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ABSTRACT

KEISHA NICHOLE BATTLE
SELF-EFFICACY OF TEACHERS OF REFUGEE ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS: A MIXED METHODS STUDY
Under the direction of ISMAIL S. GYAGENDA, PHD.

An increase in immigrant population has changed the demographics of the traditional classroom. With this change in demographics, teachers must be prepared to teach a more diverse student population which includes refugee English language learners. The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived level of self-efficacy of teachers of refugee English language learners. Years of ESOL teaching experience, ESOL endorsement status, and assigned instructional setting were examined for impact on the perceived level of self-efficacy. In addition, the experiences of teachers of refugee English language learners were explored.

This was a mixed methods study in which both quantitative and qualitative data were collected. The quantitative phase consisted of participants responding to the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale. The qualitative phase consisted of participant interviews to gain insight into their unique experiences and challenges. Data analysis involved statistical procedures, coding, and derivation of themes.

It was discovered that participants perceived moderate to high efficacy levels. There was no statistically significant relationship between the years of ESOL teaching experience and the perceived level of self-efficacy for student engagement and classroom management. However, there was a statistically significant relationship between the years of ESOL teaching experience and the perceived level of self-efficacy in instructional strategies. There was not a statistically significant difference between ESOL endorsed
and non-endorsed teachers and the perceived level of self-efficacy. Furthermore, there was not a statistically significant difference in the perceived level of self-efficacy and the assigned level of instruction (elementary, middle, or high). An analysis of interview data revealed commonalities between participants. The results from this study contributed to the nearly nonexistent research on self-efficacy and teachers of refugee English language learners.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

There has been an increase of immigrants moving to the United States (Harper & de Jong, 2004; McIntyre, Kyle, Chen, Munoz, & Beldon, 2010; Scanlan, 2011). Over time immigrants have entered the U.S. for varying reasons. According to the Migration Policy Institute (2013), the number of immigrants increased from more than nine million in 1960 to over 40 million in 2011. Legislation and changes in foreign policy have impacted the number of immigrants entering the country during this time. Many immigrants have been allowed to enter our country as refugees due to war and political conflicts. There was a significant increase of immigrants and refugees following both the Korean and Vietnam wars (Ovando, 2003). Then, as a result of the Refugee Act of 1980, more refugees were allowed for resettlement purposes. The United States continues to accept thousands of immigrants each year (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012).

An increase in the number of immigrants has educational implications. Harper and de Jong (2004) stated that the increase in this subgroup results in a large presence of English language learners (ELLs) in classrooms. As the demographics of classrooms change, teachers must be prepared to teach students who come from diverse backgrounds. McIntyre et al. (2010) contributed the increase to the number of “new immigrants from non-English speaking lands” and U.S. born students of
"language minority parents" (p. 334). Many of these students grow up hearing and speaking another language other than English at home. The number of bilingual students has risen from one in 10 students in the late 1970s to one in five students today (Scanlan, 2011). They are often taught in a general education classroom with a content teacher with limited preparation to work with these students (López, Scanlan, & Gundrum, 2013). The English language learner enters the classroom with a myriad of demands and pressures that may affect him/her cognitively, emotionally, and psychologically (Taylor, 2004). Teachers are required to implement effective instructional strategies that allow ELLs to acquire language skills as well as content knowledge. An increase in this diverse student population results in a challenge of adequately preparing teachers with the necessary skills to effectively teach and deliver instruction.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived level of self-efficacy of teachers of English language learners. More specifically, this study will focus on English language learners in a refugee population. This chapter will describe the background, theoretical framework, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, limitations and assumptions, methodology, and definition of terms.

Background

A culturally and linguistically diverse population exists in public schools today (López, et al., 2013; Prosser, 2009). As classrooms are comprised of students from other countries, more students arrive with limited or no ability to speak English. Approximately 20 percent of today's students speak a primary language other than English at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). This means that more than four million students are classified as
English Language Learners (United States Department of Education, 2012b). Filindra, Blanding, and Coll (2011) projected that more than 50 percent of America's youth will be composed of immigrant children by 2040.

The increasing population of ELL students has affected all regions of the United States. The state of Georgia is not excluded from this population increase. According to the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Educational Programs (2010), Georgia experienced a 291% growth of ELLs over a ten-year period from 1995 to 2005. As a result, more teachers are faced with the challenge of providing instruction to students in a general education classroom without any language support (Cho & Reich, 2008).

Teachers of students with limited English proficiency have expressed frustrations about not being fully prepared to deliver effective instruction to meet their needs (Cosentino de Cohen & Chu Clewell, 2007). Many of them are general education content teachers that specialize in a specific academic discipline and are not equipped with the skills to teach language acquisition. They are not trained to understand and teach the basics of language development and second-language learning skills (Fillmore-Wong & Snow, 2000).

In addition, there is a lack of training in this area in most pre-service teacher preparation programs (Watson, Miller, Driver, Rutledge, & McAllister, 2005). These programs vary from state to state due to a lack of uniformity in ESOL teacher licensure programs (Thibeault, Kuhlman, & Day, 2010). According to Ballantyne, Sanderman, and Levy (2008), only 4 states – Arizona, California, Florida, and New York, have specific
coursework related to the special needs of ELLs as a requirement for all teacher certifications. Approximately 32 states had a requirement for teacher certification that included a reference to ELLs. Also, there were 15 states with no specific requirements for all teachers to have any training or preparation to work with ELLs. In recent years, there has been a shift to design more teacher preparation programs that align with national standards. The *TESOL/NCATE Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs* are nationally recognized performance-based standards that are used to assess teacher licensure programs for ESOL teachers (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 2010). A requirement for all teachers to be trained to work with ELLs is critical because so many of these students are being taught in mainstream classrooms.

The ill-preparedness of teachers leads to problems with fulfilling federal and state mandates. Specific provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB, 2002) hold schools accountable for increasing the English proficiency and academic content knowledge of ELL students. School systems must ensure that instructional programs are implemented and utilized to help ELLs to meet these specific goals. English language learners are required to perform academically as any other student in public schools. They are expected to meet or exceed specified standards of mastery on high-stakes standardized tests. In addition, school systems must assess ELLs on an annual basis to determine if they are improving their English proficiency. This is one of the requirements for receiving federal funds for instruction of this unique population of students.
The evolution of classrooms that include more non-native speakers of English students compels educators to find better ways to provide effective instruction. Immigration, federal and state mandates, ill-preparedness of teachers, and lack of training all contributes to the academic success or failure of limited English proficient students. Taylor (2004) stated that immigrant children “are at a higher risk of failing academically than non-immigrants” (p. 43).

Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in Bandura’s self-efficacy theory (1977) which states that the perception of one’s ability affects one’s thoughts, feelings, motivation, and actions. He defined self-efficacy as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of actions required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). This is stemmed from people’s desire to control the events that may positively and/or negatively affect their lives. Bandura (1997) believed that people have wanted to have control over these events since primitive times. During primitive times, people relied on supernatural power to describe outcomes. These beliefs continued until the period of enlightenment, in which there was a shift in thinking. People began to rely more upon human power to attribute a causal relationship between thinking, actions, and outcomes.

Bandura (1997) explained the difference between self-efficacy and self-esteem. This distinction is critical because oftentimes the two terms are used interchangeably. Self-efficacy deals with personal capability, whereas self-esteem involves perception of self-worth. A person can have low self-efficacy regarding a particular task and it would have no impact on his/her self-esteem and feeling of self-worth. On the other hand, a
person can be highly efficacious in an activity, but have very low self-esteem at the same time. Although self-efficacy is different from self-esteem, people tend to engage in activities that may enhance their self-efficacy and provide greater feelings of self-worth. Bandura (1997) offered an explanation for this phenomenon. He believed that people need more than just high self-esteem to perform well and be successful. Instead, people need "confidence in their efficacy to sustain the effort required to succeed" (p. 11).

Bandura (1997) identified four primary sources of efficacy development – enactive mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion and social influences, and physiological and affective states. Mastery experiences are those from which one is able to master a skill or task successfully. Vicarious experiences are those learned by observing others as models. Verbal persuasion and social influence involves the influence of one person persuading another person to perform. Physiological and affective states include exhaustion, stress, and anxiety. How efficacy is developed is important because once it is formed, it is difficult to change.

Mastery experiences are the most influential because they can provide the most authentic evidence of the sustainability of the effort it takes to succeed (Bandura, 1997). Successful outcomes have a direct relationship with high self-efficacy. Conversely, failure can be detrimental to one's self-efficacy. People tend to persevere through tasks in which they have already experienced success. The previous successful experience provides fuel to continue and try the same task again, even if it is more difficult than before.
Vicarious experiences provide another source for developing self-efficacy. These experiences are those which are derived from comparing oneself to other’s accomplishments/successes. The ability to rate oneself as proficient or ineffective is directly related to judging one’s performance of others in the same activity and/or task (Bandura, 1997). High self-efficacy is developed through this source by performing higher than the perceived norm. This means that if a person performs a task better or receives a higher score than someone else who was labeled successful, he/she feels more confident in their own ability to perform the task. Bandura (1997) referred to this as self-modeling. Self-modeling is only effective when the person is comparing his/herself to another person with very similar capabilities. For example, a novice runner would not compare his/her running speed with those of an Olympic athlete. This may result in low self-efficacy because the novice runner may not be able to run as fast as or faster than the Olympic athlete.

Verbal and social persuasion involves the effect of others’ belief in one’s capability to succeed (Bandura, 1997). The power of someone’s encouraging words can result in one’s performance level. Knowing that someone has a grounded belief in one’s success pushes them to work harder to succeed. Bandura (1997) explained that building efficacy in this way is only successful in increasing the amount of effort given towards a certain task. It is not directly related to the feeling of efficacy. Basically, a person will exert more effort because of others’ perception of a successful outcome. The person’s self-evaluation of efficacy may still be low regardless of the amount of effort to complete the task.
Lastly, one's physiological and affective states can shape his/her efficacy. Both of these things are directly related to stress. According to Bandura (1997), people tend to perform better when their stress levels are low. Stress and anxiety can negatively affect performance which also affects one's sense of efficacy. Building self-efficacy through this source requires the person to be reflective so he/she can monitor and regulate physiological and emotional states.

The development of self-efficacy can be directly related to teacher self-efficacy. A teacher can have a mastery experience when he/she has success in teaching students. A teacher can have a vicarious experience by learning from a mentor or colleague through peer observations. Social persuasion can be exhibited through a supportive classroom environment that encourages praise and outstanding student achievement. If a teacher experiences the stress and anxiety associated with the physiological and emotional state, this can negatively impact his/her perception as well as his/her teaching performance. Although a teacher may experience all of these levels of efficacy development, Bandura (1997) believed that mastery experiences are the most influential.

Bandura (1995) believed that teacher behavior can be predicted from beliefs rather than the consequences of their actions. This idea about the potential effect of teacher beliefs on teachers' instructional practices can positively or negatively affect the learning of diverse learners such as the English language learner subgroup. Mulder, Tyler, and Conner (2008) suggested that teacher efficacy should be increased when working with this particular subgroup of learners.
Statement of the Problem

Many classroom teachers feel unprepared to work with students who speak limited or no English, especially when there is an increased accountability for achievement results among this subgroup (Chen, Kyle, & McIntyre, 2008). The population of ELLs continues to grow and is majorly impacted by federal and state legislation. As a result, ELLs are being mainstreamed into general education classroom. Sometimes, these teachers have no formal training in ELL instructional strategies. The lack of training leads to efficacy issues when instructing ELLs. Despite not being formally trained, teachers are still expected to meet standards that are set by the state for accountability purposes under the NCLB Act. This situation demands that more research should be done in this area to see how teachers perceive their preparedness to meet the diverse needs of their students and provide effective instruction. Refugee English language learners adds a more complex component to teacher efficacy as the United States receives more than 50% of the world refugees each year (Nykiel-Herbert, 2010).

As classrooms are inundated with an increasing unique subgroup of students, there should be a greater emphasis on teacher preparation. Teachers are the single most contributing factor to student success and achievement results (Ashton & Webb, 1986). With this in mind, teachers’ perceived self-efficacy directly affects instructional practices and student success. According to Ross and Gray (2006), highly efficacious teachers work harder and possess the best teaching practices. There have been several research studies on perceived teacher self-efficacy, including teachers of English language learners. However, studies of teacher self efficacy when working with refugee students
are nearly nonexistent. An intensive look into the perceived self-efficacy of teachers of refugee English learners will fill a significant gap in the body of educational literature.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the self-efficacy of teachers of ELs in a highly concentrated refugee resettlement area. The researcher investigated to see if there was a correlation between the number of years of teaching experience, ESOL certification status, and perceived level of self-efficacy. In addition, the researcher explored to discover the unique characteristics and challenges of working with refugee ELs. This study used a widely-used self-efficacy instrument the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) to collect data about the participants.

Significance of the Study

This study was significant because of the increase in the number of refugee students entering the United States each year (Nykiel-Herbert, 2010). Many of these students are being mainstreamed into general education classrooms. There is a lack of ESOL teacher preparation programs (Karabenick & Clemens Noda, 2004; Thibeault et al., 2010). ESOL certification may be achieved through multiple routes depending on the state. Therefore, instructional practices vary from teacher to teacher. This study sought to find the role of self-efficacy and its impact on instructional practices. Furthermore, this study closely examined the teachers of a unique sect of English language learners who are also non-native English speaking refugees. This study focused on this subgroup because these students enter the classroom with variety of educational experiences as
well as other social, emotional, and psychological needs. This multitude of needs brings a
different dynamic to the classroom that affects instructional practices and teachers’ self-
efficacy.

Research Questions
This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the perceived levels of teacher self-efficacy as measured by the
   TSES for teachers of refugee English language learners?
   a) Is there a relationship between the number of years of teaching
      experience with ELLs and the perceived level of teacher efficacy?
   b) Is there a statistically significant difference (at $p < 0.05$) in the
      perceived self-efficacy of the teachers who are ESOL endorsed and
      those who are not?
   c) Is there a statistically significant difference (at $p < 0.05$) in the
      perceived self-efficacy of the teachers based on the level (elementary,
      middle, or high) of school?

2. How do teachers of refugee English language learners describe their
   experiences and challenges of working with this population?

Limitations, Assumptions, and Design Controls
This study was done from the social constructivist worldview. According to
Creswell (2009), the social constructivist worldview is one in which the researcher’s
intent is to make sense out of the meaning that others have about their world. This study
examines how teachers’ instructional practices are affected by their personal beliefs. As
the meanings are being constructed, interpretations will be shaped by the researcher's own experiences and background.

This study had several limitations. The study was conducted in a large, urban school district located in the southeastern region of the United States. The results from this study may not be applicable to other schools with similar demographics. Due to the nature of the study, the results may not be generalizable. The participants in this study were only selected from schools that are identified by the school district as having a large refugee EL population. The results of this study were dependent upon respondent feedback and the rate of return of the TSES (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

Research Design Overview

The most appropriate research design for this study was a mixed methods design. According to Creswell and Clark (2011), a mixed methods design should be utilized when the researcher plans to use qualitative measures to explain quantitative results. This study used qualitative methods to explain the results from the TSES scale when making interpretations of the data to explain teachers' instructional practices and their relationship with pre-existing teacher beliefs. The qualitative method involves research in a natural setting and uses multiple sources of data (Creswell, 2009). The researcher's role is to make meaning out of the participants' experience with a particular issue with a theoretical lens. As a result, the researcher makes an interpretation of the data gathered, organizes it, and sees where it fits in a larger picture.

Qualitative research is appropriate when a problem or issue needs further explanation (Maxwell, 2005). The purpose of this study was to investigate how self-
efficacy impacts instructional practices of teachers of refugees. Exploration of this issue requires emerging analysis as data were collected.

Creswell (2007) offers five approaches to qualitative inquiry. The best approach suited for this research study is the case study approach. His definition of a case study is one in which “the investigator explores a bounded system or multiple bounded systems over time through detailed in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information and reports a case description and case-based themes” (p. 73).

This study was bounded in that the population is teachers of a refugee student population in one large, urban school district. This setting was chosen because it will answer the research question of self-efficacy and its impact on instructional practices.

Data were collected using results of the survey, interviews, documents, and other artifacts. Interviews were conducted with a random selection of participants. The format was structured and open-ended. Interviews were audio-taped and transcribed for analysis. The data collected from participants’ interviews were coded into various themes. Member-checking was performed to provide evidence for the emerged themes.

Potential documents and artifacts used in this study included the common core curriculum standards, World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA; 2012) standards, and teacher lesson plans. An in-depth look at these items provided a more comprehensive understanding of lesson preparation and instructional practices. Moreover, this provided insight as to how teachers provide language support as they teach grade level content standards.
Definition of Key Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following terms were used:

**ACCESS for ELLs**: a standards-based, criterion referenced English language proficiency test designed to measure ELLs social and academic proficiency in English across four language domains – Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing (World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment, 2012)

**Acculturation**: the change in an individual or a culturally similar group that results from contact with a different culture (McBrien, 2005).

**English learner (EL)/English language learner (ELL)**: students who are in the process of acquiring English and have a first language other than English (Goldenberg, 2008). These two terms will be used interchangeably throughout this paper. There has been a shift in ELL to EL in federal policy and mandates. However, the majority of the literature uses ELL when describing students who have a first language other than English.

**English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)**: used to describe the class and/or program that teaches English learners the English language (Cruz, Nutta, O’Brien, Feyten, & Govoni, 2003)

**Fully-endorsed ESOL teacher**: a teacher who has completed the required classes for ESOL endorsement in the state of Georgia through college coursework or professional development; used to recognize additional expertise and must accompany a base teaching certificate with a designated grade level and content area (Georgia Professional Standards Commission, 2010)
Mainstreaming: placement of ELL students into regular classrooms (with native speakers of English) for content courses (Cruz et al., 2003)

Refugee: someone who has been forced to flee his or her own country and cannot return due to persecution, war, or violence for reasons of race, religion, nationality, political associations or ethnic group membership (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2013)

Sheltered Instruction: instructional methods focused on meeting the academic needs of second language learners. There is a heavy focus on language support as well as academic content. (Hansen-Thomas, 2008).

Teacher Self-Efficacy: A teacher’s belief that he or she can influence and aid students in successfully accomplishing specific instructional tasks that will affect student performance (Paneque & Barbetta, 2006).


World-Class Instructional Design & Assessment (WIDA) standards: guiding principles of academic instruction of English language learners (WIDA, 2012)
Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the problem of teacher self-efficacy and its potential effect on instructional practices of teachers of ELLs. It addressed the implications of this situation as it relates to immigration rates, state legislation, and federal mandates. It presented a conceptual framework based on Bandura’s theory of self-efficacy. The chapter also provided the research questions that guided the study, as well as, a brief description of the research design. It ended with a definition of terms.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of the literature review was to synthesize available research on specific issues related to the instruction of English language learners (ELLs), in order to discover what factors directly and indirectly affect the instructional practices for these students. These issues ranged from the placement of ELLs in the general content classroom to professional development of teachers of ELLs. A significant portion of this literature review offered a historical background on education and language policy of immigrant and refugee children; researching the history demonstrates the journey of ELs in the U.S. educational system. The review of the literature encompassed articles related to immigration trends, federal and/or state implications of ELLs in the general classroom, research-based instructional strategies for ELLs, as well as, certification routes and professional development of teachers of ELLs.

The search process for this literature review entailed a detailed search of education databases through Mercer University’s Monroe F. Swilley, Jr. Library in specific databases such as the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) and ProQuest. I used the following key terms in the databases: English language learners, English as a second language, immigrant children, language acquisition, second language learning, bilingual education, socio-constructivist theory, immigration trends, Bandura, teacher self-efficacy, implications of English learners AND federal OR Georgia, elementary
school AND English learners, instructional models for ELLs, sheltered instruction, dual language programs, certification of teachers of ELLs, professional development of teachers of English learners, refugee children AND school. I used the following search criteria for articles included in this literature review:

1. Articles written and published in English only
2. Articles published in 1975 or later
3. Scholarly and peer-reviewed articles and journals
4. Additional resources included internet websites and reference books

Immigration Trends

English language learners are one of the fastest growing student populations in the United States (Reid, 2001; Onchwari, Onchwari, & Keengwe, 2008). This population of students almost doubled in size between 1980 and 2000 (Batalova, Fix, & Murray, 2007). According to the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Educational Programs (2011), there are more than five million students with limited English proficiency enrolled in public schools in grades pre-K through 12 in the United States. Of that number, more than 80,000 reside in the state of Georgia. These numbers continue to increase as more immigrants enter the country on an annual basis.

The increase of immigrants has a major impact on educational practices. ELLs enter the country with varying levels of English proficiency (Haynes, 2007; Lacina, Levine, & Sowa, 2006). States assess ELLs' academic achievement by their advancement toward English proficiency. This creates a paradoxical situation because research has shown that it takes approximately four to seven years for students to become
proficient in academic English (Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000; Prosser, 2009; Rance-Roney, 2008), yet English language learners are mandated to take the state standardized exams with little accommodation. Federal mandates require the inclusion of ELLs in the general classroom, which force the ability of ELLs to learn language in a time frame inconsistent with research. The length of time required to become proficient in English has a major impact on ELL student achievement. However, this is not because of the lack of cognitive ability to learn new material (Haynes, 2007). It is directly correlated with the insufficient amount of time to advance towards English proficiency and being tested in English-only on grade level standards. An additional issue related to immigrant students is that ELLs are one of the most transient groups of students and this is reflected in student enrollment of schools (National Clearinghouse for English Acquisition and Language Educational Programs, 2006).

The state of Georgia is not excluded from this increase of immigrants. According to the United States Department of Education (2009), Georgia reported an enrollment of approximately 80,000 ELLs with more than 80% receiving ESOL services. The largest language group consisted of Spanish speakers. Other language groups included Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese. Although a diverse population of ELLs exists, Georgia is one of 16 states that have an English only policy for instruction (American Civil Liberties Union of Florida, 2012). A discussion of how policy directly affects instructional practices follows.
Education Policy and Legislation


Schmid (2000) discussed the impact of several immigration acts in the United States. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 was one of the first immigration acts passed in the United States. It excluded Chinese immigrants from entering the United States for a period of 10 years. In addition, Chinese immigrants were denied the right to citizenship and faced deportation. The Immigration Act of 1924 also known as the Johnson-Reed Act limited the number of immigrants from any country allowed in the U.S. to no more than 2% of the existing number that were already living in the United States. Census information from the 1890 census was used for population caps. More specifically, this act completely excluded Asian immigrants (U.S. Department of State, 2013). This was all due to post World War I insecurities of national threats. The combination of these acts resulted in new education and language policies. English language became a requirement for naturalization procedures. Newspapers and standardized tests were being published in English only. Immigrants were forced to learn the English language through cultural submersion. Proponents of the method believed this was necessary for success in school or the workforce. This was commonly referred to as the “sink or swim” approach (Colombo & Furbush, 2009). This method affected instructional practices because
teachers made no special efforts to meet the needs of immigrant children. They were forced to learn content just as their English speaking counterparts.

Immigration quotas continued and became permanent in 1929. In 1943, the Chinese Exclusion Act was repealed and by the end of the 1940s, nearly all restrictions for Asian immigrants seeking U.S. citizenship were abolished. The two decades that span between the 1940s and 1960s were filled with a series of wars – WWII, Korean, and Vietnam. As a result, the United States allowed refugees to enter the country without the enforcement of previous immigration quotas that were established earlier in the century. More positive attitudes towards immigrants began in the 1960s as a result of the civil rights movement. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 provided federal funding to school districts that developed educational programs for students with limited English proficiency. The passing of this act sparked litigation of a 1974 landmark case for immigrant education - *Lau V. Nichols*. A group of Chinese American students sued the San Francisco Unified School District for violating Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The act prohibited “discrimination based on race, color, or national origin in programs that receive federal financial assistance” (United States Department of Education, 2012a, para. 1). They claimed that the school failed to provide specific accommodations due to their limited English proficiency. The Supreme Court ruled in their favor. This was the first time in U.S. history that language had been directly linked to someone’s national origin. The Supreme Court’s favorable ruling and the passage of the Equal Education Opportunity Act sparked a 1974 amendment to the Bilingual Education Act of 1968. The amendment defined a bilingual education program as one
that provided instruction in both English and the student’s native language. It also
couraged educators to allow bilingual students to participate in regular classrooms.
This act has been amended several times since its enactment. Each new amendment
afforded more opportunities for ELLs to gain access to education that was similar to their
English speaking counterparts.

