

Running Head: Teachers' Perceptions About ELLs

A SURVEY OF REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHERS' ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS
ABOUT ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

By

KATHERINE A. ROSS

Submitted to

The Educational Leadership Faculty
Northwest Missouri State University Missouri
Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education and Human Services
Maryville, MO 64468

Submitted in Fulfillment for the Requirements for

61-683 Research Paper

Summer 2011

April 15, 2012

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze attitudes and beliefs of regular education teachers who teach English Language Learner students in their classrooms. The research includes findings that answer 2 specific questions: “Do regular education teachers have any previous knowledge on how best to work with ELLs in their classrooms?” and “What about second language acquisition do teachers understand?” The research was conducted using an anonymous survey distributed two times during a one day sheltered instruction workshop. The results were analyzed by a Chi-Square Analysis and Descriptive Analysis. Findings indicate that there was a difference of opinion between the teachers before and after the sheltered instruction training. Continual professional development on second language acquisition is warranted while the Independence Public School district should consider more ELL training on providing strategies for regular education teachers to use in the mainstream classroom.

INTRODUCTION

Background, Issues, and Concerns

A suburban Missouri school district, hereafter referred to as IPS, located east of Kansas City, and has experienced over the last four years a steady increase of new students who speak another language. Currently, there are 21 languages represented in the IPS district. In comparison to the enrollment number of ELL students receiving ELL services during the 2008-09 school year to the current 2011-12 school year, ELL students qualifying to receive services has increased on average 16% per year. The ELL department at IPS consists of 1 full-time ELL supervisor, 4 full-time certified elementary ELL teachers, 1 part time certified elementary ELL teacher, 1 ½ certified middle school ELL teachers, and 4 certified high school ELL teachers. Looking at the IPS district as a whole with a total enrollment of 14,804 students, elementary ELL teacher's caseloads include 80-100 ELL students at 3-4 separate elementary schools each. There are 2 middle school ELL teachers divided between 4 middle schools where one of the ELL teachers divides her daily schedule between one middle school and 2 elementary schools. There is one high school ELL teacher who primarily teaches newcomers. The other high school ELL teachers teach the more highly proficient ELL students between 2-5 hours daily.

At the elementary level, ELL teachers do not have adequate time on a daily or weekly basis with their over exhaustive numbers to actually teach to the DESE recommendations. For example, many times IPS elementary ELL teachers can only teach beginning and developing proficiencies 60 minutes per week whereas they should receive at least 150 minutes per week. The non-English speaking population who is in grades 2-3 is recommended to receive 300 minutes weekly but 120 minutes per week is all that on average can be implemented. Some ELL students cannot be seen on a weekly basis due to the high ELL numbers.

It is obvious that ELL teachers cannot effectively meet the demands of their entire caseload. Moreover, it is imperative that regular education teachers are properly equipped to handle ELL students who range from newcomers (also known as the entering stage in the WIDA requirements) to bridging that enter their classroom either the first day of school or anytime throughout the year (http://www.wida.us/standards/CAN_DOs/). While it is true there are numerous educators who support ELL education, there are still many educators who do not understand the need for ELL teachers. In addition, these teachers have difficulty accepting ELL students into their classroom, properly scaffold instruction, and use best practices with each linguistically challenged and culturally diverse group of learners (O'Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez, 2008, p.6).

This project will involve a survey of existing attitudes and perceptions of current certificated regular education teachers who all teach in the IPS district at the elementary, middle and high school levels. The analysis of results will differentiate between the first survey the teachers complete before the one day workshop and the second survey they completed after the workshop. The analysis of results will also discuss teacher perceptions and best learning environments they can each provide ELLs in acquiring a second language.

Practice under Investigation

The practice under investigation is how regular education teachers view their English Language Learners in their classroom and how to best teach them.

School Policy to be Informed by Study

The results from this study will be able to assist any school district on how beneficial it is to have a full day workshop with teachers from various grade levels on the language acquisition

of English Language Learners. English Language Learner teachers could even find this study helpful by observing which questions had the most significant differences in opinion and use those for topics of discussion in their home buildings. The administration of the Independence School District will use this information to discuss ways on how the ELL department can encourage more conversations in each building of how regular teachers can develop more positive and effective strategies for those ELL students.

Conceptual Underpinnings for the Study

Two important terms in this research is the difference between BICS and CALP. BICS stands for Basic Interpersonal Communication. This refers to conversational fluency in English. CALP stands for Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency which developmentally refers to the content academic language general education teachers use in the regular classroom. Ashworth (1992) provides evidence to support that ELLs that when first arriving in the United States, will take 1-2 years to attain BICS (p.19). Furthermore, these same ELLs take nearly 5-7 and possibly up to 10 years to acquire CALP in their perspective classrooms (Cummins, 1999, p.40). Under Title III of the NLCB, ELL students are included in the mandate that every student will be proficient by 2014 (Jarrett, 2012). However, the reality is that ELL students are not achieving as their peers in content areas. Cummins (1999) explains that general educators need to understand that academic language will take longer for ELLs to acquire due to the fact they encounter far more “low frequency words (primarily from Greek and Latin sources), complex syntax (as passives), and abstract expressions that are virtually never heard in everyday conversations” (p.44)

What is SLA? SLA refers to Second Language Acquisition. Collier (1994) explains there are 4 major components effecting the SLA of a newly arriving ELL student which are

socioculture, linguistic, academic, and cognitive (p.4). The socio-culture process strongly influences each of the components positively and negatively. Focusing on creating a low affective filter, providing comprehensible input, and scaffolding techniques, students learning English as a second language have a better chance of retaining academic information.

Statement of the Problem

There is a lack of knowledge about the best way to provide adequate academic instruction for English Language Learners in the regular classroom setting.

Purpose of Study

The primary focus of this project design is to obtain a group of educator's personal viewpoints and beliefs before learning more information from a UMKC ELL professor. Afterwards, the survey group will be provided the opportunity to re-take the same survey to determine whether there is any consistency of opinions and beliefs between their pre and post questionnaire during the course of the all-day workshop.

The information gained will help administrators know how to approach regular education teachers with the purpose of educating them about how their personal viewpoints do effect how successful English Language Learners will be in their classroom.

Research Questions

RQ 1: Is there a significant difference between general education teachers' attitudes and beliefs before and after attending a workshop about English Language Learners?

RQ 2: What are teacher perceptions of the second language acquisition process?

Null Hypotheses

There is not a significant difference between teachers' attitudes and beliefs before and after attending a workshop.

Anticipated Benefits of Study

The results of this study will inform decisions makers in the public school system about the necessary curriculum, strategies and professional development required to assist regular education/ELL teachers with the necessary tools and options they need to be effective teachers. It will also help building principals to be more aware of what trainings should be required in order to implement the best practices with teaching English Language Learners. Additionally, regular education teachers will be given immediate insight as to what is needed and what specific actions must be taken to create a supportive and successful classroom climate for their ELL students.

Definition of Terms

AMAOs: Annual Measureable Achievable Objectives

BICS: Basic Interpersonal Communication System

CALP: Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency

DESE: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

ELL: English Language Learner

IRCA: Immigration Reform and Control Act

LEP: Limited Language Proficient

L1: Native language

L2: Target language to be learned

NCLB: No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

NES: Non-English Speaking

Newcomer: A student who has just arrived from another country not having previous L2 experience

SIOP: Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol

WIDA: World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment

Summary

Independence is a Midwestern suburban school district with three high schools, 4 middle schools, and 17 elementary schools. There are ELL students in attendance at every school in the Independence School District. The district practices a pull out program to provide ELL students with ELL services with a traveling ELL teacher. There are some schools that have more ELLs in attendance than others. There will be discussion about the socioeconomic effect on the location of ELLs in the school district. The research also investigates the attitudes and perceptions of regular education teachers about ELLs in their classroom. Finally, the research looks at whether there is a difference in the attitudes and perceptions of regular teachers before and after an all-day educational workshop.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The emergence of linguistically and culturally diverse learners, also known as English Language Learners, has ever increased at an alarming rate in the United States. In fact, Celce-Murcia (2001) states “in the last four decades, even before the passage of IRCA, floods of refugees and undocumented learners flocked to our classrooms to qualify for ‘amnesty’” (p.72). There are numerous reasons as to their emigration to our country. Many families desire a better life or are forced from their own country to emigrate.

Having so many students’ lacking the ability to speak adequate English to communicate academically, the United States truly is a melting pot. According to Drame and Xu (2008), they stated “in public schools across the United States, ELL represents more than 400 language groups, with approximately 75% identified as Spanish speakers” (p.305). Not only are immigration numbers increasing annually, an interesting fact is, that nearly “58% of ELL students are born in the United States...out of these, 74% are from Hispanic background” (O’Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez, 2008, p.6). As proven by these startling statistics, it only supports the desperate need for all educators to have the necessary tools to teach all levels of ELL students.

In addition to ELL teachers, regular education teachers are now facing higher numbers of ELL students in their classrooms. Not only are we seeing at the local level but according to DESE, the number of ELL students is now 7 times as many as was in the 1985-86 school year, an average increase of approximately 843 new ELL students per year (“Limited Language Proficient Census”, 2012).

One of the main purposes of the passage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2002 was the intent of improving schools and requiring 100% of students to score proficient by 2014” (Jarrett, 2012). Sadly, this included ELL students in all levels of proficiencies. As taken from the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (Title III, p.1),

“Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized in 2001, provides for language instruction for limited English proficient and immigrant students. In return, states are required to demonstrate that students are proficient in state content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading or language arts and science (ESEA, 1111 (b)(2)(B))...States are also required to show that limited English proficient (LEP) students are progressing in their proficiency of the English language by meeting annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) (ESEA, 3122(b)).”

