

Teachers' Experiences and Prepared Readiness in Servicing Culturally and Linguistically  
Diverse Student Populations

by

Frank A. Akey

A Research Paper  
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the  
Master of Science Degree  
in

School Psychology

Approved: 2 Semester Credits

  
Carlos Dejud, Ph.D.

The Graduate School  
University of Wisconsin-Stout

January, 2009

The Graduate School

University of Wisconsin-Stout  
Menomonie, WI

**Author:** Akey, Frank A.

**Title:** *Teachers' Experiences and Prepared Readiness in Servicing Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Student Populations*

**Graduate Degree/ Major:** MS School Psychology

**Research Adviser:** Carlos Dejud, Ph.D.

**Month/Year:** January, 2009

**Number of Pages:** 37

**Style Manual Used:** American Psychological Association, 5<sup>th</sup> edition

#### ABSTRACT

This literature review was conducted to determine how critical the issue of language acquisition will be in public schools across the United States in coming years. Demographics in the United States are predicted to change to such an extent that between the years of 2005 to 2050 the Hispanic population will comprise 60 percent of the total national population growth of the United States (Passel & Cohn, 2008). Teachers' attitudes and perceptions of students who have immigrated to the United States and speaking languages other than English are influenced by prior training and exposure. Federal and state laws also mandate what is required of teachers and can put stress on them to achieve adequate yearly progress. Some teachers are not knowledgeable about the difference between communicative English and academic English which impacts their methods of working with students whose primary language was not English.

The Graduate School  
University of Wisconsin Stout  
Menomonie, WI

Acknowledgments

I would like to take a minute to thank all of the people that have helped me get to where I am today. All of the professors at the University of Wisconsin-Stout that have devoted extra time and effort above and beyond what was called for to explain and teach without question. My family has been my rock through this whole adventure. They have supported my return to education, and been there with me through all of the ups and downs that life has presented us. Thank you all from the bottom of my heart for giving me the strength to pursue my dreams and helping me to reach the stars in becoming the person that I am today.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
<i>Statement of the Problem</i> .....	5
<i>Purpose of the Study</i> .....	5
<i>Assumptions of the Study</i> .....	6
<i>Definition of Terms</i> .....	6
<i>Limitations of the Study</i> .....	9
Chapter II: Literature Review .....	10
<i>Demographic Changes in the United States</i> .....	10
<i>National Ideology Impacted by Government Project</i> .....	13
<i>Teacher Attitudes and Educational Requirements Change</i> .....	14
<i>Varying State Requirements in Teacher Training</i> .....	17
<i>Laws that Impact ELL Students</i> .....	19
<i>Factors that Impact the Acquisition of a Second Language</i> .....	24
Chapter III: Critical Analysis and Recommendations .....	29
<i>Introduction</i> .....	29
<i>Summary</i> .....	29
<i>Critical Analysis</i> .....	30
<i>Recommendations</i> .....	31
References.....	32

## Chapter I: Introduction

The purpose of this investigation is to determine the perception of teachers in several Midwestern Elementary Schools on their perceived preparedness to work with the growing number of students who speak languages other than English at home. It is assumed that the more training that a teacher has had working with English language learners (ELL) the more they will perceive themselves as being ready to deal with ELL issues in classroom situations. Teacher training exposes future educators to many issues that they will face in an educational setting including many challenges in how to best provide services to students from culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) backgrounds.

Since the beginning of the intelligence testing movement in psychology, practitioners have been concerned with how accurate and predictable tests were. This concern initially came about when Alfred Binet was working with a commission in charge of identifying students in need of alternative education in France (Indiana University, 2007). Thus, the intelligence test as we know it today was created and were designed to measure future performance of individuals and would often be used in high stakes situations such as to determine special education placement. According to Cummins (1999) these intelligence tests were not faulty in their design, but were applied inappropriately by practitioners in the field. It was elaborated that the misuse of these tests has unfortunately lead to many bilingual students being taken out of English as a Second Language (ESL) programs and placed in “mainstream” classes where they did not have the support that they needed to achieve like other native language speakers could.

Within the last decade, laws have been enacted to try to make sure teachers are teaching the core classes of reading, writing, and mathematics with affective results. In 2002, a new Federal mandate known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was signed by President Bush. This new mandate holds teachers accountable by evaluating children’s

performances at different points in time throughout the year by administering achievement tests such as the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) was signed into law in 2004 and moved away from identifying individuals with learning disabilities (LD) based on a discrepancy between intelligence and achievement test scores (Murphy School District, 2005). Instead, IDEIA called for the use of a response to intervention model which would monitor test results and determine change in performance over time for each student. NCLB has put teachers of students who are from CLD backgrounds and with limited English proficiency (LEP) in a difficult position. In addition, this Federal mandate has influenced curriculum in classrooms in what is known as “teaching to the test”, in that teachers are spending more of their time making sure that all children in their classrooms are up to benchmark standards by the time of testing by covering that material more thoroughly (Bond, 2007).

This is often a major problem for students from diverse backgrounds. They simply may not have had the opportunities to learn English in such an inclusive way that other native English speaking students have had which can be a huge obstacle to overcome in order to have success on benchmark tests in the schools (Cummins, 2000). ELL students might not have access to resources that their native English speaking peers have such as access to books and other materials that are needed for academic success which could impact academic success as well. Students from CLD backgrounds may also feel like their cultural view is not acceptable in the classroom or that they are tired of trying so hard academically in order to be criticized on their performance in the classroom.

It is also vital to know that the demographics of the United States are projected to change very quickly in the next few decades. It is projected that the percentage of Hispanic Americans will increase from 12.6 % of the total population in 2000 to

approximately 24.4 % by the year 2050 (United States Census Bureau, 2008). This significant change in student demographics in our Nation's public schools is going to challenge educator's preparedness to provide appropriate classroom instruction to children and youth from CLD backgrounds while at the same time managing the classroom environment for other children. This shift in demographics will put pressure on teachers because they are required to get the same results for children from CLD backgrounds at an equal rate as from those children who have been practicing English their whole lives.

Teachers may feel like they do not have sufficient training for dealing with this diverse population. This situation will only become more critical due to the continuous change of demographics in our Nations' public schools, particularly English language learners (ELL) students. It is not realistic for ELL students just learning English to be asked to take tests in English and at the same time hold their homeroom teachers accountable for not showing significant progress towards end-of-the-year goals that these kinds of assessments measure (Cummins, 2000). These difficulties raise many questions. How long is a reasonable amount of time and what are some factors that educators can manipulate and reform to support English language acquisition? Are educators prepared to work with a growing number of students from culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) backgrounds with flexible and adaptive ways of teaching? How prepared do they feel based on their prior education experience for dealing with children from diverse backgrounds in classes? What other factors impact attitudes and willingness to support the increasing number of ELL students entering the school systems of America?

