriculum. And then from there, I give the teachers my ideas of what I think, and we work together to develop the lesson and activities for that specific group. . . . We use [each other’s] expertise on what we know, so we can work together to help our ELL students.

**Families.** Participants reported that leadership had the capacity to enhance teacher-family time by creating a welcoming environment for ELLs in their schools. In some districts,
leadership fostered a proactive position in establishing ample time and positive family interactions. Olga Ribas explained that that her district is “constantly connecting with the community, getting different support for the families and for their children.” Yasmine Winters said she makes time to “have a solid enough foundation with the interaction with the student to the family, and then go from there.”

The educators were concerned that traditional events such as parent conferences, school performances, and other activities were a problem for their ELL families because of language obstacles. Olivia Oakley indicated that when working with ELLs and their families that “language and communication are obviously the biggest barrier.” Nathan Pacillo elaborated that some of the students are from homes that speak little to no English. He suggested, “We as a school need to provide someone who can speak the parent’s native language and, currently, we do not do that well.” Nathan Pacillo recommended that leadership should be watchful to ensure that a translator is available for families who have difficulty understanding the placement process that may identify their student with special needs. For example, Nathan felt that when schools hold Planning and Placement Team meetings (PPTs), which invite a team of educators and parents to review if a student has a learning challenge, that parents are entitled to understand the process by having an interpreter at the meeting. Helena Hendricks reported that her leadership fosters family-teacher communication because they “send a newsletter to all of her parents, and for ELLs it would be translated into their native language delete Also, Yasmine Winters said, “In my, and many other districts, if you translate something into Spanish, you can reach almost all their families based on two languages.” Quinton Hanson clarified that “when meeting with the families and parents of ELLs, you often have to use translators.” He included, “Sometimes there's not even an interpreter available, and sometimes there is, and they'll in. And the parent
Quinton Hanson indicated that he held whole conferences using a language interpretation application. He stated, “I keep my laptop open, and use Google Translate. Then the families type something in, and use Google Translate.” He reasoned that if leadership provided individuals who could translate for the families, it would cultivate improved quality time with families.

**Inclusive Curriculum**

**Leadership Influence.** Although several educators applauded their leadership for providing a comprehensive curriculum for ELLs, the majority of the participants asserted that they needed more direction and assistance with curricular guidelines. Many educators sought clarification and stated that they were unaware if ELL curriculum alignment existed. For example, Oliva expressed, “The instruction for ELLs is not incorporated into our curriculum, not that I have been aware of.” Nathan Pacillo reflected, “We just went through a NEASC Review, and as a part of it, we had to look at our curriculum. When we revised the curriculum, there was no place in there to address the needs of ELLs.” In contrast, Yasmine Winters discussed how her district’s curriculum was a “work in progress” and that leadership’s support and staff collaboration were crucial components. She conveyed, “It is like building a plane as we fly. I do not mean that in a negative way. I mean that we are in the very beginning stages of trying to have something uniform for ELL students, regarding curriculum.”

**Quality Instruction.** Oliva would like her district to incorporate a structured ELL curriculum. She explained, “The quality of ELL’s instruction is from the teacher and the team of teachers. You have to create your lesson, modify your things, and fit it to that student because nobody else is going to do it.” Ideally, Olivia Oakley hoped that in the future, an inclusive ELL curriculum could be “incorporated in the planning and instruction from the district level.”
Similarly, Nathan Pacillo said that both his current district and former district’s curriculum “did not have areas to address the needs of English language learners.” He speculated, “Teachers mostly do not even know that they are not being guided or what to do with their ELLs. And from my experience it is not included in my discipline.” However, Nora Vowels preferred the choice of not having a specific ELL curriculum. She stated, “I’m incorporated in the music curriculum, so we are free to choose the pieces of music that we’re going to teach to our goals.” Nora opted to “formally and purposefully integrate songs of ELL cultures into [the music] curriculum.” Alternatively, Yasmine Winters positively reflected on the ELL curriculum that her district was constructing. She reflected, “What would give us the most bang for our buck when supporting students would be to provide differentiated support, simplifying supports when appropriate, and not doing something separate from the curriculum.” Yasmine Winters speculated,

If we had a formal program in any one content area, it would free up the teachers to put their energies [into their ELLs’ instruction] instead of looking for the resource, into enriching the lesson, differentiating the lesson, providing intervention for the lesson, and all the things that they do anyway.

**ELL Programs.** Olga Ribas announced that her leadership instituted a purchased ELL program, and it included “a clear, indexed instructional map to guide educators.” She said, “It’s cool. It is kind of a visual representation of the curriculum which helps us quickly and easily find possible gaps and helps with the alignment and sequence of instruction.” Nevertheless, she clarified that even purchased curriculum had some shortcomings such as, “very tiny fonts that don’t give students space for them to show the practice and to take notes, . . . with names that are kind of weird, and challenging text.” She determined that a purchased ELL curriculum provided an excellent framework although it necessitated some modifications, adaptations because it
provided a review of basic skills. In contrast, Grace Pacelli described her “purchased” ELL curriculum as “tainted” and in need of leadership’s direction. She elaborated that “if somebody comes into a district to sell a program and supports the staff with training, it is strong at first.” However, Grace Pacelli added, “We bastardize things when somebody who is trained then teaches the rest of the staff in the district because important ideas get lost.” She included, “Often someone in the department will take over and come up with the training of strategies that work best for English learners, and although it is meaningful training, it becomes a list of things to do.” Overall, the participants reported that they would like leadership to use their influence to enhance a more extensive, inclusive ELL curriculum.

Participants’ Additional Recommendations for Leadership. The following section included suggestions, which participants shared as ways to enhance PL, an inclusive curriculum, and collaboration. These recommendations were incorporated: PL for specialists, ELL budget planning, student and staff scheduling, and recruitment of appropriate staff.

Providing PL for Specialists. The PE/Health teacher Nathan Pacillo and Music teacher Nora Vowels requested that leadership include all the specialists when PL is being delivered, and to include specialists when they are disseminating ELL information. Moreover, Nathan Pacillo requested leadership to provide staff with “more specific lists of ELL accommodations.” Whereas Nora Vowels addressed leadership with her request: “In an ideal world, I would like a better utilization of the arts to help the transition of ELLs!.”

Budget Planning. Yasmine Winters asked that leadership think about ELL professional learning during budget time, “It is not something that should be an option anymore. Although with the budget crisis across the nation, schools are trying to save every dime . . . but teachers need quality ELL PD.”
**Scheduling.** Participants shared two scheduling appeals, one for students and one for staff. Quinton Hanson and Olivia Oakley asked leadership to consider grouping ELLs in the same classes. Olivia requested, “I would like my district to cluster the ELL students because it would make more sense than spreading them out and then not having enough resources to support them.” Moreover, Haylie Pricken and Yasmine Winters, the ELL coaches, urged leadership to plan collaborative time in the schedule for the staff and ELL coaches to meet because it would provide ongoing professional learning and alignment of instructional efforts.

**Hiring Process.** Grace Pacelli suggested that leadership consider ELLs in the hiring process by employing flexible staff that is supportive of ELLs. She recommended that leadership be watchful in the interview process and “look for someone who could be prescriptive, diagnostic, and change on the fly in the middle of what he or she is doing in the best interest of the ELL students.”

Theme 3 discussed the essential role that leadership provides when implementing professional learning, an inclusive curriculum and staff collaboration. Also, participants provided leadership additional recommendations pertaining to budgeting, scheduling, and hiring processes.

**Theme 4: Instructional Application**

Participants discussed three factors, that when applied to their teaching, improved their strategy instruction and their teaching approach with their ELLs: (a) culturally relevant teaching, (b) technology, and (c) an affective filter.

**Culturally Relevant Teaching**

Culturally Relevant Teaching (CRT), is a pedagogy used by the educators to enhance student achievement by empowering “students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and
politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 20). The participants discussed how they learned about their ELLs’ cultural backgrounds and embedded it into the class instruction, text selections, morning activities, dances, songs, and stories.

**Culturally Relevant Text.** Yasmine Winters maintained when a teacher uses passages and content that are familiar to students of a particular culture, “you spend less time building background or filling in gaps.” She contended, “When most of the class, I am not saying all, most of the class is familiar and comfortable with a concept or topic, it goes better.” Most of the participants that provided cultural enrichment mentioned how their learning communities were enriched by culturally relevant lessons.

**Culturally Relevant Lessons.** Family cultural beliefs, norms, and values enriched teachers’ instructional practices while it increased student interest and encouraged a sense of belonging. Nathan Pacillo described applying culturally relevant instruction as much as possible, when he taught about health topics such as stress, wellness, and nutrition. He felt that it enhanced the learning for all the students and created authentic opportunities to incorporate knowledge of other cultures. However, he recommended that it had to be done with sensitivity and said, “I don’t want to put them on the spot and say, okay, what is it like to live here? But if I can do that in some type of authentic way through a presentation, I like to arrange that.” He portrayed,

I had a couple students last semester from China talk about what their diet looks like, what their relationship to health was like, and things they eat that were commonplace in China, as opposed to us in the U.S. I got some interesting responses, and the kids were really interested in seeing what life in a different country is like.
Nora Vowels stated that she adds songs and dances of her ELL cultures into her music lessons. She explained her culturally relevant philosophy as follows: “I definitely make those decisions because I want the students to be able to have a little piece of home and to know that we honor all cultures in my classroom.” Nora recalled a favorite culturally relevant lesson involving an elementary age Chinese ELL student. She inquired about Chinese directional vocabulary terms such as right and left and forwards and backwards, and then she conducted the class applying his Chinese instructions. Nora recounted:

So, we did a square dance, not a Chinese dance, but we gave the directions in Chinese. I had him be our direction-giver and I had him teach the class how to say these things. And then we wrote on the board, zuǒ equals left, and yòu equals right. And then he called out the directions once we learned the dance, and the rest of the class had to figure out what to do. So, I thought that was a really a two-for-one because not only did it make my Chinese student feel like he was in charge the class and more importantly using his knowledge base, too. I mean it really was a really nice day because this kid was a quiet fourth grade student, and it was like a shining moment for this kid. Afterwards, Nora reflected on the culturally relevant activity and remarked that the benefits were two-fold. The lesson provided her learners with new cultural awareness, and it fostered student empathy for her ELL student. She recollected,

It was cool, watching all the other kids because they got so confused when the Chinese student gave the directions in Chinese. And when we stopped and discussed why we were so confused, as great realization for the other students. The students said they were confused because they didn’t understand immediately what he was saying in Chinese.
Then we discussed, how does that make you feel? How do you think it feels to hear directions given to you quickly in a language that you do not understand?

Additionally, Isabelle Xavier recommended that because we are a global society, we should look at “culture with different frames and lenses.” She advised educators and students to be more creative about cultural diversity, and to celebrate what is going on in the news, natural resources, and the important people as each country’s scientists, musicians, and artists. She described how her students study their nationality as a project, through the eye of a researcher, or analyst or mathematician, or inventor. She explained, “The language learners tell the story of their country, like a Wikipedia. The culture, and the food, but in a very sophisticated way.” Isabelle Xavier suggested that if teachers want to make a cultural impact, educators must show the learning community how important a culture is and how valuable something that came from that culture is to their people. However, Yasmine Winters added a cautionary note when addressing cultural needs. “Although we want to celebrate all that the ELLs are and all that they bring to our school, we are very mindful of not putting a spotlight on that student and or family to speak for the entire culture.” She counseled those good intentions can inadvertently be done incorrectly, and “educators should be mindful not to make any student or their family a spokesperson for the entire country.”

**Cultural Celebrations.** Most of the participants described that they utilized ELL holidays as an opportunity to integrate culture and family values. Isabelle Xavier described how she incorporates cultural observances:

I usually have the students talk about how they celebrate a holiday in their family. What is it that you do to help inform us who really do not know? So, it's a great practice for them to say it in Spanish, but at the same time, the other students are actually learning,
and you're honoring that student for what they bring, whether it is in terms of their creed or in terms of their culture.

Participants emphasized that they took advantage of opportunities to embed culturally relevant teaching in their lessons and activities because it helped their students feel proud of students’ cultural heritages and expanded social acceptance and celebrated student differences and similarities. These differences were more extensive than holidays and foods. It also reflected differences in values, social interests, and goals, as well as supported cross-cultural understanding. They stressed that lessons that fostered cultural literature, music, arts, and dance were rewarding and often exciting activities that fostered in-depth student discussion, as well as created opportunities to invite individuals from the community.

**Technology**

Teachers of English Language Learners found it particularly beneficial to enhance their strategy instruction with the use of technology. Educators described how technology had the potential to expand an ELL’s background knowledge, link prior knowledge, develop vocabulary, adjust linguistic reading levels, support a variety of ability levels including oral, reading, and writing learning needs. Furthermore, they discussed how technology provided them improved capability to translate a student’s primary language into English, or vice versa, provide visuals and videos, and modify text to match ELL linguistic levels.

**Technology and Visuals.** Some of the participants described how they use technology to provide visuals and build on students’ contextual understanding. Yasmine Winters described how “technology is beneficial for a learner, especially an ELL to have some background knowledge,” which she illustrated with an anecdote. “I was assisting with a Chromebook and providing visuals of the book and the passage as the lesson progressed. Additionally, I was able
to get the page that the excerpt was from on the Chromebook, and it provided context.” Yasmine Winters felt that the visuals and accessing the content transformed the students understanding. Moreover, Isabelle Xavier described that technology that blends visuals with audio can provide additional reinforcement. She provides her “ELLs practice vocabulary online by matching and dragging audio to pictures.”

**Translation Software.** When teachers communicated with ELLs and their families, they used online and in-person translators. Educators reported that computer software assisted learning with immediate communication and was used to adapt their lessons. Haylie Pricken clarified,

> Using a translator helps the ELL know what the teacher is showing and saying. Then I put [the translated information] in anchor charts around the room. It helps the ELLs when we type up the directions, simplify the language, and add visuals. Then we can better understand the ELL students to give them feedback.

**Videos with Subtitles.** Nathan Pacillo realized that adding “the subtitles helped the ELLs make more of a connection” when his ELLs were struggling with the theory, content, and when having class discussions. He revealed,

> By seeing the subtitles in their own language, it helped them make a connection to be able to have our follow-up conversations. I could see that the movie and topic made a lot more sense to them. Something as simple as just turning on subtitles drastically changed the classroom.

**Linguistic Adaptation.** Many of the teachers indicated that they modified the linguistic level of text using technology. For example, Isabelle Xavier conveyed that she used online websites to match text difficulty with her students’ linguistic needs. She explained, “The online
free website NEWSELA (2020) is a great internet site because the readings are differentiated and can be prepared and differentiated at different levels, low to high. So, I usually try to connect the learner with their ELA level.” Moreover, Helena Hendricks clarified, “[I] take advantage of the available digital technology that might be available to either translate or support verbal interpretation of what the student needs to have.”