In response to these far reaching and demanding national requirements, ELLs and regular classroom educators are facing a daunting challenge. How will this be appropriately accomplished? Or can it?

It seems easy for regular educators who have had no formal training in teaching linguistically and culturally diverse learners to make faulty conclusions due to mere observations of biased perceptions of how these ELLs learn. There are several misconceptions that must be addressed to dispel regular educator’s negativity in their classrooms regarding communication with ELL students. Reeves (2006) performed a survey called “Secondary Teacher Attitudes Toward Including English Language Learners in Mainstream Classrooms” where she explored four categories toward ELL instruction. These included ELL inclusion, coursework modification for ELLs, professional development for working with ELLs and perceptions of language and language learning (p.131). All of these topics are universal nationwide but have rarely been addressed openly. According to Reeves (2006), “in terms of the impact inclusion on the classroom learning environment, teachers are concerned about the possibility that ELLs will slow the class progression through the curriculum or result in inequities in educational

opportunities for all students” (p.132). On page 132, she also suggests that majority of teachers use a “traditional knowledge-transmission model of instruction” where ELLs are isolated with an unmodified curriculum (Reeves, 2006). Many educators’ perceptions simply lie in the fear that the teacher will not be able to have high expectations of the ELL student. This could simply be because in the past, ELLs were placed in programs where ELLs had limited access to more challenging and higher level content. Currently, regular teachers need to understand that mainstreamed ELL students can learn rigorous material as their peers if “content is presented in linguistically appropriate ways” (Reeves, 2006, p.138). How do we create a linguistically appropriate environment?

Let’s understand SLA and sociolinguistics. They mesh together like a ball and socket. Rod Ellis (1997) refers to SLA as “the way in which people learn a language other than their mother tongue, inside or outside of a classroom...” (p.3). In other words, the social aspect, including those positive or negative teacher’s attitudes, play a pivotal part in the successful SLA process. Within this acquisition process, the majority of NES students begin in a silent period which can last for up to 3 years. However, when discussing SLA there are multiple stages of acquisition each student may experience. Ellis (1997) describes that L2 includes internal and external factors (p.5).

Culture, society, and language are an integral part within each person and each component develops differently for everyone. Without question, one’s previous experiences in their own culture will affect how they view another culture. This perception continues with personal views of how one interacts in society as well. But how is one’s language development effected? How can living in certain circumstances provide for a fuller range of vocabulary or a lesser range of vocabulary?

Bagby, Rudd, Woods (2005) expressed in their study that “previous research has indicated that teacher interaction style does influence student language development (p.403). Most children from culturally diverse families don’t have the same learning culture at home as what they experience in regular school environment. Rasmussen (2000) says “these students are coming into a different value system, culture and educational system” (p.5). Espinosa (2005) states that “to be successful, it is important for teachers of young children to become cross culturally competent to develop the ability to think, feel, and act in ways that acknowledge respect, build upon ethnic, sociocultural, and linguistic diversity” (p.838). Educators need to be more mindful of these families of different cultures and get to know them. In fact, she suggests inquiring upon how the dynamics are in the household, what their expectations are and what language is spoken in the home.

This ties into how important it is for ELL students to have positive ethnic identity and maintain their native language. As Collier (1995) stated, “external societal factors in the U.S. may have major influence on language acquisition for school” (p.9). It seems imperative then that educators must attempt to bridge that social and psychological distance. Speaking the ELLs’ native language and providing material in their own language are two beneficial ways. Ellis (1997) says learning takes place as a result of a complex interaction between the linguistic environment and the learner’s internal mechanisms (p.44). Providing an intentional, solid, language rich environment where new experiences feel comfortable for the ELL learner, the more effective L2 retention. Positive acculturation must be given more time especially with older students. It is significant to a child to “remember...(they) are whole people, the social aspects of their lives are tied into reading and academic success” (Rasmussen, 2000, p.5)

Additionally, specific understanding of BICS and CALP is necessary for educators. Simple examples for BICS include telling a story of events the speaker personally experiences. Another is truly talking about a movie the speaker watched. In regards to CALP, an example would be to discuss the cause and effect relationships of different concepts. Educators' misconceptions are that if ELL students talk socially outside of the classroom, they should be talking the same amount in the classroom. Batt (2008) indicates "students have typically taken 5-7 years to become proficient in academic language to perform on academic tests in English or 7-10 years for language learners who have had little or no instruction in their native language" (p.42).

As educators comprehend the conceptual difference between BISC and CALP, they must grasp also that non-English speaking students will not be capable of studying constantly all day. Research states that shorter more frequent sessions lasting 17-20 minutes are preferred for more retention (Gabrielse, 2011). They need processing time to absorb what was just presented to them.

Other key components to second language acquisition are the developmental patterns, sequence of acquisition and learning strategies. This brings up the theory of Stephen Krashen who differentiated between 'acquisition' and 'learning' a second language (Ashworth, 1992, p. 42). His thoughts are that students who are learning a second language will consciously pick up the L2 similar to how one acquires their native language. Krashen promotes the idea that "all ESL students will acquire more language than they learn, provided they are exposed to sufficient language that is interesting, relevant and comprehensible" (Ashworth, 1992, p.43). Teachers must assimilate the idea that fluency of L2 does not happen immediately.

The input must resemble the concept of building blocks. For example, teachers must expose ELL students to repetitive simplified language that focuses on meaning. Each new idea is built on from the previous one. This is referred to as Input Hypothesis. Krashen also discusses the importance of lowering the affective filter in children who have anxiety from the lack of self-confidence or even motivation. In her book, The First Step on the Longer Path: Becoming an ESL Teacher, Mary Ashworth (1992) stresses that if, “anxiety is high, the filter does not allow much meaningful language to pass through if learners do not receive meaningful messages...it is difficult to produce them” (p.44).

In creating the ideal classroom environment, using sheltered instruction, also known as SIOP, is a plus in breaking down larger concepts into smaller more comprehensible and authentic pieces for ELLs. This is a teaching example of how to incorporate Input Hypothesis. Teachers need to also remember to modify jargon talk and allow enough wait time for ELLs' L2 to be retained.

Simply, educators need to comprehend that just because a newly arriving ELL student may have a grasp of BICS, their CALP may not be as developed. Teachable moments will be successful when ELL students feel comfortable and proper learning styles are exercised to acquire the new language. Collier (1995) stated something significant that the quality of instruction in the school should be “encouraging, interacting, problem solving, experiential learning through a multicultural, global perspective” (p.11).

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

A non-experimental, one-time survey served as the research design. The alpha level was set at 0.25 for all tests with this research. The independent variable will be the regular education teachers' viewpoints from the pre and post survey. The twenty-two survey questions will measure the results of several dependent variables. Tests run will include chi square analysis.

Study Group

The study group for this research consisted of 11 regular education teachers from two different high schools, one middle school, and two elementary schools in the Independence School District. The majority (91%) of the attendees were female with seventy-two percent as elementary school level teachers. Over half of the attendees, (55%), were teachers from 2 of the newly annexed schools from Kansas City. These schools have the highest attendance of ELL students in the entire district.

The educational background of the teachers ranged from Bachelors to Doctorate with 64% having their Masters. One of the two high school teachers is a new employee to the district for this next school year 2011-2012. All but two of the eleven teachers had never had any coursework in ELL. Ten out of the eleven were native English speakers and one attendee was a native Spanish speaker. Three teachers indicated they already knew how to speak a second language but with ability levels ranging from beginner to advanced. Of the 73% who indicated they did not speak another language, 2 of them shared they did not want to learn another language.

They are all certified staff members.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

An anonymous questionnaire was distributed twice during an all day summer workshop called Sheltered Instruction for the Regular Classroom Teacher with ELLs. Before the workshop began, the first survey was passed out along with a demographics page that inquired specific data from each participant. Questions on the demographics page included the location of where they taught, gender, level of education, length of service in education, and their current grade level. The responses were identified by a check in the appropriate box. Five questions asked specifically on speaking a second language that was to be answered "yes" or "no". Two questions dealt with personal reflections on previous English as Second Language training and future desires for more workshops in this area. At the end of the workshop, each participant repeated the same survey without the demographics page.

The main survey itself contained a total of 24 questions similar in nature to allow for an understanding of attitudes and perceptions of the teachers surveyed. The questionnaire took approximately 8 minutes to complete. Twenty-two of the twenty-four questions were opinions checked as strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree. All eleven teachers at the workshop participated in both surveys. Responses were posted to an Excel spreadsheet. The opinion words listed previously were recoded as numbers so that the statistical analysis could be completed.

Statistical Analysis Methods

Statistical Package (ASP) software will be used to complete the statistical calculations in this study. Chi-Square Analysis and Descriptive Analysis methods were calculated. Microsoft Excel was used to compile some totals also used in the research.

FINDINGS

To determine whether there is a significant difference between general education teachers' attitudes and beliefs before and after attending a workshop about ELLs, a chi square analysis was done for 22 out of the 24 questions asked in the main survey. Below are the results from each question demonstrating the percentage differences between the opinions pre survey and post survey.