Efforts towards bilingual education lasted for another twenty years until there was
another major increase of immigrants in the United States. Groups such as US English
pushed for English Only legislation and wanted English to be recognized as the official
language of the United States (Schmid, 2000). Other pieces of legislation such as
negatively affected the bilingual education movement. Both of these banned bilingual
education and offered full support of English only instruction (Moses, 2000). Gutierrez
and colleagues (2002) professed “the elimination of the students’ home language from
the learning process has had profound and negative consequences on the viability of
democratic schooling in the 21st century” (p. 329).

Bilingual education was essentially abolished in the 21st century with the
enactment of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. The Bilingual Education
Act was renamed the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and
Academic Achievement Act. The renaming of the act shifts the focus from “bilingual
education” to “English language acquisition” (Katz, 2004). The new emphasis on
English acquisition mirrors the emphasis on English only tactics from the immigration
acts of the 1920s.
More recently, there has been legislation that affects the education of students. Passel and Cohn (2009) suggested that there is an estimated 1.7 million undocumented children in U.S. schools. Congress has been fighting the battle of the education of immigrant children and drafted the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act of 2009. This bipartisan act was pioneered by Senators Orrin Hark (R-UT) and Richard Durbin (D-IL) and has gained support by both Republicans and Democrats. It will allow undocumented minors (ages 16 or less) to attend high school and complete either two years of postsecondary education or military service as a condition to earn citizenship and legal status. The House of Representatives and the Senate have been unable to reach a consensus. Therefore, legislation is still pending.

Refugee Children

Refugees represent a subgroup of immigrants in which there is a limited amount of educational research (McBrien, 2005). The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) defines a refugee as “someone who has fled his/her home country due to persecution, war, or violence” (UNHCR, 2013). They usually cannot return home for fear of being tortured and killed. With this definition in mind, there are some distinct differences between a voluntary immigrant and a refugee. Immigrants choose to reside in a new country, whereas, refugees are forced to leave their home country (Fong, 2007). Immigrants have time to think about and plan their new place of resettlement, whereas, refugees are usually forced to leave quickly with little or no possessions. Immigrants may have financial resources readily available, whereas, refugees often need government
assistance from their host country. Refugees sometimes are required to live in camps for an extended period of time awaiting notice to resettle in their host country (McBrien, 2005). Lastly, immigrants usually have time to learn the language of their new country before resettling, whereas, refugees are thrown into countries in which they have little or no knowledge of the host country’s language (Strekalova & Hoot, 2008).

There are currently more than 13.5 million refugees or asylum seekers worldwide (U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants, USCRI, 2009). Refugees flee from their homes to neighboring countries of asylum, often into overcrowded camps. The average stay in a refugee camp is seven to ten years (UNHCR, 2013). If all efforts to return home or resettle in the country of asylum have failed, resettlement in a third nation, such as the U.S., becomes an option. There has been a resettlement of more than two million refugees in the United States since 1975 (McBrien, 2005). Every refugee camp is different; conditions can range from extremely desperate to relatively comfortable. For the most part, life in a refugee camp is difficult and fraught with uncertainty. Life in a refugee camp is a life of restricted mobility where refugees’ lives are on infinite hold. Conditions are similar to being punished or imprisoned; however, refugees have not committed a crime. According to the USCRI (2009), half of the world’s refugees reside in camps for generations and less than one percent is ever offered a chance of resettlement.

Although life in a refugee camp is difficult, it is sometimes more desirable than trying to fend for oneself in a foreign city (UNHCR, 2013). Some camps provide a sense of community which aids in comfort and hope. Neighbors band together for support and
survival. Some camps have access to humanitarian aid and others have limited access to education and healthcare.

UNHCR (2013) estimated that more than half of any refugee population is children. In fact, some children spend their entire childhood in a camp environment. This is significant because refugee children usually have experienced traumatic situations and disrupted lives (Kugler & Price, 2009) which contributes to their academic success or failure in the classroom. Refugee children arrive in their host countries after a multitude of nightmarish experiences (McBrien, 2005; Strekalova & Hoot, 2008). Some experience separation from family members, rape, abduction, malnutrition, and lack of access to education (Roberts & Locke, 2001; McBrien, 2005; Strekalova & Hoot, 2008). Some refugee children acquire identity confusion as their roles are reversed with their parents and older generations after resettlement in their new host country. This is because they often learn conversational language faster than their parents (McBrien, 2005). Refugee children are often required to translate the new language for their parents at school conferences, healthcare appointments, and other business affairs (Kugler & Price, 2009).

The UNHCR believes that education is an essential component of rehabilitation and acculturation for refugee children (UNHCR, 2013). However, teachers have not received the proper amount of training for educating refugee children and responding to the various needs (Roberts & Locke, 2001; McBrien, 2005; Strekalova & Hoot, 2008). McBrien (2005) specifically stated that education in the United States usually boils down to political interest instead of the educational needs of immigrant or refugee students. This provides an even more daunting challenge because despite these myriad of issues,
the NCLB Act holds school accountable for the academic achievement of refugee English language learners.

Refugees in Georgia

Georgia is one of the top ten states for refugee resettlement (Refugee Family Services, 2013). Over the last 20 years, Georgia has resettled over 50,000 refugees from all over the world. The majority of the refugees are from the following countries: Burma, Bhutan, Somalia, Congo, and Burundi. There is a host of cultural and linguistic barriers that make the transition to the U.S. challenging for most refugees. Some issues that most refugees are faced with include social isolation within the first few weeks or months of arrival, loneliness, homesickness, limited employment opportunities, negative host culture attitudes and assumptions, lack of access to essential services, and adjustment to new culture, rules, customs, language, and weather (Refugee Family Services, 2013).

Burma. Burma is located in Southeast Asia nestled in between India, China, and Thailand. Burma is also known as Myanmar. The people of Burma are massively diverse in terms of ethnicity and language. It was one of Britain’s colonies from the late 1800s to 1948. In 1948, it became an independent republic and was named the Union of Burma. In 1962, the military took control by violent force and the government has been under control of the military ever since. As a result, many of the minority ethnic groups have been forced to flee as refugees. The government recognizes 135 distinct ethnic groups; however, Georgia consists mostly of the Chin, Karen, Karenni, or Rohingya ethnic groups (Refugee Family Services, 2013). Chin has over 50 languages and Karen has three. Some families speak Burmese, but many do not. The diversity of the
languages can make it difficult to transition into school because even if there are refugees from the same country, they may rarely speak the same language. Most people in Burma are Buddhist; however, some are Christian or Muslim with Animist influences. Burmese refugees are mostly from rural areas. They are usually embarrassed and hesitant to tell information to others as they value privacy (Onchwari et al., 2008). This may prevent them from communicating with school and healthcare professionals.

Bhutan. Bhutan is a tiny kingdom in the Himalayas between India and China. The Bhutanese of Nepali ancestry were forced to leave Bhutan in the 1990s. It was feared that this Hindu-minority group would take over the Buddhist-majority country (Zehr, 2008). Due to the violence, Bhutanese of Nepali origin fled to camps in nearby Nepal, India. This ethnic group has retained its Nepalese culture and language. However, Bhutanese refugees tend to know more English than refugees from some other countries (Zehr, 2008). English is used for instructional purposes in refugee camps. Education is highly valued and many acquire advanced degrees from Nepali universities. Living arrangements typically include many members of an extended family. The younger generation assumes the responsibility of caring for elderly relatives. Eye contact during conversation is standard and is not a sign of disrespect. This is in contrast to other English language learners in which direct eye contact is considered a sign of disrespect. According to Zehr (2008), the United States prepared to interview more than 60,000 Bhutanese refugees for resettlement.

Somalia. Somalia is located on the eastern coast of Africa. Somali refugees left their home due to food insecurity and pervasive conflict. As of October 2012, there are
roughly 1.3 million Somalis displaced internally and over one million refugees living in neighboring countries – Kenya, Ethiopia, and Yemen (UNHCR, 2013). Most Somalis are Sunni Muslims. Many women wear veils to cover their faces and pants are not generally accepted as attire. Somalis often greet one another with handshakes, but shaking hands with the opposite sex is avoided.

Congo. Congo refugees were forced from their homes as a result of a civil war between rebels and the government. French is the official language used for education, trade, and government. However, there are four main languages that are spoken among ethnic groups – Lingala, Swahili, Tshiluba, and Kikongo. In addition to these four languages, each tribe has its own dialect. People’s level of education and social status is often judged by their fluency in French. The main religious groups are Roman Catholic, Protestant, Kimbanguist, and Muslim.

Burundi. Burundi is located in the Great Lakes Region of Africa, bordered by the Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda, and Tanzania. Ethnic divisions between the Tutsi and Hutu tribes contributed to political unrest and led to a civil war forcing refugees to flee to neighboring country, Rwanda. The official languages of Burundi are Kirundi and French. The majority (75%) is Christian and approximately 20% follow traditional beliefs. The Burundian refugees currently being resettled in the U.S. are primarily of Hutu ethnicity (United States Committee for Refugees and Immigrants, 2011). Very few speak or understand English. Many are faced with the challenge of low literacy skills due lack of access to education from residing in rural, farming areas.
Educators need to be aware of various groups of refugees entering the United States for resettlement. Each group comes with their own unique journey of becoming a refugee. Being an informed educator can possibly posit a higher sense of efficacy. A higher sense of efficacy is usually developed from more positive attitudes towards a minority cultural group (Karabenick & Clemens Noda, 2004). Since refugees are considered to be a subgroup of ELLs, there are educational implications that stem from federal and state legislation. The following section discusses how these students are affected by current legislation and accountability mandates.

Implications of No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and ELLs

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, which was a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, endorsed the inclusion of all students for assessment and accountability purposes. ELLs are required to participate in state testing after one year in the U.S. In contrast, Cummins (2000) stated that it will require more than a year for ELLs to acquire academic English proficiency to perform well on state assessments.

NCLB allows students to be tested in other languages. However, developing tests in a student's native language can be difficult and expensive. According to Prosser (2009), there are 10 states that use native language tests for ELLs – California, Delaware, Kansas, Massachusetts, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Texas. NCLB requires testing to be in English after a student has been three consecutive years in the country.
Kieffer, Lesaux, Rivera, and Francis (2009) argued that current methods of assessment (standardized testing) "unfairly and negatively influences" the performance of ELLs (p. 1170). Test design, the lack of the appropriate testing accommodations, and limited control of academic English may cause ELLs to perform poorly on state assessments. Poor performance negatively impacts subgroup performance and adequately yearly progress (AYP) status of schools. ELLs are allowed to receive accommodations for standardized testing. Two of the most common accommodations are "providing assessment in the students' native languages and providing exemption from English-language testing for several years" (Escamilla, Mahon, Riley-Bernal, & Rutledge, 2003, p. 45). These accommodations may not be enough to close the achievement gap between ELLs and their native English speaking counterparts. In a three year study of Colorado's Student Assessment Program, Escamilla et al. (2003) found that schools with a heavy population of ELLs were negatively impacted and received low or unsatisfactory ratings on school report cards. This remained true even when schools were allowed a three year exemption of the inclusion of ELL standardized test scores. Their study suggests that knowledge of English does not seem to help Spanish speaking ELLs meet state content standards. In addition to content assessments, states are required to assess the English language proficiency of ELLs as a requirement of NCLB. There is no consistency among states for this assessment which may lead to placement issues (Pappamihiel & Walser, 2009). Currently, the state of Georgia uses the ACCESS test to assess for English proficiency. Results from this assessment are used for placing students for instruction and standardized testing accommodations.
Katz (2004) argued that the specific wording of the NCLB results in a significant decrease of federal funding for bilingual education programs. The disbandment of these programs can lead to more issues. According to Katz (2004), there are three main issues at stake. First, English language learners are at risk of losing their native tongues as well as not becoming proficient at speaking English. ELLs are essentially forced to use English only in instructional settings. The overemphasis on English causes them to lose their native tongue which results in detrimental cultural effects. Additionally, proficiency in English is not necessarily attained in a short period of time. Bilingual teachers will cease to exist because there will be no need to seek these individuals for employment. If bilingual education programs are abolished, this will result in a negative impact on the livelihood of bilingual teachers. The demand for these types of instructors will decrease. Thirdly, bilingual teacher preparation programs will be extinguished due to lack of support and/or funding. The issues pointed out by Katz are affirmed by a statement by Moses (2000), who stated that “the absence of bilingual education, then, perpetuates the problems of low achievement, dropping out, and feelings of low self-worth, which is inexcusable due to the fact that schools have access to effective bilingual programs” (p. 339). The NCLB Act renders multiple issues for English language learners. One of its main issues is the one size fits all approach for ELLs. It requires adequate academic proficiency regardless of adequate English language proficiency (Izlar, 2010). This does not take into account the process of gaining language proficiency as provided by previous research. Academic proficiency is heavily dependent upon the ability to understand the language of instruction.
NCLB was scheduled to be reauthorized in 2008. However, with a change of administration, it was not reauthorized. In the fall of 2010, the Obama administration released a blueprint for reauthorization and reform efforts of the ESEA. There were several components comprised in the blueprint which included college and career readiness, great teachers and leaders, meeting the needs of ELs and other diverse learners, literacy, science and technology initiatives, safe and healthy school environments, and innovation (United States Department of Education, 2011). Under this reform, ELs were to be provided high-quality language instruction through various programs such as dual-language, transitional bilingual, sheltered English immersions, and newcomer programs. All teachers of ELs, including academic content teachers were to receive effective professional development. School districts would be encouraged to ensure consistent processes for identifying ELs based on a valid and reliable English language proficiency assessment. According to the USDOE (2011), these things would be provided and implemented through the use of government grants. School districts would risk losing these funds if they failed to show improvement in the performance of ELs.

In the fall of 2011, the Obama administration offered relief to states by extending flexibility waivers to the ESEA. States had to apply for the flexibility waiver by outlining how they would meet certain reform measures as established by the United States Department of Education. The waiver relieved states from ten requirements of the NCLB Act. For example, states are no longer required to set annual measurable objectives to determine if schools meet adequate yearly progress. The waiver also does not require Title I schools to offer school choice nor supplemental educational services.
Schools will no longer be classified as Needs Improvement but are now identified using four distinct categories – Reward, Priority, Focus, and Alert schools. Reward schools are the highest performing percent or highest progress schools in ten percent of Title I schools. Priority schools are the five percent of the lowest achieving Title I schools in the state based on the achievement of the All Students group. Focus schools are Title I schools that have the largest within-school gaps between the highest achieving subgroups and the lowest-achieving subgroups. Alert schools are those that have low graduation rates, low achievement in a particular student subgroup, or having low achievement in a particular subject content area. Currently, there are 41 states, including Georgia, that have applied and been approved for an ESEA Flexibility Waiver (United States Department of Education, 2013).

The NCLB Act and its recent flexibility waivers continue to impact the instructional practices of teachers of ELs. Although teachers would receive professional development to work more effectively with ELs, there are some missing pieces to the puzzle. It still does not take into account of the process of students who are acquiring English as a second language. The fact that these students are still required to show academic improvement in the face of the surmounting challenge of learning a new language defies previous educational research. The next section focuses on second language acquisition and its academic implications.

Second Language Acquisition

Language learning has roots in many different theories. Each theory has components in which it specifically relates to how humans learn new languages. Second
language learning comes with its own set of challenges. The purpose of this section of the literature review was to discuss second language acquisition theory and its relation to cognitive development and language learning and the instruction of ELLs. Learning is a cultural experience, therefore, the process of learning a new language is not exempted (Bailey & Pransky, 2005).

Previous research (Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Johns & Torrez, 2001; Hill & Flynn, 2006) indicated that there are five stages of second-language acquisition. The stages are pre-production, early production, speech emergence, intermediate fluency, and advanced fluency. A person who is attempting to learn a new language must advance through these stages. However, the rate of second language acquisition will not be the same for all students at each stage of acquisition.

The first stage is the pre-production stage which is also known as the silent period. This is the time in which the ELL will engage in very few oral exchanges. The student is learning to read and speak the new language. The student is mainly observing and listening to the language that is being spoken. A student may be in this stage for up to six months (Hill & Flynn, 2006). The student is more involved in receiving speech instead of producing it. Johns and Torrez (2001) explained that speech production requires more cognition because it involves the process of translating messages between the primary and secondary languages. It is also during this stage, that students are completely engrossed in nonverbal cues and gestures (Krashen & Terrell, 1983).

The second stage is the early production stage. The student can speak small verbal phrases that consist of one or two words. This stage may last from six months to
one year (Hill & Flynn, 2006). Students move from listening comprehension to speech production (Johns & Torrez, 2001). The level of speech production at this stage is described by Cummins (2000) as Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS). BICS are those skills that are necessary for everyday communication with one’s peers. It is easier for students to express themselves using BICS because it perpetuates authentic discourse and socialization.

Next, is the speech emergence stage. A student will begin producing small sentences and developing more comprehension of the spoken language (Johns & Torrez, 2001). The student can interact with peers and the teacher by making conversation and using humor. This stage can last from one to three years (Hill & Flynn, 2006). This is the stage in which students develop Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) skills (Cummins, 2000). According to Cummins (2000), these are skills that are necessary to achieve academic achievement. They require more cognition and comprehension. Educators have to be very observant of a student’s speech use to determine the distinction from proficiency in BICS and CALP. A proficiency in BICS will not necessarily result in academic success.

The next stage is intermediate fluency and lasts between three to five years (Hill & Flynn, 2006). During this stage, the student comprehends oral and written language with few errors. Vocabulary development is an area of emphasis during this stage (Johns & Torrez, 2001). The student is able to think and process in the new language without the need of translation between the two as needed in the pre-production stage.
The final stage is advanced fluency and the student speaks as natural as a native language speaker. This normally takes about five to seven years to reach this stage of second language acquisition (Hill & Flynn, 2006). A teacher must be aware of these five stages of second language acquisition and monitor his/her student’s progress through each stage. Knowledge of these stages can improve instructional practices.

Language is the tool used for communication and expression purposes. It can’t be divided into parts because it does not exist in isolation as words and sentences. A second language learner’s advancement towards English proficiency must be viewed in its totality. Every part makes up the greater sum. Language is essential to cognitive thinking processes. Ajayi (2008) supports this idea by stating that second language learning is not a solitary event. Knowledge of second language acquisition impacts the choices of instructional models used for English learners. The following section will describe the various instructional models that have been used.

Instructional Models for English Learners

Students in the state of Georgia are required to have a home language survey completed as an initial screening test for ESOL services. If a student speaks another language other than English as indicated on the home language survey, then he/she is tested. Georgia is part of the World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) consortium. WIDA members use the Assessing Comprehension and Communication English State to State (ACCESS) test to assess English language proficiency. Placement decisions are made as a result of this test. Consideration of instructional models is critical
to the appropriate placement of ELLs. The remaining portion of this section will focus on
the various instructional models practiced.

Sheltered Instruction Program

Sheltered instruction is an instructional model in which students learn grade level
academic content in conjunction with language and literacy support (McIntyre, et al.,
2010). Sheltered instruction consists of students being taught in English. Teachers
modify the core curriculum to meet the developmental needs of ELLs. This model is
rooted in the belief that ELLs can acquire new content knowledge while simultaneously
improving English language skills. Sheltered instruction focuses on all aspects of
language learning — speaking, writing, reading, and listening (Genesee, 1999).

There are some key components that must be evident in this model. There must
be clearly defined language and content objectives. Teachers must be aware of how to
integrate these into every lesson. Supplementary materials such as graphic organizers,
models, and visual aids are often utilized. Scaffolding is one of the most important
instructional tools used in this model. This is helpful in engaging ELLs in the learning
process and helping them become successful through a moderate amount of support.
Teachers are to provide students with as many opportunities as possible to interact with
the new language and new content. There should be a heavy emphasis on meaningful
lessons with real-life application. Students should be assessed in numerous ways to
demonstrate mastery of concepts.

One of the most popular sheltered instruction models is the Sheltered Instruction
Observation Protocol (SIOP). It was developed in the late 1990s and has proven
effective for the instruction of ELLs. Vygotsky's (1978) socio-cultural theory is reflected in this model with its heavy focus on social interactions of students and constructivist learning methods.

The SIOP model consists of eight major components: Lesson Preparation, Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction, Practice & Application, Lesson Delivery, and Review & Assessment (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2010). Each one of these components helps make content more comprehensible to students. Lessons can be tailored to meet students at their unique readiness level. These components also encourage a high level of student engagement and interaction. A complete description of each component follows.

Lesson Preparation refers to writing content and language objectives, identifying supplemental materials, and planning meaningful activities for authentic learning experiences. Since sheltered instruction is concerned with teaching content and language skills at the same time; the development of learning objectives is essential for student success. During this stage, both “content and language objectives are clearly defined, displayed, and reviewed with students” (Echevarria et al., 2010, p. 26). The objectives tell students what they should know and be able to do as a result of the learning that takes place in the lesson. This is included in the first step to ensure that the teacher appropriately guides the learning. Language objectives are different from content objectives as they focus on students’ speaking, writing, reading, and listening skills. These skills should be observable and connected with a result of meeting the content
objective. For example, a language objective could be that a student will be able to create a written summary or verbally explain a particular concept.

Also, in this stage, the teacher is charged with the responsibility of identifying supplementary materials and adapting content for students. Supplementary materials may include manipulatives, realia, pictures, visuals, multi-media materials, leveled readers, and adapted text (Echevarria et al., 2010). These materials are used to create context and support the learning of new concepts. The process of adapting content for students is to meet them at their level of proficiency. Teachers can adapt content by providing students with graphic organizers, outlines, leveled study guides, highlighted text, notes, and native language texts (Echevarria et al., 2010).

Building Background focuses on connecting prior knowledge to newly acquired knowledge. It employs using instructional strategies such as activating prior knowledge, brainstorming, and scaffolding. No learning can take place without its connection to previous knowledge. Many times students enter the classroom with no knowledge or frame of reference to connect new knowledge. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the teacher to provide background. Background can be built for ELLs through discussion and explicit instruction of new vocabulary (Echevarria et al., 2010).

Comprehensible Input involves anything deepening the students' understanding of big concepts. This includes but is not limited to clear explanations of tasks, repetition of directions for clarity purposes, and the use of visual aids. Teachers must be mindful of subtle things such as rate of speech, body language, and gestures. Comprehensible input is not a result of happenstance. Echevarria et al. (2010) stated that it is a "conscious
effort to make the lesson understandable” (p. 82). For example, a teacher will use the appropriate level of speech for student comprehension. The teacher may speak more slowly and appropriately model the use of vocabulary during discussion. Another example of comprehensible input would be a teacher providing clear, concise explanations of tasks for clarification purposes.

Strategies encompass three main types of learning strategies (a) metacognitive, (b) cognitive, and (c) social/affective (Echevarria et al., 2010). Metacognitive strategies are those that require self-awareness, reflection, and monitoring. Cognitive strategies help students to organize their process of learning. Social/affective strategies are those that involve a student’s social interaction with others and emotional state. These strategies fall on a continuum that runs between teacher-centered and student-centered instructional strategies. Explicit instruction and modeling are necessary for students to be successful at learning any new content.

Interaction provides students with structured opportunities to engage in academic discourse. Students practice using the language with peers and teachers while enhancing language and thinking skills. This is possibly one of the most critical components of the SIOP model because students need the opportunity to use the language and process new content simultaneously. Echevarria et al. (2010) offered the following benefits for students who are actively engaged and interacting with both language and content (a) deeper understanding of text, (b) oral language development, (c) brain stimulation, (d) increased motivation, (e) reduced risk, (f) more processing time, and (g) increased attention (p. 120). Teachers have to be mindful of the language processing skills students
must possess to absorb the content. Allowing frequent opportunities to practice of academic language will result in the previously boasted benefits and student achievement.

In Practice & Application, the teacher facilitates the learning of students. All previous components of the model prepare the student for active engagement. Now, a shift from the instructor to the student occurs. Students are engaged in planned activities that help them apply new content knowledge. They are able to bridge gaps between concrete and abstract concepts using all language processes (Echevarria et al., 2010).

