

1-1-2013

Educators' Knowledge And Attitudes Relating To The Implementation Of Ell Programs Under Nclb Title Iii

Monetta Irene Foster
Wayne State University,

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/oa_dissertations

Recommended Citation

Foster, Monetta Irene, "Educators' Knowledge And Attitudes Relating To The Implementation Of Ell Programs Under Nclb Title Iii" (2013). *Wayne State University Dissertations*. Paper 653.

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in Wayne State University Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

**EDUCATORS' KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES RELATING TO ELL PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION UNDER NCLB TITLE III**

by

MONETTA IRENE WHITCOMB FOSTER

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

2013

MAJOR: CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION

Approved by:

Advisor

Date

© COPYRIGHT BY

MONETTA IRENE WHITCOMB FOSTER

2013

All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

This body of work is dedicated to my late husband, Bob.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I first thank God from whom all blessings flow. I would also like to thank my mother, the late Lillian Whitcomb and God-mother, Ms. Hattie Manley, for consistently sharing with me their love for education. They have been the wind beneath my wings. . To Betty, George, Roselyn, Chris, Christopher, Amanda, Kittrell, Robert, Barbara, Michael, Dr. Walter Burt and the late Dr. Mayfield; I will be eternally grateful for your unending support and motivation for staying with this project.

Immense gratitude is extended to the Office of Graduate Study for your patience, support and belief in me.

Heartfelt thanks to my Committee members, Drs. Elliott and Tilles for their guidance throughout this invigorating project. I am especially grateful to my committee chair, Dr. Rosa. In addition, I thank Dr. Zucker for her patience and support towards bringing this undertaking to closure.

Finally, to my children, Marvin (Jeanine), Mark, Portia (Andre), Rebecca (Kevin) and my granddaughter, Portia L.; I appreciate your understanding and patience towards helping me to climb this educational mountain. Your constant reminders of what I could accomplish was inspiring. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
List of Tables.....	viii
List of Figures.....	ix
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background of the Problem.....	5
Statement of the Problem.....	8
Significance of the Study.....	8
Purpose of the Study.....	9
Research Questions.....	9
Research Hypotheses.....	10
Null Hypotheses.....	10
Definition of Terms.....	11
Key Legislation.....	16
Supreme Court Cases.....	18
Assumptions of the Study	20
Limitations of the Study.....	20
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	21
Theoretical Framework.....	21
Empirical Studies.....	23
History of Bilingual Education and NCLB Title III.....	23
Educator Attitudes.....	25

NCLB Title III – Funding.....	28
NCLB Title III – Standards.....	34
NCLB Title III – Assessment.....	36
Summary.....	39
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	42
Introduction.....	42
Restatement of the Purpose of the Study.....	42
Research Design.....	43
Participants.....	43
Instrumentation.....	44
Demographic Questionnaire.....	44
Scales 1 through 3	45
Survey Scale 4	46
Finalization of Survey	46
Data Collection.....	47
Validity and Reliability	47
Data Analysis Procedures.....	48
Descriptive Analysis	48
Inferential Analyses	48
Exploratory Analysis	49
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	52
Descriptive Analysis.....	52
Missing Data.....	52

Sample Characteristics.....	53
Data Screening.....	55
Confound Screening.....	56
Inferential Analysis.....	58
Hypothesis 1.....	59
Hypothesis 2.....	60
Hypothesis 3.....	60
Post hoc Analyses.....	60
Conclusion.....	62
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	63
Scale Reliability as a Limitation.....	64
Missing Data.....	65
Inferential Results for Shifting Paradigms.....	66
Discussion of Hypothesis 1: Funding.....	67
Discussion of Hypothesis 2: Standards.....	68
Discussion of Hypothesis 3: Assessment.....	69
A Final Word on Educator Attitudes.....	70
Limitations of the Study.....	72
Educational Implications.....	72
Directions for Future Research.....	73
Conclusion.....	73
APPENDIX A: ELL Program Support Staff Survey.....	75

APPENDIX B: Descriptive Demographic Data for Demographic Categories.....	80
References.....	83
Abstract.....	93
Autobiographical Statement.....	95

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Number of English Language Learners by State- 2004-2005 School Year.....	2
Table 2. Population Increase by Race from 2000-2010.....	3
Table 3. 2010 Census Report of Population Increase/Decrease Since 2000.....	4
Table 4: English Language Acquisition – Appropriations History (\$000s).....	31
Table 5: The Annual Cost per Limited English Proficient Student Attaining English Language Proficiency.....	32
Table 6: The Percentage of US ELL Students Receiving Title III Services who have Attained English Language Proficiency.....	32
Table 7: Program Output Measures – Language Acquisition State Grants (\$000s).....	33
Table 8: Responses to Demographic Inquiries.....	53
Table 9: Number of Years Educators Served in the Current Roles.....	53
Table 10: Frequency Distribution for All Current Job Roles.....	53
Table 11: Frequency Distribution for Gender.....	54
Table 12: Frequency Distribution for Level of Education.....	54
Table 13: Frequency Distribution for Settings.....	54
Table 14: Expectations Regarding Growth of ESL Population.....	55
Table 15: Descriptive Statistics for the Total group (N=103) for Each Scale.....	55
Table 16: Descriptive Data for Demographical Categories.....	57
Table 17: Pearson Correlations among Continuous Variables (N=103).....	58
Table 18: Attitudes towards ELLs as a function of Evidence of Funding, Standards and Assessment.....	59

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Funding Allocations for Federal ELL Programs by States and Regions.....	29
Figure 2: Statistical Analyses.....	50

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Every state in the United States is experiencing an increase in population diversity resulting from the influx of immigrants and English language learners (ELLs) and this trend shows no signs of slowing down. Consequently, schools are taxed by the large number of American citizens whose primary language is not English. The 2000 Census report indicated that out of the total U.S. population of 209,860,388 (17.6%), 44,885,797 could be categorized as English language learners (ELLs) and/or limited English proficient (LEP). The 2000 Census also indicated that out of the total U.S. population of children aged 5 and above, 43.4%, or 19,492,832 were estimated to be ELLs (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2002). The National Center for Education Statistics reported that the general population had grown by 9% from 1993 to 2003, while at the same time the ELL student population in Michigan comprised 10% of the general population (Michigan Department of Education, 2003). Education Week reported the Michigan Department of Education's findings; that as of January 13, 2009, in the State of Michigan alone there were 552,000 ELLs.

The United States Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition shared information in 2006 relative to the largest state populations of English language learners for the year 2004-2005. Table 1 presents the six states with the largest ELL populations.

Table 1

Number of English Language Learners by State during the 2004-2005 School Year

State	Total English Language Learners
California	1,591,525
Texas	684,007
Florida	299,346
New York	203,583
Illinois	192,764
Arizona	155,789

Sixty-one percent of all ELLs in the United States resided in the states listed in Table 1 during the 2004-2005 school year (USDOE, 2006). The percentage of United States ESL and/or ELL students has grown well over 100% during the past 25 years (Hollins, & Guzman, 2005).

Moreover, percentage growth ranged highest in student population percentages for South Carolina with 714.2% to the lowest student population increase at 100.3% for Pennsylvania. These figures were supplied by the United States Department of Education (USDOE; 2010) for the school years 1994-95 to the school-year 2004-2005 school-year.

Table 2 shares a chart of the United States population by race from 2000-2010. Interesting to note is the percentage of increase for the White population (5.7%) during this period versus that of the Asian (43.3%) and Hispanic or Latino population (43.0%).

RACE	% of 2010 US POPULATION	% OF INCREASE SINCE 2000
White	72.4%	5.7%
Black or Afro-American Alone	12.6%	12.3%
American Indian and Alaska native Alone	0.9%	18.4%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander Alone	0.2%	35.4%
Asian Alone	4.8%	43.3%
Some Other Race Alone	6.2%	24.4%
2 or More Races	2.9%	32.0%
Hispanic or Latino	16.3%	43.0%

Table 2

According to Selwyn, by the year 2035, we may witness a significantly greater increase in the number of these same students in comparison to white students (2007), while Henry (1990) predicts a doubling of non-white citizens in America by the year 2020. Selwyn further projected an estimated 57% representation for students of color by the year 2050. Both Selwyn and Henry's research indicate a sweeping change in the face of American citizens within the next decade. Consequently, educational institutions' rate of retooling educators with skill sets necessary to meet the needs of the growing ELL population needs to be increased. Increasing the pace of skill set development will require a radical paradigm shift.

Table 3 shows the results of the 2010 Census. These results reflect the change between 2000 and 2010 in the seven highest populated states in the nation. Cell “one” list the state. Cell “two” list the approximate population. Each of the other cells indicates the percentage of increase or decrease in population from 2000 to 2010.

STATE	POPULATION	ALASKA NATIVE AMERICAN INDIAN	ASIAN ALONE	NATIVE HAWAIIAN & OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER	HISPANIC OR LATINO
California	40 Million	From 1.0% To 8.8%	From 13.0% To 31.5%	From 0.4% To 23.4%	From 37.6% To 27.8%
Texas	30 Million	From 0.7% To 44.4%	From 3.8% To 71.5%	From 0.1% To 50.0%	From 37.6% To 41.8%
Florida	20 Million	From .4% To 33.5%	From 2.4% To 70.8%	From 0.1% To 42.4%	From 22.5% To 57.4%
New York	20 Million	From 0.6% To 29.6%	From 7.3% To 35.9%	From – To -0.6%	From 17.6% To 1.2%
Illinois	13 Million	From 0.3% To 41.8%	From 4.6% To 38.6%	From – To -12.1%	From 15.8% To 32.5%
Arizona	7 Million	From 4.6% To 15.9%	From 2.8% To 91.6%	From 0.2% To 87.9%	From 29.6% To 46.3%
Colorado	6 Million	From 1.1% To 26.6%	From 2.8% To 46.0%	From 0.1% To 43.3%	From 20.7% To 41.2%

Table 3 = Increase in population growth = Decrease in population growth

Educators operating from the premise of applying what they believe to be a student’s body of prior knowledge to how students process information has not been successful. Keeney (as cited in Scully, 2002) refers to this process as the study of epistemology, a combination of positivism and modernism. Ryan however, rebutted the simplicity of the aforementioned theory and the ethical nature of this practice by declaring that studies need to include the ingredients of flexibility of discourse, narration and reflection (2004). In other words, these practices need to have a post-positivist emphasis to be utilizable and in order to meet the new requirements for ELLs as indicated in Title III of the No Child Left Behind legislation (NCLB).

Without question, our nation’s institutions of learning are obligated to educate all children while readjusting to the many shifts in theory, applied methods and laws passed relative to how best to accomplish this task by 2014. Moreover, the 2002 NCLB Title III mandates endorsed nine standards critical to the fulfillment of the mandates of this law (USDE, 2002).

Most immigrants and English language learners come to America's schools unable to read, write or speak English. The concept of holistically viewing immigrant, LEP and ELL students as assets as opposed to traditionally viewing of them as liabilities will require a significant paradigm shift in educator attitude, allocation of funds and modalities for assessment flexibility. Also, in spite of new laws, funding allocated for the training and hiring staff at levels adequate for local educational institutions to satisfy the Title III mandate needs to be reexamined.

This research will examine the relationship between educators' knowledge of funding, the application of required scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards, and assessments stated in the NCLB Title III mandates for ELLs as they relate to K-12 educator attitudes and the implementation of English language learning programs.

Background of the Problem

America has reluctantly grappled with the issue of bilingual education for centuries, depending on the degree of "nativistic" sentiment and political influence exhibited at any one point and time. Malakoff and Hakuta (1990) described bilingual education as "an object of attitude that occupies a special place in the American soul."

Immigrants starting a new life in America brought with them their culture, language and heritage, resulting in unique language communities taking root throughout the country. American education would be the unifying force that led to the mandates of the late 19th century when the federal government began to mandate universal school attendance. Glenn (1988) shares that the drive for American assimilation eliminated the painful choice for parents to have children in the general labor force as opposed to being in school. This mandate also gave rise to a discussion regarding a common or dominant language to be used in those schools and sparked

the beginning of English-only laws. In 1923, with the advent of *Meyer v. Nebraska*, the Supreme Court began to hear cases relative to teaching in languages other than English thereby granting equal access to education for children whose native languages differed from English. Not surprisingly, these cases fueled strong attitudinal differences and the expression of English xenophobia unfolded. The increasing number of immigrants entering the nation's schools unable to read, write, or speak English exacerbated the problems and increased the challenges for American educators. These students sometimes came from war zones and with other seemingly insurmountable problems such as interrupted education or no education at all. In fact, an inordinate number of these immigrant students were not literate in their primary language. The critical need to hire qualified school staff to address the needs of these students became apparent.

The hallmark program in Dade County Florida established to meet the needs of Cuban refugees led to the federal government's formal approval of bilingual education in America and also led to passing the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 which eventually certified Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The passage of this act was followed with the allocation of funds to implement additional programs and projects to foster research targeted towards meeting the needs of English language learners (ELLs). While the language of the law recognized the educational needs of the ELLs, it did not deal with the mindset of educators and staff directly responsible for educating these children.

A major breakthrough came with the signing of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation in 2002 by then President George W. Bush, mandating that local and state educational agencies (LEAs) be responsible and accountable for the delivery of academic related services with the intention of closing the achievement gaps between all students, ELLs or otherwise. In addition to raising the level of academic achievement, NCLB made public LEAs accountable for

improving student achievement at all levels and in all student subgroups (Abernathy, 2007). This also nullified the practices of equal but separate education mandating equal access to curriculum (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954; Castañeda v. Pickard, 1981; Lau v. Nichols, 1974; Serta v. Portales Municipal Schools, 1972).

In spite of the alleged federal funding of the NCLB mandate along with the ultimate goal for each student to be able to function on grade level by 2014, the funding continues to prove to be inadequate for the realization of the 2014 target. Major challenges confronting educational agencies involved the use of methodologies and technologies that would support ELL's successful attainment of standards as measured by state developed assessments.

Another important requirement of NCLB was for the provision of highly qualified personnel. This means, according to NCLB's language that each teacher would teach in the discipline in which they were certified, including those teaching ELL students.

The legislation mandated the removal of all obstacles that interfered with learning or the meeting of adequate yearly progress (AYP). Adequate yearly progress is the annual measurement by the State to determine school districts' level of proficiency in the areas of mathematics and reading/language arts. LEAs became consumed with stepping up the pace for students becoming proficient in English and encouraged a non-academic, non-scientific method for English-only instruction (Crawford, 2004). Researchers continue to provide the proof of their studies and to emphasize the need for a longer period of time for students to attain academic proficiency in English (Collier & Thomas, 1989; Hakuta, Butler & Witt, 2000). Policy makers continue to ignore the empirical research that clearly indicates the necessity of additional time and also the use of the primary language in instruction in order to reduce the time to acquire academic English (Crawford, 2004)

Statement of the Problem

The focal areas of NCLB Title III are underperforming schools and school programs designed to teach ELLs. As the number of English language learners (ELLs) throughout the country continues to increase, it is a challenge getting ELL students to meet the academic goals specified in AYP in the specified timeframes.