Table 1

*Question #1:
ELL students should acquire English within 2 years of enrolling into US schools.*

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	9% (1)	9% (1)	4	3	0.2261
Agree	54.6% (6)	27.2% (3)			
Disagree	36.4% (4)	36.4% (4)			
Strongly Disagree	0% (0)	27.2% (3)			

Sign = or > 0.25

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether ELL students should acquire English within 2 years of enrolling into United States schools. A significant difference was found. As shown in Table 1, there is a slight statistical difference (Chi Square (3) = 4, p-value=0.2261) in question #1. In the responses of strongly agree and disagree, the responses are the same at 9%. However, in the agree opinion category, there was a significant difference of 27.4% between the pre survey and the post survey. This table shows there are 63.6% of the 11 participants who agreed/strongly agreed in the pre survey. There were then 4 participants (36.2%) who, when combining the

strongly agree and agree categories, in the post survey that feel ELL students should acquire English within the first 2 years of attending US schools. Conversely, in the pre survey there were a total of 4 participants (36.4%) who strongly disagreed/disagreed with question #1. When looking at the post survey, there were a total of seven participants (63.6%) who strongly disagreed/disagreed with the same question #1. In addition, there was no one in this study who strongly disagreed with this question in the pre survey but in the post survey there were three participants (27.2%) who strongly disagreed that ELL should acquire English within 2 years of enrolling into US schools.

Table 2					
<i>Question #2: Newly arrived ELL students should be taught in a separate classroom and not in the regular classroom until they progress out of the entering stage of the WIDA proficiency levels.</i>					
Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column					
Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	9% (1)	0% (0)			
Agree	27.2% (3)	9% (1)			
Disagree	36.4% (4)	36.4% (4)			
Strongly Disagree	27.2% (3)	54.6% (6)	3	3	0.3916
Sign = or > 0.25					

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether newly arrived ELL students should be taught in a separate classroom and not in the regular classroom until they progress out of the entering stage of the WIDA proficiency levels. The Chi Square (3) = 3 and the p-value is 0.3916 which does not show a significant difference between the pre survey and the post survey. In Table 2, there were an

equal number of participants (27.2%) in the pre survey who agreed /strongly disagreed that newly arriving ELL students should be taught in a separate classroom and not in the regular classroom until they progress out of the entering stage of the WIDA proficiency standards. There were three participants (27.2%) who agreed initially in the pre survey, yet during the post survey only one participant (9%) agreed with question #2. One participant (9%) strongly agreed in the pre survey but in the post survey there were no responses in that particular category. The largest change in responses was found under the pre survey where 27.2% of the participants strongly disagreed with newly arriving ELL students being taught in a separate school. Then in the post survey, the number increased to 27.4% of the participants strongly disagreeing with the question statement. There were the same number of responses (36.4%) in the disagree category during the pre and post survey. The majorities of responses (91%) for this question combines both disagree/strongly disagree during the post survey where a total of 10 teachers responded.

Table 3					
<i>Question #3: I know of at least 5 strategies to use in my classroom with any ELL student no matter their proficiency level.</i>					
Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column					
Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	9% (1)	63.6% (7)			
Agree	36.4% (4)	36.4% (4)			
Disagree	45.4% (5)	0% (0)			
Strongly Disagree	9% (1)	0% (0)	10.5	3	0.0148
Sign = or > 0.25					

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether each teacher knew of at least five strategies to use in their

classroom with any ELL student no matter their proficiency level. As shown in Table 3, the Chi-Square is 10.5 while the df is 3. The p-value is 0.0148. There were significant differences found. During the pre survey, there were 5 teachers (45.4%) who disagreed and one teacher (9%) who strongly disagreed but both responded in the agree or strongly agree categories in the post survey. There were no negative responses (disagree or strongly disagree) in the post survey to this question. Teachers responded either as agree (36.4%) or strongly agree (63.6%) in the post survey. Initially, in the pre survey, there was only 1 teacher (9%) who strongly agreed and 4 teachers (36.4%) who agreed that they knew 5 strategies to use with ELL students. In comparing the pre and post survey, there were a total of 5 teachers with a total of 45.4% who agreed/strongly agreed that they knew 5 strategies yet in those same categories during the post survey, the number of teachers knowing 5 strategies increased to 11 total (strongly agree (63.6%) and agree (36.4%)).

Table 4					
<i>Question #4: A student learns a second language the same way he/she learns in their native language.</i>					
Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column					
Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	0% (0)	9% (1)			
Agree	18.2% (2)	36.4% (4)			
Disagree	72.8% (8)	36.4% (4)			
Strongly Disagree	9% (1)	18.2% (2)	3.333	3	0.343
Sign = or > 0.25					

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether a student learns a second language the same way he/she learns in their native language. No significant difference was found (chi square (3) = 3.333,

p>0.343). In the pre survey, the total number of teachers who disagreed (72.8%) and strongly disagreed (9%) with this statement totaled 81.8% of the teachers. In the post survey, those teachers who disagreed (36.4%) and strongly disagreed (18.2%) diminished 27.2%. There were more teachers who agreed (36.4%) and strongly agreed (9%) in the post survey than in the pre survey (18.2%). In the pre survey, there was 0% who strongly agreed and 18.2% who agreed with the survey statement. There were 3 more teachers who agreed with this statement in the post survey than in the pre survey. There seems to be some controversy on this topic according to the chi-square analysis.

Table 5

Question #5:

Newly arrived non-English speaking students should be trying to speak English immediately.

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	-	-			
Agree	54.6% (6)	9% (1)			
Disagree	45.4% (5)	81.8% (9)			
Strongly Disagree	0% (0)	9% (1)	5.714	3	0.0574
Sign = or > 0.25					

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether newly arrived non-English speaking students should be trying to speak English immediately. There were significant differences found (chi square (3) = 5.714, p>0.0574). In the pre survey, both categories of agree (54.6%) and disagree (45.4%) were nearly equivalent. No participants responded using the strongly disagree category in the pre survey. In contrast with the post survey, almost double the participants disagreed (81.8%) compared to the previous number of 45.4%. There was only one participant who agreed (9%) and one who

strongly disagreed (9%) with this statement in the post survey. No participants used strongly agree as a response in this table for either survey. There seems to be some controversy on this topic according to the chi-square analysis.

Table 6					
<i>Question #6: Building a solid connection with your newly arrived ELL students from their first day in your class is critical for successful learning.</i>					
Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column					
Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	91% (10)	81.8% (9)			
Agree	9% (1)	9% (1)			
Disagree	-	-			
Strongly Disagree	0% (0)	9% (1)	1.05263	3	0.5908
Sign = or > 0.25					

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether building a solid connection with your newly arrived ELL students from their first day in your class is critical for successful learning. No significant difference was found (chi square (3) = 1.05263, p>0.5908). In comparing the results in the pre and post surveys, each category was nearly identical. There were 10 teachers (91%) who strongly agreed in the pre survey and in the post survey; there were 9 teachers (81.8%). There was one teacher (9%) who agreed during both the pre and post survey. In the pre and post survey, there were no responses under the disagree category. Under the strongly disagree category, there were no results in the pre survey but one teacher (4.5%) responded accordingly. The comparison shows that in the pre survey, there were 11 teachers who agreed with the statement. In the post

survey, there was only one who disagreed. The majority included only 10 teachers agreeing with question #6.

Table 7					
<i>Question #7: ELL students should avoid using their native language at school.</i>					
Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column					
Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	0% (0)	9% (1)			
Agree	18.2% (2)	0% (0)			
Disagree	81.8% (9)	63.6% (7)			
Strongly Disagree	0% (0)	27.2% (3)	6.25	3	0.1000
Sign = or > 0.25					

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether ELL students should avoid using their native language at school. There was a significant difference found (chi square (3) = 6.25, p>0.1000). In Table 7, when comparing the pre and post surveys in the agree/strongly agree categories, there is only a 9.2% difference. Two teachers (18.2%) agreed with the statement and no teachers (0%) strongly agreed with Question #7 in the pre survey. In the post survey, only one teacher (9%) strongly agreed and no teacher (0%) responded in the agree category. When looking at the disagreement categories, there were nine teachers (81.8%) who responded as disagreeing that ELL students should avoid using their native language at school in the pre survey. In the post survey, seven teachers (63.6%) disagreed and three teachers (27.2%) strongly disagreed with question #7. There is only a 9% difference in the disagreement responses in comparing the pre survey to the post survey.

Table 8

Question #8:

I should try to speak the student's native language in the classroom.

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	-	-			
Agree	47.6% (5)	47.6% (5)			
Disagree	47.6% (5)	57.2% (6)			
Strongly Disagree	-	-	0.0434	3	0.8350
Sign = or > 0.25					

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether teachers felt they should use their native language in the classroom with ELL students. No significant difference was found (chi square (3) = 0.0434, $p > 0.8350$). In table 8, the pre survey shows only ten total responses whereas eleven responded to the post survey. Nearly 50% of the respondents agreed before the survey that speaking the student's native language is a good idea. The same response (47.6%) was given for the post survey in agreeing with the teacher speaking the native language in the classroom. On the contrary, the same amount of teachers (47.6%) responded in disagreement to speaking the ELL student's native language in the pre survey and one more disagreed than in the pre survey with a 57.2% in the post survey. In each of the four responses (agree/disagree in both surveys), the responses were at nearly 50% except for one being slightly higher in the disagree category in the post survey. No one chose the Strongly Agree category or the Strongly Disagree category in either survey.

Table 9

Question #9:

If my ELL student is speaking English on the playground, they should be speaking English in the classroom.

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	9.6% (1)	9.6% (1)			
Agree	47.6% (5)	28.6% (3)			
Disagree	38% (4)	57.2% (6)			
Strongly Disagree	0% (0)	9.6% (1)	1.85659	3	0.60270
Sign = or > 0.25					

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether teachers felt that if an ELL student is speaking English on the playground, the ELL student should be speaking English in the classroom. No significant difference was found (chi square (3) = 1.85659, $p > 0.60270$). In table 9, there were a total number of 10 pre surveys returned and 11 post surveys returned. In the strongly agree category, one teacher (9.6%) responded in each of the pre and post surveys. Five teachers (47.6%) agreed with the statement that ELL students who speak English on the playground should be speaking English in the classroom as well in the pre survey. However, four teachers (38%) disagreed with the question statement. In the post survey, three teachers (28.6%) agreed that ELL students who speak English on the playground should be speaking English in the classroom. In addition, six teachers (57.2%) did not agree that ELL students should be speaking English in the classroom if they are speaking English on the playground. One teacher (9.6%) strongly disagreed with question #9 in the post survey. There were no responses in the strongly disagree category during the pre survey.

