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ABSTRACT

The Role of Elementary School Principals Supporting Teachers in The Instruction of Reading for English Language Learners

This study utilized data gleaned from on-line surveys of primary level teachers and elementary school principals to understand what principals need to know and be able to do to support teachers in their instruction of reading for English Language Learners (ELLs). A review of five areas of literature provided a theoretical foundation for this study. Twenty-six primary level teachers and four elementary school principals, from eight Massachusetts’s schools, participated in separate, three-part online questionnaires. Participants answered questions about licensure, experience, and professional development focused on teaching English Language Learners. In addition, participants responded to questions about their perceptions of (1) the elementary school principal’s role in supporting teachers of ELLs learn to read in English, and (2) the leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with teachers of ELLs. Teacher perceptions of principals are considered critically significant, since teachers have a day-to-day view of principals (Marzano, Waters and McNulty, 2005). At the onset of the study, the null hypothesis assumed by the researcher was that the perceptions of teachers and principals would be the same. The survey research design used a mixed-method approach, which included both quantitative and qualitative data analyses: the former using t-test measures; the latter examining statements made by participants. Results from the 39 questionnaire statements revealed that a statistically significant number of participants accepted the null hypothesis, and that a statistically insignificant number of participants rejected the null hypothesis. After the analyses were completed, the null hypothesis was rejected for twenty-two statements. The results led to the conclusion that teachers and principals do not agree on what elementary school
principals understand and practice in support of teachers working with ELLs. One of the most critical conclusions is the lack of a shared, researched-based belief system about serving the learning needs of ELLs. Without a common belief system between a principal and teachers, it is difficult to meet the needs of ELL students. Even though principals and teachers did not agree in every area, the questionnaires provided rich data about what a principal needs to know and be able to do in order to better support teachers in their instruction of reading for English Language Learners. The study points to important implications for elementary school principals’ practice in supporting their work with teachers of English Language Learners: (1) gain key understandings about effective English Language Learning and reading instructional practices through effective professional development; (2) seek out and reflect on data about current performance from teachers; (3) develop and/or strengthen leadership characteristics in relationship to the instruction of ELLs; (4) demonstrate a commitment to working with English Language Learners by adhering to a shared, researched-based belief system about instructing ELLs; and (5) implement a continuous improvement plan to address teachers’ professional development needs in teaching reading in a second language.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

In Massachusetts, schools receive final scores and accountability information on the statewide test, the Massachusetts Assessment Comprehensive System (MCAS), in early fall. It is at that time that principals can see how students, in the aggregate and in subgroups, performed on the MCAS from the previous spring. Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, one of the subgroups, are chronic underperformers on the MCAS. In 2009 the following statewide results were found:

Only 17% of grade 4, 24% of grade 8 and 20% of grade 10 MCAS test-takers of limited English proficiency score “Proficient” in MCAS ELA (Figure 3). ELA “Pass” rates are substantially higher, but still only about 60% of MCAS test-takers of limited English proficiency reach this outcome. These measures represent the aggregate of LEP students at each of these grade levels without regard to their language proficiency. (Gap, 2009, p. 14)

When further analysis is done on data associated with LEP students, the following is noted: there has been an increase in the number of students enrolled in public schools in the United States who do not speak English as a first language (English Language Learners or ELLs).

Between 1979 and 2008, the number of school-age children (children ages 5-17) who spoke a language other than English at home increased from 3.8 to 10.9 million, or from 9 to 21 percent of the population in this age range. An increase (from 18 to 21 percent) was also evident during the more recent period of 2000 through 2008. (Sciences, 2010)
In school districts with a low number of ELLs, ELL students are often placed in the general education classroom with varying levels of ESL support. This means that many general education classroom teachers are faced with students in their classrooms who are simultaneously learning to speak English while learning to read English. During the 2010 – 2011 school year, there were 68,820 ELLs enrolled in Massachusetts public schools. This is an increase of 9,663 from the year before (Serpa, 2011, p. 2). It has been reported that “teacher quality is one of the most critical factors in any student’s learning, yet ample evidence from the field indicates that many English Language Learners are not yet receiving instruction from appropriately qualified teachers” (Gap, 2009, p. 29). As a result, students are not learning to read at the same pace as their monolingual grade level peers. In addition, students who are ELLs are being referred for special education evaluations at an increasing rate; the assumption is that when they do not learn to read at the same rate as their monolingual grade level peers then they are learning disabled:

In Massachusetts, the number of ELLs also identified as having a disability (ELL-SWDs) more than doubled – a striking increase of 115.4% - from 2001-2002 to 2010-2011. During the same time, the proportion of ELLs placed in Special Education also increased, from 9.8% to 14.8%. (Serpa, 2011, p. 2)

When an elementary-aged student is struggling to learn to read, the ripple effect is seen in all content areas. It can be difficult for a student to make any academic progress if that student cannot read or understand what has been read. This difficulty impacts the student’s teacher and principal. When a student labors over learning to read, the teacher also struggles with how to best reach the student. Booth and Rowsell (2002) write, “for teachers, literacy instruction is a complex and at times onerous task, with students at many different stages of reading and writing development” (p. 11). At the same time, the principal may not know how to support the teacher.
Reeves (2009a) speaks to the difficulties that principals face when it comes to literacy challenges, specifically around an inconsistency in the definition of good literacy instruction, “Leaders must make the case for consistency in reading instruction” (p. 119). An intervention encouraged by the English Language Learners (ELLs) Sub-Committee of the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Committee on the Proficiency Gap (2009) is for the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to provide professional development for those educational leaders who are “responsible for planning, developing, monitoring, and evaluating programs for ELLs as well as those charged with the assessment of the academic performance of ELLs and the performance of teachers” (p. 35).

Reading is an essential skill to develop, and school is where learning to read takes place. Fielding et al. (2007) argue that “reading is the language of learning. . . If elementary schools do not teach their students to read early and well, it matters little else what we teach them” (p. 30).

It is a significant challenge to teach a child to read. When the child is not a native speaker of English (i.e. English Language Learner or ELL), there are further complications. When teaching ELLs to read, the elementary classroom teacher not only needs to combine phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension with the teaching of oral English language development (similar to foreign language teaching methodology) in order to support ELLs in ‘learning how to read’, but also needs to be thoughtful and deliberate about the process. Lesaux & Geva (2006) state “language-minority students enter U.S. schools needing to learn oral language and literacy in English, and they have to learn with enormous efficiency if they are to catch up with their monolingual English classmates” (p. 53).

When elementary school principals lack the necessary skills to support teachers who are teaching ELLs to learn to read, one potential result is that teachers will not be successful in
teaching ELLs to learn to read. Lesaux et al. (2010) state that “our administrators tend to lack training in efforts directed at supporting instructional improvement; their focus is often removed from the day-to-day learning that goes on in the early education and care or primary grade classrooms” (p. 13).

If elementary school principals have the knowledge and skills necessary to better support teachers of English Language Learners learning to read in English then ELLs will become more accomplished readers:

Elevated student achievement is linked to instructional leadership – results improve administrators spend significant time reviewing student data with teachers, monitoring and supporting curricular implementation, understanding instructional strategies tailored to the population at hand, and supporting problem-solving. (N. K. Lesaux et al., 2010, p. 13)

It is my contention that there is a disconnect, between what has been researched and written about what elementary school principals need to know and be able to do to support teachers in teaching English Language Learner to learn to read in English, and what actually happens on a daily basis. This disconnect can be fueled by a lack of understanding by the principal and teachers about reading as a language-based process, as well as the actual second language acquisition process. This disconnect can be further compounded by a lack of knowledge of best practices for ELLs by teachers and principals. This disconnect can also be fueled by a lack of communication between principals and teachers when it comes to what is known and understood about teaching ELLs. I believe that this disconnect has resulted in not meeting the needs of a growing population of students, which appears when examining the achievement gap between native speaking elementary students and ELLs. As a principal, whose
school serves a large growing population of ELLs, I see the need to examine this disconnect and work out possible solutions that will result in narrowing the achievement gap.

**Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this study will be to focus on how elementary school principals can better support teachers of English Language Learners (ELLs) learning to read in English. This study will report what research tells us about best practices for teaching students to learn to read. It will compare those practices to what is known about teaching ELLs to learn to read; and it will examine what preparation classroom teachers need in order to teach ELLs to learn to read. Finally, the study will explore the characteristics of an effective instructional leader at the building level, especially those that may lead to the elementary school principal providing the necessary conditions for ELLs to learn to read.

The study will analyze data collected from two sources: primary-level classroom teachers who work with ELL students in their classrooms; and elementary school principals, who work in schools using a Sheltered English Immersion model. In addition to answering questions about licensure, experience and professional development focused on teaching English Language Learners, participants will respond to questions about their perceptions of (1) the elementary school principal’s role in supporting teachers of ELLs learn to read in English, and (2) the leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with teachers of ELLs. Teachers and principals will be surveyed with on-line instruments. The following three questions will guide this study:

1. What do elementary school principals need to know and be able to do in order to better support teachers of ELLs learning to read English (their second language, L2)?
2. What leadership factors contribute to and/or inhibit the support of teachers of ELLS learning to read in English (L2)?

3. How can elementary school principals, as instructional leaders, better educate and support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English?

**Study Design**

The research approach chosen for this study is a survey research design, using on-line questionnaires to elicit teacher perceptions and principal self-perceptions about an elementary school principal’s knowledge and behaviors in relationship to the instruction of ELLs. Also, it will draw conclusions from teacher perceptions of principal leadership, in this case as the leadership relates to the instruction of ELLs. The elicitation of teacher perception mirrors the work of Marzano et al. (2005). Three types of data will be collected from the separate teacher and principal questionnaires: (1) descriptive data that informs the reader about the teachers and principals who complete the questionnaires, (2) quantitative data from two questionnaires that asks about perceptions of principal behavior will be discussed as the related to the three research questions, and (3) qualitative data that will be gleaned from short answers.