Teachers' attitudes about mainstreaming ELL students are based on many underlying pressures that teachers experience while trying to provide for all students equally. For example, research data collected by Harklau (1994, 1999, 2000) and Verplaetse (1998) suggested that there are three main factors that can influence teacher

attitudes toward ELL inclusion including: what thoughts a teacher has on how inclusion will impact the way that they provide classroom instruction, how inclusion will effect the classroom environment, and teachers' attitudes toward ELL students in general. The National Center for Education Statistics (2002) reports that only 12.5% of U.S. teachers have received 8 hours or more of recent training to teach students who are LED. Thus, it would make sense that if teachers of the future wanted to be more effective and comfortable in working with this diverse and growing group of individuals, that they would expand their education and exposure to ELL populations.

Teachers refer students for many reasons. Factors such as student characteristics when combined with a teachers characteristics in culmination with materials used in the classroom are all of importance when teachers consider refer for assessment (Christenson, Ysseldyke, Wang, & Algozzine, 1983). Usually they have seen major problems in either academic progress (including in acquisition of ESL) or behaviors. Obviously, just because a student is a second language learner doesn't mean they cannot have a LD. The problem is not necessarily with the teachers (i.e. being biased toward ELLs or not taking their language status into account) but with a lack of knowledge about how to accommodate ELL students when they are given assessments in English (Cummins, 2000).

It is also important to understand that there are two different levels of language proficiency. Cummins (1999), stated that "in second language acquisition context, immigrant children often acquire peer-appropriate conversational fluency in English within about 2 years but it requires considerably longer (5-10 years) to catch up academically in English", p. 2. This means that it could take as much as ten years for a child to develop the level of academic proficiency in English in order to be able to rely on academic instruments to assess if he or she had possible learning disabilities or not. Furthermore, according to Delia Mirarchi, who is an English for Speakers of Other

Languages (ESOL) teacher, "If you're an ELL, you can't pick up the knowledge you need at the same rate that [native] English speakers do" (cited in Davis, 2004). This has lead many teachers to refer children to school psychologists for testing to qualify for special education before it is known if the problem is language-based or if it is in fact a learning disability (LD) which would qualify them for services.

#### *Statement of the Problem*

Due to the growing CLD population and the increase of ELL students in our Nation's public school system, there is a lack of teachers' preparedness about how to better help these students to succeed academically. This means that there will be more ELL students included in each classroom and teachers may feel unprepared to provide adequate services to such an influx. This would also be the case with teachers that have been teaching for a long time already and may not have had educational opportunities or open-mindedness that recently trained teachers might have had. Federal and State laws are also very confusing for teachers to interpret which in some cases can lead to feelings of 'it is not my problem.'" Teachers are held accountable for all student's progress through Federal and State laws and often do not have enough time to deal with struggling ELL students during the lesson or do not have the skills required to be able to provide appropriate in-class services.

#### *Purpose of the Study*

The purpose of this investigation is to determine to what extent teachers' experiences, which includes attitudes and perceptions surrounding ELL issues impact there perceptions of how prepared they are to work with the growing number of students who speak languages other than English at home. Surveys will be sent to the selected Midwestern Elementary Schools during the fall semester of 2009.

### *Assumptions of the Study*

It is assumed that there will be a positive relationship between the amount of ELL-specific training teachers have had and their self-perceived readiness to deal with ELL issues in classroom situations. When the amount of prior ELL-focused teacher training increases, then the perceived readiness to make appropriate decisions and feel confident in such decisions should also increase.

### *Definition of Terms*

The following terms will be defined for the purposes of this study: academic English, assessment, communicative competence, culturally and linguistically diverse, English language learners, Hispanic, and inclusion. Specific definitions vary from field to field and may not be easily understood by the general population.

*Academic English.* The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, as cited from the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) website (2008a) states that academic English includes semantic and syntactic features including vocabulary items, sentence structure, transition markers, and cohesive ties. It is further elaborated that academic English is the ability to read, write, and engage in academic conversations in order to further understand math, science, history, and other subjects.

*Assessment.* According to the Office of Academic Assessment (2006, n. p.), assessment is:

a participatory, iterative process that provides data/information you need on your students' learning, engages you and others in analyzing and using this data/information to confirm and improve teaching and learning, produces evidence that students are learning the outcomes you intended, guides you in making educational and institutional improvements, and evaluates whether

changes made improve/impact student learning, and documents the learning and your efforts.

*Attitudes.* Attitudes are defined by the Encyclopedia of Psychology (2009) as a disposition or tendency for someone to respond in a positive or negative way toward a certain thing (idea, object, person, situation). It was also discussed that attitudes are very closely related to an individual's opinions and beliefs based upon that individual's prior experiences. For the purpose of this study attitudes will be used primarily to look at teachers' dispositions toward students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds being included in the general education setting exclusively.

*Communicative Competence.* For the purpose of this study, communicative competence will be referred to as conversational English. Communicative competence is defined by Hymes, as cited on the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition website (2008a), as the ability to interact appropriately with other students and adults by knowing what to say, to whom, when, where, and how they will participate in conversations.

*Culturally and Linguistically Diverse.* The North Central Regional Education Laboratory (2004) discussed the term culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) as a group of people whose ancestors and relatives come from a different culture than that of the United States and that spoke a language other than English in the home. It was also elaborated that the Hispanic population is comprised of three different CLD groups in the Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans. For the purposes of this study CLD will be used interchangeably to refer to any group of people with ancestors from other countries of origin not native to the United States.

*English Language Learners.* According to the George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education (2005), English Language Learners (ELL) refers to students whose first language is not English which includes both students who are just

beginning to learn English (often referred to in Federal legislation as "limited English proficient" or "LEP") and those who have already developed considerable proficiency. This term is often interchangeable with other older terms such as English as a Second Language (ESL), English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in general sense of a person studying English who is a speaker of some other language as a native speaker. For the purpose of this study ELL will be used exclusively for anyone who is on the spectrum of just beginning to learn English to advanced English learner whose first language is not English.

*Hispanic.* Marriage and Family Encyclopedia (2009) defines the term Hispanic, as based on the race and standards for Federal statistics and administrative reporting, as any person of Mexico, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or any other culture of Spanish speaking origin regardless of race. It was further explained that the United States government has added the terms Latino and Spanish for use depending upon an individual's preference. These terms are often used interchangeably depending upon the context in which they are being used, but, for the purpose of this study I will be using the term Hispanic exclusively to refer to this diverse group.

*Inclusion.* According to Institute for Inclusion (2008), inclusion is engaging in the talents, beliefs, backgrounds, capabilities, and ways of living of individuals and groups when joined in a common goal. It is engaging our own unique differences to create a culture of belonging in which people are valued and honored for the improvement of our society, world, and enterprises. For the purpose of this study, inclusion specifically refers to students being included in school classrooms.