Table 10*Question #10:**When my ELL students don't look at me in the eye, it's a sign of disrespect.*

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	-	-			
Agree	-	-			
Disagree	72.8% (8)	63.6% (7)			
Strongly Disagree	27.2% (3)	36.4% (4)	0.2095	3	0.647141

Sign = or > 0.25

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether teachers felt that if an ELL student did not look at them in the eye; it was showing a sign of disrespect. No significant difference was found (chi square (3) = 0.2095, $p > 0.647141$). In table 10, both surveys contained eleven responses. However, there were no teachers who responded in the strongly agree or the agree categories during either survey. Eight teachers (72.8%) disagreed in the pre survey while 3 teachers (27.2%) strongly disagreed with the question statement that when an ELL student does not look at you, it is a sign of disrespect. In comparison, there were seven teachers (63.6%) who disagreed in the post survey while 36.4% of the teachers strongly disagreed. In conclusion, all the participants agree with that just because an ELL student does not look at the teacher, they do not feel that the ELL student is disrespecting them.

Table 11*Question #11:**Acclimating to a new country is a fun and exciting experience for ELL students.*

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	-	-			
Agree	18.2% (2)	0% (0)			
Disagree	81.8% (9)	72.8% (8)			
Strongly Disagree	0% (0)	27.2% (3)	5.0588	3	0.0797

Sign = or > 0.25

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on their beliefs about acclimating to a new country and that it would be a fun and exciting experience for all ELL students. The Chi Square (3) = 5.0588 and the p-value is 0.0797 which does show a significant difference in question #11. In Table 11, there were no responses under the strongly agree category in both the pre and post survey. In the agree category, there were two teachers (18.2%) but no respondents in the post survey. The majority of eleven respondents were the nine teachers (81.8%) who disagreed that acclimating to a new country is a fun and exciting experience for ELL students in the pre survey. In same category, eight teachers (72.8%) disagreed with question #11 in the post survey. There were three participants (27.2%) who strongly disagreed as well with the question statement. In the post survey, the eleven participants agreed 100% that acclimating to a new country is not a fun and exciting experience for ELL students. Conversely, there were only 9 participants (81.2%) who agreed with this question #11.

Table 12

Question #12:

In the academic setting, non English speaking students should be fully engaged in classroom activities all day long.

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	-	-			
Agree	63.6% (7)	18.2% (2)			
Disagree	27.2% (3)	63.6% (7)			
Strongly Disagree	9% (1)	18.2% (2)	4.7111	3	0.09484

Sign = or > 0.25

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on the teacher's beliefs that in the academic setting, non English speaking students should be fully engaged in classroom activities all day long. The Chi Square (3) = 4.7111 and the p-value is 0.09484 which does show a significant difference between the pre survey and the post survey in question #12. In the strongly agree category, there were no responses in either survey. There were seven teachers (63.6%) who agreed with the question statement in the pre survey and two teachers (18.2%) who agreed in the post survey. Three teachers (27.2%) disagreed during the pre survey that in the academic setting, non English speaking students should be fully engaged in classroom activities all day long. However, in the post survey, seven teachers (63.6%) disagreed with the question statement. There was one teacher (9%) who strongly disagreed that non English speaking students should be fully engaged in classroom activities all day long during the pre survey. When looking at the post survey, two teachers (18.2%) strongly disagree with the question statement.

Table 13*Question #13:**Elementary ELL students who have not acquired grade level content knowledge should be retained.*

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	-	-			
Agree	9.6% (1)	0% (0)			
Disagree	76.2% (8)	47.6% (5)			
Strongly Disagree	9.6% (1)	57.2% (6)	5.228	3	0.07324

Sign = or > 0.25

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on the teacher's beliefs that elementary ELL students who have not acquired grade level content knowledge should be retained. The Chi Square (3) = 5.228 and the p-value is which 0.07324 does show a significant difference between the pre survey and the post survey in question #13. There were no teacher responses in the strongly agree categories under both surveys. There was one teacher (9.6%) who agreed with the question statement in the pre survey. No teachers agreed with this question statement in the post survey. Eight teachers (76.2%) in the pre survey disagreed that elementary ELL students who have not acquired grade level content knowledge should be retained. In the post survey, five teachers (47.6%) disagreed with that question statement. There was only one teacher (9.6%) who strongly disagreed in the pre survey. In the post survey, six teachers (57.2%) strongly disagreed that in regards of retention, elementary ELL students who have not acquired grade level content knowledge should not be retained. In this particular question, if we look at the pre survey, nine teachers (85.8%) disagree and/or strongly disagree together whereas in the post survey, eleven teachers disagree

and /or strongly disagree. There were only 10 participants in the pre survey and eleven in the post survey.

Table 14

Question #14:

Classroom teachers do not have time to deal with the needs of the ELL students.

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	-	-			
Agree	9% (1)	18.2% (2)			
Disagree	54.6% (6)	63.6% (7)			
Strongly Disagree	36.4% (4)	18.2% (2)	1.0769	3	0.58365
Sign = or > 0.25					

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether classroom teachers do not have time to deal with the needs of the ELL students. The Chi Square (3) = 1.0769 and the p-value is 0.58365 which does not show a significant difference between the pre survey and the post survey in question #14. There were no teachers who responded in the strongly agree category. There was one teacher (9%) who agreed with question #14 in the pre survey and two teachers (18.2%) who agreed in the post survey. The majority of responses were teachers who disagreed that classroom teachers do not have time to deal with the needs of the ELL students. In the pre survey, six teachers (54.6%) disagreed with this question and in the post survey; there was an increase of 9% which resulted in seven teachers (63.6%) disagreeing as well. Four teachers (36.4%) strongly disagreed in the pre survey that the classroom teachers do not have time to deal with the needs of ELL students. Only two teachers (18.2%) disagreed strongly in the post survey. Interesting that there was a total of 10 teachers (91%) who disagreed and/or strongly disagreed with question #14 in the pre

survey and then in the post survey 9 teachers (81.8%) disagreed and/or strongly disagreed with this same question.

Table 15

Question #15:

It is good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ELL students.

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	18.2% (2)	18.2% (2)			
Agree	54.6% (6)	63.6% (7)			
Disagree	18.2% (2)	18.2% (2)			
Strongly Disagree	9% (1)	0% (0)	1.0769	3	0.78265
Sign = or > 0.25					

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether classroom teachers believe it is good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ELL students. The Chi Square (3) = 1.0769 and the p-value is 0.78265 which does not show a significant difference between the pre survey and the post survey in question #15. There were two categories that had the exact same responses in the both surveys. There were two teachers (18.2%) who strongly agreed in both surveys that it is good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ELL students. There were also two teachers (18.2%) who disagreed in both surveys that it is a good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ELL students. There were six teachers (54.6%) who agreed with question #15 in the pre survey but that increased by 9% in the post survey. Seven teachers (63.6%) agreed with the question in the pre survey that it is good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ELL students. Only one teacher (9%) strongly disagreed with question #15. The majority of the teacher's responses for the pre survey in combining the strongly agree/agree categories was 9%

less than the majority of teacher's responses in combining the strongly disagree/disagree categories of the post survey. Both categories together of strongly agree/agree had 8 teachers (72.8%) responding in the pre survey and 9 teachers (81.8%) responding in the post survey. In combining the categories of disagree/ strongly disagree, three teachers (27.2%) responded in the pre survey and only two (9%) responded in the post survey.

Table 16

Question #16:

It is good practice to allow ELL students more time to complete assignments.

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	18.2% (2)	27.2% (3)	1.2	3	0.54881
Agree	72.8% (8)	72.8% (8)			
Disagree	9% (1)	0% (0)			
Strongly Disagree	-	-			

Sign = or > 0.25

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether classroom teachers believe it is good practice to allow ELL students more time to complete assignments. The Chi Square (3) = 1.2 and the p-value is 0.54881 which does not show a significant difference between the pre survey and the post survey in question #16. There were no teacher responses in the strongly disagree category for either survey. There was only one teacher (9%) in both surveys who disagreed with the question statement that it is good practice to allow ELL students more time to complete assignments. In the pre survey, two teachers (18.2%) strongly agreed with question #16 and in the post survey, there were three teachers (27.2%) who strongly agreed with the same question statement. There were eight teachers (72.8%) in both the pre survey and the post survey who agreed that ELL

students should have more time to complete assignments. In regards to the pre survey, there were ten teachers (91%) in combination who strongly agreed/agreed with question #16. However, in the post survey, there were a total of eleven teachers (100%) who strongly agreed/agreed in ELL students receiving more time to complete assignments.