The questionnaires that are used in the study are designed and accessed through SurveyMonkey. Both questionnaires consist of three parts: an information section, a section asking questions about the role of principals in teaching ELLs to learn to read, and a section asking questions on leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with supporting teachers in their instruction of ELLs. Questionnaire items consist of multiple choice questions, to be answered using a Likert scale, and open-response questions that call for narrative responses.
Eighty-three teachers and eight principals will be asked to respond to the questionnaires. These educators work at schools associated with a group of schools from 2010 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s District Analysis and Review Tool (DART) who are associated with each other due to similar student enrollment and demographics.

**Research question #1**

What do elementary school principals need to know and be able to do to better support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English? (their second language, L2)?

**Data collection.**

Research and literature will be used to examine the history of language learning education in the United States, current educational policy in Massachusetts, how to teach English Language Learners to learn to read in English, preparing teachers and principals to appropriately instruct ELLs, and the principal as instructional leader.

**Data analysis.**

The researcher will synthesize findings made by experts in the field and concluded that in order to best support teachers, principals need to unite all of the knowledge studied. This means that elementary school principals need to have an understanding of the history of language learning education in order to build a foundation of empathy for ELL students and their families. Principals need to be familiar with current legislation and state expectations for education ELLs helps principals in order to be able to explain what and why is happening to teachers and parents. Principals need to know what is needed to teach an ELL to learn to read in English is integral knowledge in order to be able to effectively support primary level teachers and lead teachers and themselves to professional development that will help to meet the needs of their ELLs more productively. When principals integrate all of this knowledge with the responsibilities that
Marzano, Waters and McNulty (2005) delineate, they are better prepared to support his or her teachers in making sure that ELLs make academic gains.

**Research question #2**

What leadership factors contribute to and/or inhibit the support of teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?

**Data collection.**

Teachers and elementary school principals will respond to questions that focus on the roles of principals in supporting the teaching of ELLs learning to read. These factors were gleaned from the review of literature and included foci of Category I – IV trainings and findings from the National Literacy Panel (August & Shanahan, 2006a) and other researchers.

**Data analysis.**

Data will be analyzed using a t-test to determine the significance of the correlation coefficient. This analysis will be done on each question of the instrument used with teachers (Leading to Read: Teachers Perceptions of Principals, referred to in this study as LTR-T) and principals (Leading to Read: Principals’ Self Perceptions, referred to in this study as LTR-P) in order to determine the statistical significance between the teacher responses and the principal responses. This t-test will be done because the study is an examination of a relationship between variables (teacher responses and principal responses) and the participants are asked to complete a survey only one time.

**Research question #3**

How can elementary school principals, as instructional leaders, better educate and support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?
**Data collection.**

Teachers and elementary school principals will respond to questions that focus on the leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with teachers of ELLs. The naming of these factors was taken directly from the findings from Marzano et al. (2005) on the responsibilities of principals.

**Data analysis.**

Data will be analyzed using a t-test to determine the significance of the correlation coefficient. This analysis will be done on each question of the instrument used with teachers (Leading to Read: Teachers Perceptions of Principals) and principals (Leading to Read: Principals’ Self Perceptions) in order to determine the statistical significance between the teacher responses and the principal responses. This t-test will be done because the study is an examination of a relationship between variables (teacher responses and principal responses) and the participants are asked to complete a survey only one time.

**Delimitations, Limitations and Potential Biases of Study**

**Delimitations**

This study is based, in part, on input from general classroom teachers of kindergarten through grade 3, who have been faced with the task of teaching ELLs to learn to read. Intermediate-level teachers (grades 4 & 5), who may have had that same experience are excluded. This exclusion is purposeful: teachers in grades 4 and 5 do not typically teach students to learn to read; they focus on reading to learn. Therefore, they do not have a similar knowledge base with primary-level teachers.

Also included in this study are elementary school principals who lead buildings with ELL students enrolled in general education classrooms at the primary level. Intermediate and
secondary level principals are excluded, as students who are in the upper grades are not typically learning to read; they focus on reading to learn.

Teachers and elementary school principals from eight schools who are deemed comparable as identified by the “2010 District Analysis and Review Tool for Schools” from the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education will be asked to voluntarily participate in this study. The information about the study will be sent to 83 teachers. Eight principals will be asked to voluntarily participate. This size population will be chosen due to the need to have a manageable number of recorded responses.

Observation is not a part of this study. Though observation data is often an integral facet of studies having to do with schools, observing the interactions between teachers and principals will not elicit information that will be relevant in looking at teachers’ perceptions of principals.

The tools that will be used to collect the data will be drafted and pre-piloted in an elementary school and with several elementary school principals. Questions will be reviewed and approved by a panel of experts on ELLs and reading. These experts include the Director of English Language Learners for an urban school district; an assistant professor from a Boston-area college who currently is researching the literacy development of children from immigrant and bilingual homes and a doctoral candidate in Human Development and Education at another Boston-area college who is currently researching reading assessment of primary-aged ELL students. The tools will be on-line questionnaires, which will be easily accessible for voluntary participants.

This study did not attempt to verify the correlations presented by Marzano et al. (2005).
Limitations

One potential weakness of the study is the number of participants that will potentially respond to the questionnaire. In addition, though the instruments will be piloted with a small number of teachers and elementary school principals, the tool is in the initial phases of development and reliable and validity have not been established.

Another potential limitation is the unknown variable of the history and previous experience of the questionnaire respondents; it will not be possible to determine how history and previous experience might influence the respondents’ answers to the study’s queries. The answers to the questions are based on the participants’ perceptions and biases.

This study does not include a way for principals to reflect on teacher performance nor does it include student data, such as formal or informal literacy assessments. These are potential weaknesses of the study, as each can supply additional information about the current context of what is happening in the classroom.

Potential Biases

It is essential to disclose that the main researcher of this study is currently an elementary school principal working in a school with a population of ELLs. This being stated, this researcher has personal assumptions, beliefs and opinions about teachers’ and principals’ work with all students, especially ELLs.

Significance of Study

Statistics introduced earlier in this section indicate a steady increase in the school population of children for whom English is not their native language. These students will need to simultaneously learn how to speak and read English, while learning the content with which all students are presented on a daily basis. As it is the school’s responsibility to ensure that students
are academically successful, it is essential to determine the best way to make that happen.

Sinclair and Ghory begin the book *Reaching and Teaching All Children: Grassroots Efforts that Work* (1997) by stating “the promise to educate all children of all families, and to do it well, is as crucial as any democratic principles of the United States” (p. 1). The way to do this is to look at what is happening in the classroom currently in order to apply theory into practice.

The results of this study will offer key insights about what supports are needed to teach ELLs learning to read in English. The study will extend what is currently known about effective instructional leadership (Marzano et al., 2005) by connecting twelve of the responsibilities that Marzano et al. (2005) researched with skills and knowledge needed to better support teachers who work with English language learners. Based on the analyses of data, conclusions will be made about how principals can support teachers to work successfully with the growing number of ELLs who are enrolled in their classrooms. Finally, the results of the study will be applied to theory and practice in order to determine new understandings about the instruction of ELLs.

Determining how to best support teachers in their work with ELLs is like a three-piece puzzle. One piece is making sure that teachers have professional development and resources that they can utilize in the classroom in their work with ELLs. A second piece is a safe, supportive school community fostered by a strong educational leader. There is a missing piece that fits between these two pieces to complete the puzzle: information on what principals need to know about educating ELLs. This study is intended to generate understandings to help form that third puzzle part through the use of teacher and principal perceptions obtained from on-line questionnaires.

The results of this study have specific implications for principals. Elementary school principals will find the results of this study useful, as it gives them feedback from the classroom
about what teachers need in order to support the instruction of ELLs. When principals collect feedback on their performance from teachers, they can do their jobs more effectively. As a reader of the results of this study, principals are able to look at their own current functioning when it comes to supporting teachers in teaching ELLs to learn to read and design a course of professional development for themselves. Principals will learn how essential it is to have a shared philosophy with their teachers and how necessary it is to communicate their ideals and beliefs in their words and actions. They will understand the importance of knowing the best practices in curriculum, instruction and assessment of ELLs. In addition to changing their own practice, principals are able to use the results to also plan professional development opportunities for teachers.

Having feedback helps principals to do their jobs more effectively. Marzano, et al. (2005) includes a reference to a 1977 U. S. Senate Committee Report on Equal Educational Opportunity:

In many ways the school principal is the most important and influential individual in any school. He or she is the person responsible for all the activities that occur in and around the school building. It is the principal's leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for teaching, the level of professionalism and morale of teachers, and the degree of concern for what student may or may not become. (p. 4)

Given the importance of the role of the principal, every piece of information that is available will help to develop the kind of school community that is envisioned this report: one that believes in the importance in making sure that all students learn to read.

By connecting the needs to current educational leadership theory, this study provides principals with concrete ways to develop their school communities so that both teachers and
students realize success in learning. In addition, it gives principals a sense of what teachers value in terms of their teaching.

A second level of implications can be found at the district level: district leaders can find the results of this study informative as they work to design professional development opportunities for teachers and administrators by knowing what skills and strategies teachers and administrators need to be become skilled practitioners. In addition, there is a clearer sense of the values needed to create a school community that is safe and supportive for ELLs: information district leaders need to consider in providing the kinds of district support for these values to take root.

A third level of implications can be found at the state level: through a review of literature, several reports and commissions were studied that made recommendations that the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MADESE) should heed in order to help school districts meet the needs of ELLs. These recommendations include the redevelopment and strengthening of the Category Trainings (ELL professional development for regular classroom teachers) and the development and implementation of student-centered programs that are appropriate for ELLs.