*Perception.* Webster (1983) defines perception as the awareness of objects or other ideas that are experienced through ones senses. For the purpose of this study I will be using this term exclusively to refer to teachers' awareness of issues surrounding ELL

students in the educational setting and what they have experienced that may influence how the work with this diverse group of individuals.

### *Limitations of the Study*

Limitations could negatively impact the study. The amount of time that has passed since teacher training could limit recall of details. The design of the survey could negatively impact the validity of the results. Any prior training that teachers may have had with ELL, or lack of training with this diverse group, could impact honest responses to survey items. Teachers may respond in a manner that makes them look culturally sensitive to the needs of ELL students rather than how they really feel or what they believe in, which would make it difficult to collect accurate responses.

It is also possible that the narrow view of the Hispanic population data alone might make the findings less generalizable to other demographic groups in the country that may be smaller in size than this group. In particular, this study is going to look at the states of Wisconsin and Minnesota due to the projected growth in the Hispanic population. Thus, teacher responses to survey questions may be impacted about the target demographic because of lack in some areas of exposure to this group, as well as the location where data will be collected (urban versus rural school setting).

*Introduction*

This chapter will include a Federal law that influence how teachers interact with and view the inclusion of English language learners (ELL) in the classroom setting. The urgent need to address this issue is due in part to a projected increase in the number of people of minority status in the United States as well as an increase of minority students in the classroom. These rapid shifts that are occurring in the general and school wide setting are influencing attitudes teachers have about mainstreaming these ELL students and how best to help them succeed academically as well. Teacher training requirements, specifically, in Wisconsin and Minnesota will be explored. The role of national projects and attitudes generated from these projects will be explored to try to determine if they impact the type of services that are provided to ELL students in schools today. In addition, this chapter will conclude with an overview of how long it takes individuals to acquire a foreign language on average and the different levels of language proficiency that are required for education in a student's non-dominant language along with why we should all be concerned for our schools and this diverse ELL population.

*Demographic Changes in the United States*

Demographics in the United States are going thorough major changes which will be a continuing trend well into the twenty-first century. The United States Census Bureau (2008) estimates that the Hispanic population is going to approximately triple over the next forty years. They reported that in the year 2000 there were approximately 35.6 million Hispanics living in the United States, but by the year 2050 it is projected to be approximately 102.5 million. Furthermore, the Hispanic population will account for 60 percent of the total national population growth between 2005 and 2050 (Passel & Cohn, 2008; United States Census Bureau, 2008). With this kind of growth it is not difficult to

see that there is a huge need to do something about preparing educators now to work with individuals who are from different cultural backgrounds.

The school-age population is going to follow a similar trend in coming decades. For example, in 2001, there were 4.6 million ELL students enrolled in U.S. public schools which consisted of approximately 10 percent of all students enrolled in preK-12 (English Language Learners in the Saint Paul Public Schools, n.d.). It has been predicted that by the year 2030, students who speak a language other than English in their home will make up 40 percent of all students enrolled in U.S. public schools nationwide (United States Census Bureau, 2008). This number includes all private schools in the nation, but it does not include any private schools in these projections. This means that teachers will be working with four times the number of CLD students in the classrooms as comparable to today's number of CLD school-aged students.

#### *Changes in Wisconsin*

In the upper Midwestern state of Wisconsin there has been an increased influx of individuals from diverse populations in recent years. One of the primary factors that contribute to this population change is migration of individuals to the state of Wisconsin. Wisconsin has a history of relatively high migration of individuals which contributed to a 44.4 percent of the total population increase of Wisconsin coming from migration in the first half of the 1990's (Egan-Robertson, Harrier, & Kale, 2004). Migration increased to 52.4 percent of population increase in the second half of the 1990's, respectively.

In order to understand this further it is important to look at exactly how much of this change is coming from students that could be entering the schools from a diverse culture that could possibly speak a language other than English in the home. From 1995 to 2025 the projected growth of individuals coming from a Hispanic origin will increase by 120,000 individuals in the state of Wisconsin (United States Census Bureau, 2008). This is equal to an increase in the Hispanic population of 103.9 percent. This means that

the general Hispanic population is going to more than double in the state of Wisconsin from 1995 to 2025. Conversely, growth in the general Hispanic population of Wisconsin is going to impact the growth of the school-aged Hispanic population as well.

School-aged ELL students are also predicted to increase in the state of Wisconsin. According to U.S. Department of Education's census data (2008), there was a 10.3 percent growth in all school-aged groups between 1990 and 2000. During this same timeline the ELL population in Wisconsin showed a growth of 77.5 percent which translates into more than seven and a half times more growth in the school-aged group of ELL students as compared to the total population growth in Wisconsin (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2008b).

#### *Changes in Minnesota*

Similarly, the increase in demographics in the neighboring state of Minnesota is projected to be even more dramatic than Wisconsin. It is projected that the Hispanic population will grow at a much faster rate than European Americans, in some estimates it will triple, between 2000 and 2030 (Minnesota State Demographic Center, 2005). According to the Minnesota State Demographic Center (2005), this will be equal to an increase in the Hispanic population of 98 percent from 2000-2015, and an increase of 184 percent from 2015-2030. These numbers will come from migration of individuals to Minnesota from other states in the United States, other countries throughout the world, and from natural increases from births in Minnesota.

School-aged populations in Minnesota are going to demonstrate a similar pattern in coming years. Between the years of 1990 and 2000, the U.S. Department of Education (2005) estimates that the school-age ELL Hispanic population is going to grow from 3,885 school-aged students in 1990 to 13,301 who speak English less than very well in 2000. This equates to 3.4 times more school-aged students from the Hispanic population

in the year 2000 when compared to the 1990 census data (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2008b).

#### National Ideology Impacted by Government Project

The United States has been trying to secure its southern border from the influx of illegal immigrants coming from Mexico trying to cross the boarder for work and a new way of life for a long time. Projects like the Secure Fence Act, which was passed into law in 2006, called for a reinforcing of the boarder fencing separating the United States and Mexico which was estimated to stretch 850 miles and cost somewhere between 1.2 billion to 2.6 billion dollars to build (Fox News, 2007). This idea that somehow we can stop this demographic change in the United States puts Americans at opposite ideological ends from each other and ultimately makes us choose which side of the fence we are on in terms of whom to support. Furthermore, in this time of economic uncertainty the idea of spending billions of dollars trying to keep the boarder with Mexico secured fuels the resentment ideology directed toward the bilingual community. Valdes (2001) and Wrigley (2000) found that these negative attitudes about immigrants and refugees can actually trickle down to the schools and teachers. Negative attitudes that the general population harbor can lead to a rigid attitude that can actually work its way into the community itself, making it even more difficult for ELL students to receive an appropriate education and the services they need to be successful.