Table 17

*Question #17:
The modification of coursework for ELL students would be difficult to justify to other students.*

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	-	-			
Agree	0% (0)	9% (1)			
Disagree	91% (10)	72.8% (8)			
Strongly Disagree	9% (1)	18.2% (2)	1.556	3	0.4594

Sign = or > 0.25

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether classroom teachers believe the modification of coursework for ELL students would be too difficult to justify to other students. The Chi Square (3) = 1.556 and the p-value is 0.4594 which does not show a significant difference between the pre survey and the post survey in Table 17. There were no teacher responses in the strongly agree category. In the pre survey, there were no teachers who agreed with question #17. However, in the post survey, one teacher (9%) did agree that modifying coursework for ELL students would be difficult to justify to other students. The majority of the responses in the pre survey were ten teachers (91%) who disagreed with the given statement about modifying coursework for ELLs. There was 9% less teachers who disagreed during the post survey. There were eight teachers (72.8%) who disagreed with question #17. In the strongly disagree category, there was only one

teacher (9%) in the pre survey. However, in the post survey, the number of teachers who strongly disagreed rose 9%. In combining the categories of disagree/ strongly disagree, there was a total of eleven teachers (100%) who were in disagreement during the pre survey. The number of teachers disagreeing to question #17 was ten which came to 91%.

Table 18

*Question #18:
Providing materials in the student's native language is helpful to their learning.*

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	0% (0)	9.6% (1)			
Agree	76.2% (8)	85.8% (9)			
Disagree	28.6% (3)	0% (0)			
Strongly Disagree	-	-	4.0203	3	0.1340

Sign = or > 0.25

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether classroom teachers believe providing materials in the student's native language is helpful to their learning. The Chi Square (3) = 4.0203 and the p-value is 0.1340 which does show a significant difference between the pre survey and the post survey in question #18. In Table 18, all eleven of the teachers who attended the workshop participated in the pre survey whereas only ten responded in the post survey. There were no teachers who strongly agreed to question #18 in the pre survey. In the pre survey, there were eight teachers (76.2%) who did agree that providing materials in the student's native language is helpful to their learning. Three teachers (28.6%) disagreed with the question #18 statement. There are no responses in the strongly disagree category for either survey. In regards to the post survey, there was one teacher (9.6%) who strongly agreed with the aforementioned question #18.

There were nine teachers (85.8%) who agreed that providing materials in the student's native language is helpful to their learning. All of the 10 teachers who responded in the post survey agree that giving ELL students material in their native language can be beneficial.

Table 19

*Question #19:
Effort is more important to me than achievement when I grade ELL students.*

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	9% (1)	27.2% (3)			
Agree	63.6% (7)	63.6% (7)			
Disagree	27.2% (3)	9% (1)			
Strongly Disagree	-	-	2	3	0.3679

Sign = or > 0.25

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether teachers believe that effort is more important than achievement when grading ELL students. No significant difference was found. As shown in Table 19, there was no statistical difference (Chi Square (3) =2, p-value=0.3679) between the pre and post survey in Table 19. The areas of similarities were found in the agree category where it remained consistent with seven teachers (63.6%). In the pre survey, there was one teacher (9%) who strongly agreed but in the post survey the number of teachers went up by 18%. Those three teachers (27.2%) strongly agreed with question #19. There were three teachers (27.2%) who disagreed with the question statement in the pre survey. However, in the post survey, there was only one teacher (9%) who disagreed. There were no results under the strongly disagree category within both the pre and post surveys. The amount of teachers who strongly agreed with question #19 in the pre survey was 9% then it increased to 27.2% in the post survey. A similar

pattern showed up in the disagree category. They began with three teachers (27.2%) in the pre survey then one teacher (9%) disagreeing in the post survey. There were a total of eight students (72.6%) in the pre survey who agreed and strongly agree about question #19 but in the post survey, there was an increase of 18.2% with 10 teachers agreeing/strongly agreeing.

Table 20

*Question #20:
Parents of ELL students should try to only speak English to their children (even if their own proficiency is lacking).*

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	-	-			
Agree	36.4% (4)	0% (0)			
Disagree	54.6% (6)	63.6% (7)			
Strongly Disagree	9% (1)	36.4% (4)	5.876	3	0.05295

Sign = or > 0.25

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether classroom teachers believe the parents of ELL students should try to speak English to their children (even if their own proficiency is lacking). The Chi Square (3) = 5.876 and the p-value is 0.05295 which does show a significant difference between the pre survey and the post survey in Table 20. There were no teacher responses in the strongly agree category. In the pre survey, there were four teachers (36.4%) who agreed with question #20. However, in the post survey, there were no teachers (0%) who responded in this category. The majority of the responses in the pre survey were six teachers (54.6%) who disagreed with the given statement about parents of ELLs trying to only speak English to their children. There was an additional teacher who disagreed during the post survey. There were seven teachers

(63.6%) who disagreed with question #20. In the strongly disagree category, there was only one teacher (9%) in the pre survey. However, in the post survey, the number of teachers who strongly disagreed rose to four (18.2%). In combining the categories of disagree/strongly disagree; there were a total of seven teachers (63.6%) who were in disagreement during the pre survey. The number of teacher responses who disagreed to question #20 in the post survey was eleven (100%).

Table 21

*Question #21:
Communicating with ELL parents in their native language about their child's academic progress is important.*

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	36.4% (4)	45.4% (5)			
Agree	54.6% (6)	54.6% (6)			
Disagree	9% (1)	0% (0)			
Strongly Disagree	-	-	1.1111	3	0.5738

Sign = or > 0.25

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether classroom teachers believe that communicating with ELL parents in their native language about their child's academic progress is important. The Chi Square (3) = 1.1111 and the p-value is 0.5738 which does not show a significant difference between the pre survey and the post survey in Table 21. There were no teacher responses in the strongly disagree category. In the pre survey, there were four teachers (36.4%) who strongly agreed with question #21. However, in the post survey, there were five teachers (45.4%) who strongly agreed that communicating with ELL parents in their native language about their child's

academic progress is important. The majority of the responses in both the pre survey and the post survey were six teachers (54.6%) who agreed with the previous statement. There was only one teacher (9%) in the pre survey who disagreed with question #21. In the post survey, the number of teachers who disagreed was at 0%. In combining the categories of agree/strongly agree, there was a total of 10 teachers (91%) who were in agreement during the pre survey. The number of teacher responses who agreed to question #21 in the post survey was eleven (100%).

Table 22

*Question #22:
I would support legislation making English the official language of the United States.*

Summary of Chi-Square Analysis by Column

Opinion	Pre Survey	Post Survey	Chi-Sq	df	p-value
Strongly Agree	27.2% (3)	27.2% (3)			
Agree	45.4% (5)	27.2% (3)			
Disagree	27.2% (3)	45.4% (5)			
Strongly Disagree	-	-	1	3	0.6065

Sign = or > 0.25

A chi square test of significance was calculated comparing the frequency of the teacher's pre survey and post survey on whether classroom teachers would support legislation making English the official language of the United States. The Chi Square (3) = 1 and the p-value is 0.6065 which does not show a significant difference between the pre survey and the post survey in Table 22. There were no teacher responses in the strongly disagree category. In the pre and post surveys, there were equally three teachers (27.2%) who strongly agreed with question #22. However, in the agree category, there were five teachers (45.4%) in the pre survey and three teachers (27.2%) in the post survey who would support this legislation. The majority of the responses in the pre survey were combining the strongly agree/agree categories that totaled eight

teachers (72.6%) who would support English as the official language. In the pre survey, three teachers (27.2%) disagreed with supporting this legislation. In the post survey, there were five teachers (45.4%) who disagreed with question #22. In the post survey, the number of teachers who disagreed rose 18.2%. In combining the categories of agree/strongly agree, there was a total of eight teachers (72.6%) in the pre survey and six teachers (54.4%) in the post survey who believe they would support English as the official language.

In support of acquiring the responses of all the participants' perceptions of the second language acquisition process as an entire group, a frequency plot was performed on each question. In each question, the responses show percentages if the participants' opinions combining both the pre survey and post survey results.

Key for interpreting the following frequency plots:

X=1 = Strongly Agree

X=2 = Agree

X=3 = Disagree

X=4 = Strongly Disagree

Figure 1.

VARIABLE: Q1= *ELL students should acquire English within 2 years of enrolling into US schools.*

FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 1	0	0	0	0
x = 1	2	2	9.1	9.1 *****
x = 2	9	11	40.9	50 *****
x = 3	8	19	36.4	86.4 *****
x = 4	3	22	13.6	100 *****
x > 4	0	22	0	100
TOTAL	22		100	

In Figure 1, 9 participants (40.9%) agree that ELL students should acquire English within 2 years of enrolling into US schools. There are 8 participants (36.4%) who disagree. The percentage of participants who strongly agree was 9.1% and those that strongly disagreed were 13.6%. When adding the results of those participants who agree (9.1%) and strongly agree (40.9%), it totals

50%. The same situation is true when adding the results of those participants who disagree (36.4%) and strongly disagree (13.6%) which total 50%.

Figure 2.

VARIABLE: Q2= *Newly arrived ELL students should be taught in a separate classroom and not in the regular classroom until they progress out of the entering stage of the WIDA proficiency levels.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 1	0	0	0	0	
x = 1	1	1	4.5	4.5	***
x = 2	4	5	18.2	22.7	*****
x = 3	8	13	36.4	59.1	*****
x = 4	9	22	40.9	100	*****
x > 4	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100		

In Figure 2, the highest percentage is 40.9% who strongly disagree that newly arrived ELL students should be taught in a separate classroom. Those who also disagree were 36.4%. In comparison, those that agreed that newly arrived ELL students should be taught in separate classroom until they progress out of the entering stage was at 18.2%. Only one participant strongly agreed with this question which was a 4.5%. Clearly, when combining the results of the participants who disagree and strongly disagree, their percentage is 77.3%. Only 5 participants (22.7%) agree with the question statement.

Figure 3.