The state education agencies (SEA) were directed by NCLB Title III to develop research-based, scientific standards that students are expected to master on an annual basis. An aligned set of standards has been converted to annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for English language learners (ELLs). AMAOs concentrate on the domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing for English proficiency. Even though the development of state content standards and benchmarks provides a blue print for instruction, many teachers are still unable to deliver the services and may be unwilling to master the skills to implement this blue print. As the United States' ELL population increases, it becomes more challenging getting educators' to develop the attitudes and skill sets needed to implement these programs.

Significance of the Study

Results of this study will provide important information on the effect of educators' knowledge and attitudes about implementing the mandates required under Title III. This study's significance lies with the impact that NCLB has had on curriculum and pedagogy for state and local public school districts across America since its implementation. Results of this study can provide information on the implication of NCLB mandates and the paradigm shifts needed to improve the learning experiences for all children; especially those who are in underperforming schools. Educator knowledge of the mandates for funding, standards and assessments also will

be examined relative to the new methodologies. Programs designed to teach ELLs are explicitly addressed in the NCLB Title III legislation but little research has been conducted on how educators' perceptions and attitudes affect this process and the rate at which students are acquiring adequate academic English in order to be transitioned to general education classrooms.

Purpose of the Study

This study will examine elementary and secondary educators' knowledge and attitudes about implementing NCLB Title III ELL programs in public schools.

Research Questions

1. Is there a relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the funding of the NCLB Title III mandates for limited English proficient children, and educator attitudes towards the implementation of the English language proficiency and academic programs as measured by a questionnaire?
2. Is there a relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the application of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards required by the NCLB Title III mandates, and educator attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs as measured by a questionnaire?
3. Is there a relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the assessment of scientifically-based academic and student achievement standards required by the NCLB Title III mandates, and educator attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs as measured by a questionnaire?

Research Hypotheses

H₁: There is a relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the funding of the NCLB Title III mandates for limited English proficient children, and educator attitudes towards the implementation of the English language proficiency and academic programs.

H₂: There is a relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the application of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards required by the NCLB Title III mandates, and educator attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs.

H₃: There is a relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the assessment of scientifically-based academic and student achievement standards required by the NCLB Title III mandates, and educator attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs.

Null Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no statistically significant relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the funding of the NCLB Title III mandates for limited English proficient children, and educator attitudes towards the implementation of the English language proficiency and academic programs.

H₀₂: There is no statistically significant relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the application of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards required by the NCLB Title III mandates, and educator attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs.

H₀₃: There is no statistically significant relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of assessment of scientifically-based academic and student achievement standards required by the NCLB Title III mandates, and educator attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs.

Definition of Terms

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP): This term is used to describe the annual measurement used by the Federal government to determine the level of academic progress in mathematics and reading/language arts. AYP for English language learners and immigrants is determined by the annual level of English proficiency these students have acquired.

Annual Measurable Accountability

Objectives (AMAO): Standards developed by the federal government as part of the No Child Left Behind legislation, Title III. These standards are monitored by the state departments of education and are used to monitor local school districts' progress towards English proficiency of ELL and immigrant students. Annual reports are issued to LEAs indicating the level of progress, level of proficiency and whether districts have met AYP.

Affective Filter:

Associated with Krashen's Monitor Model of second language learning; the affective filter is a term that describes a learner's attitude and psychological responses and the effect that level of emotions that contribute to the level of success for teachers and for students acquiring a second language (Krashen, 1982).

Authentic Assessment:

A variety of measures that evaluate student learning, motivation, attitudes and achievement on academic activities in the classroom. It is usually based on real life experiences.

Basic Interpersonal Communication

Skills (BICS):

BICS refer to what is termed "survival or playground English". Jim Cummins (1984) describes this term as being basic face-to-face communication that is easily acquired and depends on the situation. This term is usually accompanied by gestures and body language and often relies on context for understanding.

Bilingual Methodology:

This methodology encompasses the many instructional models that utilize two languages. It involves the use of the student's native language and the target language in varying degrees, depending on use and ability as it relates to listening, speaking, reading and writing (Baker & Jones, 1998). People may become bilingual

either by acquiring two languages at the same time in childhood or by learning a second language sometime after acquiring their first language.

Bi-literacy:

The ability to effectively communicate or understand thoughts and ideas through two languages' grammatical systems and vocabulary, using their written symbols (Hargett, 1998).

Cognitive Academic Language

Proficiency (CALP):

CALP was developed by Cummins (1984). This term denotes the language ability for academic achievement in a context-reduced environment such as textbook reading assignments or classroom lectures. This term is usually used in contrast to Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS; Baker, 2000)

Comprehensible Input:

An explanation of language learning, proposed by Krashen, that language acquisition is a result of learners being exposed to language constructs and vocabulary that are slightly beyond their current level. This "input" is made comprehensible to students by creating a context that supports its meaning – situational understanding (Krashen, 1982).

Content Area:

This term refers to academic school subjects such as English/language arts, reading, math, science and social

studies. Language proficiency (English or other language) may affect these areas.

Context-embedded language:

Communication occurring in a context that offers help to comprehension such as visual clues, gestures, expressions or specific location. This includes language where there is an abundance of shared understandings and where meaning is relatively obvious due to help from the physical or social nature of the conversation (Krashen, 1982).

Dominant language:

The language with which the speaker has greater proficiency and/or uses more often (Krashen, 1982).

English language learners (ELLs):

ELLs are students whose first language is not English and who are in the process of learning English. This term is used mostly in non-legal documents to refer to students formerly called LEP or “limited English proficient”. These students are: -A student who was not born in the U.S. and whose native language is other than English; A student who was born in the U.S. but comes from a home in which a language other than English is most relied on for communication; or is an American Indian or Alaskan Native, comes from a home in which a language other than English has had significant impact on his or her level of English

language proficiency and, who, as a result of the above, has difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language.

ELP:

ELP is an acronym for English language proficiency.

English Language Proficiency

Assessment (ELPA):

The ELPA is the instrument developed by the Michigan Department of Education to assess English language proficiency. This assessment was first implemented in Spring 2006. It is administered to all English language learners eligible for Title III services (whether they are receiving them or not). This assessment can replace the ELA section of the MEAP if the student has been in U.S. public schools for fewer than 12 months.

English as a Second Language (ESL):

This is an approach in which English language learners are instructed in the use of the English language. Their instruction is based on special curriculum that might involve little or no use of the native language. Some approaches focus on language, as opposed to content and is usually taught during specific school periods.

Highly Qualified:

A term used for teachers who are credentialed in the subject area(s) they are teaching.

Limited English Proficient (LEP):	An individual who lacks English proficiency and whose primary language is other than English. It is a term used by the federal government, most states and local school districts to identify those students who are not proficient enough to succeed in an English-only classroom (Lessow-Hurley, 1991).
Mainstream:	Classes designed for native or fluent speakers of English or those with no special needs.
Office of Civil rights (OCR):	The Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, has responsibility for enforcing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Office of Civil Rights investigates allegations of civil rights violations and initiates investigations of compliance with federal civil rights laws in schools that serve special student populations, including language-minority students.
Target language:	The language that a child is learning as a second language. For English language learners in the U.S. the target language is English. For native English speakers in dual language programs, the target language is the other language being learned other than English.

Key Legislation

Elementary and Secondary

A federal initiative targeted for low income families

- Education Act (ESEA): designed to provide financial support to school districts for academic achievement.
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB): A federal legislative reform movement designed to facilitate a rise in the level of achievement and a recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education act of 1965. The act contains the President's four basic education reform principles: stronger accountability for results, increased flexibility and local control, expanded options for parents and an emphasis on teaching methods based on scientifically-based research.
- Title I: Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged of the ESEA of 1965 as amended in 2001, supports programs to assist economically disadvantaged and at-risk students. Under the No Child Left Behind Act, Title I includes provisions for instruction and assessment of English language learners for academic achievement and English language proficiency.
- Title III: This portion of NCLB provides finance for English language instruction for Limited English Proficient Students and Immigrants (U.S. Department of Education, www.ed.gov). Title III under the No Child Left Behind Act consolidates the 13 bilingual and immigrant education programs formerly entitled Title VII of the Improving

America's Schools Act of 1994 into a State formula program and increases flexibility and accountability. The focus of Title III is to assist school districts with teaching English to limited English proficient students and help these students meet the same challenging State standards required of all other students (U.S. Department of Education, www.ed.gov).

Supreme Court Cases

Meyer v. Nebraska (1923):

Robert Meyer successfully appealed the Supreme Court decision that convicted him of reading to a student in German. This case was proven to be a violation of the 14th Amendment.

Brown v. Board of
Education (1954):

This 1954 case reversed the Plessy v. Ferguson segregation decision of 1896. As a result, segregating schools were declared unconstitutional and in violation of the 14th Amendment.

Serta v. Portales Municipal Schools. 499 F2d 1147 (10th Circuit 1974).

Schools (1972):

The Portales School District was ordered to develop a bilingual bicultural Spanish program. Programs for Spanish-speaking students had not been previously designed for students to achieve at high levels.

- Lau v. Nichols (1974):** A landmark case filed by Chinese parents in San Francisco in 1974 that led to a Supreme Court ruling that identical education does not constitute equal education under the Civil Rights Act. School districts must take “affirmative steps” to overcome educational barriers faced by non-English speakers (414 U.S. 563, U.S. Supreme Court Decision).
- Castañeda v. Pickard (1981):** This was the most significant decision made in 1981 regarding the education of a language-minority student since Lau v. Nichols. The 5th Circuit Court established a three-pronged test for evaluating programs serving English language learners. According to the Castañeda standard, schools must base their programs on educational theory, recognized as sound; implement the program with resources and personnel necessary to put them into practice; and evaluate the programs making adjustments where necessary to ensure that adequate progress is being made (Castaneda v. Pickard, 1981).
- Pyler v. Doe (1982):** This case ruled that schools are obligated to educate students who are categorized as illegal aliens.
- Lau Remedies:** Policy guidelines for the education of limited English proficient students, based on the ruling in the Lau v.

Nichols suit, for school districts' compliance with the civil rights requirements of Title VI (Lyons, 1995).

Assumptions of the Study

This study makes the following assumptions:

- Public school educators are aware of NCLB and understand how it can affect ELL program implementation.
- General education educators are aware that ELLs have a limited amount of time under NCLB to master academic English.
- Educators will respond to the items on the survey accompanying this study.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations may affect the ability to generalize the findings of the present study:

- This study is limited to Michigan public schools.
- This study may not be relevant to charter schools.
- This study may not be relevant to parochial schools.
- This study may not be relevant to private institutions.

Chapter 2:

Review of the Literature

This chapter presents a discussion of the dependent variable of educator attitudes associated with Title III and discusses the paradigm shift necessary to address the needs of English language learners (ELLs). Subsequent sections include discussions on the independent variables of funding, standards and assessments related to the implementation of ELL programs; which are critical components of the NCLB Title III legislation.

Theoretical Framework

The English language learners presenting themselves to our public schools are not only immigrants entering the United States but are also non-English speaking citizens who are highly mobile and come from principally Spanish speaking areas, where English is not their first language. Public schools are required to provide appropriate educational services to meet the needs of the citizen children and the diverse population of immigrants speaking many languages as well. NCLB Title III specifically addresses the English as a second language (ESL) programs to assure that ELLs have opportunities to develop the necessary skills to function effectively in their classrooms, communities and on a global scale. However, the provision of these opportunities will require a massive paradigm shift in the traditional pedagogy in which the majority of our educators are trained.

Kuhn (1962) writes that paradigm shifts whether positive negative, or massive or minute, are a natural part of the process of life. He also adds that a paradigm shift could take as long as the span of a generation and this shift could result in a radical change for the educational arena.

Ausubel (1968) asserts that shifts are patterns that add relevancy to the way humans live.

Berman (1981), Capra (1983) and Merchant (1992) describe this shift or pattern as a change

from positivism to post-positivism or, a move from strictly concrete systems to a mixture of concrete and abstract systems in order to reach reasonable, believable and measurable outcomes. All Ells, LEP and immigrant students bring to school a uniqueness that consist minimally of values, norms and learning styles that are forced to be exposed to adults, peers and overall unfamiliar environments. As educators responsible for meeting the academic needs of these students, appreciation for the diversity that each apprentice brings to the educational setting is critical to their success. Educators who lack the aforementioned attitude will also lack the key ingredients necessary for meeting the academic and social needs of these students (Tse, 2001; Valdes, 2001; Youngs & Youngs, 2001). Hamayan (2005) promotes the belief that an appreciation for the diversity that each student brings to school necessitates a change of attitude. Karabenic and Noda surmise that one cure for this dilemma must include staff development. These researchers surveyed 729 teachers of Ell, LEP and immigrant students relative to their beliefs, attitudes and practices. The findings revealed that teachers with the most positive attitudes had a more effective pedagogy. This researcher suggests that ongoing staff development at all levels with intensive monitoring of delivery practices is crucial to the education of these students.

Educators must comply with the No Child Left Behind, Title III mandates of exposing the same challenging, State academic content that is scientifically-based to ELLs, LEP and immigrant students via high quality language instruction program development. These students must be given the opportunity to achieve at high levels in the core academic subjects. (2002, NCLB, Title III, SEC.3101).

Empirical Studies

History of bilingual education and NCLB Title III. The issue of bilingual education has been riding the educational and political wave since the 17th century. This wave has been perceived to be Americans' struggle for the survival of English as the dominant language for the United States; even though there is no official language proclaimed in the constitution. Crawford (2002) shares that as early as the 17th century; ELLs came to America and struggled to preserve their culture and language. Immigrants continue to enter the United States for reasons such as to escape the wars in their homelands, to find employment opportunities unavailable in their home countries or as employment transplants as employees of foreign corporations doing business in the United States.

Ovando (2003) divided his account of the history of bilingual education into four basic periods; the Permissive Period: 1700s - 1880s, the Restrictive Period: 1880s-1960s, the Opportunist Period: 1960s-1980s and the Dismissive Period: 1980s-Present (2003).

The Permissive Period was a time in America when most of the land had not been developed. This made the preservation of a language and culture a way of life. Havighurst (1978) termed this action as Defensive Pluralism. English was used only when communication was necessary with the American government or its agents.

The Restrictive Period brought about initiatives to suppress culture and language among immigrants, American Indians and citizens who were not English proficient. As a result of World War I federal aid began to be allocated to support the teaching of English to English language learners and also used as a platform to promote the English language (Higham, 1988). English was also the dominant language taught in public schools (Baker & Jones, 1998).

The Opportunist Period was sparked by World War II, and the obvious benefit America derived from the skills of the Navajo *Windtalkers*. The launching of Sputnik really awakened the United States to the reality of the necessity for foreign language instruction for Americans. The American astronauts experienced great difficulty communicating with the German astronauts. It was also during this period that bilingual education was revitalized due to the national attention brought about by the accomplishments of the dual language system employed to teach Cuban immigrants in Dade County, Florida (Gonzalez, 1975; Ovando & Collier, 1998). Parental and political pressure resulted in increased allocation of funds for the bilingual education programs (Crawford, 1999). These programs were established with the intent to assist students in acquiring English competency (Crawford, 2002). The bilingual education movement began to reemerge in the 1970s, spurred by a Supreme Court finding, *Lau v. Nichols*, that schools without special provisions for educating language-minority children were not providing equal access to the curriculum and education (Crawford, 2002).