**Affective Filter**

**Appropriate Error Correction.** Participants discussed the importance of using a suitable level of error correction and attending to an ELL’s emotional threshold for second language development. Stephen Krashen (1982) theorized that an appropriate amount of error correction is important for second language acquisition. Krashen concluded that criticism generated a high affective filter that caused an ELL to be psychologically unavailable to new learning, whereas encouraging suggestions fostered ELL emotional willingness. The participants reported that too much criticism caused their ELLs to give up, and small amounts of very specific scaffolded instruction created large gains in student understanding. Grace described this emotional variable that needed to be addressed before an ELL was willing to accept criticism. She said, there is “a trusting relationship that has to be built because ELLs are afraid to make mistakes.” She added, “So basically, I observe them to see if they are struggling with something they are working on.” She explained that building on what the student already knows, helps to scaffolds the student back to a level of emotional safety and helps make the student less anxious. Isabelle Xavier added that instead of emphasizing errors, try modeling the correct use of the word with an encouraging tone of voice. She reasoned that “although the languages have different coding systems, the strategies of reading and interpreting text are basically the same.” Haylie Pricken suggested adjusting instruction with a guiding technique that respects an ELL’s
emotional readiness and considers a student’s “affective filter” when teaching. She gave the following description of this technique:

When an ELL says something with an inaccurate syntax or uses an incorrect word, a great strategy is to guide their thoughts and solutions. Ask how do you think that sounds? You used the word “pull on,” how do you think that sounds? Does that sound like something you have heard before? This is a great strategy that works because the English Learner thinks that they came up with a better way to say it. You are guiding them rather than just always correcting them because constant correction shuts down students.

**Emotional Readiness.** The participants developed an ELL’s confidence by applying a student’s emotional readiness towards each learning task. Nora Vowels described how she watched her students’ facial reactions “to see when frustration or a quizzical kind of look comes in.” Olga Ribas explained, “It is so important because they just shut down and don’t want to participate, so we always give them positive feedback. It is important who does the advocating for ELLs, how well they advocate, and to whom.” She emphasized that teachers of ELLs need to “build up an ELL’s confidence and self-esteem.” Nathan Pacillo explained that it is important to have an awareness for an ELL’s learning tolerance, which becomes apparent because a student will be less willing to speak and participate. He provided the following description:

The students do not want to be singled out or to be known as somebody who does not understand what is going on. This happens especially because there is only one to two English Language Learners maximum in a classroom where they are having an ELL issue.
Nathan Pacillo suggested that when an ELL is struggling, “to reiterate the directions and provide a more personalized one-to-one personalized setting.” He clarified that this strategy is especially effective with older ELLs.

**Teacher Sensitivity.** Isabelle Xavier speculated that a teacher’s sensitivity to an appropriate level of error correction can be improved by ELL professional learning. She explained, “Teachers do not always know how to be sensitive to ELLs because they have not had the adequate professional development.” Overall, educators contended that their leadership’s support had the ability to increase teachers’ empathy for ELLs and decrease stress for both staff and students.

**Triangulation**

Theme convergence and divergence were utilized to link and explore additional implications. Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) described that the convergent design “involves collecting and analyzing two independent strands of qualitative and quantitative data in a single phase; merging the results of the two strands; then looking for theme divergence, contradictions, or relationships between the two databases” (p. 116). The progression phases are: (a) a summary of the quantitative results, (b) a summary of the qualitative results, and (c) the identification of convergent themes and subthemes. This process resulted in four supportive ELL instructional components that may advance ELL academic achievement, as shown in Figure 20 and defined in Table 28.
Figure 20

*Graphic Representation of Instructional Themes and Subthemes*

*Note.* This figure illustrates four supportive ELL instructional component themes and 13 subthemes from participant interviews, educators having high teaching self-efficacy and classroom strategy use when teaching ELLs in the general education setting.
Table 28
Instructional Components and Prerequisites to Advance ELL Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>ELL Instructional Components and Prerequisites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Strategy Instruction</strong> - Teachers utilized strategies and applied them based on their Ells’ needs and required tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Adaptive Instruction - Educators monitored ELLs’ understanding and adapted instruction to meet ELL linguistic needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Direct Instruction - Teachers delivered academic content by modeling, identifying, and summarizing material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Student-Directed Instruction - Instructors personalized learning and used cooperative activities to engage their ELLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Academic Performance Feedback - Educators monitored ELL comprehension, provided encouragement, and corrected misunderstandings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Foundational Requirements</strong> - There are essential foundational requirements needed to effectively instruct ELLs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Social-Emotional Well-Being - Educators cultivated an ELL’s social-emotional well-being prior to instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Appropriate Referrals - Accurate identification of ELLs necessitates appropriate ELL instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Teachers’ SE to Instruct ELLs - Educators need to be efficacious and comfortable when teaching ELLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>o <strong>Leadership</strong> - Teachers discussed their need for leadership support to implement effective strategies for ELLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Professional Learning - Leaderships’ endorsement impacted the amount and quality of PL advanced teachers received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Inclusive Curriculum - Educators urged and appreciated leadership involvement regarding an inclusive curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Collaborative Time - Teachers felt increased SE and comfort level when they received collaborative staff time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>ELL Instructional Components and Prerequisites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Instructional Application</strong> - Educators supplemented their instruction with CRT, technology, and an affective filter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o CRT - Teachers adapted their ELLs’ cultural beliefs, backgrounds, and linguistic abilities within their classroom instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Technology - Teachers found it particularly beneficial to enhance their Ell’s instruction with the use of technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Affective Filter - Participants attended to ELLs’ emotional threshold for second language development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Results

The present study was used to explore two research questions, and the data revealed outcomes that are explained below. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected sequentially and analyzed independently, then triangulated using a mixed methods design.

Summary of Quantitative Results

Research Question 1 investigated to what extent and in what manner do teachers’ experience, each subscale of teachers’ self-efficacy (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management), and each subscale of instructional strategies (student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance feedback) predict teachers’ adaptive instruction for educators who teach in K-12 classroom settings that include English Language Learners? To investigate question one, quantitative data were gathered using a demographic survey, the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) short form (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001A) and The Classroom Strategy Scale -Teacher Form, Instructional Scale (CSS-T IS; Reddy et al., 2016). Research Question 1 yielded significant results. The quantitative stage of the analysis surveyed 126 participants of experienced teachers in the K-12 public school setting.

A stepwise regression was utilized to explore the extent and manner that the independent variables predicted teachers’ adaptive instruction. Four variables in the model, teachers’ efficacy in student engagement, and the instructional strategies of student-directed instruction, direct instruction, and academic performance feedback, explained 42% of the variation in adaptive instruction. The overall regression model exhibited a moderately high, positive correlation, $R = .65$, $p \leq 0.001$, with a moderately large effect size.
Summary of Qualitative Results

The researcher gathered qualitative data from 10 participants who were selected from the quantitative sample based on their high self-efficacy and strategy use. Research Question 2 was used to investigate the types of instructional strategies K-12 teachers with high self-efficacy used to support English Language Learners. The researcher collected the responses from 11 semi-structured interview questions. The interviews were transcribed and entered into questions. Using HyperResearch software, the codes were downloaded into spreadsheets (Researchware, 2019). Next, an exploratory analysis was used to investigate the responses, which were coded, and categorized. The data both revealed the types of instructional strategies that K-12 teachers with high self-efficacy used to support English Language Learners and disclosed additional themes related to Research Question 1. While the quantitative data predicted the strength and relationship of the outcome variables, these qualitative themes developed from the interview data enriched the quantitative data.

An analysis for Research Question 2 resulted in the following. The participants identified specific ELL strategies and how they applied them based on the student’s need and required task. Top strategies included: (a) adaptive instruction, (b) direct instruction, (c) student-directed instruction, and (d) providing academic performance feedback to support English Language Learners. In each category, teachers described specific types of strategies that advanced ELL achievement. Additionally, participants elaborated on the importance of supplementing their instruction. First, teachers adapted their student’s instruction with culturally relevant teaching, depending on their student’s cultural beliefs, educational background, and linguistic abilities. Second, teachers of English Language Learners found it particularly beneficial to enhance their instruction with the use of technology, such as when they translated languages and utilized
videos to develop background knowledge. Third, the educators discussed the importance of applying an appropriate level of error correction and paying attention to their ELL’s emotional well-being and their threshold for second language development with their instructional strategy application. Participants also described the importance of leadership’s role in implementing effective strategies for ELLs in the general education classroom. Educators stated that leadership actions, including provision of frequent professional learning and ELL development, directly impacted their ability to effectively apply instructional strategies for ELLs. Moreover, teachers felt increased efficacy to utilize effective strategies while teaching ELLs when leadership provided them with time in their schedules to collaborate with their peers.

**Triangulated Results**

After the researcher analyzed the quantitative and qualitative data, the information was evaluated in a side-by-side comparison, which resulted in “meta-inferences” (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 213). Four themes and 14 subthemes emerged from the research questions and the investigation’s purpose statement. As a result of the quantitative and qualitative analysis, additional information about the types of instructional strategies (i.e., adaptive instruction, student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance feedback) used by teachers with high self-efficacy to improve instruction to positively impact ELL student performance was identified. Qualitative data were presented to examine the self-efficacy beliefs and instructional practices of K-12 teachers who instruct English Language Learners, which provided thematic suggestions to enhance ELL instructional practices. Theme 1 includes detailed strategies for instructional suggestions which emerged from the convergence of quantitative and qualitative data that transpired from the merged Research Question 1 and Research Question 2 data survey and interview data. Additionally, the qualitative
data revealed three additional themes including the role of leadership, instructional application, and ELL foundational requirements necessary for teachers of ELLs to implement effective instruction for their students.

**Theme Convergence**

Theme convergence established 4 themes and 14 subthemes: ELL instructional strategies (Theme 1), foundational requirements (Theme 2), the role of leadership (Theme 3), and instructional applications (Theme 4).

**Theme 1: ELL Strategies.** The qualitative data provided specific student-directed instruction, direct instruction, and academic performance feedback strategies, which educators utilized to advance ELL success. The quantitative results supported Theme 1, showing that adaptive instruction was significantly impacted by a combination of predictor variables, i.e., student-directed instruction, direct instruction, and academic performance feedback for all learners in the general education setting.

Teachers applied specific ELL strategies depending on the students’ needs and required tasks. Participants used a variety of strategies when teaching ELLs in each of the instructional strategy categories: (a) adaptive instruction, (b) direct instruction, (c) student-directed instruction, and (d) providing academic performance feedback to support English Language Learners. However, the educators who used these strategies stressed the importance of employing variety of instructional approaches, based on the student’s ability and the required objective. No single strategy worked in all settings for all ELLs. Teachers enhanced their strategy instruction by incorporating a culturally relevant teaching pedagogy and found it particularly beneficial to enhance their strategy instruction with the use of technology. Moreover, participants
talked about the value of implementing an appropriate amount of error correction with an ELL’s emotional capacity.

The most frequently discussed type of strategy used was adaptive instruction, which was incorporated to guide students’ understanding by encouraging students, affirming appropriate application of the material, and correcting misperceptions. This instruction was ongoing and used with direct instruction, student-directed instruction and when providing academic performance feedback. Specific types of adaptive instruction included the following: culturally relevant teaching, activating prior knowledge, using technology and visuals, inquiry; linking prior knowledge to new knowledge, and adapting instruction to meet the needs of the linguistic needs of ELLs.

Three instructional strategies were provided sequentially, first with direct instruction, then student-directed instruction, and then academic performance feedback. Teachers often initiated their teaching practice for ELLs with direct-instruction techniques, such as modeling, identifying, and summarizing. The participants explained how they segmented the learning into smaller sequential pieces, utilized videos that included subtitles, applied color, and simplified sentences. In addition, many of the participants referred to how they applied a mastery-based learning procedure to progress monitor their ELLs’ performance when using direct instruction. Subsequently, teachers scaffolded their instruction and released increased amounts of the learning responsibility to their ELLs to actively engage students in the learning process, with student-directed strategies. These practices encompass constructivist and hands-on instructional techniques, linking lesson content to prior learning, personal experiences, and cooperative learning. Educators described the following strategies within this domain: goal setting with ample opportunities to practice, a self-advocating approach, and peer partnership groupings.
Lastly, educators provided adaptive instructional strategies to monitor students’ understanding of the material and provide feedback on their understanding. They explained the types of strategies in this category that they used to evaluate their students’ thinking, and they inspired their ELLs to examine their own thought processes. Most of the participants revealed that they used a student consultation approach. For students with linguistic challenges, the educators employed gesturing, signaling and translation approaches to advance ELL communication and to correct misperceptions.

**Theme 2: Foundational Requirements.** Prior to the application of ELL strategy instruction, several foundational requirements are needed. These requisites included appropriate referral placement, establishing an ELL’s social-emotional well-being, high teacher self-efficacy for those instructing ELLs, as well as ongoing instruction.

**Appropriate Referrals.** All the participants discussed the importance of appropriate support services for ELLs. Some of the educators examined how their ELLs’ accommodations were frequently delivered through formalized individual education and accommodation plans. Several teachers described that their ELLs were routinely identified in order to provide them with additional academic services. In contrast, other educators discussed that legal formalized plans, such as IEPs that were really intended for students having physical, mental, and/or learning disabilities. These participants stressed that accurate identification and referral of ELLs, accompanied by culturally and linguistically appropriate instruction set up the ELL for academic achievement. They emphasized that if the ELL was not responding to appropriate ELL instruction, then referral should occur.

**Social-Emotional Well Being.** Establishing and supporting an ELL’s social-emotional well-being was a vital instructional component, and all 10 participants discussed the importance
of proactively nurturing an ELLs psychological security. Without social-emotional health, the ELLs were unavailable to learn. Consequently, the instructors discussed ways they fostered their ELLs’ mental health, including ways to promote family involvement, teacher-student interactions, and healthy student-peer relationships prior to launching student instruction. Educators expressed that by fostering an ELL’s social-emotional health, their instruction was more effective.

*Teachers SE to Instruct ELLs.* Staff discussed their confidence level when teaching ELLs, which impacted their instructional delivery. Some staff described high levels of motivation, and an ability to positively impact their ELL’s instruction, while others indicated that they needed more training and looked to specialists to educate their ELLs. Several of the educators who self-identified as having high self-efficacy for general education instruction described how she or he was not as comfortable teaching ELLs.

*Ongoing Instruction.* Similarly, participants discussed the need for ELLs who tested out of language assistance programs to continue receiving ELL support services. The educators recognized the challenge of the academic needs of reclassified ELLs who have met the exit criteria. Although the students were identified through the testing process as being academically proficient, the may still require some ELL support services. However, these students do not qualify for ELL services although they may still require ELL strategy instructional support and staff that can support them. Many participants discussed that once these students are reclassified, the teachers who instruct them may be unaware that they were a formerly identified ELL.