VARIABLE: Q3= *I know of at least 5 strategies to use in my classroom with any ELL student no matter their proficiency level.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 1	0	0	0	0	
x = 1	8	8	36.4	36.4	*****
x = 2	8	16	36.4	72.7	*****
x = 3	5	21	22.7	95.5	*****
x = 4	1	22	4.5	100	***
x > 4	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100		

In Figure 3, there are equal responses in the participants who responded with agree (36.4%) and strongly agree (36.4%). The 5 participants who disagreed (22.7%) was at least 5 times higher than the participants who responded with strongly disagree (4.5%). This plot shows that 72.7% of the participants who agree and strongly agree have at least 5 strategies to use with ELL students in their classroom. Not quite one-third of the participants (27.2%) have 5 strategies to use.

Figure 4.

VARIABLE: Q4= *A student learns a second language the same way he/she learns in their native language.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 1	0	0	0	0	
x = 1	1	1	4.5	4.5	**
x = 2	6	7	27.3	31.8	*****
x = 3	12	19	54.5	86.4	*****
x = 4	3	22	13.6	100	*****
x > 4	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100		

In Figure 4, the participants who disagree (54.5%) had the highest percentage with the participants who agreed (27.3%) with the above question statement had the next highest percentage. The participants who strongly disagreed (13.6%) feel a student does not learn a second language the same way he/she learn in their native language. On the contrary, one participant (4.5%) responded that they strongly agree with the statement. Overall, in combining the disagree (54.5%) and strongly disagree (13.6%) responses, 68.1% of them believe students learn a second language the same way an individual learns in their native language.

Figure 5.

VARIABLE: Q5= *Newly arrived non-English speaking students should be trying to speak English immediately.*

FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT

x < 2	0	0	0	0
x = 2	7	31.8	31.8	*****
x = 3	14	63.6	95.5	*****
x = 4	1	4.5	100	**
x > 4	0	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100	

In Figure 5, 63.6% of the participants disagree that newly arriving non-English speaking students should be trying to speak English immediately. In contrast, 31.8% of the participants agree with this statement. There were no participants who responded in the strongly agree category, however, there was one participant who did strongly disagree (4.5%). When combining results of the disagree (63.6%) and strongly disagree (4.5%) areas, the total is 68.1%. The 68.1% total more than doubles the responses from the participants who agreed that newly arrived non-English speaking students should attempt to speak English immediately upon their arrival to the United States.

Figure 6.

VARIABLE: Q6= *Building a solid connection with your newly arrived ELL students from their first day in your class is critical for successful learning.*

FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT

x < 1	0	0	0	0
x = 1	19	86.4	86.4	*****
x = 2	2	9.1	95.5	***
x = 4	1	4.5	100	*
x > 4	0	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100	

In figure 6, the highest percentage is 86.4% who strongly agree with the above statement that building a solid connection with your newly arrived ELL students from their first day in your class is critical for successful learning. Only two participants (9.1%) agreed with this and one participant strongly disagreed (4.5%). In combining the results of the agree (9.1%) and strongly agree (86.4%) categories, there is a total of 95.5% who agree with question 6. There were no responses in the disagree category.

Figure 7.

VARIABLE: Q7= *ELL students should avoid using their native language at school.*

FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 1	0	0	0	0
x = 1	1	4.5	4.5	**
x = 2	3	9.1	13.6	***
x = 3	19	72.7	86.4	*****
x = 4	22	100	100	*****
x > 4	0	0	100	
TOTAL	22	100		

In Figure 7, the majority of the respondents (72.7%) disagreed that ELL students should avoid using their native language at school and three participants (13.6%) strongly disagreed with this statement. There were a total of 13.6% of the participants (when combining agree and strongly agree) who feel ELL students should not use their native language in school. Two of the participants (9.1%) agree and one participant strongly agreed (4.5%) with the question 7 statement. There is a total of 86.3% of those participants that believe that ELL students should use their native language in school.

Figure 8.

VARIABLE: Q8= *I should try to speak the student's native language in the classroom.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT

x < 2	0	0	0	0	
x = 2	10	10	47.6	47.6	*****
x = 3	11	21	52.4	100	*****
x > 3	0	21	0	100	
TOTAL	21		100		

In Figure 8, there were only 2 types of responses to question statement #8. Ten participants (47.6%) agree that they should try to speak the student's native language in the classroom. Eleven participants (52.4%) disagree that they as the teacher should try to speak the student's native language in the classroom. In this question there is nearly a 50% split between the responses. There were no responses given the strongly agree or strongly disagree categories. There were also only 21 out of 22 teachers who participated in responding to this question.

Figure 9.

VARIABLE: Q9= *If my ELL student is speaking English on the playground, they should be speaking English in the classroom.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 1	0	0	0	0	
x = 1	2	2	9.5	9.5	*****
x = 2	8	10	38.1	47.6	*****
x = 3	10	20	47.6	95.2	*****
x = 4	1	21	4.8	100	**
x > 4	0	21	0	100	
TOTAL	21		100		

In Figure 9, nearly half of the participants (47.6%) disagree that if ELL students speak English on the playground, they should be able to speak English in the classroom. On the contrary, eight participants (38.1%) agree that ELL students should be able to speak English in the classroom if they are able to speak English on the playground. There were two participants (9.5%) who strongly agreed with the question statement and one participant (4.8%) who strongly disagreed. There was one participant who did not respond.

Figure 10.

VARIABLE: Q10= *When my ELL students don't look at me in the eye, it's a sign of disrespect.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT

x < 3	0	0	0	0	
x = 3	15	15	68.2	68.2	*****
x = 4	7	22	31.8	100	*****
x > 4	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100		

In Figure 10, there were only 2 categories that received responses, either disagree or strongly disagree. There were 68.2% of the participants who disagreed and 31.8% of the participants who strongly disagreed. The results show that all the participants (100%) agree that even when ELL students may not look at a teacher in the eye, it does not necessarily mean they are disrespecting the teacher.

Figure 11.

VARIABLE: Q11= *Acclimating to a new country is a fun and exciting experience for ELL students.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 2	0	0	0	0	
x = 2	2	2	9.1	9.1	***
x = 3	17	19	77.3	86.4	*****
x = 4	3	22	13.6	100	****
x > 4	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100		

In Figure 11, there were two participants (9.1%) who agree that acclimating to a new country is a fun and exciting experience for ELL students. There were 17 participants (77.3%) who disagreed that ELL students have a fun and exciting experience when they arrive in their new country. Only 3 participants (13.6%) strongly disagreed with the question statement #11. The majority of participants (90.9%) disagree that ELL students do not have a fun and exciting experience when having to acclimate to a new country. There were no responses in the strongly agree category.

Figure 12.

VARIABLE: Q12= *In the academic setting, non English speaking students should be fully engaged in classroom activities all day long.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 2	0	0	0	0	
x = 2	9	9	40.9	40.9	*****
x = 3	10	19	45.5	86.4	*****
x = 4	3	22	13.6	100	*****
x > 4	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100		

In Figure 12, there were 9 participants (40.9%) who agree that non-English speaking students should be fully engaged in classroom activities all day long. The majority of participants who disagreed were the 10 participants (45.5%) who felt non-English speaking students do not have to be fully engaged in an academic setting all day long. There were three participants (13.6%) who strongly disagree that non-English speaking students should be fully engaged in classroom activities all day long. In combining the disagree (45.5%) and strongly disagree (13.6%) categories, there is a total of 69.1% of the participants who disagree with the question statement. There were no responses in the strongly agree category.

Figure 13.

VARIABLE: Q13= *Elementary ELL students who have not acquired grade level content knowledge should be retained.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 2	0	0	0	0	
x = 2	1	1	4.8	4.8	**
x = 3	13	14	61.9	66.7	*****
x = 4	7	21	33.3	100	*****
x > 4	0	21	0	100	
TOTAL	21		100		

In Figure 13, there was one participant (4.8%) who agreed that elementary ELL students who have not acquired grade level content knowledge should be retained. The majority of the responses (95.2%) were in both the disagree (61.9%) and strongly disagree (33.3%) categories. Thirteen responses (61.9%) disagree that elementary ELL students should not be retained if they have not acquired grade level content knowledge. There were seven participants (33.3%) who strongly disagree with the question statement. There were no responses in the strongly agree category.

Figure 14.

VARIABLE: Q14= *Classroom teachers do not have time to deal with the needs of the ELL students.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 2	0	0	0	0	
x = 2	3	3	13.6	13.6	*****
x = 3	13	16	59.1	72.7	*****
x = 4	6	22	27.3	100	*****
x > 4	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100		

In Figure 14, there were no responses in the strongly agree category. There were three participants (13.6%) who agree that classroom teachers do not have time to deal with the needs of the ELL students. There are thirteen participants (59.1%) who did not agree that classroom teachers do not have time to deal with the needs of the ELL students. There were six participants (27.3%) who strongly dislike that classroom teachers do not have time to deal with the needs of the ELL students. The majority of the participants (86.4%), in combining the disagree or strongly disagree categories, feel classroom teachers do have time to deal with the needs of the ELL students.

Figure 15.

VARIABLE: Q15= *It is good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ELL students.*

FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT

x < 1	0	0	0	0
x = 1	4	18.2	18.2	*****
x = 2	13	59.1	77.3	*****
x = 3	4	18.2	95.5	*****
x = 4	1	4.5	100	**
x > 4	0	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100	

In Figure 15, there was one participant (4.5%) who strongly agreed that it is good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ELL students. The highest percentage of participants (59.1%) agreed with this statement as well. However, there were four participants (18.2%) who did not agree that this would be a good practice for ELL students. One participant (4.5%) strongly disagreed they should lessen the quantity of coursework for an ELL student. When combining the agree and strongly agree categories, there are over three quarters of the participants (77.3%) who would most likely lessen the quantity of coursework for ELL students. There were equal responses (18.2%) in the strongly agree and disagree categories that included four participants.

Figure 16.