Lesson Delivery is used as monitoring tool for teachers and students to stay on track with the intended content and language objectives. This is where preparation meets implementation. Teachers have to constantly check and see if the lesson is going according to plan. They must formatively assess if the students are getting it and if the stated content and language objectives are being met. Echevarria et al. (2010) suggested that pacing be considered during this phase. Delivering a lesson at the right pace is essential for the comprehension of ELLs.

The final component, Review & Assessment, is ongoing. Formative and summative assessments are given throughout the unit for frequent checks for understanding. According to Echevarria et al. (2010), review is essential for English language learners. ELLs must know what is important and this may be difficult to delineate if the teacher does not explicitly state it during a summative review. Furthermore, frequent assessment is necessary because it is impossible to assess learning from one source or a single assessment tool.
Sheltered instruction programs have a potential for success in English language learning classrooms. However, Gersten and Baker (2000) found that sheltered instruction programs sometimes sacrifice(s) the learning of English for learning grade level content. The combination of both content and language objectives fails to provide "adequate time for English language learning" (p. 459). Inadequate time has been linked to increased accountability systems for mastery of grade level content standards. However, McIntyre et al. (2010) concluded that a "significant difference in achievement occurred for students in the classrooms of 'fully implementing' teachers" (p. 348). This shows that SIOP can be a program of vitality if teachers implement it correctly utilizing all components with the maximum benefit.

Newcomer Program

A newcomer program is designed to help students with beginning English skills and core academic skills (Genesee, 1999). Students who are recent immigrants with very limited English or who had limited formal education are placed into this type of program. Some school districts have a newcomer program at the school level and others have them at the district level. It depends on the number of ELLs that are in the school system and the area in which they are heavily populated. Teachers provide students with intense language and literacy support. Sometimes, this program is a student's first time in a school environment. Therefore, students learn basic skills such as reading, writing, and speaking. They also learn about American culture and characteristics. Students may not necessarily learn grade-level content. Developmentally and cognitively appropriate instructional materials are used.
Dual Language Programs

A dual language program is one in which students receive instruction in two languages throughout the entire school day (Calderon, 1999). Students continue to learn in both their native language and English. A team teaching model is often adopted where the student has two teachers – an English speaking general content teacher and a bilingual teacher.

Proponents of dual language programs argue that “not allowing students to use their native language...denies them the freedoms necessary to reach their full potential” (Prosser, 2009, p. 372). Students are able to transfer literacy skills acquired in their native language over to their acquisition of English. The use of both languages during instruction allows students to make connections and bridge gaps between concepts. This may not be attained if the student is to fully rely on only one language during the school day. ELLs need time to process information in their native language and decode it into English. A dual language program will provide the needed support for this task.

Transitional bilingual education. Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) is one of the most common forms of dual language programs in the U.S. (Colombo & Furbush, 2009; Genesee, 1999). Sometimes it is referred to as early-exit bilingual education. Students learn using both their native language and English and then they are eventually mainstreamed into English only classrooms. It is designed for academic success of ELLs by allowing them to acquire academic content in their native language. This is to ensure mastery of grade level concepts first before becoming proficient in English. A transitional bilingual education program normally takes three to four years. Students start
out receiving instruction in their native language for a number of years before transitioning into an English only environment.

Developmental bilingual education. Developmental bilingual education (DBE) provides ELLs with academic instruction in their first language as they learn English (Genesee, 1999). Its focus is on bilingualism and is commonly found in the elementary grades. This is a stand-alone program that requires specially trained teachers. Teachers must be fluent in the students' native language and English. Students with the same native language are instructed in the same classroom. According to Vialpando and Yedlin (2005), students continue to receive the majority of their instruction in their first language even after they may be reclassified as a fluently English proficient student.

Two-way immersion. Two-way immersion (TWI) programs provide integrated language and academic instruction for ELLs (Colombo & Furbush, 2009). The ultimate goal of these types of programs is bilingualism and bi-literacy for ELLs and native English speakers. Teachers instruct both native English speakers and native speakers of other languages within the same class. The teacher uses both languages during instruction. Both groups of students are acquiring a second language which results in bilingualism. Students use the linguistic skills of their native language to acquire the second language. This is a program for students who already have some English speaking skills or for ELLs who have a common language first language (Vialpando & Yedlin, 2005).
Research-Based Instructional Strategies for English Learners

Teacher efficacy is closely related to the effective instruction of ELLs. ELLs require more resources and instructional support to process language and acquire content (Brown & Broemmel, 2011; Karabenick & Clemens Noda, 2004). Therefore, teachers need to be equipped with specialized educational tools for meeting the unique needs of English learners. Karabenick and Clemens Noda (2004) implied that regular content teachers may be able to meet those unique needs of an ELL by being “empowered with instructional strategies and additional in-class resources” (p. 66).

One such tool is scaffolding which is the process of providing temporary support to assist students in learning a new task (van de Pol, Volman, & Beishuizen, 2010). The completion of this task may not take place without the support being in place. Brown and Broemmel (2011) suggested scaffolding should be done with a meaningful purpose. This instructional technique reduces language barriers by making content more comprehensible and accessible for ELLs. Scaffolding “minimizes frustrations at the student level” as ELLs are provided with appropriate background knowledge (p. 35). It provides ELLs with the appropriate knowledge base to make connections and build upon new concepts. When implemented appropriately, scaffolding supports ELLs by making texts more comprehensible and easier to read despite English proficiency levels (de Jong & Harper, 2005).

A constructivist approach to teaching can also assist with the instruction of ELLs. Bailey and Pransky (2005) fully supported a constructivist approach to teaching ELLs. A constructivist teacher will value a student’s uniqueness as related to his/her cultural
A constructivist teacher will structure lessons using conceptual understandings. Students in a constructivist classroom learn by attaching relevance and meaning to new content. ELLs are often placed in educational settings in which the teacher knows very little about the cultural history and background of students. An effective teacher of ELLs will incorporate cultural pedagogy to build a sense of community. Cultural beliefs directly affect how instruction is planned, delivered, and assessed. A constructivist teacher allows students to ponder and question to make connections between prior and new knowledge. This is essential for ELLs as they construct new knowledge and acquire a second language simultaneously.

Rubinstein-Avila (2003) offered several strategies for effective instruction of ELLs. First, students should be held to high expectations. Sometimes educators lower their expectations as an act of sympathy for students acquiring a new language. This practice can damage a student's progress towards English proficiency. Second, a teacher can slow down his/her pace of speech and enunciate words more clearly. Third, visual scaffolding is another strategy especially, when providing instructions or directions for an assigned task. Students need both verbal and visual cues. A fourth strategy is to allow ELLs to use their native language when engaged in small group activities. The use of their native language and English bridges the gap between prior knowledge and new concepts. Fifth, an effective teacher of ELLs will use a variety of supplemental resources such as graphic organizers and informational picture books. Lastly, explicit modeling is essential to demonstrating what is expected as an end product of task.
Discourse, between teachers and students, is an essential component in the instruction of ELLs. Discourse is the process of engaging in active oral discussion between two or more people. Teachers are encouraged to expand response options to increase student participation within class discussions (Mohr & Mohr, 2007). Many times it is perceived that ELLs are not knowledgeable because of a lack of response to oral questions. However, this correlates with second language acquisition theories in which students may not be able to produce an “answer in a teacher expected manner” (p. 441). Students require time to develop language skills that can be spoken. A variety of response options will elicit more appropriate assessment of comprehension of new content. Teachers of ELLs can scaffold social and academic language by providing more opportunities for interaction and reducing the amount of teacher talk.

Building rapport and establishing a caring relationship are critical components of success with ELLs (Rubenstein-Avila, 2003). Teachers must show and express empathy with their ELL students. Teachers are responsible for building an atmosphere of respect for ELLs. This includes their cultural background, language, family history, previous learning experiences, and communities. All of these factors can affect one’s English language acquisition and proficiency. Furthermore, Ajayi (2006) argued that “instructional practices and language learning curriculum in middle schools must be grounded in the diverse experiences of the learners in such a way that their multiple viewpoints, diverse cultures, languages and personalities serve as resources for English language learning” (p. 472).
Teacher preparation directly impacts instructional practices. Many instructional choices stem from what was learned during teacher preparation and field experiences. A well-prepared teacher will make sound instructional decisions that positively affect student achievement. Now, the literature review will shift from instructional practices for ELLs to professional development and training of teachers of ELLs.

Professional Development and Teacher Training

Teacher preparation can affect teacher efficacy (Tasan, 2001). Increasing enrollment of second language learners present challenges related to teacher training and quality instructional practices (Karabenick & Clemens Noda, 2004). An essential component of NCLB requires all teachers to be highly qualified. However, Echevarria et al. (2010) reported that only four states - Arizona, California, Florida, and New York have pre-service training programs for effective teaching of ELLs. The shortage of professional development opportunities with a focus on cultural pedagogy is astounding compared to immigration trends and increased enrollment of ELLs in U.S. classrooms. Orosco and Klinger (2010) proclaimed that "teachers who work in culturally and linguistically diverse settings should be knowledgeable about teaching English language learner pedagogy" (p. 271). Furthermore, McIntyre et al. (2010) declared that professional development can positively affect instructional practices. This is especially true if participation is voluntary and comprehensive. The shortage of available programs should not be attributed to lack of interest because teachers want to improve their practice.
Olson and Jimenez-Silva (2008) stated that ELLs are “one of the most underserved and underrepresented student populations” (p. 247). This statement rings true in the area of professional development and teacher training. Due to the abolishment of bilingual education, very few teachers receive the appropriate training for instruction of ELLs. Furthermore, Olson and Jimenez-Silva (2008) proclaimed that lack of appropriate training is a “continuation of sink-or-swim methods for ELL students” (p. 247).

Ajayi (2008) conducted a study and found that there is a need to recruit qualified teachers for English language learners. This has to be regulated through hiring practices of school districts and certification practices of state licensing agencies. Furthermore, this will help meet the highly qualified requirement of NCLB. In a 2002 report by the National Center for Education Statistics, 42% of teachers surveyed indicated that they had ELLs in their classrooms, but only 12.5% had received more than eight hours of professional development specifically related to ELLs (NCES, 2002). More recently, Neugebauer (2008) declared that only 2.5% of the country’s teachers have received professional development for the effective instruction of ELLs.

Teachers’ attitudes can affect instruction of ELLs. Attitudes can lead to misconceptions and these misconceptions can directly affect instructional practices. There are misconceptions about the population make-up of ELL students. These students come from a variety of backgrounds. Some are immigrants and are fairly new to the United States. Others are U.S. born but speak another language other than English at home. According to Batalova et al. (2007), there are about 57% limited English proficient
students who are U.S. born. These may be the children of undocumented parents. Many educators tend to lump all ELLs in the same category and this can have a negative effect on instructional practices. However, professional development can change attitudes and eventually lead to improved practice (Lee & Oxelson, 2006).

Youngs and Youngs (2001) conducted a study on the attitudes of junior-high and middle school teachers of ELLs. They found that mainstream teachers were not fully prepared to instruct ELLs and many felt a certain degree of stress as it relates to effective instruction of ELLs. However, teachers that had been trained in a foreign language or had previously lived in a foreign country were more welcoming of ELLs in their classrooms than those who had no such experience.

A similar study was conducted by Walker, Shafer, and Iiams (2004) on teacher attitudes towards ELLs in the general classroom. This study had 422 participants, whereas, the Youngs and Youngs study only had 143 participants. This study looked at teachers at all levels – elementary, middle, and high. The Youngs and Youngs (2001) study was conducted using only junior-high and middle school teachers. This study found that 70% of teachers were not interested in having ELLs in their classrooms and 87% had never received any training for instruction of ELLs. Interestingly, only 49% expressed an interest in receiving training or professional development focused on instruction of ELLs. Moreover, they found that schools with a high population of ELLs were more apt to accepting these students in their classrooms.

A study of 729 teachers conducted by Karabenick and Clemens Noda (2004) revealed that 70% of teachers would welcome ELLs in their classrooms. These
participants echoed the same sentiment as others. They lacked training and professional
development to meet the diverse needs of a high ELL student population.

All of these studies combined reveal one major concern about teacher training.
Teachers are not prepared to work with ELLs. They lack pre-service and in-service
training opportunities. There may be a more willingness to instruct these students if
adequate training and professional development is provided. Effective instruction of
ELLs requires a specific skill set of content knowledge and language acquisition
instructional strategies.

Teacher Self-Efficacy

Teacher self-efficacy can have a major impact on student learning. Guskey and
Passaro (1994) claimed that teachers with a higher sense of efficacy report a strong
conviction that they can influence student learning, even when dealing with more
challenging students. On the other hand, teachers with low efficacy tend to give up more
easily when dealing with challenging students and often conclude that students cannot
learn because of extenuating circumstances (Ashton & Webb, 1986). Acquiring a new
language can be considered as an extenuating circumstance by some teachers and would
negatively affect student achievement.

Bandura (1997) described self-efficacy as an essential component of the
theoretical foundation of the social cognitive theory. This theory assumes that people are
capable of intentional pursuit of courses of action. Pajares (1996) claimed that academic
performance and learning are elements of self-efficacy beliefs. Tschannen-Moran,
Woolfolk-Hoy, and Hoy (1998) defined teacher efficacy as the extent to which the
teacher believes he/she has the capacity to affect student performance. According to Bandura (1997), there are three interrelated forces that influence self-efficacy: environmental influences, one's behavior, and internal personal factors, such as cognitive, affective, and biological processes. Social persuasion and a person's emotional state during social interactions can strengthen or weaken self-efficacy (Henson, 2001).

Self-efficacy is defined as perceived capabilities within specific domains (Pajares, 1996). This basic definition directly attributes to the definition of teacher efficacy. Henson (2001) described teacher efficacy as a teacher's judgment of his/her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, especially among difficult and unmotivated students. Henson (2001) also reported that teacher efficacy is related to students' own sense of efficacy and motivation.

Self-efficacy is differentiated from self-concept in that it is specific to a particular task (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). A person can feel ineffectual in one task and there could be no effect on his/her self-esteem because of the level of vested interest in accomplishing the task well. Self-efficacy is a function of self-perception of competence instead of actual level of competence (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). This differentiation between the two concepts is essential to understanding self-efficacy because people often regularly overestimate or underestimate their actual abilities (Bandura, 1977). According to Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998), teachers do not feel equally efficacious in all teaching situations; therefore, it should be evaluated within a specific context. Teachers can feel efficacious for teaching a specific subject area, a specific group of students, or in a specific instructional setting. The feeling of efficacy is
dependent upon the circumstance. In addition, Ross, Cousins, and Gadalla (1996) stated that a teacher's sense of efficacy is "one of the few individual teacher characteristics that reliably predicts teacher practice and student outcomes" (p. 385).

Highly efficacious teachers highly value their work and view it as important and meaningful, believe their teaching directly impacts student learning, and are confident they can positively influence student learning outcomes (Ashton, 1984). Students of highly efficacious teachers usually outperform students in other classes (Henson, 2001). This relates to the teaching of ELLs in that a teacher who is successful will have a higher sense of efficacy than a teacher who has little or no success with teaching an ELL. According to Gredler (2005), in order to improve education, teachers should possess a strong sense of self-efficacy. Teachers should have strong pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge, and an understanding of child development in order to be effective (Gredler, 2005). Miller and Endo (2004) suggested that teachers could become more efficacious by fully comprehending the issues associated with second language acquisition and providing ELLs with the help they need. ESOL teachers must have a strong sense of self-efficacy to be prepared to work effectively with ELLs, who are increasing in attendance in general education classrooms (Miller & Endo, 2004).

There have been a limited number of studies on teacher self-efficacy as it relates to the instruction of English language learners. Kwain (1989) investigated the effectiveness of professional development of teachers enrolled in a graduate course on language minority students. Quantitative data were collected through the use of an attitudinal scale and qualitative data were used through an analysis of personal journal
entries and interviews with select participants. Kwiat (1989) found that the differences between the scores on the attitudinal scales were not statistically significant and that teachers exhibited more positive feelings toward non-English speaking students.

Tasan (2001) conducted a study using the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) by Gibson and Dembo (1984). The results of this study suggested that diversity training was a significant factor in efficacy beliefs and student language background. In addition, teacher efficacy can be changed through teacher preparation and professional development.

In Paneque and Barbetta's (2006) study, they investigated teacher self-efficacy of elementary school teachers of ELLs with specific learning disabilities. They created and used the EXCEL Teacher Inventory and found that proficiency in the target language among students was the best predictor of teacher self-efficacy.

Teacher Efficacy Measurement Scales

Current teacher self-efficacy scales such as the widely used Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), have been questioned due to doubts about their validity (Henson, 2001; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). There is also variation as to the level of specificity teacher self-efficacy should be measured. Existing scales range from examining general self-efficacy beliefs about teaching to specific beliefs about teaching a specific content area or group of students. However, few scales exist to measure self-efficacy for teaching in certain areas, situation, or with specific populations.

Teacher self-efficacy scales are usually based upon teachers' experiences within their own classroom. This can create a limitation because teachers select their responses
based on the type of student he/she works with. A teacher may demonstrate higher levels of efficacy for working with students in which he/she has success, whereas, they will report lower levels of efficacy for a more challenging student. The high correlation of self-efficacy with personal experiences should not be overlooked.

There are currently four teacher self-efficacy scales that examines teacher efficacy with a multicultural lens (Klassen, Tze, Betts, & Gordon, 2011). The Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (Siwatu, 2007) and the Culturally Responsive Teaching Outcome Expectancy Scale (Siwatu, 2007) assesses perceived multicultural competencies among teachers. The Teaching English Language Learners Scale (TELLS) (Strawsine, 2009) was created to measure teachers’ self-efficacy when teaching ELLs. This was due to the increasing rates of immigration and high likelihood of encounters with students who are ELLs. The Teacher Efficacy for Teaching the English Language Learners (TETELL) scale (Yough, 2008) was developed to measure teachers’ self-efficacy relating to the instruction of ELLs being mainstreamed in the general education classroom.

No measure currently exists to evaluate teacher competencies for working specifically with refugee English language learners. Therefore, this study used the Teacher’s Sense of Efficacy Scale to examine teacher self-efficacy when working with this specific subgroup of students. The Teacher’s Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) was developed in a seminar course at Ohio State University. This scale is one of the most widely used teacher self-efficacy scales. It was originally named the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scales (OSTES). The instrument was
constructed to measure three dimensions of teacher efficacy (a) efficacy in instructional strategies, (b) efficacy in classroom management, and (c) efficacy in student engagement. It uses a 9-point Likert scale which rates respondents from 1-nothing to 9-a great deal. Questions are worded to specifically measure each dimension.

Relevancy to Current Study

Teacher self-efficacy is relevant to the current study because it is now a part of the new teacher evaluation system, Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES), which was implemented in the state of Georgia for the 2012 – 2013 school year. TKES is a system developed for teacher evaluation and professional growth as part of the Race to the Top Initiative (Georgia Department of Education, 2012b). This system consists of multiple components which include the Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS), Surveys of Instructional Practice, and measures of Student Growth and Academic Achievement (GADOE, 2012b).

Efficacy is included in the Professionalism standard on the TAPS evaluation document. According to the GADOE (2012b), teachers of high self-efficacy set themselves higher goals and stick with them. Teacher self-efficacy is highly associated with teaching practices. Furthermore, teachers with a higher self-efficacy tend to use more challenging teaching techniques, risk using innovative strategies, and are usually more organized with planning student-centered instruction (GADOE, 2012b).

Summary

This chapter provided a review of the relevant literature for this study. It gave a historical overview of the immigration trends and related education policies. These
issues affect current instructional practices. Secondly, implications of NCLB and its
current waivers were discussed in this chapter. NCLB had several components that
directly affected how ELLs were taught and assessed. It provided an overview of second
language acquisition and related theories to show significance for the study. A frame of
reference for this study is given by a discussion of instructional models and research-
based instructional strategies. Finally, it concluded with a discussion of professional
development and teacher training and its relationship with teacher self-efficacy.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This research study addressed teacher self-efficacy when teaching refugee English language learners. An explanatory sequential mixed methods design was used, and it involved collecting quantitative data first and then explaining the quantitative results with in-depth qualitative data. In the first, quantitative phase of the study, the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) survey data were collected from teachers of refugee ELLs. The second, qualitative phase was conducted as a follow-up to the quantitative phase to help provide the rich detail to elaborate on the quantitative results. In this exploratory follow-up, the plan was to explore the teaching of refugee English language learners with teachers within a local, urban city. Creswell and Clark (2011) stated that a mixed method research design combines the better of two approaches by utilizing the structure of quantitative research and the flexibility of qualitative research.

Methodology and Design

Phase One: Quantitative Methodology

Phase One of this study addressed the quantitative methodology by using the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES, Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) with elementary, middle, and high school teachers of a refugee student population. I intended to include at least 30 teachers at each level for the study. This gave valuable
insight of teachers at multiple levels that work with the unique student population of refugee English language learners. The survey was used to collect descriptive data. The descriptive data consisted of teachers' responses to various statements regarding self-efficacy. Demographic information that includes self-reported data such as years of teaching experience, years of experience with working with ELs, ESOL endorsement status, and level (elementary, middle, or high) of teaching was also collected. This information assisted in answering the research question regarding the relationship between the number of years of teaching experience and the perceived level of self-efficacy. It also aided in the selection of participants to be included in phase two of the study.

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) developed the TSES to measure teachers' self-efficacy in regard to three main categories (a) instructional strategies, (b) classroom management, and (c) student engagement. Permission was granted to use the TSES for this research study (Appendix E). Previous studies have reported a three-factor solution for instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement with internal consistency reliabilities ranging from .86 to .90 (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). This instrument has generally been shown to be reliable and valid across teaching and cultural contexts (Klassen et al., 2009).

Phase Two: Qualitative Methodology

Phase Two addressed the qualitative methodology by conducting interviews with a total of six teachers to gain more insight on information provided on the quantitative instrument. The six participants included two from each school level – elementary,
middle, and high. Participants were interviewed in a structured, open-ended format to
gather information about their experience as teachers of refugee EL students. According
to Stake (1995), a qualitative case study seeks to find the uniqueness in each
interviewee's experiences. Therefore, a short-list of guided questions should be provided
which will give each participant an opportunity to expound and elaborate on his/her own
experiences. A list of guided interview questions is provided in Appendix H. The
interviews were audio-taped and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

The data collected from the participants' interviews were coded into the various
themes using NVivo software. This software allowed data to be imported using word
processing software. The transcripts were transcribed using Microsoft Word and then
imported into NVivo for analysis. NVivo allowed me to use a word frequency feature to
identify recurring ideas and themes. These were used to create broad categories for
further investigation and analysis. Then, each participant's response was coded and
placed into the appropriate category for classification purposes. Raw transcript data and a
table of emerging themes are included in Appendices I and J.

According to Merriam (2009), the qualitative case study is used as a way of
“understanding how people make sense of their world and the experiences they have in
the world” (p. 13). The selection of a case study design method was used by applying
this definition. Case study research has five components of research design (Yin, 2003).
First, the case study answers questions such as “how” and “why”. This study met that
requirement because the primary research question investigated how teachers of refugee
English learners described their experiences. It also provided the answer to “why” as
participants described their desire to continue to teach this unique population despite the challenges. Secondly, case study research must have study propositions that provide the scope of the research. This study sought to explore the relationship if any between teachers’ perceived level of self-efficacy and years of ELL teaching experience and ESOL endorsement status. A third component of case study research is the unit of analysis that is universally defined as the case. The unit of analysis for this case study was teachers of refugee students. Other researchers refer to this as being a bounded system (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009). This study was bounded in that it sought to investigate self-efficacy and instructional practices of teachers of refugee English learners. The fourth component of research is the linking of data to propositions. The findings of this study directly correlated with the scope in which the researcher sought to explore. A final component of case study research is the criteria for interpreting the findings. The findings of this case study were interpreted based upon the methods of data collection and the analysis of the data that were collected during the study.

Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the perceived levels of teacher self-efficacy as measured by the TSES for teachers of refugee English language learners?

   a) Is there a relationship between the number of years of teaching experience with ELLs and the perceived level of teacher efficacy?
b) Is there a statistically significant difference (at $p < 0.05$) in the perceived self-efficacy of the teachers who are ESOL endorsed and those who are not?

c) Is there a statistically significant difference (at $p < 0.05$) in the perceived self-efficacy of the teachers based on the level (elementary, middle, or high) of school?