It is time for the MADESE and school districts to take notice and act promoting and supporting teacher efficacy in teaching ELLs to learn to read. When it comes to the ability of ELLs to read and understand what has been read, one tangible mark of the lack of success is found in the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) statewide results. In 2009, in the area of English Language Arts, there was a difference of approximately 30 percentage points between students who are EP (English proficient) and students who are LEP when looking at scores for students in grades 4, 8 and 10 (Gap, 2009, p. 2). School districts must
take this problem seriously and get to the crux of where the difficulties are occurring, and then plan interventions at the school-building level so that ELLs can have the same success as their monolingual peers. The results of this study, which are grounded in the perspectives of general education classroom teachers, ESL teachers and elementary school principals, are intended to inform building and district administrators about possible solutions to ELL reading success.

Chapter Outline

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter One introduces the study. It includes a Statement of Problem; Statement of Purpose; Design; Delimitations, Limitations and Potential Biases of Study; Significance of the Study; and a Chapter Outline.

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Chapter Two establishes a conceptual framework for the study through a review of literature in the following five areas: (1) the history of language learner education in the United States and Massachusetts, (2) current educational policy in Massachusetts, (3) teaching ELLs to learn to read English, (4) preparing teachers and principals to work with ELLs, and (5) the principal as an instructional leader.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Chapter Three will include (a) a brief restatement of the conceptual framework for the study; (b) the three research questions that will guide the study, including a rationale for their selection and how they connect with one another; (c) the facets of the study design, including participants and setting, data collection methods and, data collection procedure explanations; (d) a statement about the validity of the study; and (e) a description of the study’s limitations, including potential bias and controlling limitations.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis

Chapter Four will include an explanation of how the data are analyzed, a description of the results of the study, and an analysis of the data. Data analysis will be organized in both a narrative format and visual format, through tables and graphs. The research questions will be used as the organizing framework.

Chapter 5: Discussion of Results, Conclusions, Implications, Limitations and Recommendations

Chapter Five places the study in a larger professional context. It includes (1) a summary of the study; (2) a discussion of the results of the data; (3) conclusions based on the study’s findings, using, in part, Ronald Heifetz’s work on looking at solutions for adaptive and technical problems (1994); (3) theoretical and practical implications; (4) limitations of the study; and (5) possible future research opportunities and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In order to determine what a principal needs to know and be able to do to better support teachers in their work with teachers of English Language Learners (ELLs), the following topics will be examined through research and literature: (1) the history of language learning education in the United States, (2) current educational policy in Massachusetts, (3) how to teach English Language Learners to learn to read in English, (4) preparing teachers and principals to appropriately instruct ELLs, and (5) the principal as instructional leader.

Introduction

One of the most important facets of the principal’s job is to be able to provide the necessary conditions for teachers to teach and for students to learn. The purpose of this study is to determine how principals can better support teachers in their efforts to teach ELLs learning to read in English. The following two citations enumerate statistics that show ELLs are the fastest growing population in the United States and Massachusetts:

1. At least 7 times the overall national growth rate. Nationwide, ELL enrollment increased 18 percent from 2000 to 2005. Public school educational leaders were responsible for 5 million ELLs in the 2005 – 2006 school year, or 10 percent of the total school-aged population in the United States. (Alford & Niño, 2011, p. 1; Shellard & Protheroe, 2001)

2. English Language Learners (ELLs) are the fastest-growing group of school-age students in public schools across the nation, and in Massachusetts. In this state, even as the total student enrollment declines slightly, the number of ELLs grows steeply. They number 68,820 in the 2010-2011 school year, an increase of 9,662 from the year before. (Serpa, 2011, p. 7)
Taking on a principalship is not for the faint of heart. Aside from playing politician with local VIPs, investigating potential bullying incidents and making sure that students’ special education programs are appropriate and effective, there are the daily responsibilities of discussing, listening, writing and making decisions about building staff (from teachers to custodians to cafeteria workers), students, parents, curriculum and instruction, facilities and budget. The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2008) stress that principals are accountable for the success of all the students in their charge:

Current social and educational context – which combines high-stakes accountability with the high ideals of supporting social, physical and emotional needs of children – demands that all principals demonstrate the vision, courage and skill to lead and advocate for effective learning communities in which all students reach their highest potential. (p. 11)

Principals must monitor and respond to outside pressures. For example, whenever a change is made in district, state or federal policy, principals are expected to be on the forefront of the information in order to effectively respond to changes or mandates.

The examination of the following literature presents knowledge that is essential for principals to have in order to support teachers in their instruction of ELLs:

- The history of language learner education in the United States, providing a context for what is currently happening and insights into what is recommended as best practices, including how the United States has dealt with educating the influxes of its immigrants throughout its history, tying this to the Civil Rights of students.
- Current educational policy in Massachusetts, including how districts in Massachusetts are expected to educate English Language Learners based on the current state policy as well a description of program options and possible outcomes.
• Information on the best research-based practice for teaching ELLs to learn to read English, including the oral language development of second-language learners

• Information on preparing teachers and principals to work with ELLs in order to support ELLs in achieving academically at grade level.

• The responsibilities of the principal with regard to supporting teachers in instructing ELLs.

The first section will review the history of language learning education in the United States. Principals need to have a background in this history in order to understand how the current version of language learning education came about; the history provides the context for the present status of language learning education.

**History of Language Learning Education in the United States**

It is important for principals to know the history of language learning education in the United States in order to understand how each generation in our history has responded to immigrants’ educational needs, as well as how each group of immigrants fought to be educated. Historical background knowledge provides a context for the present-day form of language learning education. Another reason to understand the history is that principals have to navigate the confusing and sometime contradictory political nature of language learning education on a regular basis; when principals have background knowledge, they are better able to respond.

The question of how to best educate ELLs is one that national leaders have grappled with since the beginning of United States history. The debate sounds simple: educate students in English only or educate students in their native languages plus English. As simple as the choice seems, the debate has been a controversial one. “Bilingual education is one of the most contentious and misunderstood educational programs in the United States because it raises
significant questions about national identity, federalism, power, ethnicity, and pedagogy” (San Miguel, 2004, p. 1).

Spring (2008) noted that “public schools were established to distribute knowledge to children and youth;” (p. 5) and that education was “hailed as a means of ending poverty, providing equality of opportunity, and increasing national wealth” (p. 7). Public education began in Massachusetts in 1635 when Puritan settlers established a school (later to become known as Boston Latin School) for boys of various socio-economic backgrounds in the home of Schoolmaster Philemon Pormont (Boston, 2010).

Spring (2008) speaks to the theme in United States history of “the use of the school as a means of spreading a particular culture” (p. 23). He also writes about forefathers of United States history developing the common school movement for a positive purpose: “It was argued that if children from a variety of religious, social-class, and ethnic backgrounds were educated in common there would be a decline in hostility and friction among social groups” (p. 75).

David Nieto (2009) has a similar perspective on this co-mingling of all children in our nation’s public school classrooms: “Prior to the twentieth century, the U.S. Government had actively imposed the use of English among Native Americans and the inhabitants of the incorporated territories of the Southwest” (p. 2). He refers to this practice as ensuring “linguistic and cultural control” (p. 2).

The history of language learning education goes back to 1839, when Ohio was the first state in the United States to adopt a bilingual education law. It allowed parents the choice to have their children taught in German:

In Cincinnati, there was a large minority of German Immigrants attending American schools that were inferior to those in Germany. Even worse parents were forced to pay
tuition and taxes for their children to attend these shoddy schools. Americans soon
came concerned that people who spoke foreign languages should be assimilated into
the American way of life through English. In order to attract students, Ohio decided to
pass a law that required schools to provide an instructor that was qualified in teaching
German and English languages together. (Mora, 2011)

Ohio was not the only state to pass a law to teach students in their native language.
Louisiana followed suit in 1847 (PBS, 2001) with its own language learning law, allowing
students to be taught in French and English.

In the 1870s, the school superintendent of St. Louis, Missouri, William Harris, who later
became the United States Commissioner of Education, supported bilingual education. He was
quoted as saying, “national memories and aspirations, family traditions, customs and habits,
morals and religious observances cannot be suddenly removed or changed without disastrously
weakening the personality” (PBS, 2001). Mr. Harris is credited with establishing the first
kindergarten in America, taught solely in German, which gave immigrants a head start in the St.

At the same time some states were allowing bilingual education to happen, others were
denying it. Texas passed The Nationality Act in 1906, requiring immigrants to speak English in
order to begin the process of becoming naturalized and legitimizing the use of language as a
mode of exclusion and discrimination (Kubera & Phillips, 2005). Spring (2008) wrote that in
1918 it became a crime in Texas to “teach in any language but English” (p. 239). Spring also
noted that at that time of the Nationality Act, there was a sentiment that “all Americans must be
taught to read and write and think in one language” (p. 243). By the 1920s, during World War I,
anti-German sentiment turned to hostility to other languages, and many bilingual education programs around the country were dismantled (PBS, 2001).

While states and local districts were limiting the schooling of non-English speaking peoples, the United States government worked to limit immigration and the rights of immigrants through a series of laws. In 1917, during the uncertainty of World War I, Congress passed the Burnett Act, considered to be the “first widely restrictive immigration law” (Historian, 2010). Provisions of this act included a literacy test to demonstrate comprehension in any language; taxes for new immigrants; a provision that allowed immigration officials more discretion in deciding whom to exclude; and a barring of immigrants from certain Asian countries.

The Immigration Act of 1924 followed the Burnett Act. While the Burnett Act limited rights of immigrants who were already living in the United States, the Immigration Act established a quota system that made it clear how many immigrants could come to the United States. The quota system allowed “immigration visas to two percent of the total number of people of each nationality in the United States as of the 1890 national census” (Historian, 2010).

The new law excluded immigrants from Asia while increasing opportunities for individual from the British Isles and Western Europe to immigrate. The 1924 Immigration Act made further exclusions of people from Asia.