*Theme 3: Leadership.* Participants discussed the impact that leadership had on their districts’ and buildings’ ELL professional development, inclusive curriculum, and collaborative time, which had an effect on their self-efficacy when teaching English Language Learners.
Teachers discussed their need for leadership to take an active role in providing ongoing, high quantity ELL professional learning, so they would have the expertise to implement effective strategies for ELLs in the general education classroom. Educators who received quality professional learning shared detailed accounts of specific instructional strategies which increased ELL achievement. In contrast, teachers who did not receive quality PL described challenges of instructing ELLs. Similarly, the majority of participants discussed their leadership’s influence on the implementation of inclusive ELL curriculum. Participants who had a curriculum structure that included ELLs spoke with more efficacy than teachers who lacked an inclusive curriculum. They described a clearer structure that included leadership’s guidance when instructing their ELLs. Participants also spoke with appreciation of their leadership when provided time to collaborate with staff to plan, differentiate, and plan effective strategies for ELLs in the general education classroom. Overall, the participants felt that it was leadership’s role to deliver ongoing ELL professional learning, an inclusive curriculum, and collaborative time because it impacted educators’ capacity to effectively teach ELLs.

**Theme 4: Instructional Application.** Several instructional enhancement practices assisted educators when delivering effective strategy instruction to ELLs, such as culturally relevant teaching, technology and using an affective filter.

*Culturally Relevant Teaching.* Educators revealed that they included culturally relevant teaching, which represented their students’ cultural beliefs, values, and backgrounds to promote student engagement, strengthen student self-identities, and make learning relevant to their students’ diverse needs. Teachers incorporated their students’ ethnic literature, foods, holidays, and geography into their lessons to make learning relevant, foster inclusivity, reinforce students’ identity, and cultivate peer recognition. Also, to value their students’ cultures, several educators
discussed the benefit of having the students research prominent persons from their heritage, as well as having family nights where students exhibited cultural-based learning projects.

**Technology.** Educators utilized technology as an advantageous teaching tool to enhance their instruction, as it had the capability to personalize and extend ELL instruction with voice translators, vocabulary imagery connections, virtual experiences, and scaffolded text. Numerous websites were discussed that educators used to advance language skills, simplify text, and reinforce linguistic skills with an engaging, enjoyable, and game-like approach. Technology fostered independence for ELLs because it provided them with the autonomy to research unknown vocabulary and background knowledge. Additionally, translation software assisted educators with the ability to simplify directions, communicate with families, supplement classroom videos with subtitle features, and match text reading levels with their ELLs’ abilities.

**Affective Filter.** Also, participants described how they were sensitive to an ELLs affective filter, or feelings which stifled their ELLs ability to learn, such as feelings of anxiety, resentment, and embarrassment. Overall, educators explained how they focused on students’ strengths, fostered students’ comfort levels, and praised ELLs’ positive efforts to avoid emotional withdrawal. When teachers reduced their ELLs’ fears, were sensitive to students’ challenges, and built a foundation of trust, ELLs were more receptive to teachers’ feedback and were more likely to take chances with unfamiliar learning tasks.

**Summary of Chapter 4**

Chapter 4 provided an analysis of the data collection and findings that resulted from the research questions, which guided this study. Analysis of the quantitative data showed significance when investigating the extent and manner that the independent variables predicted teachers’ adaptive instruction. Four variables in the stepwise regression model, academic
performance feedback, efficacy in student engagement, student-directed instruction, and direct instruction exhibited a moderately high, positive correlation. Analysis of the qualitative data resulted in four themes and 14 subthemes, when examining instructional strategies that K-12 teachers with high self-efficacy used to support English Language Learners. Relationships between the quantitative and qualitative findings were evaluated. The conclusions, recommendations for educators, and suggestions for additional research will be discussed in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5: RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS

Guided by two research questions, the researcher examined the self-efficacy beliefs and instructional practices of K-12 teachers who instruct English Language Learners in order to examine research-based ELL instructional practices. Aligned with these intentions, this chapter provides (a) an overview of the study with discussion, (b) implications for leaders and educators, (c) suggestions for future research, (d) limitations and trustworthiness, and (e) conclusions.

The combination of a growing ELL population, the ELL achievement gap, and the lack of teacher training led to the two research questions which guided the investigation. This study occurred in five public school districts in southwestern Connecticut. Quantitative data were gathered from \((n = 126)\) educators who taught ELLs in the general education setting, and qualitative data were gathered from a subset \((n = 10)\) of the initial population.

Quantitative Summary and Discussion

Summary

Research Question 1 addressed this question: To what extent and in what manner do the subscales of teachers’ self-efficacy (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management), and instructional strategies (student-directed instruction, direct instruction, promotion of student thinking, and academic performance feedback) predict teachers’ adaptive instruction for educators who teach in K-12 classroom settings that include English Language Learners? The quantitative sample included certified K-12 public school educators, who held master’s degrees or were enrolled in a master’s program, and taught ELLs for five or more years. Three instruments were utilized (a) a demographic survey to identify participant characteristics, (b) The Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001a) to measure teachers’ self-efficacy, and (c) the
Classroom Strategy Scale -Teacher Form, Instructional Scale (Reddy et al., 2016) to measure teachers’ use of instructional strategies in the classroom setting.

A multilinear stepwise regression was used to analyze the interval data from the instruments to identify the extent that the set of independent variables predicted teachers’ adaptive instruction. The quantitative results suggested that the frequency of using adaptive instruction was predicted by the reported frequency of providing academic performance feedback, teachers’ self-efficacy for student engagement, student-directed instruction, and direct instruction ($R = .65$).

**Discussion**

The correlational findings provided information regarding the relationship between the instructional variables that K-12 educators use when instructing learners in the general education setting. The statistical data suggested that there is an integral relationship between adaptive instruction, and the predictors of academic performance feedback, self-efficacy in student engagement, student-directed instruction, and direct instruction.

Reddy, Fabiano, and Peters (2015) assert “Teaching is an active and interactive process requiring the modification and adaptation of teaching strategies as student learning is monitored” (2015, pp. 527-528). With respect to adaptive instruction, educators adjust their instruction when they “respond to their students’ learning needs while teaching” (Reddy & Dudek, 2014, p. 74). Wang (1980) further emphasized that adaptive instruction is appropriate for all learners because it is “matched to students on the basis of knowledge about each individual’s background, talents, interests, and past performance” (p. 122). Research studies show that adaptive instruction improves student learning because it is based on student abilities, utilizes alternative materials, provides achievable goals, and allows students to work at their own pace (Waxman et al., 1985).
Additional literature supported the regression outcome, which indicated that adaptive instruction is most effective in a combination of strategies (academic performance feedback, student-directed instruction, and direct instruction) and self-efficacy in student engagement. Hatti’s (2016) research found that adapting instruction with a variety of strategies is essential because no one strategy works in all settings with every learner. In contrast, Hattie rationalized that a teacher’s effectiveness when adapting appropriate instructional strategies depends on a student’s phase of learning or their “surface, deep, and transfer” learning stage (p. 1). Moreover, self-efficacy for student engagement was a critical component in relation to adaptive classroom instruction. “Teachers with a high level of efficacy believed that they could control, or at least strongly influence, student achievement and motivation” (Tschannen-Moran et. al., 1998, p. 2). In particular, the literature supported the importance of teachers’ efficacy to “actively engage students by using motivational strategies to increase interest, value learning, assist families, foster creativity, and encourage students to believe in their abilities” (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001a).

**Implications for Educators**

The quantitative results implied that teachers who possess high levels of a sense of self-efficacy and use specific classroom strategies are more likely to adapt instruction for their ELL students. Specifically, four variables in the regression model, academic performance feedback, teachers’ efficacy in student engagement, and the instructional strategies of student-directed instruction, and direct instruction predicted the criterion of adaptive instruction.

**Implications for Future Researchers**

Based on the predictors from the multiple linear regression, researchers can focus on these variables to replicate the study or conduct an experiment regarding the impact of training
teachers to enhance their self-efficacy and implement these strategies. A summary of the quantitative theme one results, connections to the literature, implications for educators and researchers, and limitations, is provided in Table 29.
Table 29

Research Question 1: Quantitative Connections, Implications, and Limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Connections to the Literature</th>
<th>Implication for Educators</th>
<th>Implication for Researchers</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four variables in the regression model, academic performance feedback, efficacy in student engagement, student-directed instruction, and direct instruction, exhibited a moderately high, positive correlation with adaptive instruction, $R = .65$, $p \geq 0.001$.</td>
<td>Adaptive instruction applies social cognitive theory and scaffolding (Vygotsky, 1978). Also, Reddy and Dudek noted that when teachers utilize adaptive instructional strategies, it “reflect[s] teacher flexibility and responsiveness to students’ needs, as well as methods of differentiated instruction” (2014, p. 75).</td>
<td>If teachers have high self-efficacy in student engagement and apply the instructional strategies of student-directed instruction, direct instruction, and academic performance feedback, then they are more likely to adapt instruction for students in K-12 classrooms.</td>
<td>Because there is little research available regarding the impact of adaptive instruction on student achievement, researchers may want to explore these instructional strategies with K-12 student pre-post groups.</td>
<td>At the time of the study, there were few reliable survey instruments available to measure teachers’ ELL self-efficacy and classroom strategy use. The researcher modified the CSS-T and used one of the two subscales.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Summary and Discussion

Research Question 2 data were obtained from interviewing 10 participants with the highest self-efficacy and strategy use from the quantitative sample of 126 participants. The 11 semi-structured interview questions were created and generated from the CSS-T and TSES instruments used in the quantitative phase. Research Question 2 employed a two-cycle coding process that included a first phase of structural and emergent coding, followed by a second cycle of pattern coding, analysis, and the emergence of qualitative themes. The qualitative data analytics encompassed a process of identifying patterns, data reduction, and drawing conclusions (Miles et al., 2014). The first cycle coding resulted in identifying 108 codes. The second cycle coding resulted in reducing these codes into four overarching themes. The qualitative data provided instructional strategies while also having provided instructional suggestions and implications for educators.

The following section reviews each of the four qualitative themes (strategy instruction, foundational requirements, leadership, and instructional applications) and results, as well as each theme’s connection to the literature and its implications.

Theme 1: Strategy Instruction

Summary

In reviewing theme 1, strategy instruction, teachers utilized a variety of approaches suggested by the educators, which varied by ELLs’ unique learning stages and learning objectives. The most frequently used strategy was adaptive instruction, which teachers flexibly used, often in the moment, to guide students’ understanding and correct misperceptions. Examples of how the educators adapted their instruction included connecting students’ background knowledge to their learning task, using an inquiry strategy, and providing language
support. Adaptive instruction was often used in conjunction with other instructional strategies. Integrated in the strategy instructional theme, the participants described using a gradual release of responsibility with their ELL students, where the teachers moved the students toward independence using three instructional strategies: direct instruction, student-directed instruction, and academic performance feedback. The educators initiated ELL learning with a direct instructional approach, which provided ELLs with explicit instruction, and the teachers clearly modeled and defined the learning tasks. With this strategy, the participants described using visuals, pre-teaching vocabulary and using a color-coding technique to identify similarities and differences. Subsequently, the educators described involving the ELLs in applying their learning using a constructivist, hands-on approach, peer partnerships, and cooperative learning. Next, the teachers explained that they supported increased ELL autonomy by providing academic performance feedback, by encouraging student efforts and achievements, and by remedying misunderstandings. Some performance feedback strategies the participants used a proficiency learning approach, student conferences, goal setting, and student recognition of accomplishments.

Discussion

Although ELLs are capable learners, there is a well-documented and persistent student achievement gap between ELLs and non-ELLs. (Murphy, 2014; NASEM, 2017; McFarland et al., 2018). As the projected ELL population continues to grow, teachers have voiced that they need to know how to teach ELLs (McGraw Hill & Morning Consultant, 2019; Prahlad, A., et al., 2017; Siwatu, 2011). Differentiated instructional strategies, used by the participants, were theoretically supported by Vygotsky’s Gradual Release model (1978), which shifted the responsibility from the instructor to the student to advance ELL student learning. Hatti and
Donoghue (2016) established that strategies have the ability to scaffold instruction. Moreover, these strategies have different effect sizes, or in other words, some strategies are more effective than others. However, the authors emphasized that effectiveness of the strategies also depends on an individual’s learning stage and unique needs.

**Implications for Educators**

All strategies from the two instruments, the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001a) and the Classroom Strategy Scale-Teacher Form, Instructional Scale (Reddy et al., 2016), were placed on a list for a priori codes. The techniques described by teachers as being the most successful with ELLs were (a) adaptive instruction, (b) direct instruction, (c) student-directed instruction, and (d) academic performance feedback. This implies that when teachers refine and implement these strategies achievement for ELLs will improve.

**Implications for Future Researchers**

There has been little research regarding which instructional strategies teachers of ELLs use (Borg & Al-Busaidi, 2012). Most of the research has been conducted with preservice teachers (Siwatu, 2011). The strategies in this study were revealed by veteran teachers with high self-efficacy, and the quantitative data supported the qualitative data. Each of these strategies should be studied in depth to understand their impact on the achievement of ELLs. This study also revealed that teachers tailored their use of ELL strategies depending on students’ needs. Using a pre and post format, researchers could utilize a combination of instructional strategies, such as, adaptive instruction, student-directed instruction, direct instruction, and academic performance feedback to study the impact on ELL achievement. A summary of the qualitative theme one, strategy instruction, is provided in Table 30.
### Table 30

**Research Question 2: Qualitative Theme 1 (Strategy Instruction): Connections, Implications, Limitations, and Trustworthiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Connections to the Literature</th>
<th>Implication for Educators</th>
<th>Implication for Researchers</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers used ELL strategies based on the student’s need.</td>
<td>Hatti and Donoghue (2016)</td>
<td>If educators utilize a blend of adaptive instruction,</td>
<td>Using a pre and post format, researchers can study the impact of instructional strategies on ELL achievement.</td>
<td>The sample population primarily included affluent, white females residing or educated in the northeastern portion of the United States.</td>
<td>To ensure trustworthiness, the researcher used thick, rich descriptions as well as electronically transcribed interviews, and concurrent validity of data procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top strategies were: (a) adaptive instruction, (b) direct instruction, (c) student-directed instruction, and (d) academic performance feedback.</td>
<td>strategies depend on the individual’s unique needs and Vygotsky’s (1978) theory of gradual release suggests that instructors scaffold instruction to the learner’s readiness to learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Theme 2: Foundational Requirements

Summary

The qualitative data revealed essential foundational requirements that were considered necessary to accompany teachers’ strategy instruction: ELL’s appropriate referral placement, social-emotional well-being, teacher self-efficacy to instruct ELLs, and ongoing ELL long term instruction for their students who were reclassified as having met the language proficiency exit criteria. Educators felt that these conditions were a vital and supplementary necessity to advance ELL achievement.