VARIABLE: Q16= *It is good practice to allow ELL students more time to complete assignments.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 1	0	0	0	0	
x = 1	5	5	22.7	22.7	*****
x = 2	16	21	72.7	95.5	*****
x = 3	1	22	4.5	100	**
x > 3	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100		

In Figure 16, the majority of participants (95.4%) responded in the strongly agree and agree categories combined. There were 5 participants (22.7%) who strongly agree that it is a good practice to allow ELL students more time to complete assignments. In addition, there were a higher percentage of participants (72.7%) who agreed that ELL students should have more time to complete assignments. Conversely, there was one participant (4.5%) who disagreed that allowing more time to complete assignments with ELL students is not a good practice. There were no responses in the strongly disagree category.

Figure 17.

VARIABLE: Q17= *The modification of coursework for ELL students would be difficult to justify to other students.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 2	0	0	0	0	
x = 2	1	1	4.5	4.5	*
x = 3	18	19	81.8	86.4	*****
x = 4	3	22	13.6	100	****
x > 4	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100		

In Figure 17, the majority of participants (81.8%) disagree that modifying coursework for ELL students would be difficult to justify to other students. Three participants (13.6%) strongly disagree that it would be difficult to modify coursework for ELL students and justify it to other students. In combining the categories that disagree and strongly disagree, 95.4% of the participants feel that it would not be difficult to justify any modification of coursework for ELL students with other students in the classroom. There was one participant (4.5%) who agreed that it would be difficult to modify coursework for ELL students and justify it to other students.

There was no response in the strongly agree category.

Figure 18.

VARIABLE: Q18= *Providing materials in the student's native language is helpful to their learning.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 1	0	0	0	0	
x = 1	1	1	4.8	4.8	*
x = 2	17	18	81	85.7	*****
x = 3	3	21	14.3	100	****
x > 3	0	21	0	100	
TOTAL	21		100		

In Figure 18, seventeen teachers (81%) agree that providing materials in the student's native language is helpful to their learning. However, three of the teachers (14.3%) disagree that providing materials in the student's native language is helpful to their learning. Only one participant (4.5%) strongly agrees with the question statement. The majority of teachers (85.8%) strongly agree or agree that helping an ELL student would be to provide material in their native language. There was one participant who did not respond to this particular question.

Figure 19.

VARIABLE: Q19= *Effort is more important to me than achievement when I grade ELL students.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 1	0	0	0	0	
x = 1	4	4	18.2	18.2	*****
x = 2	14	18	63.6	81.8	*****
x = 3	4	22	18.2	100	*****
x > 3	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100		

In Figure 19, there are two categories that received the same results. Four participants (18.2%) strongly agree that effort is more important to them than achievement when grading ELL students and four participants (18.2%) disagree with this statement. However, the majority of participants (63.6%) agree that when it comes to grading, they observe the ELL student's effort in class rather than their achievement. There is a total of 81.8% of the 22 participants who strongly agree and agree that effort is more important than achievement when it comes to grading an ELL student. There were no responses in the strong disagree category.

Figure 20.

VARIABLE: Q20= *Parents of ELL students should try to only speak English to their children (even if their own proficiency is lacking).*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 2	0	0	0	0	
x = 2	4	4	18.2	18.2	*****
x = 3	13	17	59.1	77.3	*****
x = 4	5	22	22.7	100	*****
x > 4	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100		

In Figure 20, thirteen participants (59.1%) disagree and five participants (18.2%) strongly disagree that parents of ELL students should try to speak English to their children even if their own proficiency is lacking. There were four participants (18.2%) who agreed that parents of ELL students should try to only speak English to their children. Over three quarters of the participants (81.8%) do not believe that parents of ELL students should try to communicate to their children in English when their proficiency is lacking.

Figure 21.

VARIABLE: Q21= *Communicating with ELL parents in their native language about their child's academic progress is important.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT

x < 1	0	0	0	0	
x = 1	9	9	40.9	40.9	*****
x = 2	12	21	54.5	95.5	*****
x = 3	1	22	4.5	100	**
x > 3	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22			100	

In Figure 21, nine participants (40.9%) strongly agreed and twelve participants (54.5%) agreed that discussing the progress of an ELL student with their parents in their native language is important. The majority of responses (95.4%), when combining the strongly agree or agree categories, show that communicating with ELL parents in their native language about their child's academic progress is important. There was one participant (4.5%) who disagreed with the question statement.

Figure 22.

VARIABLE: Q22= *I would support legislation making English the official language of the United States.*

	FRQ.	CUM.	%	CUM.	FREQUENCY PLOT
x < 1	0	0	0	0	
x = 1	6	6	27.3	27.3	*****
x = 2	8	14	36.4	63.6	*****
x = 3	8	22	36.4	100	*****
x > 3	0	22	0	100	
TOTAL	22		100		

In Figure 22, there were two categories that had the same number of responses. Eight participants (36.4%) agree with legislation that would make English the official language of the United States. On the contrary, another eight participants (36.4%) disagree with any legislation that would make English the official language of the United States. There are six participants (27.3%) who strongly agree as well that having an official language of English would be supported by them. There is a stronger majority (63.7%) in agreement to this question statement.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The null hypothesis tested in this study is that there is not a significant difference between attitudes and beliefs before and after a one day SIOP workshop. The results of this study indicate that there were areas of significant difference between opinions from general educators taken before and after the SIOP workshop. There were 9 out of 22 questions that did reject the null which equaled 41%. On the contrary, there were 13 questions out of 22 that were not rejected which came to 59%. The questions that were not rejected were numbers: 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, and 22. The questions that were rejected were numbers: 1, 3, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 18, and 20. Discussion about why the rejections carry significant outcomes that need further clarification will follow. Furthermore, not all questions will be addressed.

Research question one reads, "Is there a significant difference between general education teachers' attitudes and beliefs before and after attending a workshop about English Language Learners?" In nine of twenty-two questions, there was a significant difference of opinion in teachers' attitudes. Teachers agreed that ELL students should acquire English within 2 years of enrolling into US schools before the workshop then disagreed after the workshop. Over half of the participants indicated they did not have at least 5 strategies to use in their classrooms with any ELL student. However, after the workshop all the participants agreed that they acquired at least 5 useful strategies.

Before the workshop, teachers' opinion on whether newly arrived non-English speaking students should be trying to speak English immediately was nearly split in half with the majority in favor of it. Afterwards, nearly all the participants disagreed with this statement. Surprisingly, nine out of the eleven teachers disagreed that ELL students should avoid using their native language at school. Then after the workshop that number rose to then. Additionally, in the pre

survey, not all teachers agreed to provide materials in the student's native language but in the post survey, all participants agreed that was necessary.

The majority of teachers except two disagreed in the pre survey in regards to acclimating to a new country being a fun and exciting experience for ELL students. After the workshop, all participants disagreed with this statement.

In the pre survey, over half of the teachers agreed that non English speaking students should be fully engaged in the classroom all day long. Conversely, in the post survey, the majority disagreed with this statement.

In regards to retention of ELLs, the majority of teachers disagreed with this statement initially but in the post survey, all participants disagreed. Just because an ELL student has not acquired grade level content knowledge, they should not be retained.

In regards to the question about parents trying to speak only English to their children, the teachers' opinions were split initially in the pre survey. In the post survey, all participants disagreed. It is important for parents to keep the native language strong in the home.

Research question two reads; "What are teacher perceptions of the second language acquisition process?" To respond appropriately to this question, the researcher divided all the questions into three groups. The first group of opinions contained responses that did not have a majority in the agreement or disagreement categories. There were three questions that did not show whether teachers fully understood the SLA process. These were whether ELL students should acquire English within two years of enrolling, whether teachers should speak the student's native language, and if students are speaking English on the playground, teachers feel

they should be speaking in the classroom as well. These areas warrant further study to understand why there was such a discrepancy and not solid understanding on these topics.

Another group contained teachers' perceptions that were in disagreement with the question asked. There were eight out of 22 responses in this group. These were positive results. Questions included disagreements in separating newly arrived non-English speaking ELLs out of the regular classroom for more than a year, avoiding the use of the student's native language in the classroom, making sure ELLs are fully engaged the entire day and retention of ELLs. Other statements included parents speaking English to their children, modification of coursework would be too difficult, and not having the time to deal with the needs of ELL students. Teachers also disagreed as a whole with a cultural statement about eye contact of ELLs being disrespectful.

There was a question in regards to a student learning a second language being similar to how they learn their native language. This is a true statement but the teachers' opinion indicated the opposite.

Finally the third group of opinions indicated positive responses to entirely different set of eight questions. Teachers agreed with the following statements which favored positive results; knowing 5 strategies to use with ELLs, building solid connections with ELLs on the first day of arrival, and lessening the quantity of coursework. Teachers also agreed that effort is more important than achievement when grading ELLs. They would also support more time for ELLs to complete assignments and provide materials in their native language. Teachers also indicated agreement in the importance of community with parents in their native language about their

child's academic progress. Ironically, the majority of teachers agreed to support legislation where English would officially be language of the United States.

There were two questions that should have had a majority of disagreement with the teachers' opinions. Acclimating to a new country is a fun and exciting experience for ELLs is not true for most. And when they arrive, most of the time, they will not be speaking English immediately as well. These opinions warrant further study to understand why regular education teachers felt inclined to respond in agreement with the above statements.

In further explaining the need to separate each question into three groups, the researcher is able to indicate that 16 out of the 22 questions prove that nearly $\frac{3}{4}$ (73%) of the content from the questions were attained by the regular education teachers. This is a significant gain from where the teachers were before the workshop. In the demographics page, it was indicated that only 2 participants (18%) had had any previous ELL training.