2. How do teachers of refugee English language learners describe their experiences and challenges of working with this population?

Participants

Purposeful sampling was used to select the participants for this study. In purposeful sampling, "researchers intentionally select participants who have experienced the central phenomenon being explored in the study" (Creswell & Clark, 2011, p. 173). The participants of this study consisted of teachers of refugee English language learners. The participants were identified based on their teaching assignment in a school with a large refugee student population of English language learners. A goal was set of at least 30 participants selected from each school site for the quantitative phase of the study for a yielded sample size of 90. However, actual sample size varied due to the participants' rate of response and the window of data collection. The qualitative phase of the study consisted of six participants — two from each school level. Phase two participants were selected based on the following criteria:

1) Participation in the phase one, quantitative phase of the study
2) Years of ELL teaching experience based upon two categories (five years or less and six or more years)

3) Interest in participating in the qualitative portion as indicated during phase one

Context of the Study

This study investigated three schools – elementary, middle, and high within an urban city that has the highest refugee population within the state (see Appendix C). Urban City School District (pseudonym) is located in a large metropolitan area in the southeastern part of the United States. It is a Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accredited district and is the third largest school district in the state. UCSD serves more than 98,000 students within 77 elementary (K-5), 19 middle (6-8), 22 high (9-12) schools. According to the district’s website, they serve students that speak 142 languages and represent 157 countries. Eighty-eight percent of the student population is non-white and more than 70% receives free or reduced price lunches.

Under the old system of school reporting as required by NCLB, Urban City School District struggled to make adequately yearly progress (AYP). UCSD is located in a state that has received an ESEA Flexibility Waiver and no longer has to meet certain requirements of the NCLB Act of 2001. This relieves the school district from making AYP and being listed as a needs improvement system. As a part of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, each district and school receives a rating according to the College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI). CCRPI is calculated annually based on performance indicators and points received in the following categories for each school system and individual school – a) achievement, b), progress, c), achievement gap, and d) challenge.
The maximum score to be received is a total of 100 points. Each level (elementary, middle, and high) of school has a different set of performance indicators for which the CCRPI is calculated. Urban City School District received the following ratings for the initial calculation of the CCRPI – 71.2, 73.5, and 66.4 for elementary, middle, and high, respectively. UCSD serves more than 20,000 students with a primary language other than English. Academic achievement of this particular subgroup is calculated in the CCRPI. This is significant because each school level received zero points for EL achievement in their initial CCRPI ratings. The maximum of potential points available for this category is 10 points.

Urban City School District is unique because it serves the largest amount of student refugees in the state. These refugees come primarily from African and Asian countries. This is a very diverse group that is composed of more than 57 languages from more than 40 different countries. The majority of the refugees are centrally located in a small city within the school district. This city was identified by federal refugee resettlement programs as a good place for displaced persons due to its large open rental market and availability of apartment complexes. The city is considered geographically small in terms of its land area (1.1 square miles); however, it is home to more than 7,000 residents, many of them refugees (City of Clarkston, 2012). This study focused on three schools within this city and surrounding areas due to their location and the students in which they serve.

School 1 is a Title I elementary school that serves 1,100 students and it is one of the largest elementary schools within the school district. In grades K – 5, there are
approximately 860 English language learners and 85% of these are refugees. Besides being one of the largest elementary schools in the district, this school serves the largest number of refugees in the state. School 1 received a CCRPI rating of 51.4 with zero points for EL achievement, despite its large EL population. This school encompasses diversity as many of the students are from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. There is not a dominant language that is spoken by the majority of its students. However, there are a large number of students that speak Burmese (340) and Nepali (157). Interpretation and translation services are provided by the school district for parent correspondence and conferences. This phenomenon is not new for the educators at School 1 because it has served refugees from different countries for the past two and a half decades. The demographics within the refugee population change over time dependent upon which refugees are allowed to participate in the federal refugee resettlement program. However, there has been consistency with the reception of refugees from African and Asian countries.

School 2 is a Title I middle school that serves 267 students in grades 6 – 7. All of these students are English language learners and 55% of student population is composed of refugees. The dominant languages spoken at this school are Spanish (90), Burmese (54), and Nepali (30). This school received a CCRPI rating of 39.1 and is currently listed as a priority school by the state. A school receives priority school designation for low student achievement on statewide assessments and lack of progress for three years or more for all students (GADOE, 2012a). School 2 is unique because it mainly instructs students who are within their first year in the United States. These students receive
intense instruction in learning the basics of the English language and are allowed to attend their home school after one full year of instruction. This school is very transient as students are constantly enrolling and withdrawing depending on their date of entry in the United States and one year anniversary of being in the country.

School 3 is a Title I high school with 1,557 students in grades 9 – 12. There are approximately 732 English Language Learners where more than 69% are refugees. This school is part of the same school cluster as School 1. They have approximately 200 students that speak Burmese and 200 that speak Nepali. School 3 has served students within this community for over 40 years. They received a CCRPI rating of 57.1 with 1.8 points for EL achievement. School 3 was a recent recipient of a school improvement grant which allowed them to make gains in student achievement for the past three school years. The school improvement grant was awarded based upon the implementation of an intervention model to improve student achievement based on a history of low student achievement and a lack of progress.

Commonalities among these three schools included their large refugee English language learner population, low CCRPI ratings, and diversity of the student population. Demographic information such as the number of years teaching experience, the years of experience of working with English language learners, and ESOL endorsement status was collected from teachers who decided to participate in the study.

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher completed Human Subjects training and submitted a valid certificate of completion to the Office of Research Compliance at Mercer University.
Before collecting any data, the researcher completed a form detailing the minimal risk the study would have involving human subjects. This form is required for any research that involves surveys, questionnaires, observational research, and data collection. After receiving the university’s and school district’s approvals, data collection began in December 2013.

All teachers within the selected schools was notified of the study and offered the opportunity to participate. After receiving permission from the school district, the researcher notified the principals from the selected schools and sent the link to the online survey instrument to be distributed to faculty members. Teachers were originally given two weeks to complete the TSES survey via the online survey link. According to Muijs (2004), online surveys have an advantage over paper-and-pencil surveys because of the ability to directly store participant responses in a database. This saves time on data input and provides easier access for data analysis. Web-based questionnaires also may contribute to a higher response rate due to the convenience of completing a short survey online.

Demographic data were collected before each respondent answered questions related to the TSES. Therefore, seven questions were added to the beginning of the survey. The content of the seven questions are listed:

1. Name
2. Years of Teaching Experience
3. Years of Experience Working with English Learners
4. ESOL Endorsement Status (Yes or No)
5. Level of Work Setting (Elementary, Middle, or High)

6. Would you be interested in participating in the second phase of the study which includes a participant interview?

7. If yes, please provide your contact email address and phone number.

Although, the survey captured personal contact information for each participant, measures were taken to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of each participant. However, this information was critical for selecting participants for the second phase and the linkage quantitative and qualitative data. For instance, each interviewed participant was linked with his/her self-perceived rating of self-efficacy as measured on the TSES. The survey link for this study included an electronic informed consent in which the respondent provided consent by clicking yes and proceeding to the full questionnaire. All raw data was kept by the researcher and was only reported and published using pseudonyms and de-identified data.

Results from the quantitative phase were examined to see what results were unclear and required further information (Creswell & Clark, 2011). The researcher examined participants’ responses to the TSES and its relation to the number of years of ELL teaching experience and ESOL endorsement status. The answers to the first research question and its sub-questions guided the researcher for the next phase of the study. This informed the researcher of which participants to follow-up with in phase two.

Participants for phase two were selected based on their willingness to participate and their years of teaching experience. It was the interest of the researcher to gain insight from participants who have worked with a refugee student population over time.
However, participants were chosen based on two categories of teaching experience which consisted of five years or less and six years or more. Participants for phase two were only selected from the pool of participants in phase one. No new participants were added to study. Only six participants were chosen to participate in phase two based on participant interest and years of ELL teaching experience. Participant interviews took place during the spring of 2014.

I kept a researcher's journal to provide a detailed account of the data collection process in which I recorded important notes such as interview dates and times and personal reflections of the data collected. I emailed each participant after the interviews were transcribed to review accuracy of transcripts. This ensured the trustworthiness of the study (Merriam, 1997). Data were coded immediately after the transcription of participant interviews. This was done to preserve the richness of the data collected. There was a comparison of emergent themes from participant interviews. Data were continuously reviewed to identify emerging themes and organization of all data sources (Creswell, 2009).

Data Analysis

The quantitative phase of this study consisted of non-experimental, survey research. The first research question - What are the perceived levels of teacher self-efficacy as measured by the TSES for teachers of refugee English language learners? will be analyzed using factor analysis. Salkind (2009), described factor analysis as a technique that “allows the researcher to reduce the number of variables that represent a particular construct and then use factor scores as dependent variables” (p. 185). In this case, the
TSES consists of three factors – instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement. A factor analysis is recommended by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) as directed by their instructions on using the instrument.

A correlation analysis using a Pearson correlation coefficient was used to answer sub-question 1a - Is there a relationship between the number of years of teaching experience with ELLs and the perceived level of teacher efficacy? A correlation analysis should be used when the researcher wants to see if there is a relationship between two variables (Muijs, 2004; Salkind, 2009). For this study, I investigated the possible relationship between the number of years of teaching experience with ELLs (independent variable) and self-efficacy (dependent variable). A correlational analysis seeks to see if there a relationship exists between variables, not if one may cause a change in the other. Correlations are described as being direct or indirect. The Pearson correlation coefficient reflects the degree of the relationship between the two variables. These correlations range from .0 to 1.0 and can be described as being very weak or very strong (Salkind, 2009).

A t-test analysis of independent groups was used for sub-question 1b - Is there a statistically significant difference (at $p < 0.05$) in the perceived self-efficacy of the teachers who are ESOL endorsed and those who are not? According to Salkind (2009), a t-test measures the significance of the difference between two means based on two independent groups. The independent groups were ESOL endorsed and non-endorsed teachers.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used for sub-question 1c - Is there a statistically significant difference (at $p < 0.05$) in the perceived self-efficacy of the
teachers based on the level (elementary, middle, or high) of school? Muijs (2004) suggested that an ANOVA be used when the researcher wants to know if there are any differences between multiple groups. In this study, I investigated the possibilities of any significant differences between teachers at the three different school settings—elementary, middle, and high. An ANOVA is similar to a \( t \)-test; however, the difference lies in the comparison of means of three groups.

Phase two consisted of qualitative case study research. This type of research is necessary for answering research question 2 - How do teachers of refugee English language learners describe their experiences and challenges of working with this population? The first stage of data analysis in case study research is to plan and organize the data being collected (Stake, 1995). This involves “organizing the data for review and transcribing the text from interviews into word processing files” (Creswell & Clark, 2011, p. 206). I will transcribe each interview verbatim using *Microsoft Word*. This transcribed text will be imported into *NVivo*, which is a data analysis software program. *NVivo* was used to extract themes and code the transcribed data. Member checking was implemented in this study by providing participants with a copy of the transcribed interview. Participants were afforded the opportunity to correct any errors that the researcher may have made during the transcription process.

Validity and Reliability

Creswell and Clark (2011) suggested that there is more of focus on validity than reliability in qualitative research. This is to ensure that the researcher has provided an accurate account of the participants’ responses and whether the information conveyed can
be trusted and considered credible. Steps were taken to ensure the validity and reliability of this study by the following methods. The researcher informed participants about the purpose of the study and the risks for participating. Participants' anonymity and personal information was protected and held only by the primary researcher and not divulged to anyone. Pseudonyms were used in the reporting and publishing of data. The researcher used a digital recorder to capture interview data. Interviews were transcribed verbatim and transcripts were provided to participants for member-checking purposes. A researcher's journal was kept to accurately account for interactions with participants. All information will be safeguarded for a period of five years in a locked file cabinet in which only the primary researcher will have access.

In addition, steps were taken to minimize validity threats (Creswell & Clark, 2011) that are common in mixed methods research designs. Both quantitative and qualitative samples were from the same population, teachers of refugee English language learners. The use of a large sample size for the quantitative portion and a small sample size for the qualitative portion minimized the threat of using inappropriate sample sizes. Choosing only participants for phase two who have participated in phase one helped the explanation of results and served as a purpose to connect both quantitative and qualitative data.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations were present within this study. First, this study focuses on the experiences of teachers within a specific geographic region of the United States. As with many case studies, the results may not be generalizable (Yin, 2003). However,
generalization was not the intent of this study. Second, the participants provided self-reported data and it was the assumption of the researcher that this information was true and accurate. However, there is not a way to verify the validity of self-reported data. Third, the researcher worked within the same environment as the participants and there may be a bias present in the interpretation of the results. Lastly, the researcher has worked with some of the participants and has developed professional relationships with each one. This could have caused an issue in eliciting honest responses to interview questions.

Summary

The research methodology for this study was a mixed methods study. The method chosen fits the research questions desired to be answered. Data collection and analysis were intertwined to ensure reliability and validity of results. Triangulation of data was used to examine evidence from multiple sources of data. The researcher utilized a coding process to effectively interpret the data. Member checking was employed to ensure the trustworthiness of interviews. Methods of data collection and specific data collection procedures have been included in this chapter. In addition, the researcher has disclosed potential limitations of the study.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to investigate the self-efficacy of teachers of ELs in a highly concentrated refugee resettlement area. This chapter begins with the data analysis of the quantitative data, including descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Quantitative data were collected by teacher responses to the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES, Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Then, qualitative data analysis is presented which includes interview participants’ characteristics and an analysis of their responses coded into themes. Qualitative data were collected by participants’ responses to guided interview questions. The following questions guided the research:

1. What are the perceived levels of teacher self-efficacy as measured by the TSES for teachers of refugee English language learners?
   a) Is there a relationship between the number of years of teaching experience with ELLs and the perceived level of teacher efficacy?
   b) Is there a statistically significant difference (at $p < 0.05$) in the perceived self-efficacy of the teachers who are ESOL endorsed and those who are not?
   c) Is there a statistically significant difference (at $p < 0.05$) in the
perceived self-efficacy of the teachers based on the level (elementary, middle, or high) of school?

2. How do teachers of refugee English language learners describe their experiences and challenges of working with this population?

Quantitative Results

The quantitative phase of this study consisted of teachers responding to the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES). The intended population for this study was elementary, middle, and high school teachers of refugee ELs in Urban City School District. These teachers were contacted and asked to participate in the study through an email sent to the principals of the elementary, middle, and high schools included in this study. Informed consent was obtained by participants clicking on “yes” and starting the survey through a link to a secured website. Participants still had the option to opt of the study by not completing the survey items or submitting their responses.

The survey window was open for approximately eight to ten weeks to capture data. It was originally set for a two-week window; however, only a few responses had been received. The original link was sent during the first week of December. After two weeks of capturing data, a decision was made to extend the window. This time frame does include a two-week winter break at the end of the first semester of school. Hardly any responses were received during the winter break; therefore, the survey link was resent to all participating schools at the beginning of the second semester. Schools were contacted via email again after two additional weeks to capture responses from middle
and high school teachers. After three attempts to collect data during the extended time frame, the survey link window was closed.

I originally wanted to include at least 30 teachers at each school level to participate in this study which would have resulted in a total sample size of 90. However, after multiple solicitations to participate in the study, the participant respondent rate was smaller. A summary of the actual participants by school level is provided in Table 1. Survey Monkey results showed 98 respondents; but 18 were missing data by skipping some or all of the questions within the survey. These cases have been excluded from this study for data analysis and interpretation purposes; therefore, the final sample size equals 80.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale

The TSES was used to answer the research questions for this phase of the study. This instrument consisted of 24 items using a nine-point Likert scale ranging from 1
(Nothing) to 9 (A Great Deal). The 24 items are broken into three subscales: (a) efficacy in student engagement, (b) efficacy in instructional strategies, and (c) efficacy in classroom management. Each subscale contained eight items. See Appendix F for a listing of each item by scale. Teachers’ scores for each subscale were computed by taking their mean for the eight items, thus scores could range from one to nine. For purposes of this study, teachers’ efficacy levels were categorized as follows: (a) low efficacy, mean scores between one and three, (b), moderate efficacy, mean scores between four and six, and (c) high efficacy, mean scores between seven and nine. I decided on this categorization for my own interpretation and analysis purpose. I had not recognized any formal categorization used in previous studies using the TSES nor did the authors give any guidance on the breakdown of the Likert scale scores.

Each subscale measured a different area of efficacy for teachers. The first subscale, efficacy in student engagement, measured teachers’ confidence in their ability to engage students in instructional activities. Teachers who scored high on this scale believed they were capable of helping all learners, including difficult students, through various motivating strategies and techniques. Questions on this scale included questions such as “How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?” and “How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?” The second subscale, efficacy in instructional strategies, measured teachers’ confidence in their ability to employ instructional strategies to meet the needs of all types of learners, more specifically in this case, refugee English learners. Teachers who scored high on this
scale believed they were capable of using multiple instructional strategies and
differentiation for various student levels. Questions on this scale included questions such
as "How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?" and
"How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual
students?" The third subscale, efficacy in classroom management, measured teachers'
confidence in their ability to successfully manage the classroom environment. Teachers
who scored high on this scale believed they were capable of creating an environment that
was conducive to learning. Questions on this scale included questions such as "How
much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?" and "How well can
you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?"

Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability Analysis

In order to answer the primary quantitative research question 1, several analyses
were conducted. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) suggested a factor analysis
be conducted to determine the factor structure and item loadings for the TSES. Their
work boasted of the consistency of three moderately correlated factors with slight
variances at times. I conducted a principal component analysis to determine the factor
loading on each item (Table 2). The three subscales provided more than 68% of the total
variance of the TSES.

In addition, a reliability analysis was completed. These two analyses were
completed to verify the sampling adequacy and reliability of each subscale. A principal
component analysis (PCA) was conducted on the 24 items using oblique rotation
(oblimin). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis, KMO = .81 ('great' according to Field, 2009), and all KMO values for individual items were > .72, which is above the acceptable limit of .5 (Field, 2009). Bartlett's test of sphericity $\chi^2 (276) = 1244.59, p < .001$, indicated that correlations between items were sufficiently large for PCA. Since the Bartlett's test was highly significant, factor analysis was appropriate for this data. It also indicated that there were underlying relationships between the question items. The efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management subscales of the TSES had high reliabilities, all Cronbach's $\alpha > .8$ for the sample data. Due to the factor loadings on the three subscales, efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management; these served as dependent variables in all statistical tests in this study.
Table 2

*Factor Loadings of Items on the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the factor and reliability analyses were completed, efficacy scores were computed for each survey item (Appendix G), as well as, each of the subscales (Table 3). The mean scores of each survey item revealed that the average teacher fell within the high efficacy category because majority of the mean scores were between seven and nine. There was one question which fell within the moderate efficacy level. This was item #22.
which was "How much can you assist families with helping their children do well in school?" This means that teachers do not feel as confident in assisting families as related to the other questions on the TSES. The mean scores of each subscale revealed high levels of efficacy with scores that were equal to or greater than seven. This data set consisted mostly of teachers who felt confident in their ability to engage students, employ various instructional strategies, and manage the classroom environment.

Table 3

*Efficacy Scores for Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Efficacy Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. Strategies</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Mgmt.</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* N = 80. M = Mean. SD = Standard Deviation. Efficacy ratings = low (1 – 3), moderate (4 – 6), and high (7 – 9).

**Correlation Analysis**

A bivariate correlation analysis using the Pearson correlation coefficient was performed to answer research question 1a - Is there a relationship between the number of years of teaching experience with ELLs and the perceived level of teacher efficacy? The null hypothesis stated that there will be no relationship between the number of years of teaching experience with ELLs and the perceived level of teacher efficacy. The critical *r*
value ($p < .05$) to reject the null hypothesis with a sample size of 80 is .22 for a two-tailed test (Salkind, 2008).

According to Field (2009), Pearson's correlation requires that data be interval. The variables of years of teaching experience and level of efficacy meet this requirement. A two-tailed test was performed because I did not make any predictions regarding the direction of the relationship between the independent variable (years of experience in teaching ELLs) and dependent variables (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management). See Table 4 for the results of the correlation analysis.

Table 4

<p>| Pearson Correlation between Years of ELL Teaching Experience and Subscales |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Engagement</th>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Classroom Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of ELL</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (two-tailed)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $N = 80$. *$p < .05$

The obtained values of correlation for efficacy in student engagement and efficacy in classroom management do not exceed the critical value; therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that there is no relationship or the relationship is
negligible between these variables and the independent variable of the number of years of teaching experience with ELLs. However, the relationship between the perceived level of efficacy in instructional strategies and the number of years of teaching experience with ELLs is statistically significant. This means as number of years of teaching experience increases, teachers feel more confident in their ability to employ instructional strategies.

Independent Samples t-test Analysis

An independent samples t-test was done to answer research question 1b - Is there a statistically significant difference (at \( p < 0.05 \)) in the perceived self-efficacy of the teachers who are ESOL endorsed and those who are not? According to Salkind (2008), this is an appropriate test because I was interested in examining the differences between two groups (ESOL endorsed and non-endorsed) on one or more variables (efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management). The null hypothesis stated that there will be no difference in perceived self-efficacy levels for teachers who are ESOL endorsed and those who are not. The null hypothesis should be rejected if the \( p \) value is .05 or less, or the 95% confidence intervals around the mean does not include zero. Table 5 shows the summary statistics for each efficacy variable based on respondents’ endorsement status. Table 6 shows the results of Levene’s test for equality of variances. Levene’s test is non-significant for efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management. Therefore, we can assume that the variances are roughly equal which means the assumption of homogeneity of variances has been met.
Table 5

**Summary Statistics Based on Endorsement Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>Endorsement Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* N = 80.

Table 6

**Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p ≤ .05.

Table 7 shows the results of the independent samples test. These results revealed that the null hypothesis should be accepted. On average, non-endorsed teachers (M = 6.94, SE = .18) experienced a greater sense of efficacy in student engagement than those who were endorsed (M = 6.73, SE = .15). The difference was non-significant *t*(78) = -.92, *p > .05; however, it did represent a small-sized effect *r* = -.10. On average, non-endorsed teachers (M = 7.40, SE = .16) experienced a greater sense of efficacy in instructional strategies than those who were endorsed (M = 7.37, SE = .14). The difference was non-
significant \( t(78) = -.14, p > .05 \); however, it did represent a small-sized effect \( r = -.02 \). In contrast, on average, ESOL endorsed teachers (\( M = 7.63, SE = .14 \)) experienced a greater sense of efficacy in classroom management than those who were not endorsed (\( M = 7.56, SE = .20 \)). The difference was non-significant \( t(78) = .30, p > .05 \); however it did represent a small-sized effect \( r = .03 \).

Table 7

Independent Samples Test Statistics with Equal Variances Assumed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficacy</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>[-.67, .25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>[-.45, .39]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>[-.39, .53]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CI = Confidence Interval

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

An analysis of variance was completed to answer research question 1c - Is there a statistically significant difference (at \( p < 0.05 \)) in the perceived self-efficacy of the teachers based on the level (elementary, middle, or high) of school? The null hypothesis stated that there will not be a statistically significant difference in the perceived level of self-efficacy of teachers based on school level – elementary, middle, or high. This is an appropriate test for the research question because it compares the differences of three groups of teachers – elementary, middle, and high (Field, 2009). I would have rejected
the null hypothesis if the F statistic is .05 or less, if homogeneity of variances is assumed. In terms of post hoc tests (Field, 2009), I would have used Tukey’s HSD if the sample size and group variances were similar. I would have rejected the null hypothesis that group means are the same if the $p$ value was .05 or less.

Assumptions. According to Field (2009), there are several assumptions for ANOVA. The following characteristics must be present in the data set:

a) The variances in each group are fairly similar,

b) Observations are independent,

c) Dependent variables are measured on an interval scale, and

d) Distributions within groups are normally distributed.