The final era, the Dismissive Period, brought about a sweeping revision in bilingual education. The Office of Civil Rights as well as the federal government was displeased with the rate at which ELLs were learning English and concluded that bilingual education was not a necessary component for teaching students. Initially, the federal government reduced the funding levels and then subsequently, reformulated the funding process for grant applications.

The battles in favor of bilingual education continue to ensue in spite of the evidence indicating the success of the bilingual programs, the battles, often politically motivated, continued (August & Hakuta, 1997; Cummins, 2000; Green, 1998; Krashen & Biber, 1999, Ramirez, Yuen, & Ramsey, 1991; Stanford Working Group, 1993; Willig, 1985). The evidence

strongly pointed to the students who were achieving academic success and were also able to perform at or above grade level by the time they exited the bilingual program (Crawford, 1999).

Title III of the No Child Left Behind Legislation of 2001 delivered the final blow to all politicians and nativists who were not concerned with the education of ELLs, immigrants and limited English proficient United States citizens. These students are expected to be held to the same standard as English speaking students and must be afforded the identical opportunities as English speaking students, including assessments and accommodations, if necessary. School districts are charged with the task of providing a scientifically-based curriculum that addresses the same content standards and benchmarks for all ELLs, immigrants and limited English proficient students. Student progress is measured by the level of attainment of Annual Measurable Accountability Objectives (AMAOs) which are standards developed by the federal government as part of the No Child Left Behind Title III legislation. These standards are monitored by the state departments of education and are used to monitor local school districts' progress towards the English proficiency of ELL and immigrant students. An annual report is issued to LEAs indicating the level of progress, level of proficiency and whether districts have met adequate yearly progress.

Educator attitudes. A timely study by Batt (2008) voiced the most opposition to the current methodologies mandated by NCLB Title III. Her study surveyed one hundred and sixty-one educators who shared a desire for more cooperation between administrators and general education teachers, increased staff training for acquisition of knowledge and skills necessary to successfully teach ELLs and the time necessary to gain a greater understanding of the students' cultures. She also advocated for a broader understanding of the implications of multicultural education and the need for delivering the most appropriate levels of need for English proficiency.

According to Futrell, Gomez and Bedden (2003), 80% of the educators they surveyed did not feel comfortable teaching ELLs. In addition, they also supported Batt (2008), in her contention that public school administrations needed to ensure educators of the availability of support mechanisms to offset the rising tensions in the continually diversifying classrooms. More specifically, Wangchuk (2009) declares that many good teachers are being disrespected by the American bureaucratic system and this attitude transmits to society at large. It becomes evident that the paradigm shifts must include adequate time for educators to become knowledgeable regarding multiculturalism and must include the time to listen to students in order to gain an understanding of some of the perceived reasons for students' behaviors and misconduct in order to ensure that each student's culture is appreciated and that his/her dignity remains intact (Holloway, 2003; Banks & Cochran-Smith, 2005).

Wilson and Youngs (2005) agree that an educator's abilities do not necessarily insure the provision of quality instruction. These researchers identified a list of knowledge and skills that teachers must possess in order to work successfully with diverse students in today's classrooms. Their list of necessary skills includes: an educator's ability to appreciate and understand the cultures, communities, and experiences of their students; to work with them and provide services via various modalities of teaching/learning, building on the students' strengths, prior learning and knowledge, and to support them in dealing with the "boundary crossings". Wilson and Youngs (2005) describe boundary crossings as the ELL student's struggle to balance home and school structures.

Many educators are too comfortable using instructional strategies that have proven to be effective for working with homogeneous student bodies that come to school able to communicate

in English. However, with the rapid growth of ELLs in the schools, these strategies are no longer functional. Additionally, untried ideas as applied to ELLs and assumptions resulting from scientific investigation and applied to a portion of the student population have not been effective when generalized to our new student population of ELLs.

While the settings may be the same, students are presenting with more unique and diverse needs. The inclusion of ELLs in mainstream classrooms creates the necessity for educators to use differentiated methodologies and techniques for which they are not prepared (Fuller, 1994).

Researchers have been testing theories and developing models relative to the acquisition of language that can create valid processes for second language acquisition. They are seeking to develop a teaching process that includes a continuum of delivery services from grade school through post-college levels that reflect the recommended content, curriculum scope and sequence for language proficiency. Garcia (2002) promoted overall access for LEP students to the same curricular standards as non-LEP students. He asserts that LEP students need some additional specialized approaches that will directly connect these students to the identical standards as conventional students. Krashen proposed low anxiety settings that involve relevant communication and interaction with the educator and regular students (Revised by Schultz, 2002). In addition, these same researchers are also assessing new methods for assisting educators in developing a deeper sensitivity to culturally diverse (CLD) students. Garcia (2008) found that integrated thematic units filled with inquiry for students in lower elementary grades provide a rich environment for not only content acquisition but also the mastery of a second language. Educators feel deceived and discouraged from their initial quest which was to mold and shape young minds. Teachers also feel that they are only preparing students for on-going mandatory assessments contradicting their original purpose for entering the field of education;

which was to create a rich learning environment absent of anxiety where students feel free to learn and have time to reflect (Selwyn, 2007). Coupled with government mandates, a shift in the attitudinal paradigm of educators relative to the education of ELLs could very well yield revolutionary, evidence-based results over time with scientific change agents as the facilitators.

NCLB Title III – Funding. In 2007, the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor (USHRCEL) stated that for the first time in the history of public education in America, school districts would be held accountable for student and teacher performance by linking funding to achievement. Crawford espoused that Congress did not keep its promise of funding the mandated NCLB. In addition, states had the option of rejecting this funding (Lips, 2007). The consequences would be tantamount to the loss of funds whether via state takeover reconstitution or be taken over by private-for-profit companies. Crawford (2004) argued that the ultimate goal is to privatize public education.

The funding allocation issued for LEAs under Title III is calculated according to the number of students in each district. On July 1st of the 2009-2010 school-year, \$730,000,000 was made available to United States' LEAs through September 30, of the 2010-2011 school year. A portion of these funds are distributed under State formula grants and Native American discretionary grants. In addition, 6.5% of these funds are to be distributed as part of the 2-year English Language Acquisition state grants reserved for evaluation activities and the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (2002). Pending a greater than 10% reduction in the number of ELL, LEP and immigrant students in attendance, the Education Secretary will conduct a three-year average estimate for determining the allocation to be allotted. Figure 1 contains a chart listing the State allocated Language Acquisition Grant for each state from 2008 through 2010.

Figure 1
Funding Allocations for Federal ELL Programs by States and Regions

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION					
Language Acquisition State Grants					
State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	3,662,530	0	4,349,324	3,790,052	-559,272
Alaska	1,068,686	0	1,322,960	1,088,316	-234,644
Arizona	22,008,130	0	24,900,489	23,017,160	-1,883,329
Arkansas	2,993,001	0	3,331,698	3,214,286	-117,432
California	164,463,306	0	168,456,300	174,445,159	5,986,859
Colorado	10,346,532	0	11,214,892	10,785,424	-429,468
Connecticut	5,701,587	0	806,780	829,693	19,913
Delaware	1,220,192	0	1,168,916	1,297,102	128,156
District of Columbia	1,027,423	0	808,780	826,693	19,913
Florida	42,406,254	0	43,560,011	43,788,825	220,614
Georgia	15,944,963	0	16,478,879	16,397,360	-81,519
Hawaii	2,763,318	0	2,666,218	2,566,524	-99,694
Idaho	1,884,572	0	1,998,276	2,161,125	162,849
Illinois	27,696,340	0	30,906,506	30,057,699	-848,807
Indiana	6,846,078	0	6,660,567	6,912,913	252,346
Iowa	3,039,052	0	2,769,974	2,945,282	175,308
Kansas	3,580,355	0	3,684,318	3,751,546	67,228
Kentucky	2,901,342	0	3,765,040	3,487,823	-277,217
Louisiana	2,401,383	0	2,951,681	2,808,314	-143,367
Maine	825,861	0	724,271	745,606	21,335
Maryland	8,539,384	0	9,406,499	9,521,584	115,085
Massachusetts	11,645,852	0	11,839,113	12,308,424	469,311
Michigan	9,808,235	0	10,927,358	11,115,144	187,786
Minnesota	8,212,782	0	7,922,699	8,113,772	191,073
Mississippi	1,387,985	0	1,573,958	1,661,675	87,717
Missouri	4,153,455	0	5,014,363	4,632,022	-382,341
Montana	500,000	0	501,875	500,000	-1,875
Nebraska	2,845,645	0	2,667,560	2,628,913	-38,647
Nevada	7,275,754	0	8,030,369	7,435,535	-594,834
New Hampshire	750,591	0	785,653	907,400	121,747
New Jersey	18,602,562	0	18,324,110	19,048,476	724,366
New Mexico	5,797,995	0	5,115,590	4,943,123	-172,467
New York	51,902,229	0	49,792,612	51,526,965	1,734,353
North Carolina	14,756,567	0	14,334,922	13,930,773	-404,149

Language Acquisition State Grants (cont'd)

State or Other Area Estimate	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009
North Dakota	516,551	0	540,916	500,000	-40,916
Ohio	7,815,268	0	7,937,616	8,357,265	419,649
Oklahoma	3,490,217	0	3,943,527	3,904,155	-39,372
Oregon	7,609,239	0	7,868,147	8,084,488	216,341
Pennsylvania	11,325,615	0	12,756,292	12,478,688	-277,604
Rhode Island	1,658,700	0	1,926,672	1,992,130	65,458
South Carolina	4,112,405	0	4,628,599	4,642,620	14,021
South Dakota	520,987	0	500,000	631,591	131,591
Tennessee	5,122,035	0	5,998,028	5,729,202	-268,828
Texas	93,022,484	0	98,711,971	96,687,225	-2,024,748
Utah	4,718,942	0	5,322,574	4,777,664	-544,910
Vermont	500,000	0	500,000	500,000	0
Virginia	11,932,523	0	11,448,020	11,249,135	-198,885
Washington	14,234,059	0	16,488,896	14,756,542	-1,732,354
West Virginia	639,775	0	677,170	706,926	29,756
Wisconsin	6,396,351	0	7,091,009	6,886,443	-204,566
Wyoming	500,000	0	500,000	500,000	0
American Samoa	1,174,456	0	1,219,495	1,219,495	0
Guam	1,141,699	0	1,192,218	1,192,218	0
Northern Mariana Islands	1,133,400	0	1,183,552	1,183,552	0
Puerto Rico	3,231,835	0	3,369,500	3,369,500	0
Virgin Islands	52,416	0	54,735	54,735	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside Undistributed (non-State allocations)	5,000,000	0	5,000,000	5,000,000	0
	<u>45,525,645</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>47,450,000</u>	<u>47,450,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	700,394,545	0	730,000,000	730,000,000	0

Funds are allocated based upon the number of LEP students (80%) and the number of immigrant students (20%) according to Census 2000. Table 4 provides a record of a 10-year funding allocation for the ELL and immigrant student population.

Table 4

English Language Acquisition – Appropriations History (\$000s)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2001	\$460,000	\$406,000	\$443,000	\$460,000
2002	460,000	700,000	616,000	665,000
2003	665,000	665,000	690,000	685,515
2003 (supplemental)	0	0	0	-1,768
2004	665,000	685,515	669,000	685,215
2005	681,215	681,215	700,000	675,765
2006	675,765	675,765	683,415	669,007
2007	669,007	NA	NA	669,007
2008	670,819	774,614	670,819	700,395
2009	730,000	730,000	730,000	730,000
2010	730,000			

The effort to comply with NCLB Title III mandates is putting a strain on institutional budgets and results in penalizing the entire district when requirements for professional development, additional staffing and materials are not met. The following Table 5 shares information relative to the annual cost for each LEP student beginning with 2006 and concluding with 2010. The allocation is divided by the number of students reported to be attaining proficiency in English.

Table 5

The Annual Cost per Limited English Proficient Student Attaining English Language Proficiency

Year	Target	Actual
2006		\$785
2007	\$783	772
2008	782	
2009	780	
2010	775	

The requirements for student growth are based on district-wide standards as measured by AYP. A more accurate measurement of academic growth would be to measure the student's academic gains over the one year required period of time. Table 6 shows the state percentages of those students receiving Title III services and those who have attained English language proficiency since 2005.

Table 6

The Percentage of US ELL Students Receiving Title III Services who have Attained English Language Proficiency

Year	Target	Actual
2005		23
2006	29	19
2007	20	21
2008	25	
2009	30	
2010	35	

The shift in paradigm continues in the ongoing process for collecting data. This process was reviewed and changed in 2007 to reflect more realistic goals. It was also revised in 2008

and 2009 in order to realign the method for data collection with the goals and objectives which were to provide funds for helping students served by Title III funds to improve their English proficiency and to achieve at high academic levels. In order to ensure adequate support for achieving the goals and objectives for all students served by Title III, portions of the formula grants were held back for what is termed Funds for Program Output Measures. These funds were specifically used for national activities and also for Native American and Alaska Native children. Table 7 shows a pictorial view of the Program Output Measures for 2008 through 2010.

Table 7

Program Output Measures – Language Acquisition State Grants (\$000s)

Program Output Measures	2008	2009	2010
Total Appropriations	\$700,395	\$730,000	\$730,000
State Formula Grants			
Language acquisition state grants	\$649,869	\$677,550	\$677,550
Number of states and regions	56	56	56
Native American discretionary grants	\$4,990	\$5,000	\$5,000
Peer review for new awards	\$10	0	0
New Projects	9	0	0
Continuation Projects	21	30	30
National Activities			
National professional development	\$40,044	\$41,819	\$41,820
New projects	0	0	0
Continuation projects	158	139	139
Peer review	0	0	0
Clearinghouse	\$1,980	\$1,981	\$1,980
Evaluation	\$3,502	\$3,650	\$3,650

NCLB Title III is supported with funding allocations and requirements high quality instructional staff, resources, a schedule for communicating with parents and the community, an annual assessment cycle and penalties for school districts for failing to make adequate yearly progress. Penalties are still in place for schools not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) on

yearly assessments. This was built into the NCLB legislation. Penalties include denial of funds and published annual assessment results made available to all stakeholders in the community. Another penalty included the parental option for transferring their children to a different school of choice, this causing loss of funding for those students.

NCLB Title III – Standards. NCLB Title III mandates for all English language learners (ELLs), limited English proficient (ELP) and immigrant students to reach a set of challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and be able to be educated on grade level by 2014 (NCLB Title III, 2001). English language learners (ELLs), limited English proficient (LEPs) and immigrants present some of the most challenging needs among minority sub-groups within the United States. These challenging needs are rooted in social divides, dwindling achievement outcomes, and the lack of strong positive instructional innovations and also, in many cases, the inability to aspire to higher education either for political or economic reasons. However, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Title III mandates seem to be presenting many challenges for educating this student population. This legislation does allow some flexibility for implementing language acquisition programs as long as they are based on scientifically based research (Title III, Sec. 3101, 9).