At the very end of the survey, there were two short answer questions asked of each participant. This first one was asked to be filled out prior to the workshop; "What strategy do you use in the classroom that you think would be helpful to a newly arrived ELL student?" The responses were varied such as; building strong relationships, making sure items are in both languages, making sure the student had a buddy that spoke their native language and labeling the classroom. Additional comments included using the computer program called Rosetta Stone, translating, using cognates, and making picture cards to help with vocabulary and meaning. It needs to be noted that not every participant wrote a response to this question.

The second question was asked to be answered after the workshop; "What strategy or strategies did you learn about today that you would like to use this coming school year?" Every

participant responded with at least two to three specific strategies they took away from the workshop. Those responses included; whole brain and power teaching, speaking slowly to the new student and not louder, using gestures and diagrams, emphasizing new concepts as a whole then breaking down the meaning, teaching content vocabulary before it's actually introduced to the whole class, labeling the classroom, doing fun things first then diving into the core lesson, and finally, using sentence retelling of what is read or learned. Several of these strategies were repeatedly stated among the participants.

These questions were not part of any analysis but the researcher felt this information does convey that the importance of attending at least a one day workshop for those regular education teachers is indeed worthwhile. From the responses given, this workshop provided more specific guidelines on how to teach ELL students no matter their proficiency level.

First and foremost, having a larger group to evaluate would be an ideal situation for further research. Eleven participants for this particular study was minimal but there was positive feedback shared that could possibly be used for future comparisons.

It seems to be profoundly clear, IPS district would most benefit from providing more professional development in the area of second language acquisition. Teachers' opinions of ELL students, in a handful of cases in this particular study, drastically reversed in a positive direction. Currently, IPS has had only one SIOP class which was the basis for this research paper. To be the most influential with our ELL population, we also need to make a stronger connection with their community. In fact, possibly providing a continual basic Spanish educator's course on how to communicate with a non-English speaking student would be vital to our growing population. Positive communication with families creates a stronger community.

Dalhouse, Sanders, and Walker-Dalhouse (2009) stated that if teachers are to be successful in the teaching minority students, they must first change their attitudes toward the students, their languages and cultures and the community of these students...attitudinal changes are potentially more important than knowledge of SLA and other dispositions toward the use of culturally relevant curricula and teaching practices” (p.338) In fact, Dalhouse, Sanders, and Walker-Dalhouse (2009) suggests the more personal experiences regular teachers can integrate into their curriculum, the more comfortable they will be with diverse learners and their knowledge about diversity which is more effective than ESL coursework alone (p.346).

For the majority of regular education teachers to gather and retain the most culturally sensitive SLA information is to provide several shorter, sequential professional development sessions at each school. O’Neal, Ringler, and Rodriguez (2008) emphasized that “a one shot approach to professional development does not work” (p.11). Professional development sessions should focus on role-play, discussion, multiple-intelligence styles to use in the classroom. Educators are similar to the students they teach. Repetition of comprehensible input creates stronger neurons in the brain which allows the skills to be practical and become more fluid (J. Guzman, personal communications, October, 19, 2009).

Institutions of higher education should prepare our future educators adequately. Because the issue of linguistically and culturally diversity has continued to increase “at 60.76% nationally in a decade, higher institutions need to raise their bar to meet this issue head on and be proactive with our future educators which turn benefit our future leaders...our children” (O’Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez, p.5)

REFERENCES

- Ashworth, M. (1992). *The First Step on the Longer Path: Becoming an ESL Teacher*. Scarborough, Ontario: Pippin Publishing Corporation.
- Bagby, J., Rudd, L., & Woods, M. (2005). The effects of socioeconomic diversity on the language, cognitive and social-emotional development of children from low-income backgrounds. *Early Child Development and Care*, 175(5), 395-405.
- Batt, E.G. (2008). Teacher's Perceptions of ELL Education: Potential solutions to overcome the greatest challenges. *Multicultural Education*, 15(3), 39-43.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chang, M. (2008). Teacher Instructional Practices and Language Minority Students: A longitudinal Model. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 102, 2, 83-97.
- Collier, V. P. (1995). Acquiring a Second Language for School. *Directions in Language and Education*, 1(4), 2-14.
- Cummins, J. (1999). *Accelerating Second Language and Literacy Development*. Torrance, CA: Staff Development Resources.
- Dalhouse, A. D., Sanders, V., & Walker-Dalhouse, D. (2009). A University and Middle-School Partnership: Preservice teacher's attitudes toward ELL students. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 48(4), 337-349.

- Drame, E. & Xu, Y. (2008). Culturally Appropriate Context: Unlocking the potential of Response to Intervention for English Language Learners. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35, 305-311.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- English-Language Learners. (2011). Retrieved April 1, 2012, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/english-language-learners/>
- Espinosa, L. (2005). Curriculum and Assessment Considerations for Young Children from Culturally, Linguistically, and Economically Diverse Backgrounds. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42(8), 837-853.
- Hellman, Andrea. Presenter: *Connecting Theory, Empirical Research and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*, MELL conference, 2009.
- Gabrielse, K. P. (2011). Student Generated PowerPoints. Retrieved April 8, 2012, from [http://waylandhighschoolchemistry.wikispaces.com/file/view/Karen_week-5\[1\].docx](http://waylandhighschoolchemistry.wikispaces.com/file/view/Karen_week-5[1].docx).
- Guzman, J. (2012). The Top 5 Things You Can Do For Your English Language Learners and Their Teachers. Retrieved on April 8, 2012, from <http://www.nhie.net/workshops/top5.aspx>.
- Jarrett, A. (2012, Spring). Missouri applies for No Child Left Behind waiver. *Missouri National Education Association*, 18.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) PK-12 Statewide Census Results. (2012). Retrieved on April 4, 2012, from <http://dese.mo.gov/qs/me/LEPCensus.htm>.

O'Neal, D.D., Ringler, M., & Rodriguez, D. (2008). Teacher's Perceptions of their Preparations for Teaching Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Learners in Rural Eastern North Carolina. *Rural Educator*, 30(1), 5-13.

Rasmussen, K. (2000). Give me Shelter: Reading and Limited English Proficiency learners. (No data of journal source on the page given—found in my file), 1-2.

Reeves, J.R. (2006). Secondary Teacher Attitudes Toward Including English-Language Learners in Mainstream Classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research*, 99(3), 131-142.

Reeves, S. & Stanford, B.P. (2009). Making It Happen: Using differentiated instruction, retrofit framework, and universal design for learning. *Teaching Exceptional Children Plus*, 5(6), 1-8.

Title III Accountability. (2011). Retrieved April 1, 2012, from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/accountability/>.

A Teacher Survey of English Language Learners

Please answer the following questions. Your answers will assist in the categorization of the response. Thank you for taking the time to answer all questions!

1. In what building do you teach? _____
2. How many ELL students were in your classroom during the 2010-2011 school year? _____
3. Please indicate your gender. Male Female
4. Please mark the highest level of education you have received.
 Bachelor's Master's Doctorate
5. How long have you been teaching (even if you have changed school districts)?
 1-5 years 6-10 years 11-15 years 16-20 years 21+ years
6. Please indicate what grade level you teach currently.
 Primary K-2 Intermediate 3-5 Middle School High School

Please check **Yes** or **No** for the following questions.

- | | Yes | No |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Is English your native language? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Do you speak a second language? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. If yes, please indicate your ability in that language. | | <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Beginner <input type="checkbox"/> Intermediate | | |
| If no, would you like to learn a second language? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Have you received other training in teaching ELL students before today? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If yes, please state whether it was an inservice training or college coursework, etc. | | |

If no, would be interested in attending more PD's on how to best teach ELL students in your classroom?

5. Please write what you feel you want to gain from this workshop.
-
-

A Teacher Survey of English Language Learners

Please respond to the following statements with a check (or an X) in the box that demonstrates your true opinion.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. ELL students should acquire English within 2 years of enrolling into US schools.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Newly arrived ELL students should be taught in a separate classroom and not in the regular classroom until they progress out of the entering stage of the WIDA proficiency levels.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. I know of at least 5 strategies to use in my classroom with any ELL student no matter their proficiency level.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. A student learns a second language the same way he/she learns in their native language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Newly arrived non English speaking students should be trying to speak English immediately.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Building a solid connection with your newly arrived ELL students from their first day in your class is critical for successful learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. ELL students should avoid using their native language at school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. I should try to speak the student's native language in the classroom.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. If my ELL student is speaking English on the playground, they should be speaking English in the classroom.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. When my ELL students don't look me in the eye, it's a sign of disrespect.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Acclimating to a new country is a fun and exciting experience for ELL students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. In the academic setting, non English speaking students should be fully engaged in classroom activities all day long.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 13. Elementary ELL students who have not acquired grade level content knowledge should be retained. | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14. Classroom teachers do not have time to deal with the needs of ELL students. | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> |
| 15. It is good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ELL students. | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> |
| 16. It is good practice to allow ELL students more time to complete assignments. | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> |
| 17. The modification of coursework for ELL students would be difficult to justify to other students. | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> |
| 18. Providing materials in the student's native language is helpful to their learning. | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. Effort is more important to me than achievement when I grade ELL students. | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> |
| 20. Parents of ELL students should try to only speak English to their children (even if their own proficiency is lacking.) | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21. Communicating with ELL parents in their native language about their child's academic progress is important. | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> |
| 22. I would support legislation making English the official language of the United States. | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> |
| 23. Answer this question before the workshop—What strategy do you already use in the classroom that you think would be helpful for a newly arrived ELL student? | | | | |

24. Answer this question after the workshop—What strategy or strategies did you learn about today that you would like to use this coming school year?

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this survey!!