With these laws passed, limiting the number of certain immigrant groups as well as the rights of immigrants already here in the United States, “the ideal of American homogeneity was preserved” (Historian, 2010).

Once limitations were made on immigration laws, the government could focus on public educational policy and determine how immigrants should be educated: in English or in their native language. This question played out from the White House all the way down to individual
school districts. One “effect on public schools was to end most Americanization programs and to shift educational policy away from concerns about teaching non-English speaking students” (Spring, 2008, p. 313). Nieto (2009) sees this shift as hostile. He cites President Theodore Roosevelt as saying, “We have room but for one language in this country, and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns our people as Americans, of American nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boardinghouse” (p. 2).

At the same time, there was support for students being educated in their native languages. The U. S. Supreme Court ruled that a Nebraska law prohibiting instruction in any foreign language violated the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution by limiting individual inalienable rights (Nieto, 2009, p. 3). In 1927, the U. S. Supreme Court ruled that “prohibiting schools to teach in a language other than English violates constitutional rights protected under the Fifth Amendment (p. 3). “In 1949, Mo Hock Ke Lok Po v. Stainback, the judge sentenced that parents have the right to have their children taught in the language they choose” (p. 3).

When the Civil Rights movement began in the 1950s and 1960s, educating immigrants began to be considered a Civil Rights issue. The 1954 case, Brown vs. the Board of Education of Topeka, was considered to be instrumental in desegregating America schools. The U. S. Supreme Court declared that “enforced segregation of schools inherently promotes inequality and ordering its immediate desegregation” (Nieto, 2009, p. 3). This decision was followed by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that outlawed discrimination due to race, color and national origin. The result of the passage of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was that federal funds could “be withheld from school districts that maintained segregation or did not promote integration” (p. 3).

In 1968, the first federal legislation was enacted in reference to bilingual education. Prior to that, educational decisions had been left to states and school districts (San Miguel, 2004, p. 5).
This legislation was enacted in response to the NEA report of 1966 describing discriminatory educational practices toward Mexican American children. The results of this legislation were as follows: (1) it challenged the dominant ideology of the causes of underachievement, (2) it challenged the dominant belief in the importance of assimilation, (3) it referred to the native language as a handicap, and (4) it unified the diverse supporters of improvements in education for non-English speakers (p. 12).

In 1968, the Bilingual Education Act (also known as Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) was passed by Congress. Considered to be the “most important law recognizing linguistic minority rights” (Nieto, 2009, p. 2) in the United States, it did not force districts to offer bilingual education but it did encourage schools to “experiment with pedagogical approaches by funding programs that targeted principally low-income and non-English speaking populations” (p. 3).

The main idea of this law was to “provide part of the instruction in the student’s native language in order to ease his/her transition in the mainstream (i.e. transitional bilingual education) (Nieto, 2009, p. 3). This Act was not without problems. San Miguel (2004) describes five shortcomings: (1) the amount of money was not large – only $85 million vs. $1 billion for funding of other compensatory educational programs, (2) school district participation was voluntary with no requirement for implementation mandated, (3) the language was categorical in nature and compensatory in intent, (4) there were no requirements for curriculum or instruction noted, and (5) there was a lack of definition when it came to fundable programs, goals, and teacher materials (p. 18).

The shortcomings described above led to an amendment of the Bilingual Education Act in 1974. The changes included an explicit definition of bilingual programs, along with identified
goals, as well as a description of how the programs were determined to be successful was included. In addition, there was an elimination of the low-income requirements that were included in the Act of 1968 (Nieto, 2009, p. 3).

Congress and the United States Supreme Court had similar agendas in 1974. The United States Supreme Court ruled that school districts were responsible for providing support to English Language Learners. This case, one dealing with Chinese speaking students in San Francisco, “reasoned that the responsibility to overcome language barriers that impeded full integration of students falls on the school boards and not on the parents or children (Nieto, 2009, p. 4). Lau v. Nichols was ruled on in 1974 by the U. S. Supreme Court. Lau v. Nichols pointed out that (1) similar facilities, textbooks, teachers and curriculum do not automatically mean equal education for students who do not understand English; and (2) that without Basic English skills students would not find meaning in their schooling. The decision states:

Under these state-imposed standards there is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education.

Basic English skills are at the very core of what these public schools teach. Imposition of a requirement that, before a child can effectively participate in the educational program, he must already have acquired those basic skills is to make a mockery of public education. We know that those who do not understand English are certain to find their classroom experiences wholly incomprehensible and in no way meaningful. (Douglas, 1974)
In 1975, following the Lau decision, the Office of Civil Rights released a set of guidelines that would assist school departments in complying with the Supreme Court decision. San Miguel (2004) speaks of these remedies as discrediting “English language approaches to educating language minority children” and declaring “that bilingualism was the only appropriate approach for improving educational access to curriculum and school performance” (p. 36).

In 1981, in the case Castañeda v. Pickard established further definitions for the interpretation of the Lau Remedies by specifically establishing a three-part test to evaluate the adequacy of a district's program for ELL students. Questions asked in the review of ELL programs include

(1) is the program based on an educational theory recognized as sound by some experts in the field or is considered by experts as a legitimate experimental strategy; (2) are the programs and practices, including resources and personnel, reasonably calculated to implement this theory effectively; and (3) does the school district evaluate its programs and make adjustments where needed to ensure language barriers are actually being overcome (OCR, 2005).

During the 1980s, organized opposition to bilingual education grew. Spring (2008) noted that the Reagan administration began to appoint opponents of bilingual education to positions in the Department of Education (such as William Bennett as Secretary of Education) and in doing so “expressed preference for immersing non-English speaking children in the English language, rather than teaching them in a bilingual context” (p. 439). Nieto (2009) cites the Reagan administration for leading a “major campaign against bilingual education and in favour of a ‘back to basics’ education” (p. 4). In his first term, President Reagan declared,
it is absolutely wrong and against American concept to have a bilingual education program that is now openly, admittedly, dedicated to preserving their native language and never getting them adequate in English so they can go out into the job market. (Council, 1992)

The sentiment that President Reagan implies is a racist one. Referring to “their” and “they” as if the group of people have no rights to a native language or culture influenced the development of groups that had the same intention: the elimination of bilingualism. It was during this time that U.S. English was founded by California Senator Samuel Ichiye Hayakawa. One of U.S. English’s main goals is for English to be the official language of the United States. Another goal is to end transitional bilingual education:

The U.S. ENGLISH Foundation contends that learning English quickly and learning it with English-speaking peers is the best way for English learners to get ahead academically and socially. Although English learners do require special language assistance, it is the Foundation's stance that this assistance should be short-term and transitional. (U. S. English Foundation, 2011)

The federal government also wanted to limit bilingual education. This was evident during the 1980’s when the Reagan administration decreased federal funding for bilingual education, allowing an increased percentage to go to alternative programs that did not use the native language. Initially, only 4 to 10 percent of the total bilingual education funding could be used towards Special Alternative Instructional Programs (SAIP). By 1985 25% could be used toward SAIP and Secretary of Education William Bennett was advocating taking the cap off of the percentage and giving more control locally (Council, 1992).
In 1994, the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized under the Improving America’s Schools Act. The purpose of this law was to develop bilingual skills and multicultural understanding so that immigrants could become “fluent English speakers, but also a potential asset to improve the country’s prospects” (Nieto, 2009, p. 4). The Bilingual Education Act resulted in the “promotion and establishment of developmental bilingual education, which included ‘two-way’ bilingual programs” (p. 4).

In spite of the passage of the Bilingual Act of 1994, opponents to bilingualism were working to limit bilingual education and pass laws that encouraged English-only. In 1996, the United States House of Representatives approved designating English as the country’s official language; this did not pass in the Senate (Nieto, 2009, p. 4). During this same time period, states were working to abolish bilingual education at the state level. In 1998, Proposition 227 was passed in California. This required that “all public school education be conducted in English” and provided “initial short-term placement, not normally exceeding one year, in intensive sheltered English immersion programs for children not fluent in English (“English language in public schools initiative statute”, 1997). It should be noted that Collier and Thomas (2004) speak to the short-sightedness of the one-year limit on educational programming for English Language Learners: “In every study conducted, we have consistently found that it takes six to eight years, for ELLs to reach grade level in L2” (p. 5).

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) of 1965 was sent to Congress on January 23, 2001 by President George W. Bush. This law favored a monolingual and monocultural society. According to President Bush, “the primary objective of U.S. schools should be the teaching of English without any major support for the preservation of the minority language” (Spring, 2008, p. 489).
With the passage of NCLB, Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students, or Title III of NCLB, became the law of the land for language learner education. In addition, the term bilingual was completely removed from the legislation and all federal offices and programs (Gándara & Rumberger, 2009, p. 16). Title III of NCLB speaks to the importance of making sure that all children who do not speak English as a native language learn to do so in order that they can achieve academically at high levels. Title III promotes parental and community participation. Title III holds states and school districts accountable for increases in English proficiency and adequate yearly progress made in core content areas ("No Child Left Behind Act of 2001," 2002).

August et al. (2010) called NCLB a “step forward in federal policy for ELLs. . . [it has] fostered greater inclusion of ELLs in standards-based instruction, assessment, and accountability and has brought wider attention to both the language and academic content of ELLs” (p. 1).