However, Crawford contends that NCLB is not the answer to effectively educating ELLs (2004). He also states that due to the emphasis on test preparation and attainment of adequate yearly progress, educators have shelved many of the best practices that have proven to be effective and have been successful in facilitating the acquisition of English; while at the same time motivating students to a point where they achieve at or above grade level (Crawford, 2004).

Another adverse reaction to NCLB Title III is shared by the Working Group on ELL Policy. They advocate that the current standards set for ELLs by Title III are unrealistic and

erode the efforts of teachers and students (2009). In order to meet this challenge, there is a necessity for a shift in attitudinal paradigms at school building level as a launching point for resolving this ongoing summons to action which is, how best to educate ELLs.

In addition, Wangchuk (2009) asserted that the mere hiring of “highly qualified” teachers, who are certified to teach in a certain curricular strand, does not equate to the delivery of a quality education and is only one step in addressing the need to raise achievement levels for ELLs. Culture and values are rarely taken into consideration and the affective filters are insurmountable. Teachers must be knowledgeable of their subject matter, be motivated and have a positive self-image in order to be comfortable imparting that knowledge to their students (Krashen, 1981). Meanwhile, the classroom teacher struggles to find the strategies that will provide what Krashen terms comprehensible input that can engage the students in the curriculum and harness the students’ creativity allowing them to will meet and surpass NCLB standards.

Jacobs and Farrell (2001) shared that multiple attempts have been made to institutionalize paradigm shifts targeted at an effective system for educating English language learners to a point where they can achieve with a challenging curriculum set by high standards. Part of the failure to accomplish this goal can be attributed to the traditional non-holistic teacher preparation of the past. These researchers emphasized and developed eight major changes of learner autonomy: (a) cooperative learning, (b) curricular integration, (c) focus on meaning, (d) diversity, (e) thinking skills, (f) alternative assessment, and (g) teachers as co-learners to be critical to a shift in paradigm. The desired changes are categorized as communicative language teaching and use of a student-centered process wherein teachers guide instruction and students work together to discover knowledge. Kuhn (1970) contended that a shift in communicative language teaching in education would necessitate a concerted effort on the part of the total educational community.

Cummins (1980a) supported Kuhn in his assertion for the necessity for communicative and natural language approaches to teaching to enhance second language acquisition (Cummins, 1984). Wangchuk (2009) wants to ensure that the federal and local governments are a party to this endeavor.

Each state in the United States has the freedom to develop its own content standards and benchmarks for assessing core content areas that continue to be tested in rigorous examination cycles. As of February 2010, all but two states, Alaska and Texas, had adopted a Common Core of Standards that addresses the goal of having each student graduating and has provisions for post-secondary studies (Phillips & Wong, 2010). The framework for this Common Core of Standards includes training students to be critical thinkers and the acquisition of academic skills that aspire to provide a holistic view of a body of knowledge. Students obtain knowledge as a result of curriculum implementation and, conceptually, develop the skills to successfully transfer that knowledge into practical uses for the changing world (Phillips & Wong, 2010). Wangchuk (2009) contends that school systems have not reacted to an awareness that demonstrates a desire to take full advantage of the fact that the world has been changing and evolving. In addition, Phillips and Wong suggest that the implementation of this Common Core of Standards is presenting such a radical change at one time resulting in a shortage of funds and political endurance which stagnates the process (2010). However, utilizing this Common Core of Standards with an aligned assessment tool can increase the validity of both functions of classroom instruction.

NCLB Title III – Assessment. Critical to the success of all students is a valid system of accountability. Standardized testing is at the center of NCLB. However, the assessment process must consist of an alignment between content standards and the assessment tools. While each

state guides the development and utilization of their individual assessment instruments, all students in third through ninth grade and high school are required to complete the tests according to NCLB structure.

Norman Webb (1999) shares criteria for an alignment assessment: Categorical concurrence, standards and assessment tools must have similar content categories; depth-of-knowledge consistency, equality in challenge levels between standards level and assessment tool; range of knowledge consistency, content standards and assessment tool agree as to the range of information; and balance of representation, the distribution flow of assessment items aligned with the content standards. For LEPs, alignment must always be in concert with annual measurable accountability outcomes.

The Working Group on English Language Learning Policy voices objection to allowing each state to develop its own assessment instrument as it relates to the classification of LEP students (2009). Abedi also objects to the inconsistencies that exist from state to state relative to the classification of LEP students (2004). August and Hakuta suggest that research is still limited as it relates to the match between how proficient a student needs to be in English in order to be equal with an English speaking student being administered the same test (1997); as many states use the same assessments for ELLs and regular students. It is a practice that is detrimental to the reliability and validity of the assessment instrument (Abedi, Leon, & Mirocha, 2003). Voltz, Sims and Nelson voiced concern that many educators become frustrated that ELLs do not perform well on assessment instruments after being able to effectively communicate with their English-speaking peers on buses and playgrounds (2010). Educators are now beginning to understand the difference in Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) as opposed to Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) that is required to successfully perform on

complex content-based classroom assessments. (Cummins, 1980; Hakuta, Butler & Witt, 2000). In addition, low performing schools are being burdened with testing schedules, instead of being allowed time to identify and address students' achievement gaps as a result of the assessments.

In Michigan, all students including students with limited English language proficiency are required to successfully complete the English Language Arts (ELA) portion of the Michigan Education Achievement Program (MEAP) at a par with their English speaking peers after only 12 academic months in the United States.

The Michigan Department of Education has developed the English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA), which is aligned with the Michigan state content standards. The assessment instrument is administered to ELLs to determine a student's level of proficiency in oral comprehension, reading comprehension and writing and prescribes the level of service that these students will receive. MI-Access, Michigan's Alternative Assessment Program for students with cognitive impairments, was specifically designed for students with disabilities. In some cases, MI-Access requires administration to ELL students with cognitive or other special needs in addition to the ELPA or portions thereof within 10 days of enrollment in an American school.

Another driving force of the NCLB mandates also requires the use of accommodation strategies for ELLs and LEP students. Accommodation strategies derived from the Abedi, Hofstetter and Lord's body of work, though not unique, resulted from scientifically based research and dealt heavily with concern for the validity of results from administered tests. Their findings discovered the absence of empirical research and led them to eight key issues that needed to be discussed as they relate to policy and administration of tests (Scott, 2009).

All stakeholders, including the policymakers of the school communities must operate with a sense of urgency to adopt new and different delivery systems, develop new curricula and apportion more funds to support these growing needs (Zacarian, D. & Haynes, J. (2011). These needs require a critical shift in methodology and a need for closer examination on how to meet and master the required educational standards and to determine which assessment instruments would be appropriate.

Summary

Local education agencies (LEAs) continue to readjust methodologies mandated by NCLB in order to address the increasing population of ELLs. The law is very explicit as it relates to parental communication of all school documents being sent out in heritage languages. There are also mandatory measures for managing the identification of immigrants and ELLs. Currently, they are given one academic year of instruction, commencing the day they enroll in United States schools after which all testing in all subjects, including English Language Arts, must be administered in English (Hudson, 2007).

The premise was that as the level of student achievement rose, gaps in achievement for all students would be decreased within twelve years. This premise was and still remains contingent upon each student's school attendance for one year equating to one year of academic growth adequate yearly progress (AYP) (Hudson, 2007). Black and William (1998a, 1998b) asserted that the best method for tracking student progress towards meeting high standards is through the use of formative assessments which give immediate feedback and inform educators of gaps in achievement.

The pool of traditionally prepared educator candidates has not kept pace with the number of ELLs and immigrants entering the United States (Hodgkinson, 1989; National Education

Association, 1987). Although the research about the importance of teacher-student match is not unanimous, there are strong indications that it can make a significant difference in the academic achievement particularly for students of color (Klopfenstein, 2005; Oates, 2003). NCLB, through its highly qualified teacher provisions, has only served to widen the demographic gap between teachers and students (Selwyn, 2007). Banks and Cochran-Smith (2005) made recommendations in their work based on the assumption that to support democracy, educators must seek to eliminate disparities in educational opportunities among all students, especially those students who have been poorly served by our current system.

For many years, the focus of policy debates relating to the reading education of ELLs has been based on the question of language of instruction and contrasting bilingual and English-only approaches. However, as important as language of instruction is, there has been a growing recognition in recent years that the quality of instruction is at least as important as language of instruction in the ultimate success of ELLs (August & Hakuta, 1997; Brisk, 1998; Christian & Genesee, 2001; Goldenberg, 1996; Secada et al., 1998). Paradigm shifts remain tantamount to the successful education of our ELLs. Educational methodology is not the only factor in achieving these shifts. The debate over how best to serve ELL students has often been clouded by politics (Petrovic, 1997).

Multiculturalism and multilingualism are no longer desirable frills in educational offerings; they are basic necessities for creating a global student. As research continues and more English language learners desiring an American free, public education enter the public schools, more powerful strategies will be developed and implemented to create a certainty of opportunity for all children and adults who look to educational institutions as the avenue to language acquisition.

President Barack Obama, Feb. 24, 2009 stated,

In a global economy where the most valuable skill you can sell is your knowledge, a good education is no longer just a pathway to opportunity-it is a pre-requisite. The countries that out-reach us today will out-compete us tomorrow (Obama, 2009).

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

This chapter includes the methodology applied in this research, the description of the population sampling, the research questions developed for this study, the purpose of the study, research design, settings for the study, participants in the study, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and the data analysis.

Restatement of the Purpose

This study examined educator attitudes about funding, standards and assessment and the implications for NCLB Title III directives as they relate to the implementation of English language learner programs in public schools. The following research questions were posed:

1. Is there a relationship between educator knowledge of the funding of the NCLB Title III mandates for limited English proficient children and their attitudes towards the implementation of the English language proficiency and academic programs as measured by a questionnaire?
2. Is there a relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the application of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards required by the NCLB Title III mandates and their attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs as measured by a questionnaire?
3. Is there a relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of assessment of

scientifically-based academic and student achievement standards required by the NCLB Title III mandates and their attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs as measured by a questionnaire?

Research Design

A non-experimental, descriptive research design incorporating a survey as the primary data collection tool was used in this study. This type of research design is appropriate when the independent variable is not manipulated and the participants will not receive any type of treatment or intervention.

Participants

Potential participants were selected on a nonrandom, purposive sampling basis consistent with predetermined inclusion/exclusion criteria. The participants in this study were English as a second language (ESL) educators and general education educators at three levels, elementary, middle, and high school. The participating educators work with or have worked with English language learners (ELLs). Only general education educators in academic subjects such as language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies were included in the study. All ESL educators in the target schools were asked to participate. Educators of ELL students in nonacademic classes including music, art and physical education were not included as their curricular focus is different from those who are teaching core curriculum subjects. Non-instructional professional staff such as: counselors, social workers, and school psychologists were also excluded from the study.

The minimum sample size for this study was identified by use of Cohen's power table (Cohen, 1992). To ensure adequate statistical power (.80) across all analyses, necessary sample

size was determined based on an alpha level of .05 and moderate effect sizes, which would suggest clinical importance. Based on these criteria, 76 participants were necessary to carry out the primary analyses.

The researcher requested permission from superintendents of school districts that have ESL programs. An application was submitted to the Human Investigation Committee (HIC) to conduct the study of the participating school districts. In order to preserve confidentiality of participants, each questionnaire was assigned a number, so that identifying information would not be connected to the data. It was nearly inconceivable that physical or emotional harm would come to the individuals whose responses are used in the current study, as all records had no information that could connect them to particular individuals.

The participating school district was an urban Midwestern school district. Upon approval of the proposal, the researcher contacted the principals of the selected schools to arrange a time to meet and discuss the study.

Instrumentation

A thorough review of the literature on Title III of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) did not produce evidence of a published instrument which measures the effect of educator attitudes relative to implementation of Title III provisions for ELLs in public schools. As a result of the researcher's experiences teaching ELLs and upon an examination of the literature, an instrument was developed to determine the effects of implementing NCLB on attitudes of educators who work with ELLs.

The instrument developed to collect data in this study is the ELL Program Support Staff Survey. This survey consists of a demographic questionnaire and the four scales which measure

educator knowledge of the implementation of funding, standards, assessment components of Title III mandates and K-12 Educator Attitudes regarding ELL programs.

Demographic questionnaire. A demographics questionnaire consisting of categorical and ratio scale items was created by this researcher to collect information regarding the experience and preparation educators bring to their assigned role in school setting as they interact with ELLs. This questionnaire's items included forced-choice and open-ended questions designed to assess gender, education level, current role, setting of employment, years of experience, and their personal opinion on their expectation of a future increase or change in the ELL population. This researcher consulted experts in the field of education and the area of K-12 ESL instruction in order to analyze and provide a profile of the sample characteristics. The expert confirmed that all relevant demographic variables were included. Information obtained from this questionnaire are included in the discussion of generalizability of the findings of the study.

Survey Scales 1 through 3. Following the demographic questionnaire, the instrument consists of four scales. The first three scales of the ELL Program Support Staff Survey address Title III mandates for implementation of NCLB provisions for ELLs: funding, standards, and assessment. The researcher created questions based on the provisions of Title III as they pertain to the above-mentioned variables. Wording was modified to summarize the particular components of this legislation developed specifically to aid in the satisfaction of assisting immigrant, limited English proficient and English language learning students achieve at high levels. Thus, it broadly discussed major mechanisms necessary for a curriculum framework that reflects high standards. It then weaved in language for re-occurring, institutionalized funding that ensured the supplementing of funds already received by school districts and a specific reporting

system for the accountability of those funds. The requirement of a challenging curriculum, along with measurable objectives details what students should know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school. These objectives are to be included in a plan that is to be submitted to the federal government on an annual basis. Therefore, the independent variables of educator knowledge of funding, standards and assessment surfaced as being vital to this research. This process yielded 30 questions. The questions were constructed for Likert-type responses on a scale ranging from 5 for *Very Strong Evidence* to 1 for *No Evidence/I Don't Know*. Scale 1 includes ten questions relating to funding; Scale 2 includes ten questions related to Standards, and Scale 3 poses ten questions which address the variable of Assessment. Educators were asked to respond based on their knowledge of current services provided by their school district for the English language learner (ELL) as outlined in the No Child Left Behind Title III legislation.

Survey Scale 4. Scale 4, the Educator Attitudes Scale was adapted from an existing survey on teacher attitudes towards English language learners published by Walker, Shafer, Iiams (2004). The original survey consisted of 14 questions designed to measure mainstream attitudes towards having ELLs in their classes. For the purpose of this study, 12 of those survey questions were retained but wording was modified to be applicable to other support staff; and an additional three questions were created based on common beliefs about teaching ELLs that were suggested by research on second language teaching pedagogy. This process resulted in a total of 15 questions for the attitude scale, constructed for 5-point Likert responses, ranging from 5 *Strongly Agree* to 1 *Strongly Disagree*. Five items on the educator attitudes scale are aligned to each of Scales 1, 2, and 3. Items # 3, 5, 9, 10, and 12 align with knowledge of funding implementation; items # 1, 7, 11, 13, and 15 align with knowledge of standards implementation;

and items # 2, 4, 6, 8, and 14 align with knowledge of implementation of assessment provisions of Title III.