Discussion

The participants in this study held different and somewhat contrasting views of what an appropriate education for ELLs entailed, especially regarding appropriate referrals. Although the U.S. Supreme Court in 2017 ruled that all children, regardless of their origin or language (including ELLs), are entitled to a free and appropriate public education (Public Law 94-142), some participants remarked that their districts were not equipped to provide adequate ELL instruction. In these districts, educators stated that referrals either to special education (IEPs) or to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-112, Section 504) were necessary and routinely conducted to provide ELLs with the extra support needed (Gargulio & Bouck, 2021). In contrast, some participants discussed that referrals to special education were appropriate only when ELLs had a learning disability. The educators in the latter category discussed the appropriateness of providing education that was geared to the ELLs linguistic and cultural needs first because they were entitled to the same educational access as their peers. These educators indicated that an appropriate ELL referral was for students with identified learning needs or disabilities.
ELL learning supported by suitable recommendations to Special Education was evident in the literature. There has been a historical underrepresentation of ELLs in gifted programs and an over-qualification of ELLs for special education in the past three generations (Ford, 2012). Language proficiency tests have been misleading because they were not targeted for English Language Learners. Instructionally, ELLs require linguistic support as they learn both the academic content and vocabulary while simultaneously learning a new language (Harper & de Jong, 2004; Lucas, 2015). Meanwhile, ELLs with IEPs are provided educational services by special education teachers who often lack ELL training (Miranda et al., 2019).

Teachers discussed how important it was to ensure that an ELL’s social emotional comfort level was solid before beginning their instruction. Bandura’s social-cognitive theory (1977) and Pajares’ belief system (1996) emphasized the impact that one’s psychological status and beliefs have on a learner’s ability to learn. Participants explained that ELLs struggle emotionally when they are becoming accustomed to a new culture and school system. These students want to make friends, and not look different or appear as though they do not know the answers, so ELLs are often afraid to make mistakes, and, therefore, can become quiet. Bandura (1977) underscored that a learner’s anxiety and apprehension can create avoidance and low self-efficacy whereas a comfortable mindset is more likely to generate a positive and persistent attitude (Bandura, 1977). When ELLs feel apprehension, educators can lessen this emotion with verbal persuasion and positive learning experiences (Bandura & Adams, 1977). The educators nurtured students’ social-emotional well-being by developing strong student-teacher relationships, providing the students with extra individualized help, taking an interest in their culture, fostering students’ interests, developing relationships with their families, and encouraging positive student-peer relationships.
Educators who had lacked ELL professional learning described feeling not confident and needed specialist support. Participants discussed that collaboration with peers helped them feel empowered and more prepared. Additionally, teacher self-efficacy was reported to improve with ELL instructional professional learning that was accompanied with follow-up time with an ELL coach. Bandura’s social-cognitive theory of behavioral change (Bandura, 1977) stated that a teacher’s self-efficacy or belief that they can achieve an outcome supports the premise that teachers with high self-efficacy have more of an impact on student achievement. Bandura (1977) postulated that an individual’s perceived self-efficacy depended on the expected task, which in this study was ELL instruction. The literature supported how mastery of experiences, vicarious learning, verbal persuasion, and psychological states could “alter the level and strength of self-efficacy” (Bandura, 1977, p. 1). When teachers had successful ELL experiences, it created a positive association, which strengthened their ELL instructional task-related beliefs.

Additionally, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy stated that an efficacious teacher projects a positive “judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated” (2001a, p. 783). Moreover, the literature showed that teachers with high self-efficacy (SE) were more effective in the classroom (Armor et al., 1976; 2011; Hattie, 2012; Marzano, 2003; Poulou et. al., 2019; Summers et al., 2017; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011; Zee & Koomen, 2016). However, numerous teachers of ELLs indicated that they felt unqualified to teach this population and would rather not have them in their classes (Walker et al., 2004). This study suggested that to improve teachers’ self-efficacy in educating ELLs, coaching must be an integral piece of professional learning related to ELLs. Also, teachers who are more self-efficacious were less likely to refer their students to special education and for 504 plans, leading to their
misidentification as students needing special education instead of supporting their linguistic needs.

Another area that participants discussed was the abrupt disruption of educational services when an ELL mastered the state mandated language proficiency assessment. An ELL is classified to receive ELL services by his or her performance on an English language assessment, which gauges the student’s language proficiency and determines a student’s language status. The participants recounted how ELLs who were dismissed because and tested out, often required a transitional amount of support. Additionally, staff members were often unaware of who their previously identified ELLs were. Students who were formerly classified as ELLs often ended up in reading intervention and speech services as a result of a discontinuation of ELL instructional supports. Educators indicated that they often were unaware who the reclassified ELLs were. A review of the laws supporting ELL, showed that educators are required to provide reclassified ELLs with scaffolded instruction in the general education setting and to progress monitor them for an additional two years (NCLB, 2001). The literature indicates that ELLs who have been reclassified, and no longer considered an English Language Learner, often feel “separation from longstanding friendships, a feeling of otherness, self-esteem and confidence issues, a need to catch up in content areas, and a potential lack of scaffolded instruction” (Raiche, 2010, p. 44). As a result, the staff is unaware of which students require continued ELL monitoring (Raiche, 2010). Therefore, this study highlighted the importance of ongoing ELL instruction for reclassified ELLs and the need to communicate this information to staff.

Implications for Educators

Although ELLs are entitled to a free and appropriate public education (Public Law 94-142), some staff described how their districts were not prepared to provide adequate ELL
instruction. Consequently, some staff described the need to refer ELLs to special education (IEPs) and/or requested 504 plans to provide ELLs with the extra support needed. If teachers receive adequate ELL training, and districts provide enough ELL support, teachers may have higher self-efficacy to instruct ELLs, provide appropriate referrals, and deliver ongoing ELL instruction to students who are exited from ongoing ELL services. Leadership has an integral role in providing staff with resources, communication, and an appropriate setting that fosters ELL teacher performance and instruction.

**Implications for Future Researchers**

There is minimal current research about teachers’ self-efficacy, students’ social emotional well-being, and appropriate referrals in relation to teaching ELLs. Future researchers may want to investigate the following areas, using a pre and post format:

(a) how teachers’ self-efficacy impacted teachers’ ability to persevere and utilize effective strategies with their ELLs,

(b) the effects of high-quality ELL professional learning and coaching and the relationship between appropriate special education and Section 504 referrals, and

(c) both novice and veteran teachers (only veteran teachers with high self-efficacy were included in this study).

A summary of Theme 2, Foundational Requirements, is provided in Table 31.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Implication for Educators</th>
<th>Implication for Researchers</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundational Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Teachers of ELLs with high self-efficacy are more likely to provide appropriate referrals, deliver instructional support for ELLs, and a plan to deliver ongoing ELL instruction to reclassified ELLs who have been exited from Special Ed services, then ELL achievement will advance. <strong>(Bandura, 2002b).</strong></td>
<td>If teachers have high self-efficacy to instruct ELLs, researchers may want to investigate pre and post teacher groups who have been provided ELL professional learning and support ELLs, including teachers’ SE referrals, and the impact of delivering ongoing ELL instruction (after ELLs are reclassified).</td>
<td>Researchers may want to investigate pre and post teacher groups who have been provided ELL professional learning and support ELLs.</td>
<td>There is very little current research on teachers’ self-efficacy to teach ELLs. Also, few studies are available regarding appropriate referrals, and the impact of delivering ongoing ELL instruction (after ELLs are reclassified).</td>
<td>To establish trustworthiness, the researcher provided a biography, maintained a reflexive journal, electronically transcribed interviews and conducted concurrent validity data procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 3: Leadership

Summary

When reviewing theme 3, leadership, the qualitative findings showed that leadership offers potential influence, permission, and authority to guide instruction for ELLs. Leadership has an essential role in providing staff with ELL professional learning, an inclusive curriculum, and collaborative time. These influences impacted the educators’ ability and self-efficacy to effectively teach English Language Learners. Ongoing high-quality professional learning enhanced teacher knowledge and effectiveness in the classroom. Similarly, participants reported that an inclusive curriculum, a differentiated learning environment, and established ELL instructional expectations had the potential to enhance ELLs’ learning growth. Educators’ collaborative time with their peers, instructional leaders, and coaches provided them with time to create differentiated lessons and materials. The data also revealed that educators who received professional learning, embraced an inclusive ELL classroom. In contrast, educators who lacked professional learning described a lower comfort level when teaching ELLs and indicated that the responsibility for them should be assigned to ELL specialists. In addition, these same educators discussed the role that leadership possesses in making available increased, ongoing, high-quality professional learning for staff. Also, the participants requested that leadership consider professional learning during budget time, provide support teachers detailed lists of ELL accommodations, and include ELL professional learning for specialists, such as the arts, music, physical education, health teachers. Participants offered recommendations for how their leadership could best support their ability to implement effective instruction for ELLs. Table 32 illustrates the five most frequent subthemes that leadership may want to consider and highlight in educational and curriculum planning.
Table 32

*Considerations for Leadership: Highest Subtheme Frequency Totals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subthemes</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Instruction</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Directed Instruction</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Time</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Previous studies demonstrated that leadership has a vital impact on ELL strategy instruction. ELLs, while cognitively capable learners, have demonstrated an achievement gap that has been reported for at least three decades (Murphy, 2014; NASEM, 2017; McFarland et al., 2018). Elfers et al., (2013) emphasized the critical importance that leadership provides in building an ELL support system for teachers that should include professional learning, inclusive curriculum, and collaborative time to support the instructional practices for teachers of ELLs. Additional research indicated that leadership’s decisions impacted professional learning’s effectiveness, noting that when professional learning is accompanied by teacher coaching, there was higher student achievement (Kraft et al., 2018). Also, when leadership provided teachers with the time to collaborate with colleagues and extended their personal learning with colleagues to plan for their ELLs, they felt increased empowerment to teach ELLs (Celozzi, 2017; Lucas et al., 2015) Consequently, instructional delivery was found to be “consistently associated with positive and mostly statistically significant improvements in teachers’ practices” (Blazer & Kraft, 2015, p. 20).
Implications for Educators

Leadership, both at the district level and building level, can support teachers of ELLs by providing staff with quality professional learning, an inclusive curriculum, and collaborative time. Ongoing professional learning that is supported by coaching will enhance teachers’ efficacy to deliver improved instruction for their ELLs.

Implications for Researchers

There is minimal current research on the influence of leadership on the application of an ELL teachers’ support system on ELL student achievement. Future researchers could collaborate with leadership to implement and investigate ELL student achievement when leadership provides quality PL, an inclusive curriculum, and collaborative time. A summary of qualitative Theme 3 (leadership) is provided in Table 33.
Table 33

Research Question 2: Quantitative Theme 3 (Leadership): Connections, Implications, Limitations, and Trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Connections to the Literature</th>
<th>Implication for Educators</th>
<th>Implication for Researchers</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When Leadership provided ELL professional learning (PL), an inclusive curriculum, and collaborative time, it positively impacted teachers’ perceived ability to deliver effective ELL strategy instruction.</td>
<td>Elfers et al., (2013) emphasized the critical importance that leadership provides in building an ELL support system for teachers and it should include professional learning, inclusive curriculum, and collaborative time.</td>
<td>If leadership provides quality professional learning, an inclusive curriculum, and collaborative time, it enhances teachers’ perceived ability to deliver effective strategy instruction for their ELLs.</td>
<td>Using a pre-post format, researchers can investigate ELL student achievement when leadership provides an ELL teachers’ support system on student achievement. This researcher did not interview school leadership participants.</td>
<td>There is very little research on the impact of leadership on the implementation of an ELL teachers’ support system on student achievement. This researcher did not interview school leadership participants.</td>
<td>The researcher provided thick rich descriptions from participants. Qualitative results were reviewed for credibility and trustworthiness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 4: Instructional Applications

Summary

Participants reported that when they supplemented their instruction with culturally relevant teaching, technology, and an affective filter, it enhanced their ELL instruction. The participants noticed that these applications nurtured their ELLs emotionally, which increased their willingness to take risks, embrace new learning, and happily participate in classroom activities, rather than socially withdraw. CRT and technology helped improved teachers’ ability to communicate with their ELLs and their families. Moreover, by noticing an ELLs affective filter, or watching for their student’s frustration levels, educators could apply an appropriate level of challenge.

Discussion

Educators who embedded culturally relevant teaching into their instruction by integrating ethnic stories, food, holidays and festivities, as well as geography noticed that it promoted peer acceptance and recognition. The literature also revealed that the use of CRT developed ELLs’ social and cognitive development and was central to closing the ELL achievement gap (Banks 1993, Geneva Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2009). Banks (1993) recommended that educators integrate multicultural substance into every aspect of their instruction to diminish prejudice, promote impartiality, and inspire diversity (1993). Bandura (2002b) underscored that the task of educating learners is more global, and educators require the personal agency to advocate for learners within their unique cultural contexts. However, the literature also supported the finding that many preservice teachers report that they lacked culturally relevant teaching self-efficacy and would benefit from professional learning (Siwatu, 2011).
Participants reported that technology enhanced their ability to instantly adjust their instruction and consequently provide timely interventions to support their ELLs. Bandura’s learning theory (1977) emphasized that when a student observes and imitates others, these observations can shape cognitive understanding. In particular, Bandura stated that behaviors that are rewarded are more likely to build a positive experience and then be repeated by the learner (1997). This was applicable when teachers of ELLs and ELLs themselves learned using online materials. Bandura (2002b) purported that technology has the capacity to provide adaptive instruction, while delivering a positive and global, inclusive context for learners. Participants described how technology helped them as well as their students overcome instructional challenges, such as an inability to communicate due to language differences, a gap in their ELL’s background knowledge, and a need to provide differentiated reading levels. Bandura’s cognitive social learning was facilitated in the form of online observation and direct instruction when learners utilized translation software that bridged communication gaps, reinforced vocabulary with online images, provided instantaneous knowledge on particular topics, simplified text, and provided personalized, scaffolded skill practice. These findings suggested that if educators support their own learning, as well as their ELLs’ instruction, with technology resources, it can improve ELL achievement and lessen the achievement gap.