After an analysis of the data, the four assumptions for ANOVA (Field, 2009) were met. First, Levene’s test indicated that there was equality of variances, for efficacy in student engagement $F(2, 77) = .61, p = .54$, efficacy in instructional strategies $F(2, 77) = .36, p = .70$, and efficacy in classroom management $F(2, 77) = .25, p = .78$. I assumed independence because one participant’s score on the TSES was not dependent on another participant’s score. The dependent variables – efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management were measured on an interval scale based on a nine-point Likert-scale. Normality is assumed because of the results of the Komogorov-Smirnov test, with Lilliefors significance correction indicated normality for each group (Table 9).
### Table 8

**Results of Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Eng.</strong></td>
<td>Based on Mean</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on Median</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on Median and with adjusted df</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on trimmed mean</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on Mean</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on Median</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr. Strat.</strong></td>
<td>Based on Median and with adjusted df</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on trimmed mean</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on Mean</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on Median</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Mgmt.</strong></td>
<td>Based on Median and with adjusted df</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on trimmed mean</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Results of Komogorov-Smirnov Test for Each Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Work Setting</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov*</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Eng.</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. Strat.</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mgmt.</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. a. Lilliefors Significance Correction. * This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Results of ANOVA. Since the assumptions were met, an ANOVA was run on the data set to test for a difference between groups. Table 10 shows the ANOVA table. Since the p value is greater than .05 for all variables, I accepted the null hypothesis which means that there is no difference in the perceived level of self-efficacy based on the instructional level of school. Subsequently, there was no need to conduct any post hoc tests since the null hypothesis was accepted. There are no differences between
elementary, middle, or high school teachers as it relates to perceived levels of self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management.

Table 10

ANOVA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Eng.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>80.37</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.26</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. Strat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>69.62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70.39</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Mgmt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84.43</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Results

Qualitative data were collected to answer research question 2 – How do teachers of refugee English language learners describe their experiences and challenges of working with this population? All survey respondents were offered the opportunity to participate in the second phase. They marked their interest in phase two participation by
selecting a response to a question in the online survey link. This was demographic data question number six that was listed in chapter three. Random selection was used from this population to get the intended sample size of only six participants based on school level of instruction – elementary, middle, and high. Two teachers were selected from each school level. Participants were purposefully chosen for random selection based on their teaching experience from working with ELL students. Table 11 has a description of the population before random selection. One teacher was randomly selected from each group – teachers with five or less years of ELL teaching experience and teachers with six or more years of ELL teaching experience. Random selection was made using the Random Selection function in Microsoft Excel.

Table 11

*Survey Respondents Interested in Phase Two Participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yrs. of Experience</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or less</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

Participant interviews were conducted using a guided set of interview questions (Appendix H). Interviews took place at the participant’s school either during their assigned planning time or after-school hours. All interviews were audio-taped using two
digital recording devices – portable digital recorder and recording feature on smartphone. Permission to audio-tape was received from each participant on the informed consent letter. I personally transcribed every interview using *Microsoft Word*. Transcriptions were submitted to each participant via email for review to determine the true essence of the information gathered during the interview. Five out of six participants responded and verified the transcription accuracy. The sixth person was contacted several times through two different email accounts (personal and work) with no response.

Multiple reviews of the transcripts led to classification of themes. Transcriptions of interviews were imported from *Microsoft Word* into *NVivo* qualitative analysis software for coding purposes. Queries were made to look at word frequency and related text. These queries resulted in codes and emergent themes which will be discussed later in the chapter.

Description of Participants

In this section, it is my attempt to provide you with a brief description of each participant. There will also be a linkage of data from the quantitative phase to describe each participant’s levels of efficacy. Pseudonyms have been used for confidentiality and anonymity purposes.

Monica is a Caucasian female in her early to mid-50s. She is married with six children and four grandchildren. She is an Arkansas native but moved to the southeast during her formative childhood years. She is a second grade elementary school teacher and has been teaching for seven years. This is her third year teaching ELLs; however, she
does not have her ESOL endorsement. She has a B.S. in Early Childhood Education and has always taught in an urban school setting. Monica’s total and subscale scores on the TSES fall within the high efficacy level. Her overall score was 7.50 and 7.75, 7.13, and 7.63 in efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. She experienced a greater sense of efficacy in student engagement than in instructional strategies and classroom management.

Sharon is an African-American female in her early to mid-40s. She is married with no children. Ironically, she is also from Arkansas; but, moved to the southeast after college. She is a fifth grade elementary school teacher and has been teaching for 18 years. This is her 12th year teaching ELLs and she has an ESOL endorsement. She never thought of teaching as a profession and originally wanted to be a rich and famous interior designer. She has a B.S. in Psychology, M.Ed. in Early Childhood Education, and an Ed.S. in Curriculum and Instruction. She has teaching experience in both affluent and high poverty areas. Sharon’s total and subscale scores on the TSES fall within the high efficacy level. Her total score was 7.13 and 7.00, 7.38, and 7.00 for efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management, respectively. She perceived a greater sense of efficacy in instructional strategies.

Anita is a Caucasian female in her late 20s. She is a Tennessee native and has a variety of teaching experiences that includes overseas work in Australia. She has also taught from the west to the east coast of the United States. Her experience in Australia working at a private Turkish school afforded her the opportunity to become more
interested in multiculturalism and teaching non-native English speakers. Currently, she is a seventh grade middle school ESOL reading and writing teacher. This is her second year teaching ELLs and she has her ESOL endorsement. She has a B.S. in Education and a M.Ed. in ESOL. Anita’s total and subscale scores on the TSES fall within the high efficacy level. An exception is her self-efficacy in student engagement score which is classified as moderate efficacy. Her overall score was 6.67 with 6.00 in efficacy in student engagement, 6.63 in efficacy in instructional strategies, and 7.38 in efficacy in classroom management. She perceived a greater sense of efficacy in classroom management.

Shawn is an African-American female in her mid to late 30s. She is married with two children. She is a seventh grade middle school ESOL language arts teacher and has been teaching for six years. This is her fourth year teaching ELLs and she has her ESOL endorsement. She has a B.S. in Broadcast Journalism, M.B.A. in Human Resources Management, M.Ed. in Special Education, and is currently working on her Ed.S. in Instructional Technology. In addition to teaching, Shawn has been a professional actress for over 20 years. Shawn’s total and subscale scores on the TSES fall within the high efficacy level. An exception is her self-efficacy in student engagement score which is classified as moderate efficacy. Her overall score was a 6.71 with 6.38 in efficacy in student engagement and 6.88 in both efficacy in instructional strategies and efficacy in classroom management. Efficacy in instructional strategies and classroom management were her highest efficacy ratings.
Ashley is a Caucasian female in her mid to late 40s. She is a high school biology teacher and has been teaching for 24 years. This is her 14th year teaching ELLs and she has both ESOL and Gifted endorsements. She has a B.S. in Biology and Psychology, as well as, a M.Ed. in Biology Education. Ashley’s total and subscale scores on the TSES fall within the high efficacy level. Her overall score was the highest of all phase two participants with a 8.21. She received a rating of 7.63, 8.00, and 9.00 for efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management, respectively. Efficacy in classroom management was greater than efficacy in student engagement and efficacy in instructional strategies.

Robin is an African-American female in her early to mid-30s. She is a high school ESOL science teacher and has been teaching for five years. This is her first year teaching ELLs and she does not have an ESOL endorsement. Robin’s total and subscale scores on the TSES fall within the moderate efficacy level. Her overall efficacy score was the lowest of all participants with a rating of 5.29. She rated herself as 4.75 in efficacy in student engagement, 6.00 for efficacy in instructional strategies, and 5.13 for efficacy in classroom management. She perceived a greater sense of efficacy in instructional strategies than efficacy in student engagement and efficacy in classroom management.
Table 12

*Participant’s Scores from the TSES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Student Engagement</th>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Classroom Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Based on a 9-point Likert scale with 1 = nothing and 9 = a great deal.

Emergent Themes

After a thorough analysis of teacher interview transcripts, several themes emerged. These themes were derived from two different methods. The first method consisted of importing the transcriptions into *NVivo* qualitative analysis software. Texts were grouped based on word frequency and making connections of related text from each participant. The second method consisted of allowing persons independent of the research study to audit interview transcripts and identify themes by marking through the text. Two individuals besides the researcher identified similar themes among the participants during this process. This resulted in a total of six themes:

1. Desire to create an academically challenging environment,
2. Interest in whole child development,

3. Use of similar instructional strategies,

4. Lack of official training,

5. Communication, and

6. Rewarding teaching experience.

These themes are not listed in any specific order. Themes and related ideas and/or concepts are listed in Appendix J. In addition, specific quotations from participant interviews are grouped according to each theme.

Theme #1 – Desire to Create an Academically Challenging Environment. All of the participants articulated a strong desire to create an academically challenging environment for refugee English learners. This was expressed through various anecdotal accounts of working with students with a wide spectrum of abilities, as well as, diversity of cultural backgrounds. Monica stated “My biggest concern is making the tasks challenging and meaningful. I don’t want to spoon feed my kids.” She also later said “The biggest challenge is when I get kids that come into my room and they don’t even know their ABCs. They don’t know the letters first so that we can talk about the sounds.” Anita illustrated this in her comment when describing her students – “every level that you can possibly imagine from not even knowing how to hold a pencil to actually being somewhat educated in English.”

Many participants described their experience as teachers in the era of high-stakes testing and accountability. Some commented on their students being held to the same
standards as their native English speaking counterparts. Ashley strongly expressed her disgruntlement of this issue by saying

> I think it is harming our most vulnerable children the most. A child who just got here from Beijing is held to same standard as the child of a university professor...if they don't do well on the same test, the school is labeled a failure, the teacher is labeled a failure, and directly, that child is labeled failure. That cannot be fair and this is not an accurate portrayal of what goes on in a school...to give a child some bubble in test (Appendix I, Question 2, H1).

Others looked at this from a different perspective and used this as a catalyst to hold all students to higher expectations for success. For instance, Sharon stated:

> We assume these kids can't do certain things. But, they can and never have the same opportunities that other native English speakers have. So I feel as if they get slighted when it comes to education by not having the same opportunities because we assume that they can't. I like to go ahead and see if you can. At least expose you to it and you may be surprised (Appendix I, Question 2, E2).

Overall, the teachers agreed that teaching this unique subset of students comes with its own set of challenges. These challenges may include academic, as well as, language barriers. Despite these challenges, many have found ways to reach their students to provide a learning experience that is both relevant and meaningful.
Theme #2 – Interest in Whole Child Development. An analysis of various comments to most of the interview questions revealed a unique commonality that involved interest in whole child development. This consisted of several things such as connecting with students on a personal level, wanting to be a positive change in students’ lives, creating a classroom and culture of respect for diversity, and multicultural awareness. It was interesting to see that this theme was threaded throughout the three school levels. Many of the participants spoke of learning from their students.

Being a teacher of refugee ELs has afforded them an opportunity that other teachers do not get. A refugee student enters the classroom environment with a number of emotional, psychological, and developmental needs that extends beyond the average student. Monica made this evident by stating:

You know, I thought I had a diverse background; but, knowing people from another country is a lot different than teaching people who learned a separate language before English before coming here and being thrust into a situation where they are learning English and learning content at the same time (Appendix I, Question 3, E1).

Furthermore, Anita talked about gaining insight into the lives of her students by saying:

Once they leave this school, they are entering into…not all of them, but many of them, are entering into a world that is not that of a typical student. I find that their personal lives very much affect their education in such that…they don’t do their homework, they don’t have internet access, they don’t have transportation for
things like any extracurricular activities. Many of them have to go home and be a mother, cook dinner, clean, and stays up late until their parents come home from their jobs. So, they are kind of living a two-sided life, as well as, the gangs, which are a big issue. They miss a lot of school. Their personal lives really negatively affect their ability to reach their full potential as students because they have so many hindrances on them (Appendix I, Question 2, M1).

She continued on by explaining:

They never have supplies so I am their supply person. I have difficulty in getting them to complete homework. A lot of them are very tired and fall asleep in class. A lot of them try to come in with tobacco…chewing tobacco… they are out of dress code a lot. It’s just little things like that and it’s a challenge because I turn a blind eye most of the time (Appendix I, Question 5, M1).

Ashley talked about her experience by stating:

They are bringing a lot more than just a different culture. They are also bringing experiences that are tough for us to imagine, really. They may have seen war; they may have seen…or been in one of the [refugee] camps…It’s very powerful to connect with them and enjoy them. They are enjoyable little people and they have all kinds of things going on. There is hopelessness because they have a lot going on that often leads to family issues and behavior issues that makes it harder for them to learn and achieve at the levels they could (Appendix I, Question 3, H1).
These teachers have described the lives of their students on a more intimate level than the average teacher. It is because their students come from such a diverse set of background that they are able to do so. Shawn was able to sum this up by saying:

As a refugee teacher, you learn a lot from your students. It keeps you on your toes because you are always trying to learn things about their language and their culture in order to reach them. You have to understand where they came from (Appendix I, Question 1, M2).

Connecting with their students on a personal level allows them to create classroom environments in which students feel safe to learn. In fact, this was both explicitly and implicitly stated when they were describing their classroom. Having a safe classroom environment is intentional and evident by the following comments. Monica stated, “I have to try to set an environment up in my classroom where they know they are safe. No one is going to make fun of you if you make a mistake.” In addition, Anita said, “Making sure they feel safe is huge because literally, students will go months without speaking.” The concerns of these teachers go beyond the basic delivery of instruction. Being able to connect with their students and learning about their different cultures empowers them to be better teachers. This makes the environment ready for teaching and learning.

Theme # 3 – Use of Similar Instructional Strategies. When asked about successful instructional strategies, teachers at all three school levels suggested the use of similar instructional strategies. These included repetition, modeling, visual/pictorial
representations, acting it out, gesturing, etc. Shawn said, “I think the biggest strategy is the SWIRL method and to incorporate that into pretty much everything I do. When we say SWIRL, we mean speaking, writing, illustrating, reading, and language.” The SWIRL method encompasses all of the strategies that the rest of the teachers offered. Robin boasted of using “repetition of oral directions, modeling activities for them, having lots and lots of visuals, and hands-on activities.” Sharon said, “Gesturing is the most beneficial.” Anita was a strong proponent of the use of visuals by saying, “The use of visuals is probably the most effective and practical strategy. There are so many things that I couldn’t have taught without images.” She offered an additional strategy by stating:

> Something I started doing this year that has really worked well is giving them choices. Letting them choose how they would like to show what they learned and just giving them a choice between A and B is so powerful. It makes them feel so much more in control and makes them so much more motivated and excited because they get to pick what they are doing (Appendix I, Question 4, M1).

Monica presented another instructional strategy by saying, “Giving them opportunities to talk. Listening to what they are saying...modeling ways to take what they are saying and giving them or modeling a way for them to say it more correctly or more clearly.”

The instructional strategies offered by the participants are strategies that are commonly used with English language learners. It is representative of training and professional development that they talked about during their interviews. The SWIRL
method is one of the most commonly used instructional strategies that is taught in the SIOP training model (Eschevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2010).

Theme #4 — Lack of Official Training. A resounding theme was the one of the lack of official training to work specifically with refugee students. Many had not received any formal training. They felt that there was a lack of resources available to teach refugee English language learners effectively. The limited training received was related to teaching English language learners and not necessarily refugee English language learners. Monica detailed her preparation to teach her students by saying, "I didn’t have a lot of experience with students whose first language was not English and...my confidence wasn’t very high..." However, she also stated, "The first training I received was the SIOP training. It was extremely beneficial to me. A lot of things I discovered on my own were reinforced in the SIOP training." Robin stated, "I haven’t had official training. They tried to lump it in with differentiated learning." Shawn said, "The training I have received has pretty much been on the job. I have taken the SIOP training. But, I basically took the test to get certified." Anita expressed her lack of training by saying:

Specifically speaking about the refugee aspect, I’ve really had none...So, actually now that I’m thinking about it...that is disappointing because at this school there is not any particular training on refugee. Because we have a lot and there is a lot to deal with in that (Appendix I, Question 3, M1).

Ashley talked about a professional development opportunity by stating:
We have a Georgia State professor come here and teach us a sequence of classes to obtain our ESOL endorsements...She was particularly wonderful because she was very interested in us talking about culture and that things that come in addition to language. She particularly taught about refugee children (Appendix I, Question 3, H1).

In contrast to the others, Sharon listed a number of training opportunities by saying:

I have gone through CaseNex for ESOL endorsement. I’ve gone through several SIOP trainings. I’ve attended different workshops provided through county for ELL learners. In class, with my graduate classes, I’ve gone through different things about ELL learners. At school...here...different workshops. I have gone to a refugee conference two to three years ago in Chicago. It was a two-day training specifically for refugees (Appendix I, Question 3, E2).

It seems that the majority of the study participants have at least received the SIOP training which is evident in their use of similar instructional strategies that was discussed previously. However, one training session is not enough to meet the vast needs of refugee English language learners. The lack of training presents a number of issues for teachers.

Theme #5 – Communication. Communication was an overarching theme which consisted mostly of language issues with both parents and students. The lack of English language can be a barrier to effective communication. Oftentimes, communication with parents and students is needed with the assistance of an interpreter. Anita explained, “It’s very hard to communicate with the parents.” Robin detailed her parental correspondence
by saying, “I have to be able to get in contact with their parents to make sure they are aware of what the students are missing or need to do. Sometimes, I feel like they don’t understand the big picture and there is no one there to explain it to them.” Although this may be a challenge, Monica said it was one that has improved because “we have more interpreters here and we also have more communication that goes home that is interpreted”. She even described how she goes over every piece of written correspondence with her students so they can relay important messages to their parents once they get home. Sharon reflected on her communication barrier by linking it with parental support and trying to understand cultural differences between American and non-American parents.

Theme #6 – Rewarding Teaching Experience. The teaching profession is often considered a rewarding career. Interestingly, participants echoed the notion of teaching refugee ELs as the most rewarding teaching experience. It is as if working with this particular subset of students offered a more rewarding experience than teaching the average traditional class. Ashley expressed this by saying, “This is a wonderful population to serve. It really is...in particularly the ELL and refugee combo is one of the most interesting subset populations.” Anita said, “It’s been extremely rewarding a personal level. I have never felt more rewarded and with that inner thing that most people teach for. I’ve never felt more rewarded than working with these children.” Monica agreed by saying:
The most rewarding experience I have had as a teacher has been teaching here with my ELL students. I loved teaching before. But, I was in schools before where I had to try to convince my students it’s good to learn or it’s beneficial to learn...Here, my students are more intrinsically motivated to learn. But, the thing I really love about being here is that my kids are willing to work hard and I do not have to convince them to try. They’re willing to put in the hard work and it makes me want to work harder to help them learn. I’m glad that I’m learning ways that are helping them more effective than before. And they are also sweet-natured, very sweet-natured students who appreciate everything that you do for them. So, it’s a joy to work in this school (Appendix I, Question 6, E1).

Sharon affirmed this belief by saying:

Sometimes it’s easy; sometimes it is the most difficult thing I think I can do in my life. If I could not teach these kids, I would not teach. There are times when I am near tears. There are times when I am in tears. This is the best job I’ve ever had. It’s the most rewarding to see the kids...the growth...from not saying anything to one day you turn around and they ask something like “Can I go to the bathroom?” I’m like you can have anything you want...what are you talking about? Just to hear that first sentence that comes out their mouth from them not speaking at all. It’s like...it’s amazing. This is the best job I’ve ever had. It’s a lot of difficulties. This job stresses me out but I wouldn’t change it. If I couldn’t teach here, I could not, I would not. I would give up teaching. I wouldn’t teach anywhere else. Now,
I could go to Burma and work and teach. I could go to Nepal and teach. But not in the United States, I would have to do something else (Appendix I, Question 6, E2).

The statements made by these teachers illustrate their enjoyable experiences of working with the unique population of refugee English language learners. Despite all challenges that may have been presented, they are still able to label the experience as rewarding. Being able to see the fruits of their labor enables them to stick with teaching, even in a challenging environment.
CHAPTER 5  
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the mixed methods study, discussion of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research. The research findings are reviewed from both quantitative and qualitative perspectives to address the original proposed research questions. Conclusions are drawn based upon the analyzed data from quantitative and qualitative results. Then, implications that affect the educational community are made. Lastly, final recommendations for further research are given.

Overview of the Study

The demographics of the average American classroom have changed over the years. There are an increased number of English language learners due to the increase of the immigrant population (Harper & de Jong, 2004). In addition to an increase of immigrants, another phenomenon has recently occurred in traditional classrooms. Refugee students have emerged as a subset of the immigrant population. In fact, Georgia is one of the top ten states for refugee resettlement (Refugee Family Services, 2013). The changing demographics of the general education classroom present a number of issues for the teachers which are centered on the preparedness to work with these students. Preparedness to work with students is directly related to teacher self-efficacy. A teacher’s
sense of efficacy has a major impact on student learning. Therefore, this study sought out to investigate the self-efficacy of teachers of refugee English language learners.

There have been a limited number of studies on teacher self-efficacy as it relates to the teaching of English language learners (Kwait, 1989; Paneque & Barbetta, 2006; Tasan, 2001). Research on teacher self-efficacy and the teaching of refugee English language learners is nearly non-existent. The literature review provided insight on immigration trends, instructional strategies for teaching ELs, teacher training and professional development, and studies related to teacher self-efficacy. However, there was still a huge gap in the research about the unique experience of teaching refugee English language learners. The purpose of this study was to fill in that gap in the body of educational research. The following questions were used to guide the research:

1. What are the perceived levels of teacher self-efficacy as measured by the TSES for teachers of refugee English language learners?
   
   a) Is there a relationship between the number of years of teaching experience with ELLs and the perceived level of teacher efficacy?
   
   b) Is there a statistically significant difference (at \( p < 0.05 \)) in the perceived self-efficacy of the teachers who are ESOL endorsed and those who are not?
   
   c) Is there a statistically significant difference (at \( p < 0.05 \)) in the perceived self-efficacy of the teachers based on the level (elementary, middle, or high) of school?
2. How do teachers of refugee English language learners describe their experiences and challenges of working with this population?

This study utilized an explanatory sequential mixed methods design which involved collecting quantitative results before collecting qualitative data. For quantitative purposes, the *Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale* (TSES, Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) was distributed to elementary, middle, and high school teachers of refugee English language learners. The final sample size was 80 participants, although it was intended to include at least 30 from each school level. The qualitative portion of the study involved participant interviews; in which, two teachers from each level were randomly selected. Participants were chosen for random selection based on their teaching experience from working with ELL students. One teacher with five or less years of ELL teaching experience and one teacher with six or more years of ELL teaching experience were chosen from each school level. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed by the researcher and two independent reviewers for the derivation of emergent themes. The six themes identified in this process were:

1. Desire to create an academically challenging environment,
2. Interest in whole child development,
3. Use of similar instructional strategies,
4. Lack of official training,
5. Communication, and
6. Rewarding teaching experience.
Credibility threats were minimized by the use of digital audio recordings, member checking, and independent reviewers. Interview transcripts and statements that relate to each particular theme are listed in Appendices I and J.

Discussion of Findings

In chapter four, data analysis was presented from participant’s responses to the TSES and participant interviews. This provided answers to the proposed research questions for this study. Research question number one with sub-questions a, b, and c, was answered using quantitative measures. Research question number two was answered using qualitative data analysis.

Research Question 1

What are the perceived levels of teacher self-efficacy as measured by the TSES for teachers of refugee English language learners?

Factor loadings on the TSES revealed three major sub-scales – efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management. For purposes of this study, efficacy was divided into three different categories based upon each participant’s response on the nine-point Likert scale. If a participant responded between one and three, he/she was rated as having low efficacy. If a participant responded between four and six, he/she was rated as having moderate efficacy. Lastly, if a participant responded between seven and nine, he/she was rated as having high efficacy.
Mean scores on the TSES revealed participants having a high level of efficacy for all three subscales (see Table 3). A more in-depth analysis was completed to look at the mean scores of each individual survey item (Appendix G). This indicated that participants have high efficacy for all items except #22 which revealed a rating of moderate efficacy. Item #22 asked, “How much can you assist families with helping children do well in school?” It is not surprising that teachers of refugee English language learners do not feel as efficacious in assisting families. This is due to the unique needs that refugee ELs bring to the classroom. Oftentimes, these parents speak little to no English which presents a communication barrier.