A closer inspection of Title III shows that the federal government does not suggest how states can actually achieve the goal of educating ELLs. One provision states that Title III will “develop high-quality language instruction educational programs designed to assist State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools in teaching limited English proficient children and serving immigrant children and youth” ("No Child Left Behind Act of 2001," 2002). Reading down a few paragraphs is the contradictory statement that Title III will provide “State educational agencies and local educational agencies with the flexibility to implement language instruction educational programs, based on scientifically based research on teaching limited English proficient children, that the agencies believe to be the most effective for teaching English” ("No Child Left Behind Act of 2001," 2002).
This lack of guidance has not gone unnoticed. In their research, Gándara and Rumberger (2009) note a lack of support of the federal government:

Although federal policy has shifted over the years, often resulting in bitter fights between the Department of Education and immigrant advocacy groups, in reality, relatively little direction has been given to states as to how to effectively educate their immigrant students despite a growing body of research evidence. (p. 8)

In summary, the history of language learning education in the United States provides principals with an understanding of how immigrants were educated in the United States over time in order to gain a broader understanding of the current language learning education system. The preceding review of the history of the education of immigrant students follows, through time, the question mentioned at the beginning of this section: Is it best to educate ELLs in English only or in their native language plus English? Throughout history what was best for immigrant students was dependent on what was happening in the country at the time. Prior to World War I, local schools were left on their own to determine how to teach their immigrant population. After World War I, with a growing distrust and animosity toward immigrants, restrictions were made about including immigrants at the federal government level. During the Civil Rights movement of the 1950’s and 60’s, it became apparent that immigrants’ rights were being denied based on governmental policies. The result was the Civil Rights Act of 1965 that sought to end discrimination, including educational discrimination, based on race, color and national origin. From the open-ended Bilingual Education Act of 1968 that recognized language minority rights to the passage of the more restrictive NCLB in 2002 that spoke to instruction of immigrant students in English, the federal government has attempted to guide states and local school districts in the education of students who are English Language Learners. This guidance
has not been decisive, allowing states much leeway when it comes to implementation of educational programs for English Language Learners.

The federal government has given limited guidance to states but has not attached the funding that states would need to implement regulations. States are responsible for interpreting the federal policy and for paying for it. The following section will focus on how Massachusetts has interpreted federal policy in order to legislate, develop and implement education for students who are not native English speakers.

**Current Educational Policy in Massachusetts**

Massachusetts has also struggled to determine how to best educate immigrants throughout its history. This struggle, similar to the one the United States faced, has been dependent on the combination of politics and immigrant group advocacy and has responded to the lack of an effective education for English Language Learners. For example, Uriarte and Chavez (2000) note that “during the 1950s and 1960s, large numbers of Latino children went uneducated. Studies of the time reveal that, in Boston, thousands of Latino children were not attending school because of the exclusionary practices of the school system” (p. 1). Difficulties that faced children who did attend school included English-only classrooms and a devaluation of their cultures. As this was a common experience around the country, Latino parents nationally advocated for the “development of educational opportunities for Latino children. The struggle in Massachusetts led to the first state-mandated, transitional bilingual-education program in the United States in 1969” (p. 1).

The education of Latino students in Boston was impacted by the federal court order to desegregate in the early 1970’s. Uriarte and Chavez (2000) reported that
Latino parents found themselves torn between the ideals of desegregation and the need to protect the interests of their multiracial children in a system polarized racially in black and white. Much organizing energy from the community and its advocates went into seeking protection for Latino children during the desegregation process, as well as to guaranteeing effective implementation of bilingual-education programs. (p. 1)

Nieto’s (2009) history of language learning education in Boston speaks to the combination of two forces coming together to develop extensive Bilingual Education programs. One, “the struggle of the Latino community in Massachusetts (p. 5) and the other the fact that the Boston School Committee “refused unashamedly to comply with the federal court’s mandates to desegregate public schools” (p. 5). The advocacy of the Latino community and Judge Arthur Garrity’s action in 1974 in overriding the Boston School Committee’s refusal to desegregate, collectively led to the development of “intensive Bilingual Education programs” (p. 5). The goals of the English Language Education Law, MGL Chapter 71A were to support the academic learning of students who are not proficient in English by providing access to learning academic content in the students’ native languages while students were learning English and to address the disproportionately high drop-out rate for this group of students. MGL Chapter 71A required any school district with 20 or more ELL students in the same language group to provide them with Transitional Bilingual Education for a period of three years. (Serpa, 2011, p. 14)

From the early 1970’s to the early part of the 21st century, Massachusetts law mandated that districts with 20 or more Limited English Proficient students to have Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) programs. Prior to 2003, there were 40 of these programs in existence across
Massachusetts. According to Skinner (2008), the focus of the TBE program was to teach English Language Learners in substantially separate classrooms as they gradually acquired the English language skills to be successful in English-only classrooms. Students were taught with combined Bilingual (BL) and English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) instruction; subject matter content begins with BL instruction and, as students acquire proficiency in English, through ESL instruction. In general, students transitioned to English-only classes within three years. (p. 2)

In his Foreword for Rossell and Baker (1996), Charles Glenn Jr., one of the authors of the enactment of the Massachusetts Transitional Bilingual Education Act of 1971, stated that in transitional bilingual education we seek to integrate children while educating them separately. We seek to build upon their home language while dropping its use and development as soon as they are judged capable of doing schoolwork in English, we seek to make them educationally successful while not daring to ask them to take the standardized tests by which we measure the progress of other pupils. (p. xiv)

Glenn also warned that “we must do better to ensure that no language minority child is educationally segregated by the failure of our good intentions” (Rossell & Baker, 1996, p. xv).

Following the passage of Prop 227 in California (which required all public school instruction to be in English), Massachusetts had its own referendum question, authored, interestingly enough, by Ron Unz, who authored Prop 227 in California. This question had the intent to abolish bilingual education, i.e. immigrant students would “be taught English as rapidly and effectively as possible” (Galvin, 2002a). Question 2, as it was known, was based on the
belief that Massachusetts public schools had done a poor job at educating immigrant students (Nieto, 2009).

What follows is a summary of Question 2. It should be noted that there were no research citations included in Question 2. Question 2 began with the provision that “the English Language is the common public language of the United States of America and of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts” (Galvin, 2002a) and assumed that “immigrant parents are eager to have their children become fluent and literate in English, thereby allowing them to fully participate in the American Dream of economic and social advancement” (Galvin, 2002a).

Question 2 stated that it was the constitutional duty of the government and public schools of Massachusetts to “provide all of Massachusetts’s children, regardless of their ethnicity or national origins, with the skills necessary to become productive members of our society. (Galvin, 2002a), citing that “the public schools of Massachusetts have done an inadequate job of educating many immigrant children, requiring that they be placed in native language programs whose failure over past decades is demonstrated by the low English literacy levels of those children (Galvin, 2002a).

Question 2 indicated that literacy in the English language is among the most important skill for immigrant children to learn and stated that “immigrant children can easily acquire full fluency and literacy in a new language, such as English, if they are taught that language in the classroom as soon as they enter school (Galvin, 2002a).

On November 5, 2002, Massachusetts voters voted to pass Question 2 in all 14 counties. A total of 2,220,301 votes were cast with 1,359,935 people voting “Yes” and 640,525 people voting “No.” To note, there were 219,841 blanks (Galvin, 2002b, p. 52).
This “Yes” vote led to the 2002 enactment of the new Chapter 71A Law: Transitional Bilingual Education. The new Chapter 71A Law specifies that “all children in Massachusetts public schools be taught in English and that all children be placed in English language classrooms” ("English language education in public schools," 2002).

The new Chapter 71A Law states that English Language Learners “shall be educated through sheltered English immersion during a temporary transition period not normally intended to exceed one school year” and when they “acquire a good working knowledge of English and are able to do grade-level school work in English, they shall no longer be classified as English learners and shall be transferred to English language mainstream classrooms” ("English language education in public schools," 2002).

The new Chapter 71A Law clarified that “foreign language classes for children who already know English, 2-way bilingual programs for students in kindergarten through grade 12 and special education programs for physically or mentally impaired students shall be unaffected” ("English language education in public schools," 2002).

The passage of the new Chapter 71A resulted in most bilingual classrooms being “substituted with sheltered English immersion (SEI) programs whose main purpose was to teach English acquisition and content instruction at the same time” (Nieto, 2009, p. 6). Uriarte and Karp (2009) note that SEI programs are based on a misconception of how English as a second language is acquired. Specifically,

the English language is acquired quickly when taught through meaningful content and effective interaction. SEI programs rely on the use of simple English in the classroom to impart academic content, using students’ native languages only to assist students in completing tasks or to answer a question (p. 2)
Through their research, Klingner, Hoover and Baca (2008) concur with the premise of a misconception of SEI as the best method for ELLs to acquire English. Their research has led to the following findings:

1. Native language instruction helps students learn English and is more effective than immersion in English only.
2. Skills developed in students’ native language transfer to English, particularly when teachers help students make connections across languages.
3. Students acquire English when they receive comprehensible input (scaffolding or support to help students make sense of the input, e.g. through gestures, visuals or simplified language. (p. 30)

Thomas and Collier (2004) refer to sheltered programs as remedial. Their research found that, while sheltered programs may provide support for ELLs for one to four years, students lost ground in the mainstream setting during the isolation of a SEI program. They concluded that students would need to make more than one year’s worth of progress each year in order to catch up with their monolingual peers (p. 2).

In its interpretation of the law, the Massachusetts Department of Secondary and Elementary Education (DESE) requires school districts to “ensure the progress of LEP students in developing listening comprehension, speaking, reading and writing in English” and to provide instruction in the “two components of SEI: English as a Second Language/English Language Development and sheltered content” (Coordinated program review procedures: School district information packet, 2010 - 2011). The state defines sheltered content instruction as “instruction that includes approaches, strategies and methodology that make the context of the lesson more
comprehensible to students who are not yet proficient in English” (Coordinated program review procedures: School district information packet, 2010 - 2011).

One instructional resource used in sheltered instruction is the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). One “goal of the SIOP model is to guide teachers toward teaching content to all students and simultaneously assist English learners in developing literacy skills” (McIntyre, Kyle, Chen, Muñoz, & Beldon, 2010, p. 338). Another goal of the SIOP model “is to build on students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds to help students connect instruction to their known worlds and to use the patterns of their first language to build English skills” (McIntyre et al., 2010, p. 346).