An affective filter was also an important and crucial foundational teaching element that accompanied effective strategy instruction for advancing ELL student learning. Teachers said that when they were sensitive to an ELL’s affective filter, they could provide an appropriate amount of error correction. Vygotsky’s social learning theory includes the premise that learning is shaped by the cultural environment and that every child’s learning functions “first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level” (1978, p. 57). This theory can be used to recognize
the ELLs’ cognitive development using scaffolding within the learner’s zone of proximal development. When teachers were encouraging, sensitive to students learning capacity, and ensured that instruction was supported with the proper amount of challenge, students were emotionally ready for learning and were more likely to take risks. Vygotsky’s theory of optimal cognitive learning growth is maximized when the learner, who is not able to independently perform a task, achieves success with the guidance of a more knowledgeable person (adult or knowledgeable peer), the learner can advance their abilities (1978). Teachers’ sensitivity included an awareness of what ELLs knew, often in their other language, in order to develop a link to learning in English and thus strengthen ELLs’ confidence levels. This instructional filter assisted ELLs to participate rather than shut down and emotionally withdraw from new learning challenges. In this setting, Vygotsky’s theory supported the findings that ELL instruction was enhanced when educators used an affective filter and provided just enough guidance to support but not frustrate their ELL’s linguistic needs.

Implication for Educators

The participants discussed the vitally important role that CRT, technology, and an affective filter served in their daily instructional context to advance ELL learning. Leaders should facilitate this adult learning process for their staff so that teachers may knowledgeably and effectively support their instruction with these foundational components. This instructional support is especially relevant due to the expanding ELL population, which is projected to increase (Hussar & Bailey, 2020), and because the historical achievement gap continues to widen between ELL and non-ELLs (Murphy, 2014; NASEM, 2017; McFarland et al., 2018). If educators support ELLs’ instruction with culturally relevant teaching it could advance ELL achievement and close the achievement gap. To increase teachers’ efficacy and knowledge in
this area, leadership should increase CRT professional learning at every level of teaching, including at the pre-service and advanced degree stages of education, as well as ongoing PL in the school setting with ongoing coaching.

**Implications for Future Researchers**

These findings suggest that future researchers could study ELL student achievement when educators provide ELLs with instruction, which is supported with culturally relevant teaching, technology and an affective filter. Since there is little current research regarding veteran teacher use of CRT with ELLs, it is suggested that future researchers could study ELL student achievement when educators are provided with culturally relevant instruction and ongoing follow-up coaching. Researchers can assess culturally relevant instruction after educators receive professional learning and how it impacts student achievement for ELLs in the classroom, pretest and posttest. A summary of theme 4, the instructional applications, and the connections to the literature, implications for educators and researchers, as well as limitations and trustworthiness are provided in Table 34.
Table 34

Research Question 2: Qualitative Theme 4 (Instructional Applications) - Connections, Implications, Limitations, and Trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Connections to the Literature</th>
<th>Implication for Educators</th>
<th>Implication for Researchers</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants reported that</td>
<td>Bandura’s (2002b)</td>
<td>If educators support ELLs’</td>
<td>Using a pre-post format, researchers can study ELL student</td>
<td>The sample of participants in this investigation were purposefully selected.</td>
<td>The researcher provided thick rich descriptions from participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culturally relevant</td>
<td>and Vygotsky’s (1978) Social</td>
<td>instruction with culturally relevant teaching,</td>
<td>achievement when educators provide instruction, which is supported with culturally relevant teaching, and these results may not be generalizable.</td>
<td>Qualitative results were reviewed for credibility and trustworthiness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching, technology, and an</td>
<td>Cognitive Theories recognize the instructional applications of cultural and social context to a learner’s cognitive development.</td>
<td>can advance ELL achievement and close the achievement gap.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affective filter enhanced ELL instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations and Trustworthiness

Researchers aim to minimize vulnerable inherent limitations and trustworthiness (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Cook & Campbell, 1979). Despite attempts to minimize limitations and enhance trustworthiness concerns, research outcomes should be interpreted with caution. This section describes potential quantitative threats, with respect to internal and external validity, and details of trustworthiness, common to qualitative research.

Quantitative Limitations

The validity of the research implies the accuracy or more specifically, “In testing, the appropriateness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of specific inferences made from test scores” (Gall et al., 2007, p. 657). This investigation adhered to quality, rigorous procedures to ensure high validity in providing a meaningful blend of quantifiable and humanistic insights. Since research is subject to procedural risks that may be prevented, the following section analyzes and acknowledges the threats that relate to this study’s internal and external validity.

Threats to Internal Validity

Potential threats to this study’s quantitative internal validity included “any relationship observed between two or more variables [that] should be unambiguous as to what it means rather than being due to something else” (Fraenkel et al., 2012, p. 166). The authors indicated that to promote investigative precision, threats should be evaluated “in terms of their likelihood” and to create a well-planned proposal to manage the risks. Internal threats related to this correlational study addressed included: (a) subject characteristics, (b) instrumentation, (c) history, and (d) testing (Table 35).
### Table 35

*Internal Validity Threats to Correlational Studies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Steps Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Characteristics</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Unintended attributes can explain an interaction between participants and create a false correlation between the variables.</td>
<td>The researcher identified potential outliers to determine if the subject characteristics accurately reflected the target population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>The changes in instruments may cause change in outcomes.</td>
<td>The researcher used only one of the CCS-T two subscales of the CCS-T instrument. The researcher adhered to the testing and scoring procedures for each instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>The threat of history, or unforeseen incidences that occur, can potentially impact responses.</td>
<td>The Covid epidemic may have potentially affected participant responses. The researcher utilized online data collection at a similar point in time for all participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>The process of taking one assessment influences a participant’s responses to subsequent instruments.</td>
<td>Purposeful sampling of teachers with high levels of education, along with descriptions of the domains assessed were implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* These steps were addressed to minimize internal validity threats (Fraenkel et al., 2012).
Subject Characteristics. Subject selection bias presented a potential internal threat for Research Question 1. A threat to subject characteristics may occur “Whenever two or more characteristics of individuals (or groups) are correlated, there exists the possibility that yet other characteristics can explain any relationships found” (Fraenkel et al., 2012, p. 341). Fraenkel, et al. (2012) explained that the attitudes of participants can be a subject characteristic threat. In this study, participants’ attitudes and understanding of English Language Learners was a high threat. In this regard, some of the quantitative sample participants involved in this research included White, affluent educators who lacked ELL professional learning. Thirteen applicants contacted the researcher and disqualified themselves from the study because of their lack of knowledge regarding ELLs and specifically, whether they taught English Language Learners for five or more years. For example, an art teacher, who taught all students in the building for over 30 years, identified herself as not having taught ELLs for five years. The literature revealed that “White blindness” can impact an individual’s awareness to cultures other than their own (Ford, 2014; Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995b). Additional examinations suggested that middle-class educators remain culturally unaware of multicultural English Language Learner student population differences (Levine-Rasky, 2000; Moon et al., 2009). The researcher speculates that the total participants for Research Question 1 may have been greater if educators were more aware of their ELL population.

In particular, middle-class educators have been found to be culturally unaware of multicultural English Language Learner student population differences (Levine-Rasky, 2000; Moon et al., 2009). Currently, 80% of teachers are White (NCES, 2018), and educators are often unaware of the cultural and educational needs of their English Language Learner population. As Catalina Olvera (2015) clarified, “There also is a perception that English learners are individuals
who are newly arrived immigrants; however, as many as 56% of English learners are born in the U.S.” (p. 80). As a result, teacher perspectives of the previously mentioned English Language Learner criteria may have contributed to the initial small survey response completion rate and, therefore, a limitation of this study. Teachers’ perceptions of English Language Learner criteria have grown within the last five years due to a recent increase in professional development in many districts in the last decade. Some teachers indicated on their surveys that they had only recently received English Language Learner professional learning, and within the last few years have become more aware of the English Language Learner population and English Language Learner criteria.

**Instrumentation.** The instrumentation or the accuracy with which the actual instrument measures what it is purported to measure was a potential threat to the generalization of data outcomes. The researcher altered the CSS-T instrument, with the authors’ permission, and used one of the two instrument domains, the Instructional Scale (not the Behavioral Scale), because the latter scale did not pertain to this study. Consequently, this change altered the way the dependent variable was measured. While instrumentation change does not automatically present a threat, the researcher obtained as much information as possible to accurately represent the data (Fraenkel et al., 2012). To ensure additional high-quality supportive data, the researcher triangulated the data with qualitative interviews. Also, the interview questions were reviewed by an English Language Learner expert in the field who examined the questions, provided feedback and modifications, and the researcher reworked the interview questions where it was necessary.

**History.** Gall et al. (2007) cautioned that the threat of history, or unforeseen incidences that occur, can potentially impact responses. Although the present study transpired at the onset of the 2020-2021 COVID pandemic, the researcher determined the threat posed by history was
minimal as the quantitative data were electronically collected prior to the pandemic outbreak and preceded the remote educational phase of teaching. Nevertheless, a marginal possibility existed that the imminent COVID epidemic influenced subject responses.

**Testing.** Testing threat means that “the experience of responding to the first instrument that is administered in a correlational study may influence subject responses to the second instrument” (Fraenkel et al., 2012, p. 344). The authors clarify that testing is “the use of any form of instrumentation” (p. 171). In this study, testing was a low threat because the first assessment required the educator to self-assess their self-efficacy, and the second assessment pertained to classroom strategies. While these are two different constructs, the participants’ assessment of their efficacy may have influenced their responses about their frequency of using teaching strategies.

**Threats to External Validity**

The external validity of a study describes “. . . the extent to which the findings of an experiment can be applied to individuals and settings beyond those that were studied” (Gall et al., 2007, p. 388). A potential area of threat concerned population generalizability. While there was no experiment in the study, the research methods and results were recorded in detail.

**Population Generalizability.** In this study, the purposeful sample population included educators, who held a graduate degree, which may affect generalization because the participants had high levels of education. As previously mentioned, the survey was conducted in a region that had higher median income than other regions in the United States. Consequently, participants in the quantitative sample consisted of affluent, highly educated, Caucasian, female educators. Therefore, the quantitative sample participant characteristics were not as diversely exemplified as in some regions of the United States and is a potential limit to generalizing these data and
results. To increase generalization across the population, detailed participant demographic information was provided to enhance generalization in other areas such as age, gender, level of education, teaching position, number of languages spoken, instructional setting, number of years in current position, total years taught, and type of ELL professional learning received (Table 5 and Table 6).

**Sample Size.** The sample size of 126 participants was a potential limitation to this study. Although over 1000 participants were invited by email, only a portion of the teachers were willing to participate. Creswell (2012) cautioned researchers to consider email response rates and to identify steps for administering the survey to account for this difficulty. To protect the investigation against this small sample size, the researcher monitored the response rates for three months, and expanded the population with the inclusion of five public school districts within the same geographic region. Also, to recruit a larger sample size, the researcher visited university graduate classrooms and public school staff meetings to personally invite participants to partake in the online research.

**Data Collector Bias.** The data collector bias threat remained a low threat due to the utilization of electronic software, which was used to collect, download, and calculate the statistical results for Research Question 1. These procedures diminished the possibility of data collector bias, or the likelihood that the data collector and scorer might unintentionally misrepresent the data in favor of the research hypothesis (Frankel et al., 2012).

Also, Dr. Delcourt reviewed the quantitative data, survey instruments, collection procedures, electronic resources, spreadsheets, raw data, and records. She also provided extensive feedback regarding the coding process, which was used to carefully align the pathway from initial codes to themes. Additionally, Dr. Goolkasian comprehensively audited all levels of
the inquiry to ensure ethical, impartial, and substantiated results (Lincoln & Guba, 1982). This investigation included the interview protocol questions, descriptions of the educators, precise explanations of the codes, and coding procedures used in this study.

**Qualitative Trustworthiness**

Researchers require a diligent devotion to their investigations for their findings to be trustworthy and dependable (Guba, 1981). To establish qualitative trustworthiness, four factors of trustworthiness were considered and monitored throughout the course of this study: (a) credibility, (b) confirmability, (c) dependability, and (d) transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The investigator reflected on and implemented research-based methodologies in an effort to maximize trustworthiness with substantiated data (Table 36).
Table 36

Qualitative Trustworthiness and Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Steps Taken to Address Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility (Internal Validity)</td>
<td>Researcher Biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflexive Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronically Transcribed Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memo Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concurrent Validity of Data Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability (Generalization)</td>
<td>Thick Rich Descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability (Reliability)</td>
<td>Triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coding Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmability (Objectivity)</td>
<td>Checking and Rechecking the Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adhering to a Semi-structured Interview Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-recording and Transcribing the Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmability Audit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To establish qualitative trustworthiness, the researcher took steps to confirm trustworthiness in four areas (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Credibility

“Internal validity relates to the question of how research findings match reality,” or credibility (Merriam, 2009, p. 213). The researcher established practices of credibility using an interview question protocol and electronic data capturing in order that the data would be credible and trusted by the reader. The research questions were based on the investigative tools from Research Question 1, the TSES scale, and the CSS-T. Moreover, the qualitative procedure maximized participant discussion and mandated a quietness of the investigator, in order that the participant could express their current reality, and the investigator to capture, via electronically
transcribed software, the participants’ realities (Saldaña, 2016). The data collection process ensured the existence of, as Merriam (2009) described, an “adequate engagement in the data collection” process in “trying to get as close as possible to participants’ understanding of a phenomenon” (p. 219). In this way, the credibility of the findings could be afforded in the qualitative results.

Also, the researcher provided “careful record keeping as a way of connecting with important audiences” (Miles et al., 2014, p. 315). For example, a researcher biography with existing biased predispositions was provided; a reflexive journal was used to record all communication, and all the participant interviews were recorded and electronically transcribed. Moreover, research-based practices were instituted from the onset of the investigation with a detailed researcher biography, an ongoing reflexive journal that spanned the course of two years the concurrent validity of data procedures, and the utilization of triangulated data.

Additionally, triangulation was used to establish credibility as “... a systematic process of sorting through the data to find common themes or categories by eliminating overlapping areas” (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 127). Quantitative and qualitative data convergence and divergence were evaluated to assess commonality and differences for the learning for all students and that of English Language Learners.

Transferability

The degree that a researcher is able to generalize the current study’s outcomes to future contexts and populations is referred to as transferability (Merriam, 2009). The degree that the research findings could be generalized to other potential settings, was enhanced by collecting detailed, precise data that would allow future researchers to accurately employ similar procedures (Miles et al., 2014).
This study included the essential components of what Denzin (1989) described as descriptive, detailed accounts or “truthlike statements and in this way the reader could experience, the events being described” (pp. 83-84). Creswell and Miller (2000) underscored the importance of this procedure because it “creates verisimilitude, statements that produce for the readers the feeling that they have experienced, or could experience, the events being described in a study” (p. 129). Examples of database items provided a comprehensive explanation of the context, times, population, procedures, and codebook. Information was collected with purposeful sampling, selecting individual members having characteristics related to the research questions. The researcher’s dissertation advisor, Pauline E. Goolkasian, EdD., reviewed all data and procedures to “certify that the processes used fall within the ‘bounds of good professional practice’ … [and] that the data interpretations were ‘accurate and appropriate’” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 5). Qualitative coding and results were also reviewed by Marcia Delcourt, PhD.