In schools and local businesses resentment that other students often hear from their parents can be directed toward ELL students and others of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) backgrounds. For example, a cheesecake shop owner in Philadelphia recently posted two signs in his shop windows saying “this is America, when ordering speak English” (Erichsen, 2008). This ideology can spread like a flu from parents to their children and can reinforce a continuation of biases towards ELL students in the community. This kind of ideology raises many important questions. What does this

kind of sign say to school-aged students who see it and how does it influence their attitudes about ELL students? How does this impact ELL students and their learning in the classroom? These feelings that ELL individuals and students needing to change who they are in order to succeed and be assimilated into America's culture and schools are woven into the fabric of our society.

#### Teacher Attitudes and Education Requirements Change

Attitudes that teachers have about working with ELL students, and personal biases in general, can impact how willing teachers are to adapt their classroom methods to accommodate ELL students. Teachers can often feel that they have exhausted every strategy to help these students access the curriculum in the classroom and start the referral process for these students out of desperation with not knowing what to do next. Over the last quarter century, many Americans' attitudes have been changing about people from different cultures as evident in the news and Federal policies and projects (Fox News, 2007).

The Supreme Court case of *Lau v. Nicholas* in 1974 ruled that the civil rights of non-English speaking students were being violated when the schools took no steps to help these students acquire the language in which instruction was being presented (Cummins, 2000). According to Cummins (2000), in this ruling the Court did not mandate that students receive instruction in a bilingual manner, but that the school had to take steps to overcome the language disadvantage that these students were facing. This case did not point to specific solutions or what steps had to be taken, so unfortunately many did not put forth their best effort in providing services for ELL students to overcome their disadvantages. Furthermore, it was also discussed that schools were not prepared for this change system wide and the controversy on how best to overcome ELL students disadvantages has been raging on ever since then.

*Teachers' Attitudes have Lead to Overrepresentation*

ELL students have a history of being referred for special education more often than other populations of students. This problem of overrepresentation is primarily a general education problem because general education teachers are often the ones to start the referral process (Artiles & Harry, 2005). It was further explained that overrepresentation at the national level only applies to African American and Native American groups in mental retardation (MR), emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD) and learning disabilities (LD) placement. According to Finn (1982), Hispanics are not overrepresented nationally, but evidence does indicate that this group of students is affected in some states and districts. It was also reported in Finn's findings that the schools with the highest overrepresentation of ELL students in special education settings had the smallest proportion of students in bilingual programs.

Artiles, Rueda, Salazar, and Higareda (2005) conducted a study examine whether there were racial differences in schooling that lead to placement in special education and if special education provided different benefits to ELL students compared to other groups. Databases of 11 school districts in the southern portion of California were analyzed which included one district with the highest density of ELL students in the state. It was discovered that "ELLs with Limited L1 and L2 were overrepresented in LD at both the elementary and secondary levels, although the greatest overrepresentation was observed in the elementary grades" (p. 290). It was also found that this same group was overrepresented within the category of MR where as all of the other groups of students including European Americans and English Proficient Learners (EP) were underrepresented in this category.

According to Artiles et al. (2005), data also supported the fact that ELL students were forty-six times more likely than their European American counterparts to be placed in MR secondary programs. These CLD students that had limited L2 were also seventy-

five percent more likely to be placed for LD than their English proficient peers. This means that some teachers are referring ELL students for services at a much greater rate than their European American counterparts. This trend also appeared with the ELL population when there were smaller numbers of students in bilingual programs. This could be because schools are not receiving enough funding to support larger bilingual programs or are without bilingual programs and highly qualified educators entirely.

#### *Teachers' Perception of English Proficiency Required for ELL Success*

A study conducted by Solomon and Rhodes (1995) took a survey of 157 ELL teachers and asked them to define and describe academic language. This study discovered that ELL teachers viewed academic language in terms of vocabulary and grammar acquisition or that academic language was being able to compare, contrast, or sequence events. It was also discovered that it was very important for students to acquire skills and practice in reading and writing in order to facilitate positive growth in language arts skills. Similarly, it was discussed that many minority speakers had a well developed every day register in their primary language but that they may not have had the opportunity or exposure to other experiences such as academic or literate register work (Cummins, 2000). Because students are able to speak English so well, teachers assume that these language minority ELL students are able to perform similar to their native English speaking peers. When these ELL students are not able to perform in a similar manner they may be seen by the classroom teacher as having an internal deficiency which leads teachers to refer more often to special education assessment.

#### *Teacher Resistance*

Due in part to Courts not being specific enough in what types of steps should be taken to help ELL students access classroom materials many teachers have resisted system wide change to their classroom instruction. Teachers may actually take suggestions to changes in their educational method as a personal attack on their

competence as a teacher. According to Maria Ana San Miguel when you offer teachers training and they are already bombarded with other kinds of training that applies directly to the No Child Left Behind Act goals they may view ELL training as less important in general (cited in Zehr, 2005, n. p.). This lack of documentation of willingness to participate in extra educational training is supported by Clair (1995), who conducted a brief study on three teachers and found that when the teachers were given the option to attend in-service workshops in learning how to better work with ELL students, that all of them declined the offer. Clair (1995) stated that one of the teachers thought that the methods of the workshop were not appropriate for a classroom setting such as utilizing the use of puppets.

In addition, two of the teachers in the above-mentioned study believed that their teacher training was adequate to work with ELL students effectively, and one of the teachers stated that, "As far as teaching goes, teaching is the same no matter what kind of kids you have" (Reeves, 2006, p. 133). This study's findings reflect the fact that today teachers are dealing with many issues that decreases their amount of free time and willingness to attend workshops and training seminars in how to improve skills and methods of providing and accommodating ELL students in the classroom. Teachers with this mentality believe that teaching ELL students is not their problem and may feel that the language specialist in the school should be responsible for facilitating changes in understanding by these students.

#### Varying State Requirements in Teacher Training

Even though ELL students make up a large percent of many school districts throughout the country already, only about 12.5 percent of teachers have participated in more than eight hours of training or professional development in working with this diverse group of students (Washburn, 2008). It is important to point out, that the Department of Education throughout the United States, as well as specific school districts

have their own requirements for the amount of field work hours and experiences that are required for teacher certification. Wisconsin and Minnesota are no exception.