Research Question 1a

Is there a relationship between the number of years of teaching experience with ELLs and the perceived level of teacher efficacy?

A bivariate correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between the number of years of teaching experience with ELLs and the perceived level of teacher efficacy. The analysis revealed that there is no relationship between the number of years of ELL experience and the perceived levels of efficacy in student engagement and efficacy in classroom management. However, there is a statistically significant relationship between the number of years of ELL teaching experience and the perceived level of efficacy in instructional strategies. This finding affirms the belief that teachers with more years of experience feel more confident in their ability to use a variety of instructional strategies.
Qualitative data analysis in this study also confirmed this as the use of similar instructional strategies was a theme provided from participant interviews. Furthermore, the teachers with more years of teaching experience rated themselves as high with values ranging from seven to nine on the TSES.

Research Question 1b

Is there a statistically significant difference (at $p < 0.05$) in the perceived self-efficacy of the teachers who are ESOL endorsed and those who are not?

An independent samples $t$-test was completed to determine the differences in self-efficacy of ESOL endorsed and non-endorsed teachers. The results revealed that non-endorsed teachers experienced a greater sense of efficacy in student engagement and instructional strategies. Whereas, ESOL endorsed teachers experienced a greater sense of efficacy in classroom management. Although there was a difference between these two groups (ESOL endorsed and non-endorsed), the difference is not statistically significant for each subscale of self-efficacy.

There were four ESOL endorsed and two non-endorsed teachers who participated in the qualitative phase of the study. A look at their scores indicated that all of the endorsed teachers felt a greater sense of efficacy than the non-endorsed teachers. This is a contrast to the results from the quantitative data analysis with one exception. Both the quantitative and qualitative analysis revealed that ESOL endorsed teachers experienced a greater sense of efficacy in classroom management. However, it could be other factors that explain this phenomenon besides the status of ESOL endorsement.
Research Question 1c

Is there a statistically significant difference (at $p < 0.05$) in the perceived self-efficacy of the teachers based on the level (elementary, middle, or high) of school?

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized to determine the differences in the levels of efficacy based on assigned school levels. The analysis indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between the perceived level of self-efficacy and the level of school. This was true in the qualitative data analysis as well with teachers rating themselves between moderate and high on three subscales.

Research Question 2

How do teachers of refugee English language learners describe their experiences and challenges of working with this population?

Responses to interview questions in the qualitative phase of the study unveiled several themes. Participants articulated a strong desire to create an academically challenging environment for their students, interest in whole child development, use of similar instructional strategies, lack of official training, and communication issues. Despite all of this, nearly all of them still described their experience with working with refugee ELLs as the most rewarding teaching experience.

The participants were able to describe their experience as a challenging, yet successful one. Also, their perceived ratings on the TSES indicated moderate to high ratings on all three subscales – efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management. Guskey and Passaro (1994) talked
about teachers with a higher sense of efficacy being able to have the tenacity to endure challenging instructional environments. This is evident with the teachers in this study as they described their experience and the many challenges of working with refugee ELLs. They serve students with a multitude of emotional, psychological, developmental, and academic needs.

Bandura (1997) stated that mastery experiences are the most influential in developing self-efficacy. Mastery experiences are those in which a person has experienced success after an exertion of effort. The successful experience fuels them on to continue and try again regardless of the level of difficulty. This is evident in the participant's responses to the interview questions. They continue to enjoy working with this population despite all of the obstacles and challenges of meeting the unique needs.

Conclusions

The quantitative findings indicated that the majority of the teachers who participated in this study were highly efficacious at it relates to their ability to engage students, employ a variety of instructional strategies, and provide effective classroom management. This was true regardless of ESOL endorsement status and instructional school level because there was no statistically significant difference for these two items. The number of years of teaching experience seems to have a positive correlation with efficacy in instructional strategies. As the number of years of teaching increases, the teacher's perceived level of efficacy increases. Experience raises the level of confidence in their ability to use a variety of instructional strategies to meet individual student needs.
Qualitative findings illustrated the experiences of teachers of refugee English language learners. Their experiences paralleled many of the teacher training issues found in the literature review. For instance, it affirmed the belief that there is an ill-preparedness of teachers to meet the diverse set of needs for this unique population. Many of the participants talked about having a wide spectrum of abilities of students present in one classroom with a limited number of resources. They also spoke of creating an environment with high expectations due to heavy accountability requirements. In addition, many shared that they have never undergone any official training as related to working directly with refugee students. Most of their professional development was gained by on-the-job experience and attendance to a few workshops delineated for teaching English language learners; but, not specifically for teaching refugees.

The experience of a teacher of refugee English language learner included other issues besides teacher training. Language issues provided a communication barrier between teachers and their students and parents. However, this was overcome through the use of interpreters and the help of peers. Working with refugee English students afforded the opportunity to gain cultural awareness by learning more about the students’ background and connecting with them on a personal level. Cultural awareness enabled the teachers to create safe classroom environments that were immersed with a subculture of respect for diversity.

This study echoed the sentiment of teacher attitudes affecting instructional practices as found in the literature. All of the participants exhibited positive attitudes
towards working with refugee English language learners. Many of the participants welcomed the diversity of their students’ backgrounds and created classroom environments that were safe and respectful of that diversity. However, this study seemed to contradict the previous studies of Youngs and Youngs (2001) and Walker et al. (2004) which suggested that teachers with limited training as not being welcoming of ELLs in their classrooms.

The literature stated that perceived level of self-efficacy is context specific (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). This was demonstrated in the variability of efficacy mean scores for the three constructs of the TSES – efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional strategies, and efficacy in classroom management. Some teachers were more efficacious in one area than others. Overall, it seemed that teachers with more years of teaching experience were more efficacious in instructional strategies and classroom management. This makes sense because as more years of experience is gained, more instructional and classroom management strategies are learned and developed.

Surprisingly, in spite of all of the stated issues related to teaching refugee ELs, teachers had high levels of self-efficacy and described their experience as the most rewarding teaching experience. The literature suggested that lack of training led to self-efficacy issues, which was not affirmed in this study. On the other hand, the idea of highly efficacious teachers working harder and possessing the best teaching practice (Ross & Gray, 2006) was affirmed. This was expressed during participants’ interviews with responses about wanting to be a positive change in the lives of their students, going
the extra mile to connect with students, and the use of research-based instructional strategies.

Limitations

Measures were made to minimize the effects of aforementioned limitations and assumptions. However, this study was impacted by the following limitations:

1. The study was limited to participants who worked in one urban metropolitan school district located in the southeastern region of the United States.

2. Only participants who were assigned in the designated cluster of schools with the highest number of refugee English language learners were solicited for participation.

3. The response rate varied at each school level because participation was voluntary. This could affect the data because only those who demonstrated interest in the research topic volunteered to participate.

4. Data were limited to the assumption of participants’ responses on the TSES and to interview questions to be accurate and factual.

5. I work at one of the schools in which the research conducted. My professional and personal relationships with the participants could have affected their responses to interview questions.

Implications

The need for specific training on teaching refugee English language learners was illuminated in this study. This is a unique subset of students that could majorly impact
classrooms in the United States. The Office of Refugee Resettlement (2013) reported more than 58,000 refugees that arrived in the U.S. during the 2012 fiscal year. The largest populations of refugees were resettled in the following states — Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, New York, New Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington. Each one of these states received more than 2,000 refugees. Although these states received a large number of refugees, there were some states that did not receive any such as Delaware, Wyoming, and the U.S. territories of Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. As the U.S. continues to allow refugees to resettle, the number of refugee students will increase. With the arrival of these students in traditional classrooms, more preparation is needed for teaching and learning practices.

Even though these students represent a small subset of the student population, proper training is necessary due to the unique challenges that this group brings to the classroom. Teachers in this study indicated that they had not received any specific training related to the teaching of refugee English language learners. This is unfortunate because as stated in chapter two, more than half of any refugee population is children (UNHCR, 2013). This means that in 2012, there were more than 29,000 refugee children that entered U.S. classrooms. This could easily be a group that gets overlooked and result in being underserved due to lack of proper training.

Additionally, preparation should be considered at the university level since teaching assignments can vary. This is especially true for states that have federal refugee resettlement areas. As stated in chapter one, only four states – Arizona, California,
Florida, and New York have specific coursework related to ELLs for teacher certification (Ballantyne et al., 2008; Echevarria et al., 2010). These states have large populations of English language learners, as well as, refugees. Requiring coursework related to ELLs for teacher certification is only a start. There are other states with federal refugee resettlement areas which includes the state of Georgia. Some universities and colleges in Georgia offer ELL related coursework; however, it is not a requirement for teacher certification. Teacher candidates have the option of receiving an ESOL endorsement which only designates them as an expert in working with English language learners (GAPSC, 2010). They still must be certified in a specific content area and grade level in order to teach ELs. Until teacher preparation in ELL coursework becomes mandatory for certification purposes, teachers will continue to enter the classroom underprepared to work with this subgroup of students.

Recommendations for Further Research

Due to the limited research on teacher self-efficacy and the teaching of ELs, more specifically, refugee ELs, there is a number of possibilities for further research. Additional research could be done in other federal refugee resettlement areas to see if it yields similar results. This study investigated teachers in only one designated federal resettlement area. There are approximately ten metropolitan areas that are designated as federal resettlement areas in the United States. More specifically, research should be conducted in states such as Arizona, California, Florida, and New
York since they require ELL related coursework for teacher certification to determine if training has an impact on the perceived level of efficacy.

Another area of research could consist of teachers of refugee ELs from different regions that could be compared and contrasted. Refugee arrivals in the U.S. vary from year to year; however, they are dispersed into several regions throughout the country. A look into teachers of refugee English language learners at the preschool and university levels could be explored. This study only examined the self-efficacy of teachers in the K-12 setting. It would be interesting to see if teachers at other instructional levels described similar experiences since they are working with a different age group of learners. The life of a refugee student could be tracked over time until high school graduation. Standardized test scores could be compared with perceived levels of teacher self-efficacy to determine if students of highly efficacious teachers outperform students of less efficacious teachers as suggested by Henson (2001). Lastly, an in-depth investigation could be completed in newly designated refugee resettlement areas. For instance, some states like Minnesota are attracting more refugees due to the amount of federal assistance available. This creates the phenomenon of refugees relocating to different areas which affects school enrollment rates in the old and new locations. This increase in the refugee student population could impact teachers perceived self-efficacy levels, especially if they have not received any training to work with this new population of students.
Another study could be in schools that have a few number of refugee students. What is the self-efficacy of teachers who have a few refugee students in their classrooms? What are their perceptions regarding their ability to teach refugee students?

Summary

This section included a discussion of the findings, conclusions, limitations, implications, and recommendations for further research. These resulted from a thorough analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. The answers to the research questions only apply to a small segment of teachers of refugee English language learners. The results from this study are not generalizable because they represent a small portion of the entire population. A more in-depth investigation is needed to truly answer the proposed research questions.

This study provided the opportunity to gain insight into the lives of teachers of refugee English language learners. This study has only filled a small portion of a huge gap of educational literature that needs further exploration as the number of refugee students continue to increase in the average American classroom. Teachers included in this study have demonstrated that perseverance is the catalyst for successful teaching of a challenging group of students. Despite all of the challenges, they were still able to find personal fulfillment in teaching that was sparked by a genuine love of children.
APPENDIX A: MERCER IRB APPROVAL
APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT
Informed Consent
Self-Efficacy of Teachers of Refugee English Language Learners

You are being asked to participate in a research study. Before you give your consent to volunteer, it is important that you read the following information and ask as many questions as necessary to be sure you understand what you will be asked to do.

Investigating
This research study is being conducted by Keisha Battic, a Ph.D. candidate at Mercer University to fulfill degree requirements. The name of this project is Self-Efficacy of Teachers of Refugee English Language Learners. This is affiliated with the Tift College of Education at Mercer University Atlanta Campus under the supervision of Dr. Ismail Gyagenda. Mercer University is located at 3001 Mercer University Drive Atlanta, Georgia 30341. The faculty advisor can be reached at 678-547-6166.

Purpose of the Research
This research study is designed to investigate the self-efficacy of teachers of refugee English language learners. The data from this research will be used to inform the educational community about the experiences of teachers of refugee English language learners. As a student at Mercer University, this study will help me to better understand the process of mixed methods research.

Procedure
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to answer questions related to your job as an educator. Your participation will take approximately one and half hours.

Potential Risks or Discomforts
There are no foreseeable risks associated with the study.

Potential Benefits of the Research
This research may better inform the educational community about the experiences of teachers of refugee English language learners and their perceived level of self-efficacy when working with this unique population.

Confidentiality and Data Storage
The names of all participants will remain confidential at all times. Pseudonyms will be used for the participants. The principal investigator is the only one that will have access to the real names of the participants. An audio-tape will be used for all interviews. The tapes will be transcribed by the principal investigator. The transcription will be maintained in a locked file cabinet. This information will be stored for at least 3 years after the completion of the study.

Participation and Withdrawal
Your participation in this research study is voluntary. As a participant you may refuse to participate at anytime. To withdraw from the study please contact Keisha Battic at 678-602-6589.
APPENDIX C: METROPOLITAN AREA REFUGEE ARRIVALS BY COUNTY
**Metropolitan Area Refugee Arrivals by County for FY 2004 - 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>13332</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>2351</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>4126</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwinnett</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockdale</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


FY – Fiscal Year runs from October to September
APPENDIX D: TEACHERS’ SENSE OF EFFICACY SCALE
APPENDIX E: PERMISSION TO USE THE TSES
Good morning Dr. Woolfolk-Hoy,

My name is Keisha Battle and I am a Ph.D. candidate at Mercer University. I am completing my dissertation on teacher self-efficacy when teaching elementary refugee English language learners. This will be a mixed-methods study that will examine teacher self-efficacy and experiences of elementary teachers. I am extremely interested in this topic because I currently work as a math instructional coach at a school that has over 70% refugee English language learners. This is a school with a student enrollment of 1,100 preschool-5th grade students.

During my research on self-efficacy, I came across the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) as it was referenced in other publications. I believe your survey instrument will help me to explore this issue with more depth. Therefore, I am asking your permission to use the TSES in my study. I will acknowledge you as the creator of the instrument and would love to share my findings with you. Thank you in advance for your consideration. If you need to contact me, you can call me at 678-502-6589 or via email at keishabattle@yahoo.com.

Respectfully yours,

Keisha Battle

Anita Hoy
To Me

Mar 4, 2013

You are welcome to use the instrument—details are at:

http://people.ohio.edu/edithhoy/research/instruments/

Sincerely,

Anita Woolfolk Hoy
Professor Emerita
Educational Psychology & Philosophy
The Ohio State University

7807 Pebble Creek Circle
Unit 102
Naples, FL 34108

phone: 239-592-4859
Cell: 415-640-2917

http://people.ohio.edu/edithhoy
APPENDIX F: LISTING OF EACH ITEM BY SCALE
**TSES Subscale Items**

**Efficacy for student engagement**

1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?

2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?

4. How much work can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?

6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?

9. How much can you do to help your students value learning?

12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?

14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?

22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?

**Efficacy for instructional strategies**

7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?

10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?

11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?

17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?

18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?

20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?

23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?
24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?

**Efficacy for classroom management**

3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?

5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?

8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?

13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?

15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?

16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?

19. How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?

21. How well can you respond to defiant students?
APPENDIX G: EFFICACY MEAN SCORES FOR SURVEY ITEMS
Efficacy Mean Scores for Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Efficacy Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 80. M = Mean. SD = Standard Deviation. Efficacy ratings = low (1 – 3), moderate (4 – 6), and high (7 – 9).
APPENDIX H: GUIDED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
GUIDED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Describe your experience as a teacher of refugee English language learners.

2. What concerns you most about the education of refugee ELLs?

3. Tell me about the training you have received in working with refugee ELLs?

4. What teaching strategies have been successful in your experience with refugee ELLs?

5. Describe any challenges/obstacles you have with working with refugee ELLs?
APPENDIX I: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS
1. Describe your experience as a teacher of refugee English language learners.

| Monica (E1) | Initially, I was a little bit intimidated when I first came here which was about three years ago because my experience had been in an inner city school. The type of school I grew up with; I didn’t have a lot of experience with students whose first language was not English and I was...my confidence wasn’t very high and my ability to help them the best way. But, I had a SIOP training that first year. But unfortunately, it wasn’t in the beginning of the year. It was in the middle or end of the year. A lot of the things I discovered on my own were reinforced in the SIOP training. I learned some new strategies that I used that year and I continue to use. I have kinda adapted and changed them. So, I was intimidated at first but when I got more information on ways I could help my students succeed more readily. That helped a lot and my experience and reflecting on what has helped and ways that I can improve my instruction. I feel more confident now. |
| Sharon (E2) | I’ve been working with refugee English language learners for the last 11 – 12 years. The experience has been...it varies from one spectrum to the other. There are many joys in working with that. There are downfalls as well. It’s a range. Sometimes it’s easy; sometimes it is the most difficult thing I think I can do in my life. They bring a lot of different things to the table. Some have no previous schooling and some have had a lot. For some, it’s the language barrier and some it’s the academic barrier...having no school. So, it’s a wide spectrum and it’s all in one classroom usually every year. |
| Anita (M1) | Last year was my first year working at the middle school level as well as my first year working with refugee English learners. My experience thus far has been full of so many things; every level that you can possibly imagine from not even knowing how to hold a pencil to actually being somewhat educated in English, as well as, so many cultural issues and cultural knowledge that I didn’t previously have. A lot of that has presented itself and it’s been extremely rewarding on a personal level. It’s also been extremely consuming because there so many resources that do not exist or that are not sitting my classroom. So, I had to custom-make a lot but of course, that has it upside as well because I’ve had a lot of freedom. Through that, I have been able to focus in on social language |
and cultural events or holidays. So, I’ve had a little bit of leeway to try to educate them; not just in English, but also in culture here because I think for them that it is quite different.

Shawn (M2) Well, my learning experience has been that I learned a great deal from my students. The majority of them are Asian and they are from Nepal or Burma. About 70% of my students will come from those places. The other percentages come from Afghanistan and African countries such as Ethiopia, Sudan, Congo, Eritrea, those countries. As a refugee teacher, you learn a lot from your students. It keeps you on your toes because you are always trying to learn things about their language and their culture in order to reach them.

Ashley (H1) I have been at [redacted] for 14 years now and our population here is very heavily ESOL. A smaller percentage of the ESOL would be characterized as refugees. I am certified to teach ESOL students so I have some biology classes that are designated ESOL Biology. So, I work with them. We realize that ESOL students are a main clientele here at , even if they are not officially designated as ESOL. They are certainly English language learners and are certainly first-generation American if not direct immigrants themselves. We made a big push a few years ago to have content teachers go obtain ESOL endorsements in an attempt to learn strategies and familiarize ourselves with the needs and issues facing ESOL students. I obtained my ESOL certificate about 5 or 6 years ago. I’m very glad I did. We learned a lot about what it’s like to learn in another language which is quite a concept for most of us. As teachers we were once very successful in school...we like school...school is a good place for us. But learning to help them both obtain mastery in English and simultaneously trying to master a content area...especially in this era of very high stakes testing; it’s high stakes for the kids. We had to find more strategies to help them. I’m really glad we did.

Robin (H2) It has its challenges. I have classes where students don’t understand the English language well enough. I have to be able to teach them science, which is my content area, where there is a lot of complicated words. It is hard for English speaking students and it is even more of a challenge for those who don’t speak the language to understand really complex words. Some of the challenges that I face when I have to teach a concept is that
they are stumbling over the small words. Like...what is “increase” mean or “decrease” mean and I have to teach them electric magnetic spectrum. We get stuck on words and explaining what is increasing and decreasing. Or are you sure? They ask what does “sure” mean? A lot of homonyms confuses them because when you say sure, they are like sure as in beach or sure as in are you certain. Using synonyms is a challenge because they don’t understand.

2. What concerns you most about the education of refugee ELLs?

Monica (E1) Right now, where I am in my evolution of teaching in that situation...my biggest concern is making the tasks challenging and meaningful. I don’t want to spoon feed my kids. I feel like the first year, I tried so much to help my students that I did not challenge them enough. I don’t feel like I asked them enough higher order questions. I don’t feel like I gave them enough opportunities to speak and talk about what they were learning so they conceptualized it or internalized it more effectively. And...so that’s what I’m focusing on now...giving them plenty of opportunities to speak about what their learning and also to realize that there are different ways of saying things. So, when they take a test and they read it, it’s not going to be worded exactly the way they learned it. I want them to learn different ways to see things, different ways to say things. And, we’re focusing on the meaning. We’re focusing on taking what you know and using it more...instead of just understanding the concepts, using the concepts. And so I guess, I think I got off track...but, my focus is on having them to speak about, talk about what they’re learning. Having them focus on using what they’re learning more so than just gaining the knowledge...actually applying the knowledge in different ways. And also trying to challenge them in as much as possible...to think outside the box not just what is this but what can I do with this or what is the cause of this or what is the effect of this or what would happen if. So that’s where my focus is right now.

Sharon (E2) The thing that concerns me most...I know many educators like to say...we assume that these kids can’t do certain things. But, they can and never have the same opportunities that other native English speakers
have. So, I feel as if they get slighted when it comes to education by not having the same opportunities because we assume that they can’t. I like to go ahead and see if you can. At least expose you to it and you may be surprised.

Anita (M1) What concerns me most about their education is that once they leave this school, they are entering into...not all of them, but many of them, are entering into a world that is not that of a typical student. I find that their personal lives very much affect their education in such that...they don’t do their homework, they don’t have internet access, and they don’t have transportation for things like any extracurricular activities. So it is that as well. Many of them have to go home and be a mother, cook dinner, clean, stays up late until their parents come home from their jobs. So, they are kind of living a two-sided life as well as the gangs, which are a big issue. They miss a lot of school. Their personal lives really negatively affect their ability to reach their full potential as students because they have so many hindrances on them.

Shawn (M2) The biggest concern is that you have to understand where they came from. Some of the students don’t have a foundation in education. Some of them may have had an optional education or may have been child soldiers. There may not be a big value on education in their culture or formal life in their culture. So trying to acclimate them to the American way and public education can be a challenge.

Ashley (H1) This era of high stakes testing, I think, is harming our most vulnerable children the most. A child who just got here from Beijing is held to same standard as the child of a university professor sitting over at Druid Hills. If they don’t do well on the same test, the school is labeled a failure, the teacher is labeled a failure, and directly, that child is labeled a failure. That cannot be fair and this is not an accurate portrayal of what goes on in a school....to give a child some bubble in test. But, most importantly, it is not helping the kid. We’re not serving their needs to spend all this time instead of opening the wonderment of welcome to America...welcome to our way of life...welcome to the disciplines we teach. It’s a whole lot of you need to do this right now. It really concerns me for all children. No mother’s child should be subjected to this nonsense. But, I think it is the most detrimental for our most struggling
children because they are getting told right off the back that they are a failure...they’re unsuccessful...they’re feeling like it’s a lot of struggle right away. Whereas, an upper middle class child with two parents who are college-educated is probably quite a long way up the testing ladder before they have one that is difficult for them. But, it’s not the case with these children. They are struggling to learn the language. They do not understand the references in the test. Their parents don’t speak English. The very first things we’re doing to them are basically telling them that they are not good enough and their school is not good enough because it gets written in the paper all the time that we have bad test scores and they people here trying to help them are not good enough. This is not healthy and this is not a way to help the children reach their potential. That’s my job as a teacher is to help children grow into the people they will become. I don’t need everyone to be a biologist...that’s silly. But, I would like everyone to appreciate the natural world, know a little bit about it, maybe get to know a little bit more. I don’t want to just beat them to death with a bunch of facts so they can pass a test.

| Robin (H2) | They are held to same standard as everyone else. They still have to take the EOCTs. They still have to take the same standardized tests as the regular students. They are already at a disadvantage from not knowing English. On top of that, you are now being penalized for not knowing it and still having to take the test. So, you have to catch up on language and catch up on content and still pass this test in order to say that you meet the requirements of the particular subjects. |

3. Tell me about the training you have received in working with refugee ELLs?

| Monica (E1) | The first training I received was the SIOP training. It was extremely beneficial to me. I think the most meaningful thing I got from that or the thing that stood out the most initially was the word wall. She pointed out how you can get a picture that helps with conceptualizing meaning and use words that make it easier to understand and that was the first thing that I used and I continued to use that. But, the SIOP training helped me understand it better. You know, I thought I had a diverse background; |
but, knowing people from another country is a lot different than teaching people who learned a separate or another language before English before coming here and being thrust into a situation where they are learning English and learning content at the same time. So, SIOP training was the first training. I think there were a couple of other professional learning opportunities here at the school. One was where...refugee...uhhh...I think there are people who help refugees. There is an actual refugee center...I can’t remember the name of it. But, they came and they had a slide show and they showed the situation that many of the students here lived in before they came here. The stress they underwent, the devastation they may have experienced. And, it was an eye-opening experience for me. I was able to see that they had many challenges before they even got here. So, that I could be more understanding of their past experiences. And that helped me because we’ll talk about their past experiences and relate it to what we’re learning now. And, that’s helping me bridge what they know with what they are learning. So that experience helped me to use more of...what am I trying to say? It helped me understand that even though they may have learned other stuff in another language in another country before, there is stuff they have learned and they can still make connections to what they are learning now to their experiences and what they learned then and that helps them better understand it now.