Echevarria and Short (2008) have done research on the SIOP model and write that in Sheltered Immersion “language and content objectives are systematically woven into the curriculum of one particular subject area” (p. 8).

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Education defines English as a Second Language instruction (or English language development or ELD) as explicit, direct instruction about the English language intended to promote English language acquisition by LEP students and to help them “catch up” to their student peers who are proficient in English. It includes learning outcomes in speaking, listening comprehension, reading and writing. ESL/ELD instruction is a required part of an academic program for LEP students. ESL instruction should be based on an ESL curriculum and appropriate ESL/ELD textbooks and other materials.

ESL instruction addresses social and academic vocabulary, grammar and syntax commonly used in both social and academic communication, habits and norms of social and academic instruction in American schools, and strategies that promote second
language learning and content learning. In an effective ESL classroom, learning takes place where there is sustained verbal interaction, often in small groups, as the students complete carefully designed academic tasks that include speaking, listening, reading and writing. Effective ESL instruction is often characterized by the use of thematic units, project-based instruction, and language instruction closely aligned with grade-appropriate content standards. ("Designing and implementing sheltered English immersion (SEI) programs in low incident districts," 2006)

According to the First Report of the English Language Learner sub-committee of the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Committee on the Proficiency Gap (2009), SEI programs rely on the “Intensive use of ESL to learn English and the use of simple English in the classroom to impart academic content, completing tasks or to answer a question (p. 6). This report concludes that this type of program puts “tremendous pressure on school systems to teach English quickly and effectively. Unlike transitional or maintenance bilingual programs, which provide academic content in the student’s own language while the student learns English, in immersion programs, content is delivered primarily in English” (p. 15).

In 2009, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education commissioned the English Language Learners Sub-Committee of the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Committee on the Proficiency Gap to inform them on what was needed to improve education for ELLs. Its report, *Halting the Race to the Bottom: Urgent Interventions for the Improvement of the Education of English Language Learners in Massachusetts and Selected Districts* did not directly focus on the success or lack of success that has been attributed to the Sheltered English Immersion model. The English Language Learners
Sub-Committee of the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Committee on the Proficiency Gap (2009) noted that

using student outcomes in MCAS ELA as an indicator of attainment of English proficiency, we can conclude that current English instruction leads to proficiency for only about 20% of English Language Learners and that the time frame for even that small group of students to attain proficiency is long (five years or more in Massachusetts schools). (p. 17)

In spite of commissioning the report, the DESE has largely ignored its findings.

The finding that only 20% of ELLs have achieved proficiency on the ELA portion of the MCAS after five years clashes with Collier and Thomas’s (1997) definition of success, “English learners reaching eventual full educational parity with native-English speakers in all school content subjects (not just in English proficiency) after a period of at least 5-6 years” (p. 7) shows that current outcomes should not be considered successful. The authors continue to state that a “successful educational program” is a program whose typical students reach long-term parity with national native-English speakers (50th percentile or 50th NCE on nationally standardized tests) or whose local English learners reach the average achievement level of native-English speaking students in the local school system. A “good program” is one whose typical English learners close the on-grade-level achievement gap with native-English-speaking students at the rate of 5 NCEs (equivalent to about one-fourth of a national standard deviation) per year for 5-6 consecutive years and thereafter gain in all school subjects at the same levels as native-English speaking students. (p. 7)

Thomas and Collier (1997) also point out that within an English-only program, it would take multiple years for ELLs to catch up with their grade-level peers: “For ELLs, progress at the
typical rate of native-English speakers means maintaining the initial large gap, not closing it, as
the native-English speakers continue to make additional progress” (p. 46).

Recent data indicate that English Language Learners enrolled in Massachusetts public
schools numbered 68,820 in the 2010 – 2011 school year (Serpa, 2011, p. 2). According to the
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Student Information System (SIMS) data
collection report that “as of October 1, 2009, 59 districts in the Commonwealth reported an
enrollment of 100 or more English Language Learners while 315 districts report at least one
English Language Learner” (Chester, 2010b, p. 3).

According to Chester (2010b), districts that enroll fewer than 100 English Language
Learners are referred to as “low-incidence districts,” (p. 3) and “within these low-incidence
districts English Language Learners may be distributed across all grade levels and all schools
within a district” (p. 3).

The tremendous pressure is a result of the interpretation and implementation of Question
2 that “all children in Massachusetts public schools shall be taught English as rapidly and
effectively as possible” ("Question 2: English language education in public schools", 2002)
coupled with the fact that learning to read is not necessarily an easy process for native English
speakers, let alone non-native speakers of English. And, as Murphy (2009) queries, “How can
students learn to both read and speak a new language at the same time?” (p. 27).

To answer Ms. Murphy’s question, Massachusetts law allows school districts to choose
from a range of programs when it comes to educating English Language Learners. The
following table, from the From Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary
Education’s Student Information System (SIMS), gives an overview of the language learner
education programs that are found in Massachusetts schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English Language Learners Program Options in Massachusetts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Not enrolled in an English Language Learner program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Sheltered English immersion — A full day of sheltered grade-level subject matter instruction and English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction. Sheltered subject matter instruction is content instruction modified such that an LEP student may comprehend it and participate in the class at his or her level of English proficiency. All instruction and materials are in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Two-way bilingual — A bilingual program in which students develop language proficiency in two languages by receiving instruction in English and another language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Other bilingual education (for waivered students only) — An instructional program, including transitional bilingual education, in which the native language of the LEP student is used to deliver some subject matter instruction. These programs must also provide for English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>LEP student whose parent/guardian has consented to opt out of all ELL programs offered in the district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The decision of what program to offer is one that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts leaves up to school districts. Though it is known that “ELLs perform better in programs that are designed with their needs in mind, programs that foster challenging activities, language development, and appropriate assessments” (Nieto, 2009, p. 7), most school districts in Massachusetts use the Sheltered English Immersion programs. “Most students of limited English proficiency (83%) are enrolled in programs for English Language Learners. SEI programs hold the largest proportion of students, 77% of all students of limited English proficiency are in a SEI program” (Uriarte & Karp, 2009, p. 3). In fact, Uriarte and Karp (2009) go on to state that
most of the districts with high density of English Language Learners cluster their students in SEI programs, offering few other alternatives for students. Only Framingham and Brockton, and to a lesser extent Worcester, have developed a broader array of programs. Districts with a broader array of program options can be more responsive in meeting the diverse needs of English Language Learners. (p. 8)

Nieto (2009) agrees that many programs offered are not designed for ELLs and that existing programs may not “account for differences in English language proficiency or academic ability” (p. 7). Uriarte and Karp (2009) agree that “… districts show a narrow range of options to address the diversity in age and literacy level of students of limited English proficiency” (p. 13) concluding that “… a broader array of program options can be more responsive to the diverse needs of English Language Learners” (p. 13).

As was reported earlier in this section, there is growing evidence that the current model is not working. Thomas and Collier (1997) cautioned, “the field of bilingual/ESL education not to focus so much on the name or label of a given program, but instead to think about the underlying characteristics that lead to a given program’s success” (p. 48). The English Language Learners Sub-Committee of the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Committee on the Proficiency Gap (2009) cited the following issues that need further investigation:

- There has been broad variation in the implementation of the changes to ELL educational programming across the state’s districts.
- There has been an increase in the proportion of LEPs referred to special education.
- There has been an increase in the annual high school drop-out rate of students of limited English proficiency.
• There have been gaps in the availability of trained ESL teachers and of teachers in the four categories of skills that teachers need to have in order to teach sheltered content.

• There have been interventions by the U. S. Department of Justice to protect the educational opportunities of students if limited English proficiency. (pp. 4-5)

Further investigation about the proportion of LEPs referred to special education has been done by Serpa (2011). She reports that there has been an increase of 115.4% from 2001-2002 to 2010 – 2011. In fact, “the percentage of ELLs who have been placed in Special Education programs grew noticeably during the 2000s, from 9.8% in 2001-2002 to 14.8% in 2010-2011” (p. 3).

Thomas and Collier (1997) studied research findings from “five large urban and suburban school districts in various regions of the United States where large numbers of language minority students attend public schools, with over 700,000 language minority student records collected from 1982-1996” (p. 11). They concluded that the program with the highest long-term academic success is two-way bilingual education. This is an integrated form of bilingual education in which all students may participate. Since this is a mainstream, grade-level model of schooling, it is the most cost-effective model of bilingual education, because add-on services do not need to be provided by extra staff (p. 52)

Collier and Thomas (2004) go as far as to classify Sheltered English Immersion and Transitional Bilingual Education models as remedial models, with an important flaw: children do not make progress fast enough and “to catch up to their peers, students below grade level must make more than one year’s progress every year to eventually close the gap” (p. 2). According to Collier and Thomas (2004), the two-way bilingual model is the most successful language
learning model. The two-way bilingual model, also known as “enrichment dual language schooling, is described as curricular mainstream courses taught in two languages with a focus on real world problem solving in a collaborative setting. Collier and Thomas (2004) have researched the success of this model. They found that enrichment dual language schooling closes the academic achievement gap in L2 [second language] and in first language (L1) students initially below grade level and for all categories of students participating in this program. This is the only program for English learners that fully closes the gap; in contrast, remedial models only partially close the gap. Once students leave a special remedial program and join the curricular mainstream, we find that, at best, they make one year’s progress each school year (just as typical native English speakers do), thus maintaining but not further closing the gap. (p. 2) Maria de Lourdes Serpa’s (2011) report concurs that Two-Way Model benefits students more than the Sheltered English Immersion. The full comparison between Sheltered English Immersion and the Two-Way Model can be found in Table 2.
Table 2