However, it is important to note that several changes occurred during the research process due to the 2019 Coronavirus or COVID pandemic. Initially, the researcher planned to conduct a sequential explanatory design, but modified the model to a convergent parallel mixed methods design. This consideration was altered because it was determined to be optimal to the investigation to utilize two separate and distinct processes that occurred in tandem, a quantitative phase and a qualitative phase. The mixed methods research design allowed the researcher a simultaneous and independent approach to collect and analyze data established by the research questions. In this way, the data were independently supportive rather than progressive and clarifying. In addition, the time factor was more efficient. The COVID epidemic changed face-to-face interviews to telephone interviews. This may have altered the results, as participants may have felt more comfortable in their home settings, and the interviewer could not observe facial
expressions. Also, the change of educational settings may have participant perspectives, as during this time, they were teaching remotely.

**Dependability**

The dependability of this study was established with detailed, specific accounts to provide future researchers with the opportunity to replicate the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Dependability refers to regularity that other researchers can duplicate the findings of a study (Lincoln & Guba, 1982). Codes and themes were electronically labeled using HyperResearch software, which provided digital accuracy. Dr. Pauline E. Goolkasian checked and rechecked the codes and themes to verify accuracy.

The consistency with which this study’s findings can be duplicated was established with clearly documented research methods and instruments that provided reliable measures over time (Lincoln & Guba, 1982; Merriam, 2009). Dr. Delcourt and Dr. Goolkasian performed audits and adhered to Lincoln and Guba’s (1982) suggestions “for assessing the process of inquiry for reliability and the product of inquiry for absence of bias” (p. 1).

The 10 participants were 8% of the quantitative sample. This posed a medium limitation. Though it is unlikely that the selected participants were representative of the larger population of educators, these ELL educators were purposefully selected and represented educators with high overall self-efficacy and strategy use. If future researchers select teachers of ELLs using a similar selection procedure having high overall self-efficacy and strategy use and apply the interview protocol provided, these results are deemed dependable. Although these data included an affluent, White teacher population, which may or may not be transferable to a more diverse population or setting, educators in the United States are similarly represented (Hussar & Bailey, 2020; NCES, 2018).
To ensure quantitative rigor, data audits were conducted by Marcia A.B. Delcourt, PhD and Pauline E. Goolkasian, EdD. Dr. Delcourt, Professor of Education and Educational Psychology at Western Connecticut State University, reviewed the data and verified the assumptions of the regression and stepwise procedure with corresponding outcomes. Her independent results established inter-rater reliability and the consistency of the co-rater findings, which safeguarded quantitative statistical accuracy (Huck, 2008). Additionally, Dr. Pauline E. Goolkasian, the coordinator of the Master of Science in Education in Special Education K-12, Adjunct Professor of Education, and primary doctoral advisor for this dissertation, conducted a comprehensive confirmability audit of the qualitative process. Audit procedures conducted by Dr. Goolkasian included a review of the researcher’s reflexive journal, raw data (interview transcripts, observational notes, survey scores), and professional contacts. Additionally, Dr. Goolkasian performed “debriefing sessions, whereby the field researcher checked insights, hypotheses and developing theories with peer professionals external to the inquiry effort . . . .” (Lincoln & Guba, 1982, p. 14). Dr. Delcourt provided feedback which was used to realign the coding process. Moreover, the aggregated results were emailed to respective school administrators, when requested, for the purpose of data verification, coding, and analysis. Thus, the assessors evaluated all data to establish research validity and certify uniformity, authenticity, and accuracy.

**Confirmability**

Confirmability describes the ability of a researcher to accurately reproduce the participants’ views in an impartial, neutral way. It establishes qualitative validity because other researchers are more likely to be able to verify the findings. The investigator remained objective and impartial, cognizant of researcher’s bias and intentions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This
investigation provided the researcher’s personal background, which included the experience of coaching educators who taught ELLs. To remain impartial, the data were gathered with an adherence to the semi-structured interview protocol, the utilization of a non-leading inquiry technique, and recording and transcribing (Saldaña, 2016). Additionally, the researcher fostered confirmability by checking and rechecking the data (Lincoln and Guba, 1982). These procedures were followed with integrity and with the accompaniment of the primary advisor’s vigilant supervision. When the study was concluded, a confirmatory audit was conducted with two reviewers to validate the data coding and analysis procedures, theories, constructs, and documents (Miles et al., 2014).

**Conclusions**

Research indicates that when ELLs are provided with the proper educational supports, they are capable learners with many strengths (Bialystok, Craik & Luk, 2012; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017). Concurrently, the U.S. Department of Education reveals that English Language Learners constitute one in ten students (USDE, 2020). However, there has been an achievement gap between ELLs and non-ELLs for over 20 years (McFarland et al., 2018; Saunders & Marcelletti, 2013). Because ELLs are simultaneously developing English proficiency in the mainstream classrooms, educators have a responsibility to provide a blend of instructional strategies that supports their cultural and social needs (Harper & de Jong, 2004; Lucas, 2015; Turgut et. al., 2016).

In spite of this reality, educators have not received adequate professional learning to teach this population, which has affected teacher effectiveness and self-efficacy (Prahald et al., 2017; Santibañez & Gándara, 2018). The researcher of this examination sought to benefit the educational community by providing additional information about the types of adaptive
instruction used by teachers with high self-efficacy in K-12 inclusive classrooms having ELLs and to improve instruction to positively impact ELL student performance. Additionally, this study was also used to examine self-efficacy beliefs and instructional practices, which provided research-based strategy suggestions to enhance ELL achievement.

Teachers of ELLs, with high self-efficacy described using the gradual release model when they initiated personalized or classroom learning for ELLs with direct instruction, followed by student-directed instruction and then, academic performance feedback (Vygotsky, 1978). Cultural implications were evident when teachers supplemented their instruction with culturally relevant teaching and used an affective filter to incorporate an ELL’s background to advance learning (Ladson-Billings, 2009). When leadership provided ELL professional learning, an inclusive curriculum, and collaborative time, it positively impacted teachers’ self-efficacy to instruct ELLs. Both the research and the literature highlighted the essential role that leadership provides in establishing the foundation for ELL instruction. In conclusion, leadership has the capacity to influence, and to provide the resources necessary, such as budgetary decision-making, materials, and collaborative time for staff, because it impacts ELL instruction and ELL student achievement.

These research implications suggest that adaptive instruction enables ELLs to obtain the appropriate guidance from their teachers, within their individual zone of instruction. Consequently, it may be beneficial for leadership to utilize its influence at budget time and when arranging staff’s instructional planning time to focus on the achievement of ELLs. Also, leadership has an influence in the implementation of an inclusive curriculum, one that authentically includes a representation of diverse cultures while supporting the academic,
linguistic needs of ELLs. Additionally, leadership has an essential role to provide, coordinate and align collaborative instructional supports for ELLs.

It is important to note that study participants who were selected for interviews had high self-reported self-efficacy and strategy use in the general education setting. However, as Bandura (1977) purported in his self-efficacy theory that self-efficacy is domain specific. Therefore, some participants in this present study stated that they needed more ELL professional learning to competently teach ELLs, assess their learning, and identify their individual ELL student needs. There was a disagreement among the participants regarding special education referrals and 504 plans, with some educators believing that ELLs could obtain additional support if referred for services. This study revealed that the majority of the participants felt that their English Language Learners were not receiving adequate ELL support.

As demographics throughout the United States continue to change, the results of this study continue to highlight the importance of the adaptive instructional approach for ELLs, which was revealed by K-12 public school educators. Cognizant of the expanding English Language Learner student population, it behooves educators to embrace ELL professional learning, adaptive instruction, and a culturally responsive curriculum.
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Appendix A

Teacher Demographic Survey

1. I agree to participate in the research study The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practice for English Language Learners.
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. I give the researcher my permission to contact and conduct a follow-up interview.
   a. Yes
   b. No

3. I give the researcher my permission to contact and conduct a follow-up interview.
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. The following is my name and contact information (will be kept confidential).

5. What is your current teaching role?

6. How long have you held this position?

7. Throughout your entire career, what grade levels have you taught?
   a. Elementary (Pre-K-6)
   b. Secondary (7-12)
   c. College
   d. NA (please specify)

8. How long have you held a teaching position?
   a. 1-2
   b. 3-4
c. 5-6

d. 7+

9. What grade level are you currently teaching?
   a. Elementary (Pre-K-6)
   b. Secondary (7-12)
   c. Pre-K-12
   d. N/A (Please Specify)

10. In what type of classroom setting do you currently teach?
   a. Classroom
   b. Content Area Subject
   c. Content Area or other area of specialty (Please specify content area or specialty area).

11. Do you have five or more years of experience teaching English Language Learners? *An English Language Learner, or ELL, is a student whose home language is not English and who may need support learning. ** Example instructional settings include the general education setting, special education setting, whole group instruction, small group, or one-on-one instructional settings).
   a. Yes
   b. No

12. Have you taught English Language Learners (ELLs), or students whose home language is not English who needed support learning English, within the last 10 years? (Example settings: general education, special education, small group, one-on-one.)
   a. Yes
b. No

13. How do you identify your gender?
   a. Female
   b. Male
   c. Prefer not to say

14. What is your age?
   a. 20-29
   b. 30-39
   c. 40-49
   d. 50-59
   e. 60-69
   f. 70+

15. What is your ethnicity? (Please select which answer you identify most with or choose other.)
   a. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   b. Asian or Pacific Islander
   c. Black or African American
   d. Hispanic or Latino
   e. White /Caucasian
   f. Prefer not to answer
   g. Other (Please specify)

16. How many languages are you able to speak fluently?
   a. 1
b. 2

c. 3+

17. Have you ever lived in another country?
   a. Yes
   b. No

18. Educational Background (Please check all that apply).
   a. Certified in Teaching Students of Other Languages (TESOL)
   b. Have taken English Language Learner (ELL) Classes
   c. Have taken coursework that included ELL instruction content
   d. Received Professional Learning that provided ELL content
   e. None of the above
   f. Other (Please specify.)

19. What is the highest level of education that you have completed or the highest level of education you are working toward at a college or university as an educational candidate?
   a. Graduate candidate (or are currently enrolled in a graduate degree program i.e., master's program)
   b. Graduate degree
   c. Sixth year degree
   d. Doctoral candidate
   e. Doctorate
   f. Other (Please specify.)

20. Please list your teaching degrees and certifications.
Appendix B: Semi-Structured Interview Protocol
### Appendix B
Semi-Structured Interview Questions, Literature Rationale and Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question and Probe</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>How do you monitor your English Language Learner student’s understanding</strong></td>
<td>Reddy and Dudek (2014).</td>
<td>Adaptive Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during a lesson and provide feedback? <strong>Probe:</strong> What strategies do you use to</td>
<td>Summers et al. (2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hatti and Donoghue (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Can you tell me about a time when you differentiated English Language Learner</strong></td>
<td>Reddy and Dudek (2014).</td>
<td>Student-Directed Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic content or conveyed information in a way that specifically supported <strong>Probe:</strong> Can you describe some strategies you use to activate English Language Learner students’ thinking about the lesson material?</td>
<td>Marzano (1998, 2003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners?</td>
<td>Hattie (2003, 2009, 2012),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probe:</strong> Can you describe some strategies you use to activate English Language Learner students’ thinking about the lesson material?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>How do you provide specific feedback to support your English Language</strong></td>
<td>Reddy and Dudek (2014).</td>
<td>Academic Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner students’ comprehension? <strong>Probe:</strong> Can you describe specific strategies you use to support English Language Learner feedback?</td>
<td>Marzano (1998, 2003)</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hattie (2003, 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question and Probe</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Constructs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many years have you been teaching (elementary K-6 or secondary 7-12)? Probe: What subject area do you teach? How many English Language Learners (ELLs) are you teaching this year?</td>
<td>Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001, 2007)</td>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Podolsky, Darling-Hammond, Doss, and Reardon (2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is your comfort level teaching ELLs (1-10 scale)?</td>
<td>Bandura (1982, 1997, 2002)</td>
<td>Instructional Efficacy for Teaching ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tschannen-Moran &amp; Woolfolk Hoy (2001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How do you think teaching ELLs is different from teaching native English-speaking students? Tell me about your favorite lesson that you differentiated for ELLs.</td>
<td>Hattie and Purdie (1996)</td>
<td>Student Differentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estrella (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Durgunoğlu and Hughes (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question and Probe</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Constructs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Informed Consent
Hello Ms. Heath,

I am pleased to inform you that your I.R.B. protocol number 1819-178 has been approved by Expedited review. This email is documentation of your official approval to start your research. If you need a copy of this official approval for funding purposes, please let me know. The WCSU I.R.B. wishes you the best with your research.

You have 1 year from the date of this email to complete your research; if you are still conducting that date, you will need to fill out a renewal application. When are you finished with your study please fill out and return via email a Termination/Completion Report (available here: http://wcsu.edu/irb/forms.asp) so we know your study is complete?

Finally – and most importantly! – we have recently learned that current BOR technology policies do not guarantee privacy of any info stored on work on computers physically, remotely, or otherwise (i.e., laptop, drop box, etc.). As such, to maintain the truth of any anonymity or confidentiality promises you make to participants (consent form, for example), you will need to store all electronic data obtained from those human subjects on a system/computer/file not connected to any CSU system. It is your responsibility as the primary researcher to make sure personal data of participants remains securely private – something not guaranteed in the currently existing CSU system.

Rest assured, (because it is ridiculous to expect faculty to store work-related research on non-work-related systems and/or to conduct research where participants are not guaranteed anonymity/confidentiality), we are working to gain an exception for research purposes to this policy. But until then, it is technically and legally possible for anyone in the system office to access your participants’ data at any time – without your consent or knowledge before doing so… which makes any guarantees made on research documents (e.g., consent forms) deceptive unless info is stored elsewhere.

Thanks,
Jessica J. Eckstein, Ph.D.
Chair, WCSU Human Subjects Institutional Review Board
www.wcsu.edu/irb
IRB Amendment

From: Anne M. Heath <heath004@wcsu.edu>
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2019, 5:21 PM
To: WCSU IRB <wcsuirb@wcsu.edu>
Cc: Pauline Goolkasian <goolkasianp@wcsu.edu>
Subject: IRB Amendment Proposal, Attention Dr. Eckstein

Jessica J. Eckstein, Ph.D.
Chair, WCSU Human Subjects Institutional Review Board
www.wcsu.edu/irb

October 24, 2019

WCSU IRB Committee
Attention: Jessica J. Eckstein, Ph.D.

Dr. Eckstein,

I, Anne Heath, WCSU doctoral student, am writing to seek an amendment to my IRB application (protocol number 1819-178) from the WCSU Institutional Review Board (IRB), to expand my population due to low response of invited participants. The title of my research is The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practices for English Language Learners.