#### *Wisconsin's Requirements*

For example, in the State of Wisconsin, the University of Wisconsin-Madison (UW-M) is the center of the university system and has multicultural requirements specific to the teacher education program. According to UW-M, prospective teachers have to be competent in the areas of: history of American Indian tribes in Wisconsin, history of women and various culturally diverse groups, philosophies of these groups, discrimination in American society toward these groups, and consultation and mediation skills in dealing with these diverse groups (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2007). Furthermore, orientation sessions on multicultural and human relations as well as reflecting on community and school experiences from a multicultural perspective are offered to prospective teachers and are recommended but not required for teacher certification. These courses will give teachers skills and knowledge in understanding other cultural perspectives and being able to communicate effectively with these groups but seem to be lacking in how to apply this knowledge to the classroom setting and how to best accommodate for these CLD students (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2007).

#### *Minnesota's Requirements*

Respectively, the University of Minnesota (UM) also requires future teachers to take classes to specifically experience differences in diverse groups of students in general. For example, the UM foundations course in elementary education curriculum plan for future middle school social studies teachers to take multicultural perspectives in sociology or some other comparable class related to diversity in American culture (University of Minnesota, 2005). It is also required that students in the elementary education program take a three credit course in foundations of special education. This means that elementary education students are being exposed to some concepts related to

diverse populations. Educators in other areas of expertise and focus are not required to take any multicultural programming other than foundations of special education.

Within both of these core institutions of Wisconsin and Minnesota respectively, there are classes that expose students to CLD populations but there is limited exposure in applying this knowledge in an educational setting (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2007; University of Minnesota, 2005). It is very important to realize that these teachers are going to be assessing in class whether ELL students are able to access the curriculum and try to ensure an appropriate educational experience for all students.

#### Laws that Impact ELL Students

Our nation's school systems have seen major changes in school policies which have been influenced by government research projects, the need to provide every child in the United States with an appropriate education, and holding educators accountable for showing adequate yearly progress (AYP). This shift in attitude developed during Ronald Reagan's presidency in the early 1980's. The United States was in an arms race with the former Soviet Union and funding in the United States and rights of Americans were talked about in the news at an increased rate. It was during this period that President Reagan told Terrel Bell, the President's Secretary of Education, that he wanted the U.S. Department of Education shut down (Borek, 2008). But, instead of shutting down the U.S. Department of Education however, Bell created a commission to research the condition of the public school-aged students of the United States and how best to help them.

The appointed commission made a report titled "A Nation at Risk" and presented it to President Reagan. This report included recommendations about how to get our schools back on track with other nations around the world. According to Borek (2008), the commission recommended to President Reagan that all teachers be required to show their competence in the subject that is being taught and be paid according to how well

they were doing their jobs. Finally, the report lead to an increase in standardized testing in schools and put the nation on a path that has played out thorough new laws designed to provide every child in America with a well-rounded education.

#### *No Child Left Behind Act*

There have been many studies concerned with what this law is actually doing to American school systems and what other types of negative consequences are happening with the compliance of NCLB in schools throughout the country. This section will focus on a couple of significant difficulties that educators face when trying to comply with NCLB mandates which schools are supposed to follow.

According to Freeman (2005), the fact of the matter is that “a ‘colorblind racism’ ensues under the NCLB mandate, which disregards the realities of racial disparities.” He elaborated that this form of racism effects more children from a culturally diverse background because their parents are often unaware of services that may be provided in the community and may not have the time or resources to pursue one-on-one tutoring for their children. In addition, it was also suggested that European Americans, in contrast, may be more culturally connected and able to be advocates for their children as well as to provide more time and finances for finding services for their children.

#### *IDEIA 2004*

This law was originally known as Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 1997, but was recently reauthorized in 2004 and is now known at the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) (LD Online, 2008). It was further explained that changes in this federal mandate in 2006 have allowed schools to move away from the discrepancy model of waiting for students to fail before interventions could be tried toward an approach where interventions could be tried and monitored for changes. Many questions about who is supposed to monitor the students’ progress, how often, and what to do when progress is not being made have been a primary concern for

teachers in how best to provide services to students struggling in general as well as ELL students.

### *NCLB and Highly Qualified Teachers*

It is often the case that schools throughout the nation find it difficult to find competent and qualified teachers to teach. According to NCLB mandates, schools are charged with hiring “highly qualified” teachers or to supply their current teachers with training in order to qualify them as “highly qualified” no later than the 2005-2006 school year (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). It was expressed by Jameson and Huefner (2006) that it is practically impossible for schools to stay in compliance with NCLB laws when there is very limited funding for hiring new special education teachers or other specialized teachers. Consider the recent situation that faced the state of Florida. During the 2007-2008 school year, the state was in the process of hiring 25,000 new teachers because of changing class size amendments requiring fewer students in each classroom (Smyth, 2008).

Each state in the country has different guidelines for what qualifies someone as a highly qualified teacher of ELL in order to be able to teach this diverse population of students. This individual state judgment was based on the legal case of *Flores v. The State of Arizona* which was primarily concerned that ELL students were being taught by under-qualified teachers (Mahoney, MacSwan, & Thompson, 2005). This Federal case has led to further endorsement requirements by teachers in the state of Arizona of an additional fifteen hours of training for a provisional endorsement and forty-five hours of training for a full structured English immersion (SEI) endorsement. The results were far from what was hoped for by the plaintiff in this case, because the number of hours required by the state that each student training to be a teacher would be required to work with ELL students before state licensure was reduced from twenty-one credit hours to only four credit hours (Mahoney, MacSwan, & Thompson, 2005).

*Wisconsin and Minnesota Endorsement Requirements*

The states of Wisconsin and Minnesota have additional endorsement requirements for teacher training in order to qualify for licensure. For example, in a report prepared by Ballantyne (2008), the state of Wisconsin has no requirement for all teachers to have training in working with or exposure to ELL students. This means that there could be teachers with ELL students in their classrooms that have not had any exposure to how to work with students from diverse populations which could lend itself to limited opportunities for ELL students to learn in such classrooms as well as possible biases of the teacher impacting the student-teacher relationship. The state of Minnesota has a higher standard for teachers to be considered competent for working with ELL students. According to Ballantyne (2008), teachers are trained in second language acquisition and in strategies that can be used to support these students in being successful in the classroom.

Highly qualified teachers are seeing many problems with the application of NCLB laws and guidelines in the classrooms. According to April Marinell, an English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) teacher who was concerned for her students, “We were told, ‘You need to follow the core curriculum,’ but it wasn’t always appropriate” (cited in Davis, 2004, n. p.). Davis stated that in many situations it would not be appropriate to teach students with such a limited English knowledge the same kinds of things that their classmates were learning. This leads most teachers to opt for getting as many students as possible up to the AYP level and often leaves out the few who do not have a chance at acquiring this level of proficiency. The students that are most often left behind in this teaching approach are the ELL students. Many ELL students are being excluded from acceptable educations in many schools solely because of their lack of academic English. In addition, Abedi (2004) stated that “the validity of AYP reporting is threatened when schools inconsistently label limited English proficient (LEP) students.”