Finalization of survey. The total survey consists of 45 Likert-type questions divided into the four scales. A composite score for each of Scales 1, 2, and 3 were calculated by totaling the scores on each response on a given scale. In that way, by calculating these composite scores, the data obtained from the scales were analyzed as interval data. Each of the three groups of 5 questions (Scale 4) were given a composite score for analyzing educators' attitudes specifically related to the three independent variables.

Validity and Reliability

In order to establish the content validity of the survey, three experts in ESL education provided comments regarding items that they felt were ambiguous, needed rewording for clarification, or needed to be eliminated as irrelevant. In addition, they were asked to provide suggestions for additional items that could strengthen the survey. The researcher made the suggested changes if at least two of the three content experts were in agreement. Other changes were made at the discretion of the researcher that resulted in a survey that may improve the content validity of the instrument.

Once content validity had been established, the internal consistency reliability of the scales was analyzed by calculating Cronbach alpha coefficients based on the pilot sample responses. High alpha levels on items within a scale indicated that they reliably measured the same construct.

Data Collection

The researcher developed survey packets that included four items: a letter of permission from the superintendent, a passive research information sheet, a copy of the survey, and a

preaddressed, postage-paid envelope for confidential return of the completed survey. The research information sheet contained all information that was typically found on an informed consent form, but did not require the participant to sign and return one copy. Instead, the research information sheet indicated that the return of the participant's completed survey was evidence of his/her willingness to participate in the study. The use of a research information sheet provided additional assurances that no individual respondent could be identified.

The principals of the participating schools placed a survey packet in the mailboxes of all educators in their buildings or they distributed the survey packets at a regular staff meeting. The educators were asked to complete and return their surveys within five working days. Two weeks after initial distribution of the survey packets, the researcher sent each school a follow-up letter to be posted in the staff lounge. This letter thanked the educators who completed the survey and asked educators who had not yet returned their surveys to take a few minutes to complete and return the surveys. A telephone number and email address was provided to request another copy of the survey if the original had been lost or misplaced. All data collection was considered complete after four weeks.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data collected from the surveys was entered into a computer file for analysis using IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20.0. The data analysis was generally divided into two sections: descriptive and inferential statistics.

Descriptive Analysis

The first section used frequency distributions and measures of central tendency and dispersion to provide a profile of the participants. In addition, measures of central tendency and dispersion were used to summarize the continuous data in this study.

Inferential Analysis

The inferential statistical analysis was used to answer the research questions and address their three related hypotheses. All decisions on the statistical significance of the findings were made using a criterion alpha level of .05. Figure 1 presents the statistical analysis that was used in this study. The following were the statistical hypotheses:

H₁: Scores on Scale 1 (funding) would significantly predict scores on Scale 4 (educator attitudes).

H₂: Scores on Scale 2 (standards) would significantly predict scores on Scale 4 (educator attitudes).

H₃: Scores on Scale 3 (assessment) would significantly predict scores on Scale 4 (educator attitudes).

All three hypotheses were examined using a multiple regression to analyze the four continuous variables (scales). The three predictor variables were Scale 1 (funding), Scale 2 (standards), and Scale 3 (assessment). The outcome variable was Scale 4 (educator attitudes). Scales 1, 2, and 3 were entered into the regression together to determine their predictive power on Scale 4. Statistical significance (assessed by the *F* statistic for model analysis and *t* statistics for individual predictors) and variability (R^2) in outcome variable scores (accounted for by scores of each predictor) were examined to determine whether scores on Scales 1, 2, and 3 significantly predict scores on Scale 4. In addition, a partial correlation between each predictor variable and the outcome variable was also surveyed to examine the unique influence of each predictor.

Exploratory Analysis

Further analysis was conducted to describe the impact of demographic variables on educator attitudes towards ELLs.

Figure 2

Statistical Analyses

Research Questions and Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analysis
1. Is there a relationship between K-12 educators' knowledge of the funding of the No Child Left Behind Title III mandates for limited English proficient children and their attitudes towards the implementation of the English language proficiency and academic programs as measured by a questionnaire?		
<p>H₁: There is a relationship between K-12 educators' knowledge of funding of the No Child Left Behind Title III mandates for limited English proficient children and their attitudes towards the implementation of the English language proficiency and academic programs.</p> <p>H₀₁: There is no statistically significant relationship between K-12 educators' knowledge of funding of the No Child Left Behind Title III mandates for limited English proficient children and their attitudes towards the implementation of the English language proficiency and academic programs.</p>	<p><u>Independent Variables</u> Funding</p> <p><u>Dependent Variable</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-12 educator attitudes 	A multiple regression was used to examine the strength and direction of the relationship between educator knowledge of funding for the NCLB Title III mandates for limited English proficient children and their attitudes regarding the implementation of English language and academic programs.
2. There is a relationship between K-12 educators' knowledge of the application of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards required by the No Child Left Behind Title III mandates, and their attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs as measured by a questionnaire?		
H ₂ : There is a relationship between K-12 educators' knowledge of the application of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards	<p><u>Independent Variable</u> Standards</p> <p><u>Dependent Variable</u> K-12 educator attitudes</p>	A multiple regression was used to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between K-12 educator attitudes regarding implementation of English language

Research Questions and Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analysis
<p>required by the No Child Left Behind Title III mandates, and their attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs.</p> <p>H₀₂: There is no statistically significant relationship between K-12 educators' knowledge of the application of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards required by the No Child Left Behind Title III mandates and their attitudes towards the implementation of English language Proficiency and academic programs.</p>		<p>proficiency and academic programs and their knowledge of the application of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards</p>
<p>3. Is there a relationship between educators' knowledge of assessment of scientifically-based academic and student achievement standards required by the No Child Left Behind Title III mandates and K-12 educator attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs as measured by a questionnaire?</p>		
<p>H₃: There is a relationship between K -12 educators' knowledge of the assessment of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards required by the No Child Left Behind Title III mandates, and their attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs.</p> <p>H₀₃: There is no statistically significant relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the assessment of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards required by the No Child Left Behind Title III mandates and their attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs.</p>	<p><u>Independent Variable</u> Assessment</p> <p><u>Dependent Variable</u> K-12 educator attitudes</p>	<p>A multiple regression was used to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between K-12 educator attitudes regarding implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs and their knowledge of the assessment of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards</p>

Chapter 4: Results

The following research was conducted to examine the relationship among awareness of funding, standards, and assessment of English language learning programs and attitudes of educators toward the implementation of English language learning programs. The utilization of scientifically-based academic curriculum content and student achievement standards and the assessment of those standards were critical components of the legislation passed to provide improved services to English language learners, limited English proficient, immigrant and now, refugee children. The results of the research will be reported in two major sections: descriptive and inferential analyses. As detailed in Chapter 3, the data from both the descriptive and inferential analyses was derived from a Support Staff Survey that consisted of 7 demographic questions and four individual scales (Funding, Standards, Assessment, and Attitudes) consisting of 45 inquiries.

Descriptive Analyses

Participant demographic data were examined in order to provide a description of the sample for the assessment of external validity. Descriptive statistics for the sample used in this study were reported utilizing measures of central tendency and variance.

Missing data. Participants in the survey consisted of male and female administrators, teachers and staff who participated in other roles. Surveys were collected from 106 participants; however, three of these surveys were excluded from the study due to the minimal number of responses to inquiries provided by these participants. As shown in Table 8, a total of 103 participants completed the survey although a portion of the demographic questions were not answered by all participants. All participants (N = 103) provided responses to primary scale items.

Table 8

Responses to Demographic Inquiries

	Current Job Role	Gender	Level of Education	Present Assignment	Expectations Re ELL Population	Number Of Years in Current Role
N	103	92	91	102	102	103
Missing	0	11	12	1	1	0

Sample characteristics. Table 9 presents the number of years educators served in their current role. As seen in the table, years of teaching and/or administrative experience ranged from 2 to 48, with a mean of approximately 15 years.

Table 9

Number of Years Educators Served in their Current Roles

N	103
Minimum	2.0
Maximum	48.00
Mean	15.22
Median	14.00
Mode	10.00
Std. Deviation	9.90

The following tables present frequency distributions for all categorical demographic variables. As shown in Table 10, the smallest group of participants was administrators, and the largest group of participants was teachers. As also shown in Table 11, females comprised the majority of participants.

Table 10

Frequency Distribution for All Current Job Roles

	Frequency	
	N	Valid %
Administrator	2	1.9
Teacher	84	81.6
Support Staff	17	16.5
Total	103	100.0

Table 11

Frequency Distribution for Gender

	Frequency	
	N	Valid %
Male	19	20.7
Female	73	79.3
Total	92	100.0

As shown in Table 12, the level of education for the participants in the study ranged from a bachelor's degree to a doctoral degree. Most educators in the study achieved a master's degree.

Table 12

Frequency Distribution for Level of Education

	Frequency	Valid %
Bachelor	21	23.1
Master	60	65.9
Ed. Spec.	9	9.9
Doctorate	1	1.1
Total	91	100.0
Missing System	12	
Total	103	

Table 13 reveals that most educators in the study worked in elementary schools, and the least number of participants worked in multiple settings.

Table 13

Frequency Distribution for Settings

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Preschool	10	9.8
Elementary	37	36.3
Middle School	24	23.5
High School	23	22.5
Multiple	8	7.8
Total	102	100.0
Missing System	1	
Total	103	

Table 14 reflects that the highest percentage of participants felt that the ESL student population would increase..

Table 14

Expectations Regarding Growth of the ESL Population

Remain Same	12	11.8
Increase	90	88.2
Total	102	100.0
Missing System	1	

Data screening. All variables included in the hypotheses were first examined for violations of normality and other parametric assumptions. Descriptive data for the variables are presented in Table 15.

Specifically for regression, the assumptions include 1) the outcome variable must be measured by interval/ratio data; 2) the scores of one person do not influence the scores of another person; 3) the data must be nearly normally distributed; 4) the relationship between variables must be linear; 5) there must be normality among the errors of prediction (homoscedasticity); and 6) there should be an absence of perfect multicollinearity, which indicates the independent variables in the analysis are not inter-correlated to an extent that they would influence the model.

Table 15

Descriptive Statistics for the Total Group (N=103) for Each Scale

	Mean	SD	MIN	MAX	MED	MODE	SK	KT
1. Funding	21.1845	9.99289	10	43.00	21.0000	10.00	.358	-1.195
2. Standards	33.5728	10.01724	10	50.00	35.0000	34.00 ^a	-.613	-.463
3. Assessment	31.6408	10.85452	10	50.00	32.0000	39.00	-.134	-1.058
4. Attitudes	19.3398	7.09951	6	35.00	19.0000	18.00	.088	-.765

*Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Assumptions 1 and 2 were not tested statistically and are met. Each outcome variable consistent with the interval data, and there is no evidence to suggest that any one score influenced another. For assumption 3, frequencies/descriptives and histograms were run for each

of the primary variables to visually see the distributions. As shown in Table 15, the normality assumption was met, as kurtosis/skewness values were within acceptable limits (± 1.5 ; Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006). In addition, z-scores were created for each of the scales in order to assess for univariate outliers. A score was deemed to be an outlier if it fell outside ± 3.0 standard deviations from the mean of its scale. Examination of the z-scores revealed no outliers. Multivariate outliers were also assessed by calculating Mahalanobis distance scores for each participant on the combination of the variables in this study. These results were compared to a critical value. In this case, with four continuous variables, the critical value of 18.467 was used. Any numbers equal. Since no violations of normality were determined, no transformations or alterations of the data were necessary. With regard to assumption 4, no violations were revealed in the area of linearity, as assessed by examination of scatterplot matrices. For assumption 5, examination of case diagnostics and scatterplots indicated homoscedasticity, or normality among the errors of prediction; thus, this assumption was also met. Finally, for the sixth assumption, evaluation of multicollinearity included the examination of tolerance and VIF statistics for each of the multivariate analyses during the hypothesis testing. Acceptable values were Tolerance $> .01$ and VIF < 10 (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006).

Confound screening. First, in order to determine whether participant role (administrator, teacher, or support) could potential confound results, a Kruskal-Wallis test was run to compare these roles on with regard to their attitudes about ELL's (Scale 4). The result of this test revealed that the distribution of attitudes was not statistically different across job roles. As such, separate analysis of each job role was not required.

Next, 16 ANOVAs were run (see tables *) with the four categorical demographic variables (Gender, Level of Education, Setting, and Expectations Regarding Growth of the ESL

Population) as IV's and each of the four primary scales as DV's. This was done to determine whether levels of any of the categorical demographic variables differed in terms of their scores on the primary scales. If groups differences were found on the DV in combination with any of the IV's, then the variable could be a possible confound and would require further testing.

Setting was the only variable related to both predictor (scales 2 and 3) and outcome variables (scale 4). Therefore, this variable will need to be controlled for possible confounding effects during hypothesis testing.

Table 16

Univariate Analysis Variance for Demographic Categories

Gender

Variable	df	F	Sig.
Scale 1	1	.41	.521
Scale 2	1	.021	.884
Scale 3	1	.168	.683

Level of Education

Variable	df	F	Sig
Scale 1	3	2.381	.075
Scale 2	3	.113	.952
Scale 3	3	.889	.450
Scale 4	3	.287	.835

Assignment Setting

Variable	df	F	Sig
Scale 1	4	2.289	.065
Scale 2	4	2.587	.042
Scale 3	4	3.299	.014
Scale 4	4	5.046	.001

Expectation for ELLs

Variable	df	F	Sig
Scale 1	1	8.743	.004
Scale 2	1	4.810	.031
Scale 3	1	2.970	.088
Scale 4	1	1.400	.240

Next, the continuous demographic variable, Number of Years in Current Role, was examined for possible confounding effects by assessing the relationships between number of

years and the scores on scales 1 through 4. See Appendix B. Results of these analyses reveal that number of years in a current role was not significantly correlated with scores on scales 1, 2, 3 or 4, and therefore, can be ruled out as a potential confound.

Table 17

Pearson Correlations among Continuous Variable (N = 103)

	Number of Years in Current Role	Funding Scale 1	Standards Scale 2	Assessment Scale 3	Attitudes Scale 4
Number of Years in Current Role	1	-.40	-.17	-.12	-.04
Funding: Scale 1 -	.04	1	.504**	.604**	-.07
Standards: Scale 2 -	.17	.504**	1	.79**	.30**
Assessment: Scale 3 -	.12	.604**	.79**	1	.24*
Attitudes: Scale 4 -	.04	-.07	.30**	.24	1

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

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

Inferential Analyses

A multiple regression was run to analyze Hypotheses 1 through 3. The three predictor variables were Scale 1 (funding), Scale 2 (standards), and Scale 3 (assessment). The outcome variable was Scale 4 (educator attitudes).

First, to ensure that there was an absence of perfect multicollinearity, Tolerance and VIF statistics were examined and were found to be well within acceptable values (Tolerance > .01 and VIF < 10). These tests indicated that the independent variables in the analysis were not inter-correlated to an extent that they would influence the model.