Below please see the previous wording and highlighted revisions for section #10 PARTICIPANTS & RECRUITMENT and #13 CONSENT. Also included are the revised appendices. Appendix H is now Participant Consent of Public-School District Superintendent and Appendix I is now the Participant Letter and Participant Consent Form.
Hello,

These revisions are fine; consider them accepted and proceed using the same protocol # you were originally assigned, with the original expiration date as well.

Jessica J. Eckstein, Ph.D.

Chair, WCSU Human Subjects Institutional Review Board
www.wcsu.edu/irb
5/26/2020

Hello Anne,

Please continue to use the same protocol # you were previously assigned and simply extend the deadline 1 year from today's date, so that this renewal expires June 16th, 2021.

Consider this the "official renewal/approval" to proceed.

Jessi

Jessica J. Eckstein, Ph.D.
Professor, Communication Department
Director, Women & Gender Studies Program
Chair, Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research
Western Connecticut State University
Hello Anne Heath,
I am pleased to inform you that your I.R.B. protocol number 2021-116 has been approved by expedited review. This email is documentation of your official approval to start your research. If you need a copy of this official approval for funding purposes, please let me know oconnore@wcsu.edu. The WCSU I.R.B. wishes you the best with your research.
You have 1 year from the date of this email to complete your research; if you are still conducting that date, you will need to fill out a renewal application. When are you finished with your study please fill out and return via email a Termination/Completion Report (available here: http://wcsu.edu/irb/forms.asp) so we know your study is complete?
Finally – and most importantly! – we have recently learned that current BOR technology policies do not guarantee privacy of any info stored on work on computers physically, remotely, or otherwise (i.e., laptop, Dropbox, etc.). As such, to maintain the truth of any anonymity or confidentiality promises you make to participants (consent form, for example), you will need to store all electronic data obtained from those human subjects on a system/computer/file not connected to any CSU system. It is your responsibility as the primary researcher to make sure personal data of participants remains securely private – something not guaranteed in the currently existing CSU system.
Rest assured, (because it’s ridiculous to expect faculty to store work-related research on non-work-related systems and/or to conduct research where participants are not guaranteed anonymity/confidentiality), we are working to gain an exception for research purposes to this policy. But until then, it’s technically and legally possible for anyone in the system office to access your participants’ data at any time – without your consent or knowledge before doing so… which makes any guarantees made on research documents (e.g., consent forms) deceptive unless info is stored elsewhere.
Thanks,
Jessica Eckstein, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board
Western Connecticut State University
www.wcsu.edu/irb
Carol O’Connor
Secretary Psychology Department
Western Connecticut State University
181 White Street
WA 304 Danbury, CT 06810
203-837-8470
Informed Consent of the University Coordinators

Jun 15, 2019, at 5:23 AM,

Anne Heath <heath004@connect.wcsu.edu> wrote:

Dear Dr. <Name>,

I am writing to request your permission to invite Golden Connecticut State University’s instructional leadership doctoral program students, both current students, and graduates, to participate in my research for *The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practices for English Language Learners.*

It would be very helpful to me if I could conduct my research at <Name of University>. I have attached a letter in this regard. Many thanks for your consideration and support in this endeavor. Please feel free to contact me at any time if you have any questions or would like to discuss this further. I can be reached on my cell or by email at heath004@connect.wcsu. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Anne M. Heath

WCSU Doctoral Candidate

<WCSU Faculty University Coordinator Letter Dr. XX t 6-15-19.pdf>
Dear XXX

I am writing to request your permission to invite Sample University’s master’s program students, both current students and graduates, to participate in my research. I am researching *The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practices for English Language Learners*. The purpose of my study is to investigate the instructional practices that influence positive teaching outcomes for English Language Learners (ELLs).

Participants will be asked to complete a demographic survey and two brief surveys. The surveys will take approximately 30 minutes of their time. Additionally, involvement in this study has been secured from the Western Connecticut State University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), and subjects will be informed that their participation is strictly voluntary. All data will be kept confidential until the conclusion of this study, at which point it will be destroyed. Aggregated data results will be made available upon request.

Many thanks for your consideration and support in this endeavor. Please feel free to contact me via email or on my cell phone if you have any questions. In addition, should you wish to contact my faculty advisor Dr. Pauline E. Goolkasian, you may reach her by email at goolkasianp@wcsu.edu.

Sincerely,

Anne M. Heath
WCSU Doctoral Candidate

From: Dr. < Name >
Anne,

While I give you my permission for the doctoral students to be in your study, I request to be the person to send the email to them. I would also wish to see in advance the email that they receive. I am away and will not be able to send the emails until after I return on June 29.

Sincerely,

Dr. Noname
6/19/19

Dear Dr. Pseudonym,

    Thank you again for granting me permission to invite Sample University’s instructional leadership doctoral program students to participate in my research study, *The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practices for English Language Learners*.

    As requested, please find the attached proposed student letter that I wish to send to by email. I look forward to your feedback and counsel.

With appreciation,

Anne M. Heath

WCSU Doctoral Candidate
Principal Investigator: Anne M. Heath
Faculty Advisor: Pauline Goolkasian, Ed.D.
Title of Study: THE IMPACT OF TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY BELIEFS ON INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS
Email: Sunday, June 21, 2019

Dear Dr XXX,

I am writing to request your permission to invite Sample University’s education graduate students, both current and graduates, to participate in my research for The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practices for English Language Learners. It would be very helpful to me if I could conduct my research at WCSU. I have attached a letter in this regard.

Many thanks for your consideration and support in this endeavor. Please feel free to contact me at any time if you have any questions or would like to discuss this further. I can be reached on my cell at 203 623 7804 or by email at heath004@connect.wcsu.com. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Anne M. Heath
WCSU Doctoral Candidate
cc: Pauline E. Goolkasian, Ed.D.

Letter (Attached)
June 8, 2019

Dear Dr. XXX,

I am writing to request your permission to invite Sample Connecticut University’s education program students, both current students and graduates, to participate in my research. I am researching *The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practices for English Language Learners*. The purpose of my study is to investigate the instructional practices that influence positive teaching outcomes for English Language Learners (ELLs).

Participants will be asked to complete a demographic survey and two brief surveys. The surveys will take approximately 30 minutes of their time. Additionally, involvement in this study has been secured from the University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), and subjects will be informed that their participation is strictly voluntary. All data will be kept confidential until the conclusion of this study, at which point it will be destroyed. Aggregated data results will be made available upon request.

Many thanks for your consideration and support in this endeavor. Please feel free to contact me via email, or on my cell phone if you have any questions. In addition, should you wish to contact my faculty advisor Dr. Pauline E. Goolkasian, you may reach her by email at goolkasianp@wcsu.edu.

Sincerely,

Anne M. Heath,

WCSU Doctoral Candidate
Hi Anne,

I'm delighted to see your topic as it is greatly needed! Of course, I give permission...is there a form you need me to sign??

Dr. XXX
Chair of Education & Educational Psychology Department
Sample University 6/16/19

Dr. X,

Thank you for allowing me to work with the graduate students. I will check with Pauline about if there is a form. I may need your help in obtaining the names of the students. Marcy requested to personally send out the dissertation student emails.

With appreciation,
Anne M. Heath
WCSU Doctoral Candidate
cc: Pauline E. Goolkasian, Ed.D.
June 18, 2019

Dear Dr. X,

I am delighted to hear that you have granted me permission to invite Sample University’s education graduate students to participate in my research, *The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practices for English Language Learners.*

To our knowledge, there is no form that you need to sign. Your email permission is all the formal consent that is required to move forward.

With appreciation,

Anne M. Heath
WCSU Doctoral Candidate

cc: Pauline E. Goolkasian, Ed.D.
District Superintendent Permission Letter

November 1, 2019

Dr. <Name>

I am writing to request your permission to invite Sample Public School general education teachers to participate in my research, *The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practice for English Language Learners (ELLs)*. The purpose of my study is to investigate the instructional practices that influence positive teaching outcomes for ELLs.

Participants are asked to complete a demographic survey and two brief surveys. The surveys will take approximately 10 minutes of their time. Participant criteria are (a) five years of experience teaching ELLs in the general education setting within the past 10 years and (b) possess a graduate degree (or are currently enrolled in a graduate program).

Additionally, approval for this study was obtained from the Western Connecticut State University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). Subjects will be informed that their participation is strictly voluntary. All data will be kept confidential until the conclusion of this study, at which point it will be destroyed. Aggregated data results will be made available upon request.

Many thanks for your consideration and support in this endeavor. Please feel free to contact me via email if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Anne M. Heath, Principal Investigator

Faculty Advisor, Pauline E. Goolkasian, Ed.D.
Dear <Superintendent >

I am writing to request permission to invite <your district teachers or University graduate students> to participate in my research, The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practices for English Language Learners. The purpose of my study is to investigate the instructional practices that influence positive teaching outcomes for English Language Learners (ELLs). Participants will be asked to complete a demographic survey and two brief surveys. The surveys will take approximately 8 to 10 minutes of their time.

Participant criteria include teachers who are (a) general education teachers with five years of experience teaching ELLs in the general education setting, as well as teachers of ELLs (b) who possess a graduate degree or are currently enrolled in a graduate program. Involvement in this study been secured from the Western Connecticut State University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), and subjects will be informed that their participation is strictly voluntary. All data will be kept confidential until the conclusion of this study, at which point it was destroyed.

Attached please find a participant letter that includes an electronic participant consent form and survey monkey link (https://www.surveymokey.com/r/7PRNRCD). Many thanks for your consideration and support in this endeavor. Please feel free to contact me via email, heath004@connect.wcsu.edu or on my cell phone at (203) 623-7804 if you have any questions. You may also contact my University Advisor, Dr. Pauline Goolkasian (goolkasianp@wcsu.edu).

Sincerely,
Anne M. Heath
Dr. <Name of Superintendent>

Thank you for your assistance with my research study. The next step is to invite <Name of School>’s general education teachers to participate in my research, The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practice for English Language Learners (ELLs). The survey takes about 8 minutes to complete and can be done on a computer or cell phone.

Attached is a letter for your review. The letter invites teachers who are (a) general education teachers with five years of experience teaching ELLs in the general education setting, as well as teachers of ELLs who (b) possess a graduate degree (or are currently enrolled in a graduate program to complete a consent form and survey by clicking on a link: https://www.surveymokey.com/r/7PRNRCD.

Anne M. Heath,

WCSU Doctoral Candidate

Faculty Advisor, Pauline E. Goolkasian, Ed.D.
Appendix D: Permission to Use Instruments
Permission from Dr. Tschannen-Moran to Use the TSES

October 16, 2018

Anne,

You have my permission to use the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (formerly called the Ohio State Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale), which I developed with Anita Woolfolk Hoy, in your research. You can find a copy of the measure and scoring directions on my web site at http://wmpeople.wm.edu/site/page/mxtsch . Please use the following as the proper citation:


I will also attach directions you can follow to access my password protected web site, where you can find the supporting references for this measure as well as other articles I have written on this and related topics.

I would love to receive a brief summary of your results.

All the best,

Megan Tschannen-Moran
The College of William and Mary
School of Education
Email requesting permission to use the Classroom Strategy Scale for Teachers (CSS-T)

Rutgers University
Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology

10/15/18

Dr. Reddy,

I have read your articles and studies that have used the Classroom Strategy Scale for Teachers (CSS-T) Instrument and would appreciate assistance with obtaining a copy of the actual instrument. I would like to obtain a copy of the actual instrument and wondering if you could please provide any information where I might obtain it.

Also, I would like your permission to use the Instructional Strategies (IS) portion of the instrument in my research. My study will use a mixed methods sequential explanatory design to research teachers’ beliefs and Self-Efficacy regarding English Language (ELL) students and linguistically diverse instruction. In particular, my research will investigate the instructional strategies teachers implement to support English learners.

Sincerely,

Anne Heath, M.Ed. (Spec. Ed), CAS (Literacy Ed.)
Doctoral Candidate, Instructional Leadership EdD,
Western Connecticut State University
Permission to use the CSS-T Letter and call from Dr. Linda Reddy and Christopher Dudek

10/16/18

Good evening, Anne,

Thank you for expressing interest in using the Classroom Strategies Assessment System – Teacher Form (CSAS-T) as part of your research. Dr. Reddy and I would be happy to provide you with a copy of the form for your research. Please find attached to this email a copy of the CSAS-T that you can review. It would be helpful for us to know more about your research and how you intend to use the CSAS-T. Knowing more, we would be able to offer you guidance and suggestions on implementing the CSAS-T. Could we schedule a date and time to converse via phone about your dissertation? Please let us know what works best for you.

Best Regards,

Christopher Dudek
Assistant Director of Research and Technology Integration
School System Improvement (SSI) Project 10/18/18

At 7 PM: The researcher received a phone call from Dr. Reddy and Chris Dudek verbally granting permission.
Letter Requesting Permission to modify the CSS Instructional Methods Scale

November 2, 2018

Dr. Reddy and Chris,

Since I am using your instrument to evaluate teacher's instructional strategies, rather than use it as an assessment system, may I have your permission modify the directions? Of course, I would give you full credit.

1. Change the directions to include only the Instructional Scale:

Original Directions:

Proposed Directions for your review:

Strategy Rating Scales - Item and Dimension Scores: Please complete the following Instructional Strategies rating scales. When you complete the rating scales, think about where you are on the scales this year. For each rating, please circle the number that reflects the frequency from 1 (Do not use) to 7 (Always use) that you use an instructional strategy in your classroom. Please rate each strategy. Do not leave any strategies blank or label any strategies as Not Applicable.

2. May I modify the table, so it has one Frequency (1 2 3 4 5 6 7) column and subtitle? (In other words, may I delete the 3 subtitles: Observed, Recommended, and Discrepancy and include only one table titled "Frequency").

Thank you,

Anne Heath
Hi Anne,

Sure thing. Please just indicate it is modified for your study.

Best wishes,

Linda
Email Requesting permission to modify the CSS-T Assessment

Rutgers University
Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology
152 Frelinghuysen Road
Piscataway, NJ. 08854-8020
lreddy@gsapp.rutgers.edu

7/24/2019

Dr. Reddy,

I am writing to you to request your permission to amend the Classroom Strategy Scale for Teachers (CSS-T) instrument, so I may send the survey to respondents by email. Previously, on October 16, 2018, you granted me permission to use the Classroom Strategies Assessment System – Teacher Form (CSAS-T), and then you granted me permission on November 2, 2018, to use only the teacher's instructional (IS) strategies scale, rather than the entire instrument as an assessment system.

Now, I would like your permission to also modify the format of the IS so participants may complete the Instructional Scale CSS-T online. I will continue to maintain the validity and reliability of the assessment, and of course give you full credit for your instrument.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Anne Heath, M.Ed. (Spec. Ed), CAS (Literacy Ed.)