These types of school achievement assessments require a high level of understanding of English concepts. Even though it may not appear like it because ELL students can often generally hold a conversation with others, it is often the case that they lack this high of a level of English proficiency (Smyth, 2008).

#### *Legal Limitations Exclude Some ELL Students from Receiving Services*

Federal regulations include some exclusionary factors for qualifying for special education services. This further complicates the issue of identifying children for possible referral for special education services and evaluation. The fact that there are situations in which a student does not qualify for services based on certain background issues may or may not be known by general education teachers but would have to be taken into account when determining placement of ELL students.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (2008) states that children do not qualify as having a specific learning disability (LD) if the learning problem is because of some kind of cultural or limited English proficiency (LEP) issue. That means that ELL students are denied services unless it can be determined that their educational difficulties were caused by a cognitive or LD of some sort and not just their language difficulties. This is an almost impossible task, because ELL students can not be validly assessed for a cognitive or LD and the tests that are used to do these assessments are almost exclusively designed for native English speakers. This is also difficult because it is not known how proficient their use of the English language is and if they have had adequate opportunities to learn before being referred for an evaluation (Rhodes, Ochoa, & Ortiz, 2005).

The ELL student population is then at a higher risk for falling between the cracks of receiving the support that they need in order to receive an appropriate education. This is possible because teachers are focusing on making sure that a majority of the students in the classroom are meeting AYP which often leaves ELL students left out of classroom instruction (Borek, 2008). ELL students could also be in need of the extra support

services, but moved to the United States recently and thus does not qualify for special education support based upon the presumption that their deficit is one of culture or LEP.

#### Factors that Impact the Acquisition of a Second Language

In order for ELL students to have access to the core curriculum they must have a strong understanding of the English language. But just how long does it take to have such an understanding of the English language that ELL students are able to access the curriculum being taught in class successfully?

#### *Academic Proficiency Influences*

The time that it takes children to acquire a second language to the skill level required to be proficient in academic domains and on achievement tests in schools varies. According to Collier (1987) and Cummins (1984), immigrant children in schools often acquire conversational English appropriate to communicate with peers in approximately two years but require as much as five to ten years to become academically fluent in English. School-aged ELL students often have a much more difficult time on benchmark testing conducted in English, because they have not had the opportunities that native English language speakers have had who have been immersed in American culture and the English language their whole lives. Teachers and psychologists that are lacking in a solid knowledge base of language acquisition often assume that these children had overcome all the difficulties with English when they are seen to be easily conversing in the English language (Cummins, 2000).

#### *BICS Versus CALPS*

Children generally develop “playground” speaking skills, also known as basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) more easily than they do skills to understand complex academic tasks known as cognitive academic language proficiency skills (Aukerman, 2007). According to Cummins (2000), if students do not have cognitive academic language proficiency skills (CALPS) in their primary language or their

secondary language, in this instance English proficiency, then they may be at a significant disadvantage in adjusting to the new academic setting. For example, if a child were to move to the United States when they were six years old and start school, they probably would not have a mastery of their original country's language. When this child starts first grade and is required to learn and test in English, research suggests that he or she would be lost in the instruction and would have to be accommodated for in the classroom. But, according to Cummins (2000), the child could only become as proficient in the English language as his or her basic skill level in the primary language that was used in his or her country of origin.

#### *Years it Takes to Acquire a Second Language*

A cross-sectional longitudinal study conducted by Thomas and Collier (1997) attempted to explore the effectiveness of education for ELL students and was entitled *School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students*. This study was a very thorough investigation on educational effectiveness and included more than 700,000 student records which were compiled from five large school districts during the years 1982-1996. Thomas and Collier (1997) were primarily interested in answering two central questions in this study: How long does it take ELL students to reach the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile of the Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) while considering when they arrived in America and how old they were when they entered the United States and what influence do school programs and instructional variables have on long-term achievement for ELL students. They found the following answers to those questions:

It takes typical bilingually schooled students who are achieving on grade level in L1 [language 1], from 4-7 years to make it to the 50th normal curve equivalent (NCE) in L2 [language 2]. It takes typical 'advantaged' immigrants with 2-5 years of on-grade-level home country schooling in L1 from 5-7 years to reach the 50<sup>th</sup> NCE in L2, when schooled all in L2 in the US. It takes the typical young

immigrant schooled all in L2 in the US 7-10 years or more to reach the 50<sup>th</sup> NCE, and the majority of these students do not ever make it to the 50<sup>th</sup> NCE, unless they receive support for L1 academic and cognitive development at home (cited in Cummins, 2000, p. 223).

This means that ELL students who immigrate to the United States have a significant disadvantage achieving an equivalent level of competence in English and in academic tests compared to their native English speaking peers.

Thomas and Collier (1997) also discovered that one of the strongest predictors of how quickly ELL students could acquire a second language was dependent upon the amount of formal schooling that the ELL student had been exposed to in their primary language. It was further explained that language acquisition in schools is driven by a prism model which consists of four major components including: sociocultural, linguistic, academic, and cognitive processes (Thomas & Collier, 1997). This meant that all languages that the individual is knowledgeable of will have a certain level of development in each of these four areas, but if one of these areas is neglected by the individual or environment that they are functioning within then it may impact in a negative way their overall future success and time that it takes to develop proficiency in a second language.

#### *Legal Frameworks that Limit Access to the Curriculum for ELL Students*

As previously mentioned in this chapter, teachers as well as schools in general are held accountable for showing AYP so that the Federal government will continue to provide funding to individual schools. It has become an increasing concern of educators as to what to do with ELL students in state-mandated standardized assessment so that they do not pull down the school averages in order to continue to receive government funds (Cummins, 2000). These results, Cummins asserts, are often passed on to the general public through television news shows and read about in newspapers which often

looks like schools and educators are providing inadequate educational opportunities for not only for ELL students but for all students in the United States. This often gives the appearance that schools and educators are providing inadequate educational opportunities for not only ELL students but for all students. It is very important to be mindful that news corporations are selling a service and trying to get as many consumers of their services as possible, thus at times they make the story look one way or another in order to improve sales and television ratings.

The question of what educators should do with ELL students and how best to accommodate their needs is a difficult one that has not been addressed adequately in Federal legislation. The many different accommodations that have been supplied by Cummins (2000) include: exempting them from state-mandated assessment for a period of five years or waiting a set period of time before they be required to take such assessments. The major drawback to these accommodations is that educators are already disregarding the ELL population in participation in some cases, but if they were not required to show AYP the worry is that teachers would hear the message between the wordings and thus be justified in their non-willingness to work to improve the educational opportunities of ELL students.