Comparison between SEI and Two-Way Major Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEI</th>
<th>TWO-WAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Academic proficiency in English only.</td>
<td>High academic language proficiency in two languages: English and the native language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Does not usually speak or understand the language of the student (i.e., the teacher does not understand the student’s language and thus the student is placed in an emotionally challenging position).</td>
<td>Speaks and understands the student’s language. (i.e. the teacher understands the student).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td>SEI has two components: English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction and sheltered content instruction taught in English.</td>
<td>Two-way has two components: English and native language (e.g., English + Spanish).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Instruction</td>
<td>English Sometimes with an explanation for academic concepts in the student’s L1.</td>
<td>Native language (L1) + English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone of proximal development (ZPD)</td>
<td>ZPD is restricted, particularly if ELLs have not already achieved the academic concepts or skills being taught. Learning rate (how fast) and amount (how many concepts, skills) of learning are affected negatively.</td>
<td>The ZPD is adequate because (all factors being equal) the students have meaningful language access to achieving grade-level content and their learning rate and amount are not affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>Only 20% achieve at grade level in MCAS ELA after five years; 80% take longer (Gap, 2009).</td>
<td>Most students achieve at grade level or above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Only ELLs of the same language or mixed-language backgrounds.</td>
<td>English-speaking students + ELLs (i.e., minority and majority language students learning to together in two languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teachers per Student</td>
<td>2 (i.e. one for SEI and one for ESL)</td>
<td>1 (i.e., each of the two teachers has an average of 20 or so students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of ELLs in each of the two program types in MA</td>
<td>Over 80%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>Most restrictive</td>
<td>Least restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Less cost effective</td>
<td>More cost effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Serpa, 2011, p. 52)
After longitudinally studying 23 school districts for nearly 15 years, Thomas and Collier (2004) derived several conclusions based on data that spanned students’ educational careers from entering school in Kindergarten or Grade 1 as a nonnative English speaker. They concluded:

- **English Language Learners (ELLs)** whose parents refuse bilingual/ESL services show large decreases in reading and math achievement by Grade 5. Cross-sectional findings indicate that the largest number of dropouts come from this group, and those remaining finish school near the 12th percentile (25th NCE) on the standardized reading test (from our 1996-2002 analyses).

- Proposition 227 in California (one year immersion in English classes, followed by immersion in the mainstream) has resulted in EVEN LESS gap closure than ESL pullout, the next lowest achieving program. There is no significant evidence of achievement gap closure by ELLs, especially in the secondary grades (from our analyses of CA Dept. of Education statewide test scores, 1998-2001).

- Typical end-of-school achievement for graduates of ESL pullout (2-3 years) is 11th percentile (24th NCE) - highest is 18th percentile (31st NCE); and its dropout rate is highest among the programs (from our 1991-1996 analyses).

- Graduates of ESL content (or sheltered instruction) for 2-3 years reach the 22nd percentile (34th NCE) by the end of their high school years - highest is 32nd percentile (40th NCE) (from our 1991-1996 and 1996-2002 analyses).

- Transitional bilingual education (TBE) in a segregated classroom 2-3 yrs., reaches the 24th percentile (35th NCE) (from our 1991-1996 analyses).

- TBE for 3-4 yrs., integrated with native-English speakers for half-day instruction in English, reaches the 32nd percentile (40th NCE) (from our 1991-1996 analyses).
• 90:10 TBE (Grades PK-2, 90 percent of instruction in minority language, gradually increasing majority language (English) instruction until by Grade 5, all instruction is in English for the remainder of schooling) reaches the 45th percentile (47th NCE) (from our 1996-2002 analyses).

• Enrichment 90:10 and 50:50 one-way and two-way dual language education programs (or developmental bilingual, bilingual immersion) are the only programs we have found to date that assist students to fully reach the 50th percentile in both L1 and L2 in all subjects and to maintain that level of high achievement, or reach even higher levels (highest we’ve seen is 83rd percentile-70th NCE), through the end of schooling. The fewest dropouts come from these programs. (One-way - one language group receiving schooling through two languages; Two-way - two language groups receiving integrated schooling through two languages.) (50:50 - half of the instructional year is taught in each language; 90:10 - early grades 90 percent instruction in minority language, gradually moving towards 50:50 by Grade 5.) (from our 1991-1996 and 1996-2002 analyses)

• When English Language Learners initially attend segregated, remedial programs, these students do not close the achievement gap after reclassification and placement in the English mainstream. Instead, they maintain or widen the gap in later years. Therefore, their average achievement NCE at reclassification should be as high as possible, since this is likely to be the highest achievement level that they reach during their school years. Ideally, instructional gains are best accomplished in an enrichment (not a remedial) program (from our 1991-1996 and 1996-2002 analyses).
• Socioeconomic status influences only 5% of achievement with strong programs, but as much as 18% for weaker programs. Therefore, effective and sustained programs can almost completely overcome the negative effects of low socioeconomic status (from our 1996-2002 analyses).

• The strongest predictor of L2 student achievement is amount of formal L1 schooling. The more L1 grade-level schooling, the higher L2 achievement (from our 1991-1996 and 1996-2002 analyses).

• Bilingually schooled students outperform comparable monolingually schooled students in academic achievement in all subjects, after 4-7 years of dual language schooling.

• Bilingual/ESL programs must be effective (at least 3-4 NCE gains per year-more than mainstream students are gaining), well implemented, not segregated, and sustained long enough (5-6 years) for the typical 25 NCE achievement gap between ELLs and native-English speakers to be closed. Even the most effective programs can only close half of the achievement gap in 2-3 years, the typical length of remedial ELL programs (from our 1991-1996 and 1996-2002 analyses). (pp. 1-2)

What matters most to the Massachusetts Department of Secondary and Elementary Education about the evaluation of ELLs is how they perform on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS). English Language Learners have performed poorly on the MCAS since the 2002 passage of No Child Left Behind and its mandate to assess all students. Two examples of MCAS results were cited in *Halting the Race to the Bottom: Urgent Interventions for the Improvement of the Education of English Language Learners in Massachusetts and Selected Districts*: 
- Current math instruction for English Language Learners leads to proficiency rates that are below 20% for 4th and 8th graders and rise to 32% among 10th graders.

- Proficiency rates in science are below 15% for both 8th and 10th graders. (p. 17)

It should be noted that both of these “measures represent the aggregate of LEP students at each of these grade levels without regard to their language proficiency” (p. 17).

There has been no movement, to date, of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary education to take notice of the low proficiency levels of ELLs and recommend different bilingual education models to school districts.

In Summary, Question 2 was an attempt to abolish bilingual education in Massachusetts. It was passed by a very large margin of voters who supported it. Question 2 resulted in the dismantling of bilingual education in Massachusetts. The law that followed the passage of the referendum was interpreted by the Massachusetts Department of Education narrowly and, in spite of the research that indicates the success of the two-way bilingual model, most school districts have been cited above as using the Sheltered English Immersion model as the new Chapter 71A (the law enacted after the passage of Question 2) specifically mentions the using the SEI model to teach ELLs English and along with moving ELLs to English language mainstream classrooms within one year. The movement to the SEI model seems to have ignored the large amount of research done that indicates it is not the optimum way to teach a nonnative speaker how to read, write and speak in English. The information examined in this section is essential for principals in Massachusetts to know and understand as it relates to the current law and programming that is in place in Massachusetts schools. While principals may not be allowed to implement programming in their schools, depending on their districts, they are better able to advocate for the other potentially more research-based bilingual educational programming.
English Language Learners will be able to pass these assessments when they can perform academic tasks in English. In order to do that, ELLs need to be able to read English. One of the stipulations of Question 2 was that literacy in the English language is one of the most important skills to teach. What neither Question 2 nor the new Chapter 71A speak to is how to teach literacy to English Language Learners. The following section will describe the suggested components of a reading program for ELLs.

**Teaching ELLs to learn to read English**

Teaching reading to ELLs is not the same as teaching reading to students for whom English is the native language. It involves more than good teaching, more than differentiation and more than a larger bag of tricks. Since one of the major tasks of a primary level teacher is to teach his or her students to learn to read, it is essential that grade-level teachers understand the similarities and differences between teaching reading to native English speakers and teaching reading to ELLs.

There are countless definitions of reading found in research and literature. Indrisano and Chall (1995) define reading as a combination of two concepts: “the medium, or word recognition (alphabetic writing that corresponds to the sounds of the words), and the message, the meaning (the story, the textbook, the recipe, the legal document) that is read” (pp. 66-67). In *Reading and the Brain*, Stanislas Dehaene (2009) describes reading as a parallel process: “the phonological route, which converts letters into speech sounds, and the lexical route, which gives access to a mental dictionary of word meanings” (p. 11).

Definitions of reading from experts in the field take us only so far; neither of the above-mentioned definitions considers the experience of ELLs. This was also the case when the National Reading Panel (2000) made its conclusions. In 1997, Congress asked the
Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), in consultation with the Secretary of Education, to convene a national panel to assess the status of research-based knowledge, including the effectiveness of various approaches to teaching children to read. (p. 7)

That report focused on the reading instruction of native English speakers and identified five essential areas: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.

August and Shanahan pointed out that the 2002 National Reading Panel (NRP) did not include studies that addressed how English Language Learners learn to read in English:

Enhanced teaching of the key components of English literacy provides a clear advantage to English Language Learners. . . However, while approaches that are similar to those used with native-language populations are effective, the research suggests that adjustments to these approaches are needed to have maximum benefit with language-minority students. (August & Shanahan, 2006b, p. 3)

Following the “conscious decision [of the NRP] not to include the scientific literature available in the development of language and literacy for those students learning to read in English for whom English was not their first or native language” (August & Shanahan, 2006a, p. ix), the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth was charged to do establish “a foundation for both current and future research on reading in language-minority students” (August & Shanahan, 2006a, p. x). It should be noted that the NLP went about its work in the same way that the NRP did: by examining research. The only difference was that the NLP did what the NRP did not do: it focused on effective reading instruction of ELLs.