Researcher: So, is there any other trainings besides SIOP and the ... 

The refugee...no. I started an ESOL class but I couldn’t keep up with it because the rigor of what they wanted was too difficult for me to keep up with and do what I needed to do to help my students in my classroom. I would like to take the ESOL endorsement class. But, the only way I can see myself doing it successfully is in the summer time when I am not also teaching. Otherwise, I don’t know how else to do it. But it is something I would very much like to get actually. Beyond that, I can’t think of anything else right now.

Sharon (E2) I have gone through CaseNex for ESOL endorsement. I’ve gone through several SIOP trainings. I’ve attended different workshops provided through county for ELL learners. In class, with my graduate classes, I’ve gone through different things about ELL learners. At
Researcher: Anything specific to refugees, or just general ESOL?

Teacher: Yeah, just general ESOL. Wait, I have gone to a refugee conference two to three years ago in Chicago. It was two-day training specifically for refugees.

Anita (M1) Specifically speaking about the refugee aspect, I’ve really had none. I was not even aware that [redacted] County had such a huge refugee population. I just discovered that when I started working here. We have plenty of professional development but it is usually focused on data, testing, and all of those things. So, actually now that I’m thinking about it...that is disappointing because at this school there is not any particular training on refugee. Because we have a lot and there is a lot to deal with in that. So, that part...yes, I have not really received any training. As far as English learners, we have had a few PDs on that and I got my master’s degree in ESOL but not with the intention of coming into the refugee population. That’s just how it worked out.

Shawn (M2) The training I have received has pretty much been on the job. I have taken the SIOP training. But, I basically took the test to get certified. I took two classes in my graduate program online with Grand Canyon University when I was working on my second master’s degree in special education. Grand Canyon is in Arizona and they have a lot of ELLs, it was a requirement to take those classes. I took the GACE test in ESOL and since I have been working with ELLs at the [redacted] middle school since 2009, most of my training has been on-the-job. There has been some professional development activities; however, most of my own training has been reading and researching independently. I believe that about 70% has been independent research and the other 30% has been formal.

Ashley (H1) Several years ago, we were a part of the professional development school grant with Georgia State. We had a Georgia State professor come here and teach us a sequence of classes to obtain our ESOL endorsements. That’s the way a lot of us did it back at that time. She was particularly wonderful because she was very interested in us talking about culture and the things that come in addition to language. She particularly taught
about refugee children. They are bringing a lot more than just a different culture. They are also bringing experiences that are tough for us to imagine, really. They may have seen war; they may have seen...or been in one of the camps. One of our great soccer players that graduated from here a few years ago had been in a refugee camp for a year before a family resettled him here. He is a marvelous young man but you could see that he carried a lot with him. So, I’m very grateful for the professor that really encouraged us to reach out and spend time talking to the children with good sense of tact. We are not counselors and cannot address your deepest fears; but, at the same time, trying to understand what is going on with you as my student is real powerful. I think it lets them know that we see them as a whole person and not a data point. So, we received a lot of training in that. We continued to try to do a lot with our community here by trying to reach out to them and get them in our building. A lot of our parents are undocumented...so there is a large contingent of our parents that feel very uncomfortable to come up to the building or are concerned that it is not a good idea for them. We have reached out the Latin American Association and they have opened a mini office right here on our campus to try to help us connect with the community more and learn how to serve that community. We are not entirely Latin American but that is our largest group....students from Latin American countries.

Robin (H2) I haven’t had official training. They tried to lump it in with differentiated learning. I think it is too broad to encompass ELL and special education students and cultural diversity. They try to nail everything as differentiated learning. Some of the things can cross over; but, there is definite need for a separate...it has to be content specific too because in science, the things I have to brush up on like their math skills. Science words are not something that would regularly get in an English class.

4. What teaching strategies have been successful in your experience with refugee ELLs?

Monica (E1) Giving them opportunities to talk. Listening to what they are saying...modeling ways to take what they are saying and giving them or
modeling a way for them to say it more correctly or more clearly. And having them do that and giving them that practice. So, practice with speaking, modeling the more effective ways of expressing their ideas, and letting them practice after I give them that guidance. If you ever have the opportunity to come in and listen to my kids have conversations about what they are learning, I’m impressed with it. In the beginning of the year, it wasn’t all that great. Last year, it wasn’t anywhere near what it is now. But now, if I give them something to talk about, they turn, they look to each other, they’re talking and they’re talking about the content and they are speaking more correctly than they did at the beginning of the year. It’s because of that practice. So, I definitely will keep doing that. We make connections all the time like I said to their past experiences and past experiences in their homes. I try to make as many connections as possible. That’s a strategy that I will continue to use. Having visual picture representations or models of something...I’ll continue to do that. Having them make models of things, having them act it out...I’ll continue to do that. We use a lot of graphic aids and at the beginning of the year with more support and then put less and less in it and work towards them being the writers of the content that goes in there. Having them talk about something means and summarize their reading. That’s a strategy that I am working on now because we are focusing on meaning. In the beginning of the year...like with reading...we focused on strategies for sounding out the words so they knew what it was saying. Now, that was difficult at first. But, I told them that we are doing now...they got that and they are going to keep using that. But now, we are focusing on the meaning like if you don’t know what it means, what can you do to try to figure out what it means and get an understanding of that. Those are strategies we are working on too.

Sharon (E2)  
Total-Physical-Response…what is it? TPR? Like, you act it out. Gesturing is the most beneficial. Having someone there that speaks their language. Not depending on them all the time; but, when I just can’t get something through. Having peer tutoring, realia or pictorial representation, hands-on experiences, repetition, applying things, making things fit with their background knowledge…that’s all I can think of right now.
Anita (M1) | Definitely and most important to me is...maybe this isn’t a direct strategy but I feel like it is one...to create a classroom where first and foremost, mistakes are wonderful because they will make them all the time. You know, at this age plus the things they deal with, they have a lot of anger and they don’t react very well to things like people laughing at them or calling them a name. So, there’s absolutely zero tolerance here for that kind of thing. I push that point so hard from the very beginning. There’s no such thing as a bad mistake because we can learn from them. There’s no name-calling or telling people to shut up in here. So, it creates a really great climate of respect. The thing is that students are constantly coming and going so it’s not as if I have a stable class from the beginning of the school year to the end of the year. So, as the dynamics change, that becomes a very important issue. It helps them feel...making sure they feel safe is so huge because literally, students will go for months without speaking. That’s the number one complaint from mainstream teachers is that they don’t say anything. Then, I’m thinking, well, how safe do they feel in your class? It’s all to do with that social filter and also differentiating...it’s necessary because the level range is so huge. So that just gets built in to everything. The use of visuals is probably the most effective and practical strategy. There are so many things that I couldn’t have taught without images and also just lots of things on display within in the room. I am constantly referring to them, especially vocabulary. Repetition and constantly reviewing because getting them to do homework is difficult. So, they are not reviewing or reading or anything...Something that I started doing this year that has really worked well is giving them choices. Letting them choose how they would like to show what they have learned and just giving them a choice between A and B is so powerful. It makes them feel so much more in control and makes them so much more motivated and excited because they get to pick what they are doing.

Shawn (M2) | I think the biggest strategy is the SWIRL method and to incorporate that into pretty much all that you do. When we say SWIRL, we mean Speaking, Writing, Illustrating, Reading, and Language. That is going to attack all the levels that ELL students need. If you incorporate that into your lessons, that is going to help improve the student’s progression in the language proficiency, as well as, improve your data.
| Ashley (H1) | Whew! That’s a funny one…I don’t they call it a teaching strategy in any of the books…but being open to them; being interested in them. They will struggle through some really long soggy nonsense if they get the idea that you like them. It’s not a lie…I’m not trying to manipulate the children. I just noticed over the years that being open to understanding them a little bit….being curious about it. I remember one kid said to me years ago…it was life-altering a little bit…he said “Ms. You like us”. I was like yeah, I’m the teacher and that’s what we do, but apparently that’s not the case. It was also surprising to me because I was like…why are you doing this job if you do not like kids. You are in the wrong place buddy….move on …there’s the door. One thing I would say about my colleagues here…is that; overall, this is a really good school. This is the kind of place that if you spent a day or two around here…you would send your own child. I mean it. You would be surprised. A lot of people assume a lot of things about us and about our school because of our low income population, our refugee population, our immigrant population; they make a lot of assumptions…oh, all of the girls are pregnant and the guys are in a gang. There’s some of that but that’s not a lot of that on our campus. It’s not dangerous…we don’t have big fights. A lot of our kids…a really significant portion…achieve at great levels. It’s very powerful to connect with them and enjoy them. They are enjoyable little people and they have all kinds of things going on. |
| Robin (H2) | Repetition of oral directions, modeling activities for them, having lots and lots of visuals, hands-on activities, and making a connection with students. I just started this new idea of mine is to meet only with my ELL students on Tuesdays. I try to isolate them from everyone else and help them go through questions and understanding what the questions are asking. That one-on-one tutoring where I might have it based on that culture or language….like, I can meet with my Burmese kids on a certain day and if I can get someone that understands the concept or the language, I can get help in providing them with help. Trying to connect…they feel the cultural barriers like this is my teacher, I shouldn’t question or ask her to repeat stuff. Even when they don’t get feedback, it’s pushing them more to try to get them to come out. Having translators for parents or peers/students that speak the language trying to them group according to that to help them. |
5. Describe any challenges/obstacles you have with working with refugee ELLs?

| Monica (E1) | The biggest challenge is when I get kids that come into my room and they don't even know their ABCs. They don't know the letters first so that we can talk about the sounds. So, if you are trying to cover...well not cover, but teach the content where that can understand it but then you also have to try to go back and help them with the basic fundamentals of reading and the alphabet, the sounds, and the phonics. It's an extreme challenge sometimes because there doesn't seem to be enough time or enough support to be able to address all of the needs. That's one challenge. Another challenge that has actually improved has been communication with parents. But, we have more interpreters here and we also have more communication that goes home that is interpreted. One thing I do to address that challenge is I will have all of the kids to look over the papers we have to go home and we go over it together. And we talk about what it means and I explain it to them so that when they go home, they can explain it to their parents because oftentimes their parents speak very little or no English. But, that's the case always. But it helps in those cases. So, communication with parents is a challenge. Initially, the challenge to get them to be able to not be afraid to make a mistake. I have to try to set an environment up in my classroom where they know they are safe. No one is going to make fun of you if you make a mistake. You are not in trouble with me if you make a mistake. I'm not mad at you if you make a mistake. Making a mistake is part of learning. That's the only way you can learn. If you don't try...if you don't practice, you don't learn. That's been a challenge. But I think I have addressed that challenge pretty well. It's just at the beginning of the year, they are kinda scared...you know because that don't know what to expect. They have their experiences. If they haven't been here before, or with teachers in their country or maybe other kids that made them feel like they weren't good enough or what they are saying is good enough or valid. So...I try to be firm in my classroom that this is our classroom community and we respect each other. Its okay to make a mistake and it is not okay to make fun of someone or make someone feel bad if they are not perfect because we are all learning. So, scared of making mistakes is another challenge. I can't think of another challenge right now. So...is that enough or would |
you like for me to think of something else.

| Sharon (E2) | Background knowledge. Just the different cultures. Sometimes, just like in reading...sometimes they know none of the words. What is “at”? What is “by”? The girl sat by the water. What is by? Just comprehending...them understanding the English language; the lack of the English language; not, the lack of knowledge but just the language barrier. That is the most...and parental support...the cultural differences. Because in some cultures, the school is different from the...they think that they shouldn’t be interfering with what the school says and they feel like the school shouldn’t be interfering with parenting. There are two separate things. But, in our country, we’re like we got to get this altogether. One hand washes the other. It takes a village. In some of their cultures...no, it’s like this is something separate...two totally different things. I’m not going to interfere with what they are doing over here. That’s why in my experience a lot of parents don’t come and I’ll talk to them and they are like “no, whatever you say...no, I don’t come, no. They see it almost as disrespectful to try to interfere or come to the school. So, having the school and them learning that...the parents themselves...that school or the systems we have in place that we do need the parents to support our educational system. And, several of them come from countries where they don’t have the expectations and it’s just two separate entities. We need their support. |

| Anita (M1) | They never have supplies so I am their supply person. I have difficulty in getting them to complete homework. A lot of them are very tired and fall asleep in class. A lot of them try to come in with tobacco...chewing tobacco. I guess the males. I’ve never seen females with it but the males. I guess it’s acceptable with their young age to do that. I’ve learned the smell. It smells like Windex and I can tell when it is in their mouth. They try to hide it [laughs] but I make them spit it out. So, things like that. And, of course then there are some pretty hot racial tensions; which actually this year hasn’t been a big of a problem as last year. I have been more successful in creating an environment that when you walk in the doors, you drop your garbage and we’re not being racial in here...we’re not going to be mean. It has actually worked pretty well. Last year, oh gosh, I had some really big clashing racial tension things. I had a couple |
of fights in here. Their anger...I think it’s this age; but, I feel like they have anger that comes from different places. You know what they wear...they are out of dress code a lot. It’s just little things like that and it’s a challenge because I turn a blind eye most of the time. It’s usually shoes because that’s what they can afford so I just pretend I don’t see. They will come in sandals, high heels, or flip-flops in the middle of winter. So, no... [Laughs]...I’m not going to try to send them home. A lot of their lack of education is a problem because you may get some students in and they don’t know how school works. Expectations that you would assume someone would know...they don’t. So, there are a lot of things that you would assume that people know or that it is this way because you are used to American children and then they come in with whole set of other issues. So, you can’t pretty much assume anything. Another problem is them speaking in their native language because they will say things that you know are bad. This is one problem between the students a lot. They’ll say “So and So is calling me bad names in his language” and I don’t know how to speak Swahili or Chin. I can’t confirm or deny that [laughs], so, it causes a lot of conflict and then the students are mad at me and they start spouting out in another language. I know they are telling me off but I have no idea what they are saying. That’s frustrating. Also, there’s the parental involvement issue. Engaging with the family unit is pretty much not there because of the lack of transportation, lack of language, and the lack of telephones that work. I can’t tell you how many times I call or try to call the number in the system and it has been disconnected or it rings and this person hasn’t set up voicemail, or there’s no answer. So, actually, that’s a pretty huge problem; it’s very hard to communicate with the parents. You have to use language line. And, the parents are kind of like...if the students are acting up, they don’t seem to really care. Which that is kind of a new revelation for me but I think that their expectation is as long as you...I don’t know, I haven’t figured it out. For instance, a student left school and skipped with some students of the same culture and then when the teacher called home to talk to the parent about it. The parent wanted to know was he with other children of that same culture. She is like “yes” and then the parent said well then it was fine. The whole parent element is really kind of crazy. Their lack of understanding of technology - I mean there are many students that I have to actually show them how to
click the mouse when they first come in. Again the lack at home, it’s common for them to not have internet. Also, eating...a lot of the students will not eat the food here because it is a whole different...they’ll eat...like they’ll get double fruit or double vegetables instead of pizza because they are just eating healthier or differently. Rice, vegetable, maybe a little meat; but they don’t really seem to eat which is a problem nutritionally because they already tired. That’s a problem.

| Shawn (M2) | I think the biggest obstacle for me is trying to understand the different populations of students. It is different from...let’s say that everyone is Spanish...you know 90% of your students are from Spanish speaking countries. You would be dealing with one specific culture or sub-culture. But, we have kids from all over the world...15 different countries. It’s very hard to really understand the psyche of that child. That’s the hardest thing for me because I like to get down to the root cause and see why a child acts the way they do. I’m really relating that to middle school boys. A lot of boys come in and adapt to the American culture of mediocrity; more so than the girls do. They boys develop faster than the girls do too. If I look at my data from last year, my boys increased quicker than the girls did. So, I’m trying to understand that. Also, trying to adapt to the negative culture and the things they see. So, trying to understand why that’s the case. That’s the biggest challenge for me because my smartest students...by smart I mean they can learn and apply the information quickly...are involved in gangs. The socio-cultural issues would be my biggest concern. As far as moving students with education or strategies; that’s easy. But, the hardest thing is fighting those socio-cultural issues which I think is standard for middle school. |

| Ashley (H1) | It’s a long list unfortunately. Transients...a kid is not here for very long; coming in the middle of the year. A lot of our curriculum is built on this idea that you have or have had certain things at different times. You know the notion that you were in middle school here in [---], if not down the road at [---], at least you were here in [---]...well no, these children weren’t. They might not have been in school in their previous environment. So...background and trying to develop their skills. Sometimes, there is hopelessness because they have a lot going on that often leads to family issues and behavior issues that makes it harder for |
them to learn and achieve at the levels they could. These kids have to pass that EOCT because it is 20% of their grade. So...trying to guess every word that might be on the EOCT so I can make sure they know what an "ice cream cone" is. People who don't work with these kids just don't get it. It's like they don't see...it's a complete frame of reference that our kids often do not have. So, trying to build all that frame of reference and scaffold it on something else; in addition to teaching your content is tough. I'm running ragged trying to teach them things that would become organic after being here for a while. But, no, you need to get it right now because we are going to give you a test and you are going to pass or you will be sitting in ninth grade again. Or, we are going to give you a test and if you don't do well, you'll feel bad about yourself. It's very frustrating. I don't think it is too strong to call it child abuse. Whoever thought this up, I ought to lock them up in a room and have to take tests by the hour in another language with references to things you don't know anything about like using mantega versus oil to make your tamales and you tell me how well you are going to do. We are going to publish these scores by putting them in the newspaper and you are going to answer for them. That would be appropriate punishment for all of these clowns under the gold dome who think this is how we should help education. Again, we are hurting our most vulnerable children the most and that, I do believe qualify as a sin. How you the least of me is how you treat me...I believe was said. It is heartbreaking because these are great kids; they really are. I came here from another school with a very different population. I taught the children of my college professors when I first started teaching. It was fun to be around kids...I told one of my colleagues today...I was lecturing about Gregory Mendel, genetics guy who did the research with the peas and came up with the ideas of inherited traits. He is very famous in biology world. Variably, there would be one or two kids in class who had been to Austria and visited the little museum and bring in the vacation photos to show everybody. That's neat! That's great! But, it's such a different world. Those children deserve good teachers too and they deserve good experiences. Every mother's child deserves the best we can offer them; but, it was very different to feel like you are serving kids who are going to be fine either way. Your mom's a college professor; dad is a CDC researcher...you are
Robin (H2)

The ones who are dedicated, they come all the time. I have the ones who think that because they may have not had formal schooling, they show up too infrequently to get proper instruction. I have to be able to get in contact with their parents to make sure that they are aware of what the students are missing or need to do. Sometimes, I feel like they don't understand the big picture and there is no one there to explain it to them. It's kind of left up to them to figure out as they go along and it's hard. A lot of them are probably the eldest child in their home and the only one in their household that speaks English well enough. So, they may have to miss school to facilitate the cable guy coming in or if the parent or younger brother or sister has to go to the doctor. They have a lot of responsibilities.

6. Is there anything else you would like add or let me know about your experience being a refugee ELL teacher?

Monica (E1)

The most rewarding experience I have had as a teacher has been teaching here with my ELL students. I loved teaching before. But, I was in schools before where I had to try to convince my students it's good to learn or it's beneficial to learn. I had to work really hard to pull those students in. Here, my students are more intrinsically motivated to learn. I think it is important to their parents. They pay attention, I have to make sure that them just sitting quietly... that was another challenge. If they are sitting quietly, it does not necessarily mean that they are paying attention and they understand. If you say ok, your kids are going to say okay and nod their head but that doesn't necessarily mean that they are going to understand. But, the thing I really love about being here is that my kids are willing to work hard and I do not have to convince them to try. They're willing to put in the hard work and it makes me want to work harder to help them learn. I'm glad that I'm learning ways that are helping them more effective than before. And they are also sweet-natured, very sweet-natured students who appreciate of everything that you do for them. So, it's a joy to work in this school.
| Sharon (E2) | If I could not teach these kids, I would not teach. There are times when I am near tears. There are times when I am in tears. This is the best job I’ve ever had. It’s the most rewarding to see the kids…the growth…from not saying anything to one day you turn around and they ask something like “Can I go to the bathroom?” I’m like you can have anything you want…what are you talking about? Just to hear that first sentence that comes out their mouth from them not speaking at all. It’s like…it’s amazing. This is the best job I’ve ever had. It’s a lot of difficulties. This job stresses me out but I wouldn’t change it. If I couldn’t teach here, I could not, I would not. I would give up teaching. I wouldn’t teach anywhere else. Now, I can go to Burma and work and teach. I could go to Nepal and teach. But not in the United States, I would have to do something else.  

*Researcher: Wow! Would you work at a school that has the same population as this one?*

Teacher: Yeah, yeah. I can go anywhere that has the population. With a school like this, I feel like I can make a difference. I student taught at Oak Grove where you have time and you can talk about famous paintings and painters and artists and the kids have gone to the Louvre or they have the paintings you are talking about and they are correcting you. It’s different. I knew that I couldn’t work it. And this is County. They’re very successful…those kids. I student taught in a first grade over there and it was 20 kids. Thirteen of them were in Discovery and the other ones would have been high achievers if they had it. So, I knew I couldn’t work there. |

| Anita (M1) | Well, this is my tenth year teaching and the last two years I’ve made a big change. I’ve come into the middle school level and I’m teaching ESOL. Whereas before, I was just a classroom teacher with several different grades in elementary but with more average students, not a refugee population by any means. I have never felt more rewarded and with that inner thing that most people teach for. I’ve never felt more rewarded than working with these children. That love that you get from elementary, especially the really young ones…first grade, second grade…that love that you get. You know, a lot of them will end up loving me the same way but it usually doesn’t come from older students |
like that, you know. They draw me pictures. I feel like more than ever that I actually making a difference and I know this to be true because of the letters they write me and the things that they say. So many of them felt like they couldn’t do it until they were in my class. My students that were in my class before always want to come to my class. It’s so fulfilling because I’m making a difference. The ones who really, really do care, they really care and I’m helping them to integrate into a new society and it is a really amazing feeling, you know. It is so amazing to watch them grow. Yes, a very, very rewarding population to work with in my opinion.

Shawn (M2): I think it is very important. I tell my students its all math at the end of the day. I know that they feel some type of the way in the general education setting. I teach sheltered ESOL ELA. So, I want to do a little bit more modifications than the general education teacher. Most of the general education teachers I surveyed said that they do not modify their curriculum. So, the kids are really trying to meet seventh grade level standards when they are on first or second grade level of understanding. I think the biggest thing for us to have a cultural awareness or cultural immersion training with the teachers and teaching them how to modify the curriculum. A lot of people are not as knowledgeable as they pretend to be. This is very important to me because they kids need to spend extra time adapting to the culture. So, being able to have afterschool programs such as 21st century, a program I’m involved with, allows you to spend time with the students for five days a week for two hours after school. Also, they have Saturday sessions where we go on fieldtrips so they can be immersed in the culture. This is very important and you can see more progress with those students.