Schools that fail their AYP are often told that scores must improve in order to continue to receive the Federal funding allotted to them to establish programs to work with ELL students (Borek, 2008). This legal implication of NCLB is far reaching and particularly problematic in areas that have much higher percentages of ELL students such as the Los Angeles and Miami school districts because these states have districts that have larger percentages of ELL students. Even though they have larger percentages of ELL students, they are held to the same required AYP as other districts which can more easily lead to loss of funding from the Federal government which was used to support ELL students with programs.

This chapter discussed how changes in the demographics of the United States in the general population as well as the school-aged population are going to be going through major changes in the years to come. This will impact education and how services are provided in the classrooms around the nation. Teacher training requirements across the nation also come into play with influencing teachers' attitudes and perceptions associated with the ELL students being included in the general education setting and how able they are to provide adequate services for this population in the classroom. It was specifically looked at what the requirements for teacher training programs as it pertained to cultural experiences in the states of Wisconsin and Minnesota specifically. Research findings from Thomas and Collier (1997), and Cummins (2000) were also discussed as to how much time is required for ELL students to acquire the second language of English and be proficient enough to be able to take reliable assessments in English.

*Introduction*

This chapter will include a critical analysis of the literature presented in Chapter II. This will be accomplished by tying together how demographic changes in the overall population of America are going to require education reform like nothing that we have experienced in America prior to this. It will also tie together attitudes that some teachers have about culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) groups and how much previous teaching training experience working with English Language Learners (ELL) will influence how prepared teachers are to work with this group of students in the classroom. Finally, it will discuss how Federal mandates play a critical role in attitudes and perceptions that teachers have about holding ELL students accountable for adequate yearly progress (AYP) (i.e. how this often leaves ELL students without adequate academic supports in classroom instruction). In addition, recommendations for how best to improve teachers' attitudes about having ELLs in their classrooms will be discussed as well as how to improve the quality of education being provided to ELL students. The chapter will conclude with recommendations for future research.

*Summary*

The United States Census Bureau (2008) is predicting that the Hispanic population in the United States is going to triple in the next forty years. In addition, it is also predicted that the enrollment of ELL students will increase from the current level of 10 percent of the total population of all school-aged students enrolled in public schools throughout America to 40 percent by 2030. This major shift in demographics is going to put added pressures on teachers to be knowledgeable about how best to improve the skills of ELLs within the classroom while at the same time providing adequate instruction for native speaking counterparts (Washburn, 2008).

Learning a language takes time, and it has been postulated in research studies (e.g. Cummins, 1984, Thomas & Collier, 1997) that academic understanding and communication at appropriate levels could take as much as five to ten years for individuals to develop. Why then are educators held accountable for showing end-of-the-year progress with these students and evaluated based upon their success? The educational system of America will continue to be challenged in the future and in order to rise to the occasion will need to continue to revise Federal and State legislation addressing the issue of how best to help ELL students succeed.

### *Critical Analysis*

NCLB mandates were developed with good intentions in mind which were to deliver an appropriate education to all children in the United States. However, this appropriate education has been inadequately accessed by certain demographic groups, specifically ELL students. Every child should be performing at proficient levels in reading, writing, and math by a certain time in the year. But, the fact is that ELL students are being left behind in many instances because the same law that is designed to get them extra help is really holding them up to an unattainable standard. ELL students need time to learn vocabulary, learn about social situations, and about school environments and routines that are not as familiar to them as their native speaking counterparts. These factors, and the amount of time that is required for each individual ELL student, is really out of the teachers control and is not something that teachers can just provide more of in their classes in order to improve this populations basic English skills. By helping ELL students feel more connected and invested in the materials being covered and showing them that they are valued as individuals in their respective schools and society, it is possible for them to develop a stronger desire to learn English.

*Recommendations*

According to the research that was discussed in Chapter II, teachers need to have more training in their credentialing programs in order to provide high-quality services to ELL students in the classroom. If preconceptions of biases directed toward ELL students are going to be challenged, then teachers need to educate themselves and become more aware of diverse cultures. Working with students from CLD backgrounds will allow future teachers to challenge their stereotypes and open their eyes that it is not because ELL students are internally deficient but that they just have not had the same exposure to English as students who have had the opportunity to speak English their whole lives. When teachers are exposed to more experiences with ELL populations, they will be more able to empathize with ELL students and understand just how difficult it is to perform academically from their perspective.

## References

- Abedi, J. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issue. *Educational Researcher*, 33, 4-15.
- Artiles, A., & Harry, B. (2005). Issues of overrepresentation and educational equity for culturally and linguistically diverse students [Electronic version]. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 41, 110-113. Retrieved December 19, 2008, from EBSCOhost database.
- Artiles, A. J., Rueda, R., Salazar, J. J., & Higaeda, I. (2005). Within-group diversity in minority disproportionate representation: English language learners in urban school districts. *Exceptional Children*, 71(3), 283-300.
- Aukerman, M. (2007). A culpable CALP: Rethinking the conversational/academic language proficiency distinction in early literacy instruction [Electronic version]. *Reading Teacher*, 60, 626-635. Retrieved June 15, 2008, from: EBSCOhost database.
- Ballantyne, K. G. (2008). Teaching ELLs in mainstream classrooms: State-by-state requirements for all pre-service teachers [Electronic version]. Retrieved October 5, 2008, from [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/policy/legislation/preservice\\_reqs.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/policy/legislation/preservice_reqs.pdf)
- Bond, L. (2007). Teaching to the test [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 20, 2009, From <http://www.carnegiefoudation.org/perspectives/sub.asp?key=245&subkey=579>
- Borek, J. (2008). A nation at risk's 25<sup>th</sup>: Missing the obvious [Electronic version]. *Education Week*, 27, 26-26. Retrieved June 15, 2008, from: EBSCOhost database.

- Christenson, S., Ysseldyke, J. E., Wang, J. J., & Algozzine, B. (1983). Teachers' attributions for problems that result in referral for psychoeducational evaluation [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from <http://www.questia.com/googleScholar.qst;jsessionid=J2QbxFbqhbdTvLnMynTvG35RxQPPXqpd5Jt1BQJ7G1sY8TnrNQFf!105961495?docId=77504423>
- Clair, N. (1995). Mainstream classroom teachers and ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 189–196.
- Collier, V. P. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 617-641.
- Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. San Diego, CA: College-Hill Press Inc.
- Cummins, J. (1999). *BICS and CALP: Clarifying the distinction* [Electronic version]. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from: EBSCOhost database.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. In C. Baker & N. Hornberger (Eds.), Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Davis, B. (2004). *ESOL curriculum addresses longtime need, but concerns persist*. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from: [www.thenotebook.org/editions/2004/fall/ESOL.htm](http://www.thenotebook.org/editions/2004/fall/ESOL.htm)
- Egan-Robertson, D., Harrier, D., & Kale, B. (2004). *Wisconsin population 2030: A report on projected state, county and municipal populations and households for the period 2000-2030*. Retrieved October 5, 2008, from [www.doa.state.wi.us/docview.asp?docid=2114](http://www.doa.state.wi.us/docview.asp?docid=2114)
- Encyclopedia of Psychology. (2009). *Attitudes*. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from <http://tip.psychology.org/attitude.html>
- English Language Learners in the Saint Paul Public Schools (n.d.). *English language Learner: Demographics of the ELL population in SPPS*. Retrieved December 6, 2008, from <http://ell.spps.org/printview/Demographics.html>

- Erichsen, G. (2008). *Restaurant with speak-English sign wins dispute*. Retrieved January 6, 2008, from <http://spanish.about.com/b/2008/03/20/restaurant-with-speak-english-sign-wins-dispute.htm>
- Finn, J. D. (1982). Patterns in special education placement as revealed by the OCR Surveys. In K. A. Heller, W. H. Holtzman, & S. Messick (Eds.), *Placing children in special education: A strategy for equity* (pp. 322-381). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Fox News. (2007). *Democrats slow to approve funding for border fence*. Retrieved June 22, 2008, from [www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,244264,00.html](http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,244264,00.html)
- Freeman, E. (2005). No child left behind and the denigration of race. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 38, 19-29.
- George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education. (2005). *Center expertise: ELLs*. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from <http://ceee.gwu.edu/ELLs/ELLs.html>
- Harklau, L. (1994). Tracking and linguistic minority students: Consequences of ability grouping for second language learners. *Linguistics and Education*, 6, 217-244.
- Harklau, L. (1999). The ESL learning environment in secondary school. In C. J. Faltis & P. M. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 42-60). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the 'good kids' to the 'worst': Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 35-67.
- Indiana University. (2007). *Human intelligence: Historical influences, current controversies, teaching resources*. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from <http://www.Indiana.edu/~intell/binet.shtml>

- Institute for Inclusion. (2008). *Search for specific definitions*. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from <http://www.instituteforinclusion.org/>
- Jameson, J. M., & Huefner, D. S. (2006). Highly qualified special educators and the provision of a free appropriate public education to students with disabilities. *Journal of Law and Education* 35, 29–51.
- LD Online. (2008). *The world's leading website on learning disability and ADHD: IDEA 2004*. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from <http://www.ldonline.org/features/idea2004>
- Mahoney, K., MacSwan, J., & Thompson, M. (2005). The condition of English language learners in Arizona: 2005 [Electronic version]. Retrieved October 5, 2008, from [epsl.asu.edu/aepi/Report/EPSSL-0509-110-AEPI.doc](http://epsl.asu.edu/aepi/Report/EPSSL-0509-110-AEPI.doc)
- Marriage and Family Encyclopedia. (2009). *Hispanic-American families: The Hispanics/Latinos and group definition*. Retrieved January 8, 2009, from <http://family.jrank.org/pages/773/Hispanic-American-Families-Hispanics-Latinos-Group-Definition.html>
- Minnesota State Demographic Center. (2005). *Minnesota population projections by race and Hispanic origin: 2000-2030*. Retrieved October 5, 2008, from <http://www.demography.state.mn.us/DownloadFiles/PopulationProjectionsRaceHispanicOrigin.pdf>
- Murphy School District. (2005). *IDEA and IDEIA 2004*. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from [http://www.msdez.org/espweb/IDEA97\\_2004.htm](http://www.msdez.org/espweb/IDEA97_2004.htm)
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *School and staffing survey 1999-2000: Overview of the data for public, private, public charter and Bureau of Indian Affairs elementary and secondary schools*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2008a). *NCELA faq: Glossary of terms related to the education of linguistically and culturally diverse students*. Retrieved December 7, 2008, from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>

- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2008b). *NCELA: State-specific numbers and statistics*. Retrieved January 8, 2009, from [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/stats/3\\_bystate.htm](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/stats/3_bystate.htm)
- North Central Regional Education Laboratory. (2004). *Children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds*. Retrieved January 10, 2009, from <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/content/entareas/reading/li4lk1.htm>
- Office of Academic Assessment. (2006). *A definition of assessment from the higher learning commission*. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from <http://www.uni.edu/assessment/definitionofassessment.shtml>
- Passel, J. S., & Cohn, D. (2008). *U.S. population projections: 2005-2050*. Retrieved December 6, 2008, from <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/85.pdf>
- Reeves, J. R. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms [Electronic version]. *Journal of Educational Research*, 99, 131-142. Retrieved June 15, 2008, from EBSCOhost database.
- Rhodes, R.L., Ochoa, S.H., & Ortiz, S.O. (2005). *Assessing culturally and linguistically diverse students: A practical guide*. New York, NY: Guildford Press.
- Smyth, T. S. (2008). Who is no child left behind leaving behind [Electronic version]? *Clearing House*, 81, 133-137. Retrieved June 18, 2008, from EBSCOhost database.
- Solomon, J. & Rhodes, N. C. (1995). *Conceptualizing Academic Language*. Santa Cruz: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- United States Census Bureau. (2008). *U.S. interim projections by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin: 2000-2050*. Retrieved June 18, 2008, from [www.census.gov/ipc/www/usinterimproj/](http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/usinterimproj/)

- University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. (2005). *Elementary education: Foundations B. S.* Retrieved December 28, 2008, from <http://onestop2.umn.edu/programCatalog/viewCatalogProgram.do?programID=42&strm=1089>
- University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison. (2007). *Teaching education program requirements in multicultural education*. Retrieved December 24, 2008, from <http://www.education.wisc.edu/eas/METeachingReqs.asp>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2005). *Elementary and secondary education part a—Improving basic programs operated by local educational agencies sec. 1119*. Retrieved June 15, 2008, from [www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg2.html#sec1119](http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg2.html#sec1119)
- Valdes, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Verplaetse, L. S. (1998). How content teachers interact with English language learners. *TESOL Journal*, 7, 24–28.
- Washburn, G. N. (2008). Alone, confused, and frustrated: Developing empathy and strategies for working with English language learners [Electronic version]. *Clearing House*, 81, 247-250. Retrieved November 24, 2008, from EBSCOhost database.
- Webster, N. (1983). Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary. In J. L. McKechnie (Ed.), New York, NY: Gulf and Western Corporation.
- Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (2008). *Specific learning disabilities in plain language*. Retrieved June 19, 2008, from [dpi.wi.gov/sped/eligild.html](http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/eligild.html)
- Wrigley, P. (2000). Educating English language learners in rural areas. NABE News. November/December.
- Zehr, M. A. (2005). Influx of new students can outpace teacher preparation: But training programs don't always find a receptive audience [Electronic version]. *Education Week*, 24, 6-7. Retrieved June 22, 2008, from EBSCOhost database.