In addition to determining how ELLs can best master the five elements of reading that were described in the NRP, the National Literacy Panel, or NLP (August & Shanahan, 2006) did
an equivalent work to the NRP with a focus on ELLs. Their findings indicated that ELLs need to develop oral language in addition to phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, & text comprehension. More specifically, in the Executive Summary of the report of the National Literacy Panel, August and Shanahan (2006a) point out that it takes more than good instruction to teach ELLs. In fact,

   instructional approaches found to be successful with native English speakers do not have as positive a learning impact on language-minority students. It is not enough to teach language-minority students reading skills alone. Extensive oral English development must be incorporated into successful literacy instruction. The most promising instructional practices for language-minority students bear this point: Literacy programs that provide instructional support of oral language development English, aligned with high-quality literacy instruction are the most successful. (p. 4)

In the Executive Summary of the National Literacy Panel Report, August and Shanahan (2006b) state that “teaching language-minority students to read and write well in English is an urgent challenge in the nation’s K – 12 schools” (p. 1). Kindler points out that some language-minority students are not faring well in U.S. schools. For the 41 states reporting, only 18.7% of English-language learners scored above the state-established norm for reading comprehension (p. 13). Kindler also reports that “since the 1990-91 school year, the Limited English Proficient population has grown approximately 105%, while the general school population has grown only 12%” (p. 3). According to Palmer et al. (2010) “as our nation’s cultural diversity continues to increase rapidly, English Language Learners laboring to build reading fluency and comprehension are a more frequent occurrence” (p. 44).
An important conclusion of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth (August & Shanahan, 2006a) was the understanding that there are six components that are essential in the teaching of reading: the five that the NRP focused on (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension), and oral language. A visual representation of the six components is illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1

*National Reading Panel and National Literacy Panel*

(Serpa & Colombo, 2010) Used with permission.

Lesaux and Geva (2006) have also studied the importance that oral language proficiency in teaching an ELL to learn to read in English. They provide support for the NLP when they conclude that

For language-minority learners, oral language proficiency plays an important role in the acquisition of skilled reading. Oral language proficiency is a complex construct that has been conceptualized and operationalized in diverse ways in research about English Language Learners. It includes both receptive and expressive skills and can also encompass knowledge or use of specific aspects of oral language, including phonology, vocabulary, morphology, grammar, discourse features, and pragmatic skills. (p. 55)
Lesaux and Geva (2006) go on to report that “reading comprehension is compromised when skills such as oral language and relevant prior knowledge are insufficient to support understanding of the text” (p. 62).

In addition to knowledge of six essential elements in reading instruction, the National Literacy Panel also looked at how to enhance the instruction that was cited by the National Reading Panel. This author compared the major findings of the NLP and the NRP and determined implications for teaching ELLs. The comparison, using sources that include August and Shanahan (2006a), National Reading Panel Report (2000), Klingner (2008) and Zacarian (2011) is delineated in Table 3.
### Table 3

*Elements of Reading in Comparing National Reading Panel and National Literacy Panel Findings and Implications*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Reading with the Definition</th>
<th>National Reading Panel ((NRP), 2000) Native English Speaking Students</th>
<th>National Literacy Panel (2006) English Language Learners</th>
<th>Implications For Teaching ELLs to Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Phonemic Awareness (PA)**            | Teaching children to manipulate phonemes in words was highly effective under a variety of teaching conditions with a variety of learners across a range of grade and age levels. Teaching phonemic awareness to children significantly improves their reading more than instruction that lacks any attention to phonemic awareness (p. 7).  
- Phoneme isolation, which requires recognizing individual sounds in words, for example, “Tell me the first sound in pain” (/p/) (p. 20)  
- Phoneme deletion, which requires recognizing what word remains when a specified phoneme is removed. For example, “What is smile without the /s/?” (mile) (p. 20) | Teaching ELLs to manipulate phonemes in words was also effective. However, ELLs are in the process of learning the new language.  
- Scaffold reading to ensure students comprehend the text they are reading or having read to them.  
- Helping students hear English sounds that don’t exist or are not salient in their home language is beneficial (August, 2006).  
- In testing phonological awareness, directions and practice given in both languages.  
- Use of a transition curriculum where sounds that are different/don’t exist in the first language are emphasized | Oral language is the foundation for influences phonemic awareness. ELLs need to speak and understand the English words used for PA  
- It is important to understand that all of the sounds in English are not present in other languages and therefore ELLs may not hear them. See Learner English (Swan & Smith, 2001) for detailed information about many languages and how these influence performance in English  
- Educators should not be quick to conclude that an ELL is not proficient in phonemic awareness if he cannot hear or pronounce certain sounds in words at the beginning stages of learning English. |

---

(Klingner et al., 2008, p. 59).
**Phonics**

“The understanding of sound-symbol correspondence or, in other words, which letters make which sounds” (Klingner et al., 2008, p. 61).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The meta-analysis revealed that systematic phonics instruction produces significant benefits for students in kindergarten through 6th grade and for children having difficulty learning to read (p. 9).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The teaching of phonics also produces benefits for ELLs:  
  - Teach meaning to words ELL students are learning to read; give students a lot of opportunity to read orally to build word automaticity (slide 18).  
  - Interactive oral reading of the text using sound second-language teaching techniques. |
| Phonics instruction begins with oral language instruction:  
  - Educators must understand that ELLs need to learn letter-sound relationships based on words they understand and speak in English as their second/new language. |

**Fluency (oral reading)**

“The ability to read quickly and accurately, with expression. Fluency requires both word recognition and comprehension” (Klingner et al., 2008, p. 63).

| Guided oral reading procedures that included guidance from teachers, peers, or parents had a significant and positive impact on word recognition, fluency, and comprehension across a range of grade levels (p. 12).  
  - Oral reading fluency practice is not a substitute for explicit phonics instruction. |
|---|
| Oral reading fluency is not to be confused with spoken fluency. Provide many opportunities for reading connected text connected to their level of English proficiency: after explicit instruction in letter-sound relationships, students engage in echo reading, whisper reading, cloze reading, and partner reading.  
  - Ensure that ELL students are practicing on text that is at the proper level and calibrated so the passages build on each other.  
  - Fluency practice is not a substitute for explicit phonics instruction. |
| Fluency for ELLs has two dimensions spoken fluency and oral reading fluency. Oral English language proficiency influences oral reading fluency. See stages of second language Page 60.  
  - The more an ELL practices reading and has interactive oral reading experiences, the smoother the fluency.  
  - Native English speakers use ‘meta-linguistic awareness’ since they know what the words and sentences should sound like and have an intuitive understanding of grammar. ELLs who are learning to read through English and are also learning to speak the new language. |
### Vocabulary

“Vocabulary is critically important in oral reading instruction and comprehension.

- Vocabulary instruction does lead to gains in reading comprehension.
- Methods must be appropriate to the age and the ability of the reader.
- Vocabulary must be taught both directly and indirectly (pp. 13-14).

Vocabulary is also critically important in oral reading instruction and comprehension for ELLs.

- Teach words: focused on a small number of words that students are likely to encounter often (e.g. heritage, values, periodically); help students make semantic links to other words and concepts related to the target word.
- Teach strategies: infer meaning from cultural context, use roots and affixes, cognates, morphological relationships, comprehension monitoring that are age and second language stage appropriate.
- Build word consciousness (slide 25).
- Immerse students in a language rich environment: appealing themes, variety of genres, games, cooperative activities. (N. Zacarian, 2011, p. 102).

Vocabulary starts with oral language development. Teachers need to consider academic language in the classroom. Academic language is

- The language used at school across all the academic content areas. For most students, this language must be learned in order to reach academic success. Needless to say, it is much more difficult for students to learn new concepts if they are taught in a second/foreign language. ("Why is academic vocabulary important?", 2008)

have not yet developed the oral language skills in English when it comes to proficiency in using grammatical structure.

- Fluency is directly related to knowledge of phonics and proficiency in oral language.
Reading comprehension is one of the ultimate goals of reading instruction. In general, evidence suggests that teaching a combination of reading comprehension techniques is the most effective. These techniques include: comprehension monitoring, cooperative learning, use of graphic and semantic organizers, question answering, question generation, story structure and summarization (p. 15).

Reading comprehension is also one of the ultimate goals of reading instruction for ELLs. It is related but different from oral language (or listening) comprehension.

- Identify and teach/clarify difficult/unknown words and passages within text to facilitate comprehension.
- Constantly monitor and build students’ comprehension (slide 29).
- Provide lots of opportunities for students to practice their second language (slide 29).
- Respond to students in ways that build oral proficiency and comprehension (slide 29).

Reading comprehension begins with the student’s understanding oral language and the teacher recognition of his/her cultural funds of knowledge.

- Teachers need to look at alternate/additional ways to check for ELLs’ understanding of text and focus “more on content and less on grammatical errors or accents” (Zacarian, 2011, p. 61)
- Consideration must be made to ensure that text is culturally relevant to student’s life experience.

### Oral Language

- includes the ability to communicate verbally in a functional and accurate way in the target language.” (Stein, 1999, p. 2)
- In Massachusetts, the MELA-O (Massachusetts English Language Assessment-Oral) is used

Oral language is not included or addressed in the National Reading Panel. “Having well-developed second language oral proficiency is associated with well-developed comprehension skills” (August & Shanahan, 2006a, p. 14)

- Oral language teaching is of paramount importance For ELLs learning to read in English. ELLs who are in the process of learning a second language need to understand and speak it in order to effectively connect to the written code.

Teachers must have an
to assess students in both Comprehension and Production (Fluency, Vocabulary, Pronunciation and Grammar) (Chester, 2010a).

understanding of second language acquisition and have access to second language teaching strategies and methods. See Category