Doctoral Candidate, Instructional Leadership EdD,
Western Connecticut State University
Cc: Pauline E. Goolkasian, Ed.D.
goolkasianp@wcsu.edu
Faculty Advisor
Western Connecticut State University
Hi Anne,

I am providing permission with authorship and copyright statement on each page.

Thank you and best wishes,

Linda Reddy
Appendix E: Participant Letter and Participant Consent Form
Hello! My name is Anne Heath, and I am a doctoral student in the Instructional Leadership program at Western Connecticut State University. I would like to extend an invitation to teachers (regular education teachers, special education teachers, content area teachers, and teachers of English Language Learners) to participate in research to investigate if teacher self-efficacy has an impact on teachers’ instructional practices, strategies, and supports when teaching English Language Learners. An English Language Learner, or ELL, is a student whose home language is not English and needs support learning English.

Survey participant criteria are (a) five years of experience teaching ELLs (i.e., in the general education classroom, special education, small group setting or ELL setting) and (b) possess a graduate degree or currently pursuing a graduate degree. If you would like to participate in this study, and meet the criteria, please click on the following Survey Monkey link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/7PRNRC

Thank you again for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Anne M. Heath, WCSU Doctoral Candidate in Instructional Leadership

Pauline E. Gookasian, Ed.D., Faculty Advisor
Participant Letter and Participant Consent Form

Dear Prospective Participant:

My name is Anne Heath, and I am a student in the doctoral program for Instructional Leadership at Western Connecticut State University in Danbury, Connecticut. For my dissertation, I am examining the impact of teacher self-efficacy beliefs on instructional practices for English Language Learners. I am looking for volunteers to participate in my study. You are invited to participate in a study, The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practices for English Language Learners. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, will require the completion of three brief, teachers’ surveys and will take approximately 20-30 minutes. With your consent, you may be selected as one of 10 participants to participate in a 45-60-minute follow-up interview.

The researcher will collect your forms after they are completed, and your individual information will not be shared, and your participation will be kept confidential. This survey does not involve any risk to you. However, the benefits of your participation may provide insights regarding successful instructional supports teachers use to promote ELL academic success.

Data, without any personal identifying information, will be reviewed by the faculty supervisors in order to obtain feedback and support during analyses. Regarding the qualitative data, an outside reviewer will also be provided with conclusions, findings, implications, themes, categories, codes, and data related to the findings and the line of argument for those findings in order to follow and examine the line of reasoning created by the investigator. Any data presented for review will not have identifying information. Please know, you do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. I will answer any questions you have about this study. Feel free to contact me, Anne Heath, at (203) 623-7804 or at heath004@connect.wcsu.edu if you have any inquiries about this study. You may also contact my University Advisor, Dr. Pauline Goolkasian at goolkasianp@wcsu.edu.

This research study has received approval (protocol number 1819-178) from the WCSU Institutional Review Board (IRB), a group of individuals who review research studies to protect the rights and welfare of research participants. Please accept this letter as a formal request on my behalf, for your participation in this research, which will be conducted during the 2019-2020 academic year. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the IRB at (203) 837-8563.

If you would like to participate in this study, please click on the attached link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/3YYQKB8M. Thank you for your interest in this research.

Sincerely,
Anne M. Heath, WCSU Doctoral Candidate in Instructional Leadership
Pauline E. Goolkasian, Ed.D., Faculty Advisor
Participant Consent Form

I, ________________________________, agree to participate in the research study The Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Instructional Practice for English Language Learners, described in the attached letter.

By signing my name below, I understand that:

- All information provided to the researcher will be kept confidential.
- My participation in the study is voluntary, and I may withdraw at any time.
- The study will require me to answer questions on a demographic survey, and two short surveys about teacher self-efficacy and instructional strategies for teachers.
- I may be invited to participate in a follow-up interview which will be audio-recorded.

_____________________________ at ________________
(Printed full name) (phone number) (e-mail address)

Also, I give the researcher my permission to contact and conduct a follow-up interview:

_____________________________ at ________________
(printed full name) (phone number) (e-mail)

Signature of Participant: ________________________________
Appendix F: Demographics Codebook
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
<th>Value 5</th>
<th>Value 6</th>
<th>Value 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent ID</td>
<td>Caseno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree To Participate</td>
<td>Particip</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree To Follow-Up Interview</td>
<td>Folup</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Teaching Position</td>
<td>Crtposn</td>
<td>ESL (TSOL)</td>
<td>Content Area</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Sped, Psychologist</td>
<td>Special Art, PE, Music, Library, Health</td>
<td>Other: Sub, Retired, Para</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Grade Level</td>
<td>Curgrade</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix F Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
<th>Value 5</th>
<th>Value 6</th>
<th>Value 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience (Total Years Teaching)</td>
<td>Ttlyrt</td>
<td>1-2 Years</td>
<td>3-4 Years</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>7+ Years</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Setting</td>
<td>Clsrnstg</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Content Area</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Yrs. Teaching ELLs</td>
<td>Fyyrtel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach ELLs Within Last 10 Years?</td>
<td>TEL10yr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>Prefer Not to Say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Ethncty</td>
<td>Am Indian</td>
<td>Asian, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Prefer Not to Say</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix F Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
<th>Value 5</th>
<th>Value 6</th>
<th>Value 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Many Languages Speak Fluently</td>
<td>Numlang</td>
<td>One Language</td>
<td>Two Languages</td>
<td>Three Or More Languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (Total Years Teaching)</td>
<td>Ttlyrt</td>
<td>1-2 Years</td>
<td>3-4 Years</td>
<td>5-6 Years</td>
<td>7+ Years</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resided In Other Country?</td>
<td>Ocountry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Education</td>
<td>Elled</td>
<td>TSOL Cert</td>
<td>ELL Classes</td>
<td>ELL Course</td>
<td>ELL PD Or PL</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level Education</td>
<td>Hgstlved</td>
<td>Graduate Candidate</td>
<td>Graduate (Masters)</td>
<td>6th Year Degree</td>
<td>Dr. Candidate</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Degrees, Certifications</td>
<td>Tdgrcrt</td>
<td>Elementary Or Secondary</td>
<td>World Language, Spanish, TSOL, ELL</td>
<td>English Content Area</td>
<td>Art, Music, Admin Sped, Speech, Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Initial Code List
Initial Code List

1. Collaboration
   a. Collaboration: Families
   b. Collaboration: General
   c. Collaboration: Leadership
   d. Collaboration: Staff

2. Culture
   a. Culture: Families
   b. Culture: General
   c. Culture: Strengths
   d. Culture: Student Social Emotional

3. Culturally Relevant Teaching (CRT)
   a. CRT: Activities
   b. CRT: and Family
   c. CRT: Frequency

4. ELL
   a. ELL: Demographics
   b. ELL: Dismissed Support
   c. ELL: Levels Instruction
   d. ELL: Strengths
   e. ELL: Struggles
   f. ELL: Testing

5. Professional Learning (PL)
   a. PL: Amount and frequency
   b. PL: and coaching
   c. PL: and feeling prepared
   d. PL: and Language Programs
   e. PL: effectiveness
   f. PL: formal education
   g. PL: General
   h. PL: job train
i. PL: lacking or necessity for
j. PL: Self-Ed
k. PL: Type of

6. Recommendations
   a. Recommendations: Leadership
   b. Recommendations: PL
   c. Recommendations: Strategies

7. Setting
   a. Setting: Classroom Type
   b. Setting: Grade Level
   c. Setting: Inclusive
   d. Setting: Pull out

8. Sped and EL Struggles
   a. Sped: ELLs (IEPs and 504s)
   b. Sped: ELLs General

9. Strategies
   a. Strategies: academic performance feedback
   b. Strategies: Adaptive instruction
   c. Strategies: and Manipulatives
   d. Strategies: Background Knowledge
   e. Strategies: Bilingual Students
   f. Strategies: Cognates
   g. Strategies: Direct instruction
   h. Strategies: ELL student success
   i. Strategies: General
   j. Strategies: Hands On
   k. Strategies: Level Text
   l. Strategies: Not Helpful
   m. Strategies: promotion of student thinking
   n. Strategies: Student Achievement
   o. Strategies: Student-directed Instruction
p. Strategies: Successful
q. Strategies: Technology
r. Strategies: Visuals (pictures, charts, outlines, story boards)
s. Strategies: Vocab

10. TSE (Teacher Self-Efficacy)
   a. SE: and Mastery Experience
   b. TSE: and Classroom Management
   c. TSE: and Language
   d. TSE: and Student Achievement
   e. TSE: and Student Engagement
   f. TSE: CRT
   g. TSE: Gender
   h. TSE: General
   i. TSE: Grade Level
   j. TSE: Influence of Training for PL
   k. TSE: Instructional Practices
   l. TSE: Job Stress
   m. TSE: Qualifications
   n. TSE: Strategy Use
   o. TSE: Teacher Experience
   p. TSE: toward ELLs
Appendix H: Qualitative Codes, Categories, and Themes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Teaching</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Ability</td>
<td>Adaptive Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Thinking</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry Strategy</td>
<td>Adaptive Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Background</td>
<td>Adaptive Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Struggles</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence Simplification</td>
<td>Adaptive Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Strategies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Link Known to New</td>
<td>Adaptive Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Provide Linguistic Support</td>
<td>Adaptive Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher-Directed Approach</td>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visuals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visuals</td>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv Organizers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Break Down the Learning</td>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clearly Defined Tasks</td>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar - Different</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Color Technique</td>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Color Technique</td>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulatives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Visuals</td>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Directed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project-Based Learning</td>
<td>Student Directed</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Levels</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Partnerships</td>
<td>Student Directed</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hands-On Activities</td>
<td>Student Directed</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-On</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hands-On Activities</td>
<td>Student Directed</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Language</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Advocating</td>
<td>Student Directed</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>Student Directed</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix H Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Fluency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>Student Directed</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>Student Directed</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Monitor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Perform</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcing Effort</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforcing ELL Strengths</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Strengths</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery Learning</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Strategy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery Learning</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gesturing</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Setting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Feedback</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate PF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Feedback</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Feedback</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Helpful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gesturing</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubrics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>Academic PF</td>
<td>1: Strategy Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Necessity</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of PL</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality PL</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Type</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality PL</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Frequency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of PL</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Self-Ed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of PL</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix H Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL Formal Ed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of PL</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Grants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Quality PL</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Curriculum</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership's Influence</td>
<td>Inclusive Curriculum</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Coaching</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality instruction</td>
<td>Inclusive Curriculum</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality instruction</td>
<td>Inclusive Curriculum</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang Programs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership's Influence</td>
<td>Inclusive Curriculum</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud Achievement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality instruction</td>
<td>Inclusive Curriculum</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality instruction</td>
<td>Inclusive Curriculum</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Schedule</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality instruction</td>
<td>Inclusive Curriculum</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL General</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Leadership's Influence</td>
<td>Inclusive Curriculum</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Staff Support</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Time Coaches</td>
<td>Collaborative Time</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Collaboration</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Time with Staff</td>
<td>Collaborative Time</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Collaboration</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Time with Staff</td>
<td>Collaborative Time</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership and Scheduling</td>
<td>Collaborative Time</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Time Families</td>
<td>Collaborative Time</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Job Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Collaborative Time Coaches</td>
<td>Collaborative Time</td>
<td>2: Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix H Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology with Visuals</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3. Instructional Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Effectiveness</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Application</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3. Instructional Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Translation Software</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3. Instructional Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Text for ELLs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtitles</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3. Instructional Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Differentiation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Translation Software</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3. Instructional Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology in General</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3. Instructional Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSE and Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology for Reinforcement</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3. Instructional Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtitles</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3. Instructional Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology with Visuals</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>3. Instructional Application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix H Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>3: Instructional Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL Effectiveness</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Linguistic Application</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Translation Software</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Text for ELLs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Subtitles</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Differentiation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Translation Software</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Technology in General</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSE and Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technology for Reinforcement</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Subtitles</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Linguistic Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using CRT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Appropriate Error Correction</td>
<td>Affective Filter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Setting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Emotional Readiness</td>
<td>Affective Filter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix H Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Instructional Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pull Out Setting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonlinguistic Rep</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's SE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Strengths</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Classroom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix H Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Part of Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE Staff Support</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Family Dynamic Sensitivity</td>
<td>SEWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Demographic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Positive Family Interactions</td>
<td>SEWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Stud Teacher</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Student-Teacher Relationships</td>
<td>SEWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Recommend</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Student-Peer Connections</td>
<td>SEWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Success</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social-Emotional Programs</td>
<td>SEWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social-Emotional Programs</td>
<td>SEWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSE Influence PL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>ELL Distinct Needs</td>
<td>Appropriate Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sped and ELLs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Appropriate Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td>Appropriate Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use ELL Program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Distinct ELL Needs</td>
<td>Appropriate Referrals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix H Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Instruction Type</th>
<th>Requirement Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELL Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Routine Referrals</td>
<td>Appropriate Referrals</td>
<td>4: Foundational Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL IEP 504</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 77</td>
<td>ELL Training and Referrals</td>
<td>Appropriate Referrals</td>
<td>4: Foundational Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dismissed ELL Instruction</td>
<td>Ongoing Instruction</td>
<td>4: Foundational Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dismissed ELL Support Plans</td>
<td>Ongoing Instruction</td>
<td>4: Foundational Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dismissed ELL Support Plans</td>
<td>Ongoing Instruction</td>
<td>4: Foundational Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclassified ELLs</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dismissed Support</td>
<td>Ongoing Instruction</td>
<td>4: Foundational Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE ELL Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ongoing Exitied Instruction</td>
<td>Ongoing Instruction</td>
<td>4: Foundational Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 65</td>
<td>Ongoing Exitied Instruction</td>
<td>Ongoing Instruction</td>
<td>4: Foundational Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSE toward ELLs</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>ELL Teaching SE</td>
<td>TSE Instruct ELLs</td>
<td>4: Foundational Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teacher SE Coaching</td>
<td>TSE Instruct ELLs</td>
<td>4: Foundational Requirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix H Continued)
Feeling Prepared 8 Teacher SE and Coaching TSE Instruct ELLs 4: Foundational Requirement
Teacher SE 8 ELL Teaching SE TSE Instruct ELLs 4: Foundational Requirement
TSE Class Manage 2 Teacher SE Coaching TSE Instruct ELLs 4: Foundational Requirement
TSE and Gender 1 ELL Teaching SE TSE Instruct ELLs 4: Foundational Requirement
TSE and Language 1 70 ELL Teaching SE TSE Instruct ELLs 4: Foundational Requirement

Note. The following key is provided to clarify the abbreviations used in Appendix H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>Culturally Relevant Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Performance Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWB</td>
<td>Social-Emotional Well-Being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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