The regression model, including all three predictors, was able to significantly predict educator attitude scores, $F(3, 99) = 6.51, p < 0.001, R^2 = .16$. The analysis revealed that about 16% of the variance in Scale 4 was accounted for by the model, or the combination of the three

predictors. Each predictor's contribution is discussed under the hypotheses below. Table 18 presents the results for the individual scales.

Table 18
Attitudes toward ELLs as a function of Evidence of Funding, Standards and Assessment

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	12.91	2.31	N/A	5.59	.000
Funding: Scale 1	-.24	.08	-.34	-2.96	.004
Standards: Scale 2	.23	.11	.32	2.10	.038
Assessment: Scale 3	.13	.11	.19	1.17	.245

Three hypotheses were tested relative to the degree of knowledge and beliefs associated with funding, standards, assessments and attitudes of educators regarding Title III of the No Child Left Behind legislation.

Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 1 predicted that the K-12 educator knowledge of the funding of the NCLB Title III mandates for limited English proficient children (Scale 1) would significantly predict their scores on the measure of educator attitudes towards the implementation of the English language proficiency and academic programs (Scale 4). This hypothesis was supported.

As can be seen in Appendix B, a significant negative Pearson Correlation was found between Scale 1 and Scale 4 scores. As hypothesized, and as can be seen in Table 18, scores on Scale 1 significantly contributed to the prediction of scores on Scale 4 ($t = -2.96, p = 0.004$); however, interestingly, an inverse relationship was revealed between the two scales. Examination of the semipartial correlation indicated that after covarying, or partialling out, the predictive effects of Scale 2 and Scale 3, Scale 1 accounted for approximately 7% (Semipartial Correlation = $-.27$) of the variance in Scale 4.

Hypothesis 2. Hypothesis 2 predicted that the K-12 educator knowledge of the application of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards required

by the NCLB Title III mandates (Scale 2) would significantly predict their scores on the measure of educator attitudes towards the implementation of the English language proficiency and academic programs (Scale 4). This hypothesis was supported.

As can be seen in Appendix B, a significant positive Pearson Correlation was found between Scale 2 and Scale 4 scores. As hypothesized, and as can be seen in Table 17, scores on Scale 2 significantly contributed to the prediction of scores on Scale 4 ($t = 2.10, p = 0.038$). Examination of the semipartial correlation indicated that after covarying, or partialling out, the predictive effects of Scale 1 and Scale 3, Scale 2 accounted for approximately 4% (Semipartial Correlation = .19) of the variance in Scale 4.

Hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 3 predicted that the K-12 educator knowledge of the assessment of scientifically-based academic and student achievement standards required by the NCLB Title III (Scale 3) would significantly predict their scores on the measure of educator attitudes towards the implementation of the English language proficiency and academic programs (Scale 4). This hypothesis was not supported.

As can be seen in Appendix B, a significant positive Pearson Correlation was found between Scale 3 and Scale 4 scores; however, in contrast to what was hypothesized, and as can be seen in Table 17, scores on Scale 3 did not significantly contribute to the prediction of scores on Scale 4 ($t = 1.17, p = 0.245$). Examination of the semipartial correlation indicated that after covarying, or partialling out, the predictive effects of Scale 1 and Scale 2, Scale 3 accounted for approximately 1% (Semipartial Correlation = .11) of the variance in Scale 4.

Post hoc analyses. To control for possible confounding effects of the demographic variable, setting, five additional multiple regression analyses were run. One regression was run for each individual setting: 1) preschool, 2) elementary, 3) middle school, 4) high school, and 5)

multiple settings. In each analysis, scales 1 through 3 were included as predictors and Scale 4 was entered as the outcome variable.

The regression for the preschool setting included 10 participants. The regression model, including all three predictors, was able to significantly predict educator attitude scores, $F(3, 6) = 10.07, p = 0.009, R^2 = .75$. The analysis revealed that about 75% of the variance in Scale 4 was accounted for by the model, or the combination of the three predictors; however, none of the individual predictors significantly predicted the outcome variable scores.

The regression for the elementary setting included 37 participants. The regression model, including all three predictors, was able to significantly predict educator attitude scores, $F(3, 33) = 3.70, p = 0.02, R^2 = .18$. The analysis revealed that about 18% of the variance in Scale 4 was accounted for by the model, or the combination of the three predictors. Further examination revealed that scales 1 ($t = -2.25, p = 0.03$) significantly contributed to the prediction of scores on Scale 4; however, interestingly, an inverse relationship was revealed between the two scales. Scales 2 and 3 did not significantly add to the prediction of Scale 4 scores.

The regression for the middle school setting included 24 participants. This regression model, including all three predictors, did not significantly predict educator attitude scores.

The regression for the high school setting included 23 participants. The regression model, including all three predictors, was able to significantly predict educator attitude scores, $F(3, 19) = 3.31, p = 0.04, R^2 = .24$. The analysis revealed that about 24% of the variance in Scale 4 was accounted for by the model, or the combination of the three predictors; however, none of the individual predictors significantly predicted the outcome variable scores.

The regression for multiple settings included 8 participants. This regression model, including all three predictors, did not significantly predict educator attitude scores.

Conclusion

Overall, the results lend support to Hypotheses 1 and 2 but not Hypothesis 3. In addition, post hoc analyses suggest that the predictors in this study may more effectively predict attitudes among educators in preschool, elementary, and high school settings than among educators in middle school or multiple settings. Due to the very small sample sizes in each of the post hoc regression analyses, however, these results should be interpreted with caution.

A more in-depth interpretation of the impact of educator attitude as it relates to the implementation of English language learning programs will be included in the final chapter of this study.

Chapter 5: Discussion

As far back as 1983 with the publishing of *A Nation at Risk*, national and state leaders have grappled with the solution to reducing the gap between the educational achievements of students in other countries versus the educational achievement of students in the United States. The United States' education system is not keeping pace with other countries as it relates to preparing students for a global economy. Leaders also recognize the lack of consistency nationwide; in a vehicle that specifically details what students should know and be able to do at the conclusion of their high school years. As many inconsistencies across the states exist, leaders agree that a massive shift in the way our youths are being educated needs to occur. It was not until the National Governor's Association Center for Best Practices and Council of Chief State School Officers joined forces to institute the Common Core State Standards released (June, 2010) that viable solutions to these inconsistencies began to occur. The development of these standards began before the implementation of the No Child Left Behind legislation in 2002. These new standards cultivated a path whereby, across the nation, each state's curriculum would contain the same goals and skillsets necessary for the most mobile student to graduate from K-12 institutions and be college and career ready. The achievement of these goals and skillsets also applied to students with disabilities and to the English language learners. These state regulated Common Core Standards were developed apart from the federally regulated No Child Left Behind legislation and Title III, with its nine standards (USDE, 2002).

The No Child Left Behind, Title III legislation is the focus of this study. This project in particular, examined the attitudes of educators as they relate to the implementation of English language learning programs. As this subject matter was being scrutinized, the researcher found

little empirical research on this topic. However, as this topic was being examined, three critical sub-topics emerged and proved to be noteworthy to this discussion. These sub-topics- funding (Scale 1), standards (Scale 2) and assessment (Scale 3) – were classified as the independent variables for the purpose of this study. The researcher developed surveys for each of the independent variables. The Educator Attitudes Scale (4) was adapted from an existing survey on teacher attitudes towards English language learners, published by Walker, Shafer, Iiams (2004) and is the dependent variable in this study. In addition, a demographic inquiry was also constructed to acquire a profile for each of the 106 original educator participants.

Scale reliability as a limitation. As noted in Chapter 4, the three scales of the survey instrument that measured educator awareness of funding, standards, and assessment were highly reliable. The fourth scale, however, that measured educator attitudes was slightly below the acceptable range of .70 with a .662 Cronbach alpha. Even when dividing the scale into its 3 component subscales (questions that addressed one of the specific independent variables), reliability was not improved. Thus, the analysis was conducted using the one-dimensional model of the entire set of questions for Scale 4. This result suggests a lack of consensus among various attitudes related to different items in and among the scales related to the implementation of English language learning programs (Tavakol, 2011). The degree of inconsistency among educator attitudes might be interpreted in a few different ways.

Perhaps educators simply have mixed feelings about implementing programs with ELLs. They may feel that the extra funding should be directed to the general education population, or perhaps to the students in special education. Perhaps teachers have empathy for ELLs as they struggle, but at the same time do not want further training in how to teach ELLs, or do indeed feel that ELLs are a burden in the classroom. In any case, there was a noticeable degree of

ambivalence conveyed by the responses that educators gave in response to the attitudes survey questions even considering the reverse coding of answers. Their attitudes especially were out of line with their awareness of assessment provisions of Title III.

Furthermore, the attitude reliability reflection could have been the result of feeling powerless as it relates to having a mandate for educating English language learners. This may be particularly the case since the breaking scale 4 into subscales and narrowing the construct failed to increase the level of reliability for this scale. The number of years educators served in their role reflected a mean of 48 years ($M=48$) while the minimum years served in the current role was 2. These results clearly reflect a relatively seasoned staff that felt that the English language learning, limited English proficient, immigrant, refugee and English as a second language student population would increase (88.2%).

Missing data. The lack of response for various segments of the demographic data section of the survey may also reflect a measure of distrust regarding how the results of the survey would be used or perhaps minimized the significance of the study. While twelve educators did not specify a level of education, eleven did not record their gender.

A recapitulation of the degree to which the attitudinal state of educators continues to be impacted by the demands of the No Child Left Behind, Title III legislation will be discussed in more detail in the next section of this chapter. Finally, recommendations for further research in the area of educator attitudes as they relate to the implementation of English language learning programs will also be included in this chapter.

Inferential Results for Shifting Paradigms

Inconsistency in educator attitudes was remarkable. For the examples below, all correlations of .5 or above indicate a strong relationship, scores .3 to .49 are moderate and all scores below .3 indicate a small relationship.

1. While participants felt that (Q3) Language minority students bring needed diversity to my school (.614), reverse coding revealed that most participants did not feel that ELL's state test scores should be counted in the school's overall averages for AYP (-.183).
2. While all participants felt they wanted more district-sponsored training in methods for teaching ELLs (Q5), a moderate (yet notable) relationship showed that participants felt they would prefer not to participate even if training sessions were offered (Q13 = .347).
3. While a small number of participants felt that teachers should be trained to teach ELL, LEP and immigrant students (Q10), even fewer felt these students bring needed diversity to their school (Q6=.148).

Thus, the internal reliability of Scale 4 (attitudes) was affected by inconsistency, perhaps ambivalence, on the part of the educators as they expressed their attitudes towards working with ELLs in the context of the recently implemented Title III context. Changes mandated by government institutions have come quickly and educators have had to adapt. But adapting does not mean that people's underlying beliefs have been altered. They may, in fact, harbor conflicting feelings about implementing the new programs for ELLs.

The process of life is always in constant change. In order for educational institutions to meet the educational needs of ELL, LEP, immigrant and refugee students in this consistently mobile society, a dramatic paradigm attitudinal shift will be necessary. The face of America has changed dramatically with the constant growth in the number of ELL students and the traditional curriculum delivery system is out of date. Educators of today strive to balance a commitment to molding all young minds that sit under their tutelage. The successful management of today's classroom involves more than implementing a rich curriculum that is student-centered. The student make-up of these classrooms may contain non-English-speaking students with a variety of native languages and minimal support. Yet, by law, the students must continue to systematically learn via reading, writing, speaking and listening. Educators must consistently implement sound practices to students who possess a variety of levels of English proficiency, may have little formal training in their native languages coupled with the satisfying of the mandates of the No Child Left Behind legislation and Title III within targeted timelines.

Discussion of Hypothesis 1: Funding. As predicted by Hypothesis 1, there is a relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the funding of the NCLB Title III mandates for limited English proficient children, and educator attitudes towards the implementation of the English language proficiency and academic programs. This hypothesis was supported by the regression analysis. As educators became more aware of the funding available for teaching ELLs, their attitudes toward implementing the program became more positive.

Title I funds as well as III funds are distributed to LEAs according to the number of ELL, immigrant and refugee students in each school district. The Title III budget has grown from \$460m in 2001 to \$730m and average approximately \$775 per student (See Table 3). These fund allotments are divided into nine basic categories (See Table 5) and states are penalized when a

targeted number of students do not reach English proficiency. The percentage of English proficiency among ELLs rose from 23% in 2005 to 35% in 2010 (See Table 4). Researchers continue to maintain their assessment of a lack of adequate funding to educate these children according to the 2014 deadline; even though many states have applied for deadline extensions (Crawford, 2004; Hudson, 2007).

Discussion of Hypothesis 2: Standards. There is a relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the application of scientifically-based academic content and student achievement standards required by the NCLB Title III mandates, and educator attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs as measured by a survey.

This hypothesis was supported by the data. Educators understand the role of standards in the education of all students. These standards are critical to the setting and achievement of goals for each student. Standards for ELL, LEP, immigrant and refugee students are specifically spelled out in Title III of NCLB. All of the aforementioned students must be exposed to the identical rigorous curriculum as other students and must be afforded the opportunity to achieve at high levels. Increased awareness of the standards predicted more positive educator attitudes towards implementing ELL programs. This might be a reflection of how educators appreciate being given more concrete direction in what they can expect of ELLs and how they should design curriculum.

The implementation of a vehicle that would ultimately close the achievement gap between all students was the purpose of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation signed in 2002 by then President George W. Bush. This legislation was the biggest wake-up call for United States educational institutions in decades. In addition to raising the level of academic

achievement, NCLB mandated equal access to a rigorous, scientifically-based curriculum for all students (Abernathy, 2007; Brown v. Board of Education, 1954; Castañeda v. Pickard, 1981; Lau v. Nichols, 1974; Serta v. Portales Municipal Schools, 1972). The necessity to institute the Title III legislation was a clear indication that proof by researchers continues to be ignored that there is a need for a longer period of time for students to attain academic proficiency in English (Collier & Thomas, 1989; Hakuta, Butler & Witt, 2000).

However, researchers contend that NCLB is not the answer to effectively educating ELLs and that many of the previously shelved best practices based upon a scientifically-based challenging curriculum that is delivered in a student-centered environment using natural communicative approaches can be instrumental in assuring students achieve adequate yearly progress (Crawford, 2004; Kuhn, 1970; Cummins, 1980a; Cummins, 1984, Hudson, 2007).

Researchers share that the attainment of adequate yearly progress for every student can become a reality with the implementation of the Common Core Standards. This would give assurance for all students to develop the skills to successfully transfer knowledge into practical uses for the changing world (Phillips & Wong, 2010). The act of incorporating a monetary support system behind these standards would add a greater degree of assurance for its success.

Discussion of Hypothesis 3: Assessment. This hypothesis predicted a positive relationship between K-12 educator knowledge of the assessment of scientifically-based academic and student achievement standards required by the NCLB Title III mandates, and educator attitudes towards the implementation of English language proficiency and academic programs.

The assessment hypothesis was not supported in the data. Evidence of a positive attitude was not shown by this analysis. While educators understand the role of assessment in the

evaluation of student progress, implementation of NCLB, informal conversations with educators often reveal their perception that Title III has forced them to focus as much or more on assessment than on the delivery of curriculum.