Ashley (H1): This is a wonderful population to serve. It really is... in particularly the ELL and refugee combo is one of our most interesting subset populations. They are a smaller subset here than some of the other schools. We are hugely ELL, but we are smaller on the refugee ELL; but, we do have them. It’s just the challenges they bring. Sometimes what they bring refreshes your faith in humanity. Somebody has brought them over here or somebody has taken them in... they are still willing to give life a try. Some of them have seen some mess... some real mess. Let me
tell you a funny story...a couple of years ago, my mom and dad were celebrating their 50th wedding anniversary. So, the whole family went out to a real fancy restaurant downtown at Nicolas Roof. It was real fancy with white tablecloths and tuxedo waiters bringing the silver trays. We were having a good time and this very tall African young man was our head waiter at our table. He was very fun to talk to...he had a good sense of humor. We were chatting a little bit and I mentioned that I was a teacher. The whole family rolls their eyes and are like oh God, don’t start her about being a teacher because I love what I do and I like to talk about it. He likes that’s great, my mom’s a teacher. I say that’s cool, where does your mom teach? He says _______. I’m like huh...immediately in my mind I’m like I can’t think of anyone on staff right now that is African unless I’m forgetting one of my colleagues. So, I ask who is your mom, son. He says, “Ms. Campbell, the librarian. Well you need a visual here...Ms. Campbell is a white lady about this tall [uses hand gestures]...a tee tiny little thing and I looked at him real funny because this is a six-foot tall gentlemen from Africa and I’m thinking, hmmm...like you don’t look a lot like your mom, huh. He laughs and says he likes to say it that because he always get that response. She adopted him. He was a refugee. His family wanted him out of Eritrea and her children had just gotten off to college and out of the house. She and her husband decided to adopt this young man and bring him over. His family was mostly killed in the violence there but they wanted for him to get out. She brought him here. The covet to the story is that...a couple of years ago...she brought him here at _______, he went on the college at Georgia State and got his masters. He is a business owner. He got married recently into a young woman of Eritrean descent and they had a traditional Eritrean wedding. Ms. Campbell, his adopted mom was telling how the parents of the bride and groom are a very big deal at these weddings so they are carried in on these things on guy’s shoulders. She says there she went riding in as the mother of the groom. He says that you raised me and my parents are dead so she served as his mother at the wedding. Sometimes, there are really great stories. He’s a great kid. The rewards are wonderful. It’s good stuff but it’s tiring. It’s hard because you are looking at kids like “wow, we have a lot of ground to make it kiddo, buckle up your seat belt!”
Robin (H2) I think that, schools that have high ELL populations, all teachers should be trained. They do have sheltered classes but the sheltered classes only last up until about 9th or 10th grade. Then, they have to go join regular ed courses which mean that everyone should be trained. If you come out of a sheltered class and into a regular classroom, your teacher may or may not have the necessary skills to deal with issues. A better way to communicate with parents because the information that is sent out is not written in different languages because it is a cost to the school to get it translated. Just to have multiple ways to make sure the parents are aware. They need to get information from the school in their language or making sure that someone is taking the time so the students know the courses they need to take to matriculate. These are basic things that we take for granted when they really may not understand fully.
APPENDIX J: EMERGENT THEMES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interested in the whole child</th>
<th>Desire to create an academically challenging environment</th>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Lack of Official Training</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Most rewarding experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecting to students on a personal level</td>
<td>Wide spectrum of abilities of students</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>SIOP training</td>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>Personal fulfillment in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe classroom environment and culture of respect</td>
<td>High-stakes testing and being held to same standards as native English speakers</td>
<td>Modeling, Acting it out, Gesturing</td>
<td>Limited refugee training</td>
<td>Language barriers with students and parents</td>
<td>Love of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to be a positive change in the lives of children</td>
<td>High expectations</td>
<td>Visual Aids</td>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
<td>Sees growth over time in students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td>Speaking Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Interested in the whole child**: Connecting to students on a personal level, Safe classroom environment and culture of respect, Want to be a positive change in the lives of children, Cultural awareness.
- **Desire to create an academically challenging environment**: Wide spectrum of abilities of students, High-stakes testing and being held to same standards as native English speakers, High expectations.
- **Instructional Strategies**: Repetition, Modeling, Acting it out, Gesturing.
- **Lack of Official Training**: SIOP training, Limited refugee training.
- **Communication**: Parental support, Language barriers with students and parents.
- **Most rewarding experience**: Personal fulfillment in teaching, Love of children, Sees growth over time in students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interested in the whole child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1: You know, I thought I had a diverse background; but, knowing people from another country is a lot different than teaching people who learned a separate or another language before English before coming here and being thrust into a situation where they are learning English and learning content at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an actual refugee center...I can't remember the name of it. But, they came and they had a slide show and they showed the situation that many of the students here lived in before they came here. The stress they underwent, the devastation they may have experienced. And, it was an eye-opening experience for me. I was able to see that they had many challenges before they even got here. So, that I could be more understanding of their past experiences. And that helped me because we'll talk about their past experiences and relate it to what we're learning now. And, that's helping me bridge what they know with what they are learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to try to set an environment up in my classroom where they know they are safe. No one is going to make fun of you if you make a mistake. You are not in trouble with me if you make a mistake. I'm not mad at you if you make a mistake. Making a mistake is part of learning. That's the only way you can learn. If you don't try...if you don't practice, you don't learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to be firm in my classroom that this is our classroom community and we respect each other. It's okay to make a mistake and it is not okay to make fun of someone or make someone feel bad if they are not perfect cause we are all learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M1: ...so many cultural issues and cultural knowledge that I didn't previously have.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...once they leave this school, they are entering into...not all of them, but many of them, are entering into a world that is not that of a typical student. I find that their personal lives very much affect their education in such that...they don't do their homework, they don't have internet access, they don't have transportation for things like any extracurricular activities. So it is that as well. Many of them have to go home and be a mother, cook dinner, clean, stays up late until their parents come home from their jobs. So, they are kind of living a two-sided life as well as the gangs, which are a big issue. They miss a lot of school. Their personal lives really negatively affect their ability to reach their full potential as students because they have so many hindrances on them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You know, at this age plus the things they deal with, they have a lot of anger and they
don’t react very well to things like people laughing at them or calling them a name. So,
there’s absolutely zero tolerance here for that kind of thing. I push that point so hard from
the very beginning.

It helps them feel...making sure they feel safe is so huge because literally, students will
go for months without speaking. That’s the number one complaint from mainstream
teachers is that they don’t say anything. Then, I’m thinking, well, how safe do they feel in
your class?

They never have supplies so I am their supply person. I have difficulty in getting them to
complete homework. A lot of them are very tired and fall asleep in class. A lot of them
try to come in with tobacco...chewing tobacco. I guess the males. I’ve never seen females
with it but the males. I guess it’s acceptable with their young age to do that. I’ve learned
the smell. It smells like Windex and I can tell when it is in their mouth. They try to hide it
[laughs] but I make them spit it out.

...they are out of dress code a lot. It’s just little things like that and it’s a challenge
because I turn a blind eye most of the time. It’s usually shoes because that’s what they
can afford so I just pretend I don’t see. They will come in sandals, high heels, or flip-
flops in the middle of winter. So, no...[laughs]...I’m not going to try to send them home.
A lot of their lack of education is a problem because you may get some students in and
they don’t know how school works. Expectations that you would assume someone would
know...they don’t. So, there are a lot of things that you would assume that people know
or that it is this way because you are used to American children and then they come in
with whole set of other issues. So, you can’t pretty much assume anything.

...a lot of the students will not eat the food here because it is a whole different...they’ll
eat...like they’ll get double fruit or double vegetables instead of pizza because they are
just eating healthier or differently. Rice, vegetable, maybe a little meat; but they don’t
really seem to eat which is a problem nutritionally because they already tired. That’s a
problem.

M2: As a refugee teacher, you learn a lot from your students. It keeps you on your toes
because you are always trying to learn things about their language and their culture in
order to reach them. you have to understand where they came from. Some of the students
don’t have a foundation in education. Some of them may have had an optional education
or may have been child soldiers. There may not be a big value on education in their
culture or formal life in their culture. So trying to acclimate them to the American way
and public education can be a challenge.

I think the biggest obstacle for me is trying to understand the different populations of students. It is different from...let's say that everyone is Spanish...you know 90% of your students are from Spanish speaking countries. You would be dealing with one specific culture or sub-culture. But, we have kids from all over the world...15 different countries. It's very hard to really understand the psyche of that child. That's the hardest thing for me because I like to get down to the root cause and see why a child acts the way they do. I'm really relating that to middle school boys. A lot of boys come in and adapt to the American culture of mediocrity; more so than the girls do. They boys develop faster than the girls do too. If I look at my data from last year, my boys increased quicker than the girls did. So, I'm trying to understand that. Also, trying to adapt to the negative culture and the things they see. So, trying to understand why that's the case. That's the biggest challenge for me because my smartest students...by smart I mean they can learn and apply the information quickly...are involved in gangs. The socio-cultural issues would be my biggest concern. As far as moving students with education or strategies; that's easy. But, the hardest thing is fighting those socio-cultural issues which I think is standard for middle school.

H1: But, most importantly, it is not helping the kid. We're not serving their needs to spend all this time instead of opening the wonderment of welcome to America...welcome to our way of life...welcome to the disciplines we teach. It's a whole lot of you need to do this right now. It really concerns me for all children. No mother's child should be subjected to this nonsense. But, I think it is the most detrimental for our most struggling children because they are getting told right off the back that they are a failure...they're unsuccessful...they're feeling like it's a lot of struggle right away. They are struggling to learn the language. They do not understand the references in the test. Their parents don't speak English. The very first things we're doing to them are basically telling them that they are not good enough and their school is not good enough because it gets written in the paper all the time that we have bad test scores and they people here trying to help them are not good enough. This is not healthy and this is not a way to help the children reach their potential. That's my job as a teacher is to help children grow into the people they will become.

They are bringing a lot more than just a different culture. They are also bringing experiences that are tough for us to imagine, really. They may have seen war; they may have seen...or been in one of the camps.

I don't they call it a teaching strategy in any of the books...but being open to them; being interested in them. They will struggle through some really long soggy nonsense if they
get the idea that you like them. It's not a lie...I'm not trying to manipulate the children. I just noticed over the years that being open to understanding them a little bit...being curious about it. I remember one kid said to me years ago...it was life-altering a little bit...he said “Ms. You like us”. I was like yeah, I'm the teacher and that's what we do, but apparently that's not the case. It was also surprising to me because I was like...why are you doing this job if you do not like kids. You are in the wrong place buddy...move on ...there's the door.

It's very powerful to connect with them and enjoy them. They are enjoyable little people and they have all kinds of things going on.

there is hopelessness because they have a lot going on that often leads to family issues and behavior issues that makes it harder for them to learn and achieve at the levels they could

H2: making a connection with students

I just started this new idea of mine is to meet only with my ELL students on Tuesdays. I try to isolate them from everyone else and help them go through questions and understanding what the questions are asking. That one-on-one tutoring where I might have it based on that culture or language...like, I can meet with my Burmese kids on a certain day and if I can get someone that understands the concept or the language, I can get help in providing them with help. Trying to connect...they feel the cultural barriers like this is my teacher, I shouldn’t question or ask her to repeat stuff. Even when they don’t get feedback, it’s pushing them more to try to get them to come out

It’s kind of left up to them to figure out as they go along and it’s hard. A lot of them are probably the eldest child in their home and the only one in their household that speaks English well enough. So, they may have to miss school to facilitate the cable guy coming in or if the parent or younger brother or sister has to go to the doctor. They have a lot of responsibilities.
**Desire to create an academically challenging environment**

**E1:** ...my biggest concern is making the tasks challenging and meaningful.

I don’t want to spoon feed my kids. I feel like the first year, I tried so much to help my students that I did not challenge them enough. I don’t feel like I asked them enough higher order questions. I don’t feel like I gave them enough opportunities to speak and talk about what they were learning so they conceptualized it or internalized it more effectively. I want them to learn different ways to see things, different ways to say things.

...trying to challenge them in as much as possible...to think outside the box not just what is this but what can I do with this or what is the cause of this or what is the effect of this or what would happen if.

The biggest challenge is when I get kids that come into my room and they don’t even know their ABCs. They don’t know the letters first so that we can talk about the sounds. So, if you are trying to cover...well not cover, but teach the content where that can understand it but then you also have to try to go back and help them with the basic fundamentals of reading and the alphabet, the sounds, and the phonics.

**E2:** Sometimes it’s easy; sometimes it is the most difficult thing I think I can do in my life. They bring a lot of different things to the table. Some have no previous schooling and some have had a lot. For some, it’s the language barrier and some it’s the academic barrier...having no school. So, it’s a wide spectrum and it’s all in one classroom usually every year. ...we assume that these kids can’t do certain things. But, they can and never have the same opportunities that other native English speakers have. So, I feel as if they get slighted when it comes to education by not having the same opportunities because we assume that they can’t. I like to go ahead and see if you can. At least expose you to it and you may be surprised.

**M1:** My experience thus far has been full of so many things; every level that you can possibly imagine from not even knowing how to hold a pencil to actually being somewhat educated in English, as well as, so many cultural issues and cultural knowledge that I didn’t previously have.
M2:

H1: A child who just got here from Beijing is held to same standard as the child of a university professor sitting over at Druid Hills. If they don’t do well on the same test, the school is labeled a failure, the teacher is labeled a failure, and directly, that child is labeled a failure. That cannot be fair and this is not an accurate portrayal of what goes on in a school....to give a child some bubble in test.

H2: I have classes where students don’t understand the English language well enough. I have to be able to teach them science, which is my content area, where there is a lot of complicated words. It is hard for English speaking students and it is even more of a challenge for those who don’t speak the language to understand really complex words. Some of the challenges that I face when I have to teach a concept is that they are stumbling over the small words. Like...what is “increase” mean or “decrease” mean and I have to teach them electric magnetic spectrum. We get stuck on words and explaining what is increasing and decreasing. Or are you sure? They ask what does “sure” mean? A lot of homonyms confuses them because when you say sure, they are like sure as in beach or sure as in are you certain. Using synonyms is a challenge because they don’t understand. They are held to same standard as everyone else. They still have to take the EOCTs. They still have to take the same standardized tests as the regular students. They are already at a disadvantage from not knowing English. On top of that, you are now being penalized for not knowing it and still having to take the test. So, you have to catch up on language and catch up on content and still pass this test in order to say that you meet the requirements of the particular subjects.
Instructional Strategies

E1: Giving them opportunities to talk. Listening to what they are saying...modeling ways to take what they are saying and giving them or modeling a way for them to say it more correctly or more clearly. And having them do that and giving them that practice.

We make connections all the time like I said to their past experiences and past experiences in their homes. I try to make as many connections as possible. That's a strategy that I will continue to use.

Having visual picture representations or models of something...I'll continue to do that.

Having them make models of things,

having them act it out

We use a lot of graphic aids and at the beginning of the year with more support and then put less and less in it and work towards them being the writers of the content that goes in there.

Having them talk about something means and summarize their reading.

E2: Total-Physical-Response...what is it? TPR? Like, you act it out.

Gesturing is the most beneficial

Having someone there that speaks their language. Not depending on them all the time; but, when I just can’t get something through.

Having peer tutoring, realia or pictorial representation, hands-on experiences, repetition, applying things, making things fit with their background knowledge

M1: to create a classroom where first and foremost, mistakes are wonderful because they will make them all the time.

The use of visuals is probably the most effective and practical strategy. There are so many things that I couldn’t have taught without images and also just lots of things on display within in the room. I am constantly referring to them, especially vocabulary.

Repetition and constantly reviewing because getting them to do homework is difficult.

Something that I started doing this year that has really worked well is giving them choices. Letting them choose how they would like to show what they have learned and
just giving them a choice between A and B is so powerful. It makes them feel so much more in control and makes them so much more motivated and excited because they get to pick what they are doing.

M2: I think the biggest strategy is the SWIRL method and to incorporate that into pretty much all that you do. When we say SWIRL, we mean Speaking, Writing, Illustrating, Reading, and Language. That is going to attack all the levels that ELL students need. If you incorporate that into your lessons, that is going to help improve the student’s progression in the language proficiency, as well as, improve your data.

H1:

H2: Repetition of oral directions, modeling activities for them, having lots and lots of visuals, hands-on activities
Lack of Official Training

E1: I didn’t have a lot of experience with students whose first language was not English and I was...my confidence wasn’t very high and my ability to help them the best way. A lot of the things I discovered on my own were reinforced in the SIOP training. The first training I received was the SIOP training. It was extremely beneficial to me. I started an ESOL class but I couldn’t keep up with it because the rigor of what they wanted was too difficult for me to keep up with and do what I needed to do to help my students in my classroom. I would like to take the ESOL endorsement class. But, the only way I can see myself doing it successfully is in the summer time when I am not also teaching.

E2: I have gone through CaseNex for ESOL endorsement. I’ve gone through several SIOP trainings. I’ve attended different workshops provided through [Redacted] county for ELL learners. In class, with my graduate classes, I’ve gone through different things about ELL learners. At school...different workshops. I have gone to a refugee conference two to three years ago in Chicago. It was two-day training specifically for refugees.

M1: Specifically speaking about the refugee aspect, I’ve really had none. I was not even aware that [Redacted] County had such a huge refugee population. I just discovered that when I started working here. We have plenty of professional development but it is usually focused on data, testing, and all of those things. So, actually now that I’m thinking about it...that is disappointing because at this school there is not any particular training on refugee. Because we have a lot and there is a lot to deal with in that. So, that part...yes, I have not really received any training. As far as English learners, we have had a few PDs on that and I got my master’s degree in ESOL but not with the intention of coming into the refugee population. That’s just how it worked out.

M2: The training I have received has pretty much been on the job. I have taken the SIOP training. But, I basically took the test to get certified. I took two classes in my graduate program online with Grand Canyon University when I was working on my second master’s degree in special education. Grand Canyon is in Arizona and they have a lot of ELLs, it was a requirement to take those classes. There have been some professional development activities; however, most of my own training has been reading and researching independently. I believe that about 70% has been independent research and the other 30% has been formal.

H1: We made a big push a few years ago to have content teachers go obtain ESOL endorsements in an attempt to learn strategies and familiarize ourselves with the needs and issues facing ESOL students. I obtained my ESOL certificate about 5 or 6 years ago. I’m very glad I did. We learned a lot about what it’s like to learn in another language.
which is quite a concept for most of us. As teachers we were once very successful in school...we like school...school is a good place for us. But learning to help them both obtain mastery in English and simultaneously trying to master a content area...especially in this era of very high stakes testing; it's high stakes for the kids. We had to find more strategies to help them. I'm really glad we did.

Several years ago, we were a part of the professional development school grant with Georgia State. We had a Georgia State professor come here and teach us a sequence of classes to obtain our ESOL endorsements. That's the way a lot of us did it back at that time. She was particularly wonderful because she was very interested in us talking about culture and the things that come in addition to language. She particularly taught about refugee children.

H2: I haven't had official training. They tried to lump it in with differentiated learning. I think it is too broad to encompass ELL and special education students and cultural diversity. They try to nail everything as differentiated learning. Some of the things can cross over; but, there is definite need for a separate...it has to be content specific too because in science, the things I have to brush up on like their math skills. Science words are not something that would regularly get in an English class.
E1: Another challenge that has actually improved has been communication with parents. But, we have more interpreters here and we also have more communication that goes home that is interpreted. One thing I do to address that challenge is I will have all of the kids to look over the papers we have to go home and we go over it together. And we talk about what it means and I explain it to them so that when they go home, they can explain it to their parents because oftentimes their parents speak very little or no English. But, that’s the case always. But it helps in those cases.

E2: Background knowledge. Just the different cultures. Sometimes, just like in reading...sometimes they know none of the words. What is “at”? What is “by”? The girl sat by the water. What is by? Just comprehending...them understanding the English language; the lack of the English language; not, the lack of knowledge but just the language barrier.

...parental support...the cultural differences. Because in some cultures, the school is different from the...they think that they shouldn’t be interfering with what the school says and they feel like the school shouldn’t be interfering with parenting. There are two separate things. But, in our country, we’re like we got to get this altogether. One hand washes the other. It takes a village. In some of their cultures...no, it’s like this is something separate...two totally different things. I’m not going to interfere with what they are doing over here. That’s why in my experience a lot of parents don’t come and I’ll talk to them and they are like “no, whatever you say...no, I don’t come, no. They see it almost as disrespectful to try to interfere or come to the school. So, having the school and them learning that...the parents themselves...that school or the systems we have in place that we do need the parents to support our educational system. And, several of them come from countries where they don’t have the expectations and it’s just two separate entities. We need their support.

M1: Another problem is them speaking in their native language because they will say things that you know are bad. This is one problem between the students a lot. They’ll say “So and So is calling me bad names in his language” and I don’t know how to speak Swahili or Chin. I can’t confirm or deny that [laughs], so, it causes a lot of conflict and then the students are mad at me and they start spouting out in another language. I know they are telling me off but I have no idea what they are saying. That’s frustrating.

...there’s the parental involvement issue. Engaging with the family unit is pretty much not there because of the lack of transportation, lack of language, and the lack of telephones that work. I can’t tell you how many times I call or try to call the number in the system and it has been disconnected or it rings and this person hasn’t set up
voicemail, or there's no answer. So, actually, that's a pretty huge problem; it's very hard to communicate with the parents. You have to use language line. And, the parents are kind of like...if the students are acting up, they don't seem to really care. Which that is kind of a new revelation for me but I think that their expectation is as long as you...I don't know, I haven't figured it out. For instance, a student left school and skipped with some students of the same culture and then when the teacher called home to talk to the parent about it. The parent wanted to know was he with other children of that same culture. She is like "yes" and then the parent said well then it was fine. The whole parent element is really kind of crazy.

M2:

H1:

H2: Having translators for parents or peers/students that speak the language trying to group according to that to help them.

I have to be able to get in contact with their parents to make sure that they are aware of what the students are missing or need to do. Sometimes, I feel like they don't understand the big picture and there is no one there to explain it to them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Most rewarding experience</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E1:</strong> The most rewarding experience I have had as a teacher has been teaching here with my ELL students. I loved teaching before. But, I was in schools before where I had to try to convince my students it's good to learn or it's beneficial to learn. I had to work really hard to pull those students in. Here, my students are more intrinsically motivated to learn. But, the thing I really love about being here is that my kids are willing to work hard and I do not have to convince them to try. They're willing to put in the hard work and it makes me want to work harder to help them learn. I'm glad that I'm learning ways that are helping them more effective than before. And they are also sweet-natured, very sweet-natured students who appreciate of everything that you do for them. So, it's a joy to work in this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E2:</strong> If I could not teach these kids, I would not teach. There are times when I am near tears. There are times when I am in tears. This is the best job I've ever had. It's the most rewarding to see the kids...the growth...from not saying anything to one day you turn around and they ask something like “Can I go to the bathroom?” I’m like you can have anything you want...what are you talking about? Just to hear that first sentence that comes out their mouth from them not speaking at all. It's like...it's amazing. This is the best job I've ever had. It's a lot of difficulties. This job stresses me out but I wouldn't change it. If I couldn't teach here, I could not, I would not. I would give up teaching. I wouldn’t teach anywhere else. Now, I can go to Burma and work and teach. I could go to Nepal and teach. But not in the United States, I would have to do something else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1:</strong> it's been extremely rewarding on a personal level. I have never felt more rewarded and with that inner thing that most people teach for. I’ve never felt more rewarded than working with these children. That love that you get from elementary, especially the really young ones...first grade, second grade...that love that you get. You know, a lot of them will end up loving me the same way but it usually doesn’t come from older students like that, you know. They draw me pictures. I feel like more than ever that I actually making a difference and I know this to be true because of the letters they write me and the things that they say. So many of them felt like they couldn't do it until they were in my class. My students that were in my class before always want to come to my class. It's so fulfilling because I’m making a difference. The ones who really, really do care, they really care and I’m helping them to integrate into a new society and it is a really amazing feeling, you know. It is so amazing to watch them grow. Yes, a very, very rewarding population to work with in my opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H1: This is a wonderful population to serve. It really is... in particularly the ELL and refugee combo is one of our most interesting subset populations.

The rewards are wonderful. It’s good stuff but it’s tiring. It’s hard because you are looking at kids like “wow, we have a lot of ground to make it kiddo, buckle up your seat belt!”

H2:
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