The utilization of authentic assessment tools aligned with curriculum content standards add a degree of assurance of the evaluation of student learning that is based on real life experiences. This alignment, for ELLs must always be in concert with annual measurable academic outcomes. Ensuring the success of all ELL students must include an authentic assessment system that begins with identifying these students and monitoring their progress through effective programs that prepare them for transition into English speaking classrooms. Critical to this transition process is the need for differentiated instruction out of respect for each student's learning pace and style. Assessment tools also need to be replicated within each state, with separate assessment tools for regular students and for ELLs (August and Hakuta, 1997; Abedi, Leon, & Mirocha, 2003; Abedi, 2004; The Working Group on English Language Learning Policy, 2009). The pressure on educators at all levels to produce high test scores continues to grow, and may well be responsible for negative attitudes toward ELL program implementation being negatively predicted by their increased awareness of assessment provisions of Title III.

A Final Word on Educator Attitudes

There are many forces that impact educator attitudes. Educator attitudes are impacted by funding or the lack thereof of ELL program implementation that include scientifically-based curriculum standards and authentic assessments. However, educators may feel hampered by the lack of needed classroom and/or building support. Lack of support may present itself in the overcrowding of classrooms containing ELL, LEP, immigrant and/or refugee students as well as

regular English-speaking students, lack of adequate books and supplies for the classrooms as well as, a lack of tutors to assist with communicating with these students. Other negative attitude building vehicles may present themselves in lack of clear and consistent policies related to the student entry and exit to mainstream classrooms, lack of training for all staff and the placement of qualified teachers. In addition, educators must also note students' experiential backgrounds and dialects that English language learners possess.

Krashen (1982) explicitly states that the English language learner's level of success in the classroom is directly related to the environment's affective filter. The lower the affective filter, the greater the chance that students will experience diminished stress, feel free to respond to instruction and increase the rate at which a second language can be acquired. Consequently, critical to the educational success of students is not only the attitude of the teacher, but also, the attitude of the student. However, teachers are responsible for establishing the classroom environment. The stress associated with these mandates is often passed to students. It is with all urgency that educational institutions nation-wide must act so that educators will be able to consistently facilitate student learning towards outcomes that are reasonable, believable and measurable (Berman ,1981; Capra, 1983; Merchant ,1992 and National Governor's Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers, June 2010).

While Wangchuk (2009) explores the impact of the American bureaucratic system on educator attitudes, other researchers reveal data on the discomfort of many educators who teach ELLs and therefore, stress the critical need for school administrators to provide the needed support for these educators (Futrell, Gomez and Bedden 2003; Batt, 2008).

Educators who view students as assets add a level of appreciation to the classroom and provide a greater opportunity for meeting social and academic needs of students (Tse, 2001; Valdes, 2001; Youngs & Youngs, 2001; Hamayan ,2005).

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations affected the ability to generalize the findings of the present study:

- One Michigan urban public school district responded to the request to participate in the study. Correspondence was sent and phone calls were made to more than 20 school districts across the state. Most of the district leaders shared that staffs already had too much to do or that they did not care to participate while the remaining districts did not respond to written or phone requests.
- A total of 106 individuals participated in the study. Three surveys were discarded due to the incompleteness of the instrument. Therefore, 103 instruments were used. A technology based response system such as Survey Monkey may have increased the number of respondents to the study.
- Charter schools were not included in the request for participation in the project, nor were they invited to participate in the study.

Educational Implications

The 2012 Bilingual Education Report shares that there are 63 languages spoken in the U.S. with sixty-one most commonly spoken (USDE, 2012). All of the research indicates a steady increase in the number of ELLs, LEPs, immigrants and refugees in the U.S. The frequency results in Table 14 revealed 88.2% of the 102 participants also predict a future classroom with growing numbers of ELLs.

The states have already responded to the impact of the alarming growth in the ELL student population as evidenced by the incorporation of the Common Core Standards into their curriculum. As a matter of fact, permission for the extension of the NCLB deadline has been granted to the states that applied because of the commitment for states to have students career and college ready through goal setting by the end of their high school years. The language of Common Core Standards has become the most popular linguistic jargon.

Directions for Future Research

The success of each ELL student will depend on what happens in the classroom. The teacher is responsible for daily setting the tone for each child's learning. For the purpose of further study, below are some possibilities to add to the empirical research on this topic.

- Implement a tracking system of staff development at all levels for the school district where this study was conducted
- Construct and conduct focus groups
- Research study on pedagogical styles of teachers

Perhaps future studies will tell why educators have mixed feelings about implementing ELL programs. Why do they feel empathy for their ELLs and at the same time not want to participate in any further training to help them?

Conclusion

The face of American has changed with the rapid increase in English language learners, limited English proficient, immigrant and illegal alien student populations. Radical changes must occur in order to face the acute reality that is predicted: the doubling of the non-white student population by 2020, and also an estimation of 57% representation for students of color by

2050 (Hollins, & Guzman, 2005; Selwyn, 2035; Henry, 1990). The United States must bear its own burden for readying its education institutions to meet the looming challenge of providing for the academic needs of these students. Meeting this need will require a radical paradigm shift for many educators. Multiculturalism and multilingualism are basic necessities for creating a global student.

APPENDIX A

ELL Program Support Staff Survey

Please indicate by checking which role you currently play in your district :

Administrator

Classroom Teacher

Other support staff position

Introduction: Support Staff impressions relative to the implementation of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Title III Legislation is the key variable in this survey. This survey has 4 parts; a section on Funding, Standards, Assessment and Attitudes. All questions are asking for your honest viewpoint; there are no correct or incorrect answers. Your responses relative to current services provided by your school district for the English language learner (ELL) as outlined in the No Child Left Behind Title III legislation will prove to be invaluable to this study and could provide insights for all who work with English language learners.

Demographic Questions:

Gender :

Male

Female

Educational Level:

Bachelor

Master

Educational Specialist

Doctorate

Post Doctoral

To which building level are you presently assigned?

Levels: Elementary

Middle School

High School

Multiple

State the number of years as a school support staff member for ELL students _____

Number of years in present school district _____

Do you expect the English Language Learner population in your district to:

Increase

Decrease

Remain at present level

Scale 1: Funding

Please respond to each of the following items, marking the option that best describes your knowledge of Title III mandated procedures in your district.

Very Strong Evidence 5	Strong Evidence 4	Some Evidence 3	Little Evidence 2	No Evidence/ I don't know 1
---------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------

	5	4	3	2	1
1. Priority funding consideration is given to LEAs with the greatest percentage of increase in the ELL student population.					
2. Additional funding is allocated to LEAs that demonstrate continued proficiency with the transitioning out of ELL programs.					
3. LEA funding is leveraged and distributed to individual departments according to AMAO(Annual Measurable Achievement Outcomes) goal progress.					
4. Special monetary incentives are offered to teachers who complete certification in ESL from institutions of higher learning.					
5. LEAs fund activities for professional development that helps personnel in meeting state and local certification and licensing requirements for teaching LEP (limited English proficient) children.					
6. State funds are set aside for technical assistance and other forms of assistance for eligible entities that tutor ELLs.					
7. State monetary incentives are allocated to LEAs who identify and implement language instruction programs for ELLs that are scientifically based.					
8. Financial awards are given to schools that excel in meeting AMAO goals.					
9. Title III sub-grants are used to contract outside agencies to train educational staff.					
10. Title III sub-grants are utilized to fund a trainer-to-trainer model of increasing the internal capacity for ELL instruction.					

Scale 2: Standards

Please respond to each of the following items, marking the option that best describes your knowledge of Title III mandated procedures in your district.

Very Strong Evidence 5	Strong Evidence 4	Some Evidence 3	Little Evidence 2	No Evidence/ I don't know 1
---------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------

	5	4	3	2	1
1. Standards are in place to ensure that Ells (English language learners) become proficient in English.					
2. Steps are being taken to assure a high level of proficiency in English for ELLs.					
3. Vehicles are in place to ensure that all LEP (limited English proficient) and ELLs are striving to meet challenging state academic standards.					
4. A system is in place to assist LEP, ELLs and immigrant children with achieving at high levels in core academic subjects.					
5. Several high quality language instructional programs are in place to assist students with becoming proficient with the English language.					
6. Teachers are allowed flexibility as it relates to ensuring that all ELLs meet individualized goals.					
7. Differentiated instruction is utilized in classrooms containing ELLs, LEP and immigrant students.					
8. Peer tutoring is encouraged in the classroom to increase ELL, LEP and immigrant comprehension levels in academic subjects.					
9. A vehicle is in place to <i>educate your school community</i> relative to what students need to know and be able to do at each grade level.					
10. Your district curriculum has been aligned with the State content standards and benchmarks.					

Scale 3: Assessment

Please respond to each of the following items, marking the option that best describes your knowledge of Title III mandated procedures in your district.

Very Strong Evidence 5	Strong Evidence 4	Some Evidence 3	Little Evidence 2	No Evidence/ I don't know 1
---------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------

	5	4	3	2	1
1. There is emphasis in my district on the alignment between individual academic standards and assessment items.					
2. Instructional staff members are allowed time to identify and address students' achievement gaps as a result of the assessments.					
3. Formative assessments, which give immediate feedback and inform educators of gaps in achievement, are used in classrooms containing LEP and ELL students.					
4. Teacher training is provided to improve their ability to understand the curriculum, assessment measures and instructional strategies useful for teaching ELLs and LEP students.					
5. The English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA), which is aligned with the Michigan state content standards, is administered to ELLs to determine a student's level of proficiency in oral comprehension, reading comprehension and writing and prescribes the level of service that these students will receive.					
6. Ongoing assessments are in place to monitor LEP student progress after the student is transitioned to a classroom not structured for LEP students.					
7. District policies state clear expectations for effectively transitioning LEP students into American society.					
8. A system of accountability is used to monitor the academic progress of limited English proficient and formerly limited English proficient students.					
9. Family education programs and parent outreach and training activities designed to assist parents to become active participants in the education of their children are currently being implemented (NCLB, Title III, Sec 3212).					
10. Ongoing effort is focused towards improving programs for LEP children by identifying, acquiring, and applying effective curricula, instruction materials and assessments that are all aligned with State and local standards (NCLB, Title III, PL 107-110, SEC 3212, iv, 2002).					

Scale 4: Educator Attitudes

Please respond to each of the following items, marking the option that best describes your view.

Strongly Agree 5	Agree 4	Neutral 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1					
				5	4	3	2	1	
1. I feel comfortable working with ELLs in the classroom.									
2. ELLs' state test scores should not count in the school's overall averages for AYP.									
3. Language minority students bring needed diversity to my school.									
4. Mainstream teachers should not be responsible for the achievement of ELLs.									
5. I would like more district-sponsored training in methods for teaching ELLs.									
6. ELL, LEP and immigrant students bring needed diversity to my school.									
7. Teachers should adapt their instruction to help ELLs.									
8. It is the responsibility of the English language learner to adapt to American Culture									
9. My school openly welcomes English language learners.									
10. I feel that all teachers should be trained to teach ELL, LEP and immigrant students.									
11. Students who don't speak English well are an extra burden to regular classroom teachers.									
12. ELLs perform well in my school.									
13. If training in ESL methods were offered in my school, I would prefer not to participate.									
14. I feel empathy for the ELLs as they struggle to learn English.									
15. In two years, ELLs should become proficient enough in English to succeed in their academic subjects.									

APPENDIX B: Descriptive Demographic Data for Demographic Categories

Dependent Variable: Funding scores by gender: Scale 1

Gender	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Male	19	22.4737	10.69459
Female	73	20.7945	9.97352
Total	92	21.1413	10.08925

Dependent Variable: Total Standards: Scale 2

Male	19	33.0526	10.54869
Female	73	33.4384	10.16801
Total	92	33.3587	10.19004

Dependent Variable: Total Assessment: Scale 3

Male	19	32.4211	11.95043
Female	73	31.2466	10.91989
Total	92	31.4891	11.08260

Dependent Variable: Total Attitudes: Scale 4

Male	19	17.2632	8.42511
Female	73	19.9452	6.87162
Total	92	19.3913	7.25207

Dependent Variable: Funding scores by level of education: Scale 1

Level of Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Bachelor	21	23.4286	10.06266
Master	60	20.6167	10.15322
Ed. Spec.	9	15.7778	7.46287
Doctorate	1	39.0000	
Total	91	20.9890	10.14067

Dependent Variable: Total Standards: Scale 2

Bachelor	21	33.8095	10.60481
Master	60	33.8000	10.31011
Ed. Spec.	9	32.1111	6.09189
Doctorate	1	37.0000	
Total	91	33.6703	9.91750

Dependent Variable: Total Assessment Scale 3

Bachelor	21	33.8571	11.84181
Master	60	31.4187	11.59382
Ed. Spec.	9	27.1111	8.05364
Doctorate	1	39.0000	
Total	91	31.6374	11.35245

Dependent Variable: Total Attitudes: Scale 4

Bachelor	21	20.0952	8.99947
Master	60	19.0167	6.16302
Ed. Spec.	9	21.1111	9.31993
Doctorate	1	20.0000	
Total	91	19.4835	7.14977

Dependent Variable: Total Funding: Scale 1

Present Assignment	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Preschool	10	26.5000	9.27661
Elementary	37	19.0000	9.74109
Middle School	24	19.2500	11.08956
High School	23	24.9130	7.73371
Multiple	8	20.1250	11.72832
Total	102	21.2157	10.03719

Dependent Variable: Total Standards: Scale 2

Preschool	10	41.3000	4.76212
Elementary	37	32.2973	9.23720
Middle School	24	34.1250	9.18085
High School	23	33.8696	11.80641
Multiple	8	27.2500	11.75646
Total	102	33.5686	10.06662

Dependent Variable: Total Assessment: Scale 3

Preschool	10	42.2000	6.17882
Elementary	37	30.3243	9.20765
Middle School	24	31.2917	11.74541
High School	23	31.6957	11.74515
Multiple	8	26.0000	11.68638
Total	102	31.6863	10.89825

Dependent Variable: Total Attitudes: Scale 4

Preschool	10	19.0000	5.90668
Elementary	37	21.5405	6.36656
Middle School	24	21.8750	6.68751
High School	23	15.2609	5.52035
Multiple	8	15.0000	9.95705
Total	102	19.4412	7.05926
Expectations re ELL Population	N	Mean	Std. Deviation

Dependent Variable: Total Funding: Scale 1

Remain Same	12	13.5000	7.21740
Increase	90	22.2778	9.91994
Total	102	21.2451	10.02318

Dependent Variable: Total Standards: Scale 2

Remain Same	12	28.0000	8.13522
Increase	90	34.5333	9.86903
Total	102	33.7647	9.87464

Dependent Variable: Total Assessment: Scale 3

Remain Same	12	26.6667	9.02857
Increase	90	32.3778	10.98065
Total	102	31.7059	10.88790

Dependent Variable: Total Attitudes: Scale 4

Remain Same	12	17.1667	6.75323
Increase	90	19.7333	7.09613

Total	102	19.4314	7.0731
-------	-----	---------	--------

REFERENCES

- Abedi, J. (2004). The No child Left Behind Act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues. *Educational Researcher* 33, no 1: 1-14.
- Abedi, J., Leon, S., & Mirocha, J. (2003). *Impact of students' language background on content-based assessment: analysis of extant data*. (CSE Tech. Rep. No. 603) Los Angeles. University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing.
- Abernathy, S. F. (2007). No Child Left Behind and the public schools. *The University of Michigan Press*, pp. 3-10 . ISBN:97804 72021512
- August, D. and Hakuta, K., eds. (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority students: a research agenda*. National Research Council. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Ausubel, D. (1968). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Baker, C., & Jones, S.P. (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon, England: Multicultural Matters
- Banks, J. and Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 232-275). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Batt, e.g. (2008). Multicultural Education. Teachers' perceptions of ELL education: *Potential solutions to overcome the greatest challenges*.
- Berman, M. (1981). *The re-enchantment of the world*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Black, P. and William, D. (1998a). "Assessment and Classroom Learning." *Assessment in Education* 5 (1):7-68.
- Black, P. and William, D. (1998b). "Assessment and Classroom Learning." *Assessment in Education* 5 (1):7-68.
- Brisk, M. (1998). *Bilingual Education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka., 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Capra, F. (1983). *The turning point: Science, society, and the rising culture*. Toronto: Bantam.
- Castaneda v. Pickard., 648 F. 2d 989 (5th Cir. 1981).
- Christian, D., & Genessee, F. (Eds.). (2001). *Bilingual education*. Alexandria, VA:TESOL.
- Collier, V., & Thomas W. (1989). How quickly can immigrants become proficient in school English? *Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 5 (Fall), 26-39.
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Services, 1999.
- Crawford, J. (2002). The Bilingual Education Act – Obituary. Language Policy Research Unit. Arizona State University.
- Crawford, J. (2004). No Child Left Behind: Misguided Approach to School Accountability for English Language Learners. National Association for Bilingual Education. Retrieved from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/33365082/crawford-No-Child-Left-Behind-Misguided-Approach-to-School-Accountability-for-English-Language-Learners>
- Cummins, J. (1980a). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14(2), 175-187.

- Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Fuller, M. (1994). The monocultural graduate in the multicultural environment: A challenge for teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education* 45(4), 269-277.
- Futrell, M., Gomez, J., & Bedden, D. (2003). Teaching the children of a new America. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(5), 381-385.
- Garcia, E. (2002). *Student cultural diversity: Understanding and meeting the challenge* (3.ed.). New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Garcia, A. (2008). ELL Integrated Thematic Learning: *Creating Consistency for Language Acquisition in Primary Grades*.
http://esllanguageschools.suite101.com/article.cfm/integrated_thematic_instruction
- Glenn, C. (1988). *The Myth of the Common School* Amherst, MA: U of MA Press (ISBN 0-87023-602-4). xi and 369 pages
- Goldenberg, C. (1996). The education of language-minority students: Where we are, and where do we need to go? *Elementary School Journal*, 36(4), 715-738.
- Gonzalez, J.M. (1975). Coming of age in bilingual/bicultural Education: A historical perspective, *Inequality in Education*, 19, 5-17.
- Green, J. P. (1998). *A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of bilingual education*. Claremont, CA: Tomás Rivera Policy Center.
- Jacobs, G., & Farrell, T. (2001). Paradigm shift: Understanding and implementing change in second language education. *TESL-EJ Journal*, 5 (1), pp.1-12. Retrieved from (<http://www.tesl-ej.wordpress.com/issues/volume5/ej17/ej17al>)

- Hakuta, K., Butler, Y., & Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take for English learners to attain proficiency?* Santa Barbara, CA: Linguistic Minority Research Institute.
- Hamayan, Ph.D., E. (2005). Diversity and differentiated instruction. Hampton-Brown. Seb 19-0546A. www.hampton-brown.com.
- Hargett, G. (1998). *Assessment in ESL & Bilingual Education*. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Havighurst, R.J. (1978, March). Indian education service 1960. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*.
- Henry III, W A. (1990, April). Beyond the melting pot. *Time*, 28-31
- Higham, J. (1988). *Strangers in the land: Patterns of American nativism, 1860-1925* (2nd ed). New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press
- Hodgkinson, H. (1989). *The same client: The demographics of education and service delivery systems*. Washington, DC: The Institute of Education.
- Hollins, E., & Torres Guzman, M. (2005). Research on preparing teachers for diverse populations. In M. Cochran-Smith, & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education* (pp. 477-548). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Holloway, J. (2003). Managing culturally diverse classrooms. *Educational Leadership*, 61 (1), 91.
- Hudson, D.L. (2007). *Point centerpoint: Educational standards*. Chelsea House: Infobase Publishing.
- Karabenick, S. & Noda, P. (2004). *Professional Development Implications of Teachers' Beliefs and Attitudes Toward English Language Learners*. Eastern Michigan University. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28: 1 Spring, 2004.

- Klopfenstein, K. (2005). Beyond test scores: The impact of black teacher role models on rigorous math taking. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 23(3), 416-428.
- Krashen, S. (1981). Theory of Second Language Acquisition. <http://www.sk.com.br/sk.krash.html>
- Krashen, S. (1982). Glossary of Second and Primary Language Terms. Earth Renewal. Term usage: when the “affective filter” is low. <http://www.earthrenewal.org/secondlang.htm>.
- Krashen, S. & Biber, D. (1999). *Condemned Without a Trial: Bogus Arguments Against Bilingual Education* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. 1988 On course Bilingual education’s Success in California. Sacramento: CABE
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL. University of Chicago Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).
- Lyons, J. (1995). The past and future directions of federal bilingual education policy. In O. García & C. Baker (Eds.), *Policy and practice in bilingual education: Extending the foundations* (pp. 1-15). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lessow-Hurley, J. (1991). A Commonsense Guide to Bilingual Education. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Lips, Dan. (2007). The Heritage Foundation. Reforming No Child Left Behind by Allowing States to Opt Out: An A-Plus for Federalism. www.heritage.org/research/reports/2007/06/reforming-no-child-left-behind

Malakoff, M. & Hakuta, K. (1990). *History of Language Minority Education in the United States*. Yale University and CLEAR and University of California, Santa Cruz and CLEAR. <http://faculty.ucmerced.edu/khakuta/research/publications/1990>.

Merchant, C. (1992). *Radical ecology: The search for a livable world*. New York: Routledge.

Meyer v. Nebraska., 262 U.S. 390 (1923).

Meyers, L., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. (2006). *Applied multivariate research: Design and Interpretation*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishers.

Michigan Department of Education, Office of Field Services. (2003). *State Manual: To assist school districts in their work with English Language Learners (limited English proficient students)*. Lansing, Michigan

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, “The Growing Numbers of English Learner Students, 1998/99-2008-09”, January 2010. Printed in Education Week, March 27, 2012. Downloaded March 27, 2012 from [www.edweek.or/ew/issues/English Language Learners/](http://www.edweek.or/ew/issues/English_Language_Learners/)

National Education Association. (1987). *Status of the American public school teachers, 1985-1986*. Washington DC: Author.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards*. National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School. June 2010.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 .S.C. 6301 Pub.L.No.107-110, 115 Stat. 1425. (2002). Retrieved January 19, 2005 from <http://www.edgov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>

No Child Left Behind Act (2001) Title III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students. Public Law 107-110. Office of English Language Acquisition,

Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students. United States Department of Education.

Oates, G. (2003, September). Teacher-student racial congruence, teacher perceptions, and test performance. *Social Science Quarterly*, 84(3), 508.

Obama, President Barack (2009, February). Address to a joint session of congress and the nation, recorded by CQ Transcriptions. <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/24/uspolitics/24obama-text.html>? Retrieved April 29, 2012.

Ovando, C.J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27:1 Spring.

Ovando, C.J. & Collier, V. (1998). Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill

Petrovic, J. (1997). Balkanization, bilingualism and comparisons of language situations at home and abroad. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21(2-3), 233-254.

Phillips, V. & Wong, C. (February, 2010). Tying together the Common Core of Standards, instruction and assessments. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 91 (5), 37-42.

Plessy v. Ferguson 163 U.S. 537 (1896). No. 210

Pylar v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202 (1982)

Ramirez, J., Yuen, S. and Ramey, D. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children*. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Ryan, Anne B. (2006). Post-Positivist Approaches to Research. In: *Researching and writing your*

- thesis: A guide for postgraduate students. MACE: Maynooth Adult and Community Education, pp. 12-26. Retrieved from http://adulthoodeducation.nuim.ie/department_staff/AnneBRyan.s; <http://eprints.nuim.ie/874>
- Schultz, R. (2005). Stephen Krashen's Theory of Second Language Acquisition. Retrieved from: <http://perso.univ-lyon2.fr/~giled/050801Stephen%20Krashen's%20Theory.htm>
- Scott, C. (2009). Expanding Restructuring and Taking on High Schools. An NCLB Follow-up Report in Michigan. Center on Education Policy. Washington, DC.
- Secada, W., Chavez-Chavez, R., Garcia, E., Munoz, C., Oakes, J., Santiago-Santiago, I., et al. (1998). *No more excuses: The final report of the Hispanic dropout project*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Selwyn, D. (2007). Highly quantified teachers: NCLB and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, <http://jte.sagepub.com>. Vol.58, 2, March/April 2007, <http://jte.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/58/2/124>, pp. 124-136. Retrieved from <http://jte.sagepub.com> at Oakland University on January 11, 2010.
- Serta v. Portales. 499 F2d 1147 (10th Circuit 1974).
- Stanford Working Group. (1993). *Federal education programs for limited-English-proficient students: A blueprint for the second generation*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.
- Tavakol, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2 (53-55).
- Tse, L. (2001). "Why don't they learn English?" *Separating fact from fallacy in the US language debate*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- United States Department of Education, Center for Education Statistics. (2002). Digest of education statistics, (NCES 2003-060). Washington, DC: Author.

- United States Department of Education (2006) United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). The condition of education 2006 (NCES 2006-071). Available: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2006/pdf/07_2006.pdf
- United States Department of Education (2010). Office of English Language Acquisition; Consolidated State Performance Reports: Current State of English-Language Learners in the U.S.; K-12 Student population.
www.ets.or/Media/Conference_and_Events/pdf/ELL/_factsheet.pdf
- Valdes, G. (2001). Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Voltz, Sims, & Nelson (2010). Connecting Teachers, Students and Standards: *Strategies for Success in Diverse and Inclusive Classrooms*. Pp. 123-126. ASCD. Alexandria, Virginia.
- Walker, A., Shaker, J., & Iiams, M. (2004). "Not in my classroom": Teacher attitudes towards English language learners in the mainstream classroom. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 130-160.
- Wangchuk, D. (2009). My life My work My country Bhutan. *Time for a paradigm shift in education*. Downloaded: http://dorjiwanchuk.blogspot.com/2009/01/time_for_paradigm_shift_in_education_27.html 4/14/2011.
- Webb, N.L. (1999). Research Monograph No. 18. Alignment of science and mathematics standards and assessments in four states. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Council of Chief State School Officers. Washington, DC.
- Willig, A. C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research*, 55(3), 269–317.

Wilson, S., & Youngs, P. (2005). Research on accountability processes in teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education* (pp. 549-590). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Working Group on English Language Learner Policy (2009). The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act: Recommendations for addressing the Needs of English Language Learners. Palo alto, California: Retrieved March 27, 2012, from <http://www.standard.edu/~hakuta/ARRA/>.

Youngs, C. & Youngs, G. (2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes toward ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, (1), 97-118.

Zacarian, D. & Haynes, J. (2011). Everything ESL.net. *Who are the ELLs in your classroom?* www.everythingsl.net/in-services/ells_classrooms_03336.php.

ABSTRACT**EDUCATORS' KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES RELATING TO ELL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION UNDER NCLB TITLE III**

by

MONETTA IRENE WHITCOMB FOSTER**May 2013****Advisor:** Dr. H. Marc Rosa**Major:** Curriculum and Instruction
Bilingual/Multicultural Education**Degree:** Doctor of Education

This study examined educators' knowledge and attitudes towards the implementation of programs for English language learners. The study was conducted in an urban school district with 106 participants. Participants were surveyed relative to their knowledge and attitude towards the No Child Left Behind, Title III legislative mandates of 2002. Of particular interest was the impact this legislation had on their performance as educators; specifically in regards to their attitude towards the funding, standards and assessment associated with this legislation's mandates.

A five part instrument was used in the study. Three components of the instrument were a 5-point likert scale rating related to funding (Scale 1), standards (Scale 2) and assessment (Scale 3) and their knowledge of the No Child Left Behind, Title III legislation. Another component of the instrument rated the educators' attitude (Scale 4) relative to program implementation for English language learners. The final component of the instrument requested demographic information relative to each participant, i.e., gender, level of education, setting they worked in, and whether or not they believed that the ELL student population would increase.

Three hypotheses were examined using multiple regression to analyze the four continuous variables (scales). Scales 1 (Funding), Scale 2 (Standards) and Scale 3 (Assessment) were analyzed as predictor variables. Scale 4(Attitudes) was analyzed as the predictor variable. Analysis was also completed to determine the impact of demographic variables on educator attitudes towards ELLs. Hypotheses 1 and 2 regarding funding and standards were supported by the data. However, Hypothesis 3 regarding assessment was not supported by the data. In fact, evidence of a positive attitude regarding this hypothesis was non-existent. This hypothesis predicted a positive relationship between K-12 knowledge of the assessment of scientifically-based academic and student achievement standards as required by NCLB Title III mandates and educator attitudes towards the implementation of English language learning programs.

This study revealed a dire need for a paradigm shift in the system utilized for meeting the needs of ELLs. Critical to this shift is the necessity for institutionalization of nation-wide standards and policies.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

I have been actively involved in the field of Education for more than fifty years. My journey began at the Kansas University in Lawrence, Kansas. I was instrumental in tutoring neighborhood children, whose achievement levels needed to increase and also led a team of volunteers to establish a private school in Kansas City, Missouri where I taught Spanish and Arabic.

When my family relocated to Pontiac, I resumed my pursuit of an Elementary education endorsement which ended with my return to school (Madonna University) in 1982 and a degree in Elementary Education with a Special Education endorsement in 1985. I immediately applied to Wayne State University in Master's program, while simultaneously teaching at Pontiac Central High School as a Special Education teacher. This degree qualified me for the position of Executive Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent of Schools in Pontiac, Michigan in 1989. I was the first person to serve in this position for Pontiac Schools. This position afforded me the opportunity to experience life in Japan and especially the opportunity to study the Japanese educational system.

I also became the first Early Childhood Principal, simultaneously serving for three years as principal of a Special Education center and also as Principal of an Early Childhood Center for children without disabilities. Throughout my career and after retirement, I participated in various multicultural organizations; as well as volunteered in schools, working with children of other cultures and nationalities. I have been recognized throughout the community of Pontiac for my contribution to education outside of the classroom. The most recent honor was a Lifetime Achievement Award from the Northern Oakland County NAACP. I am a life-long learner who continues to serve in the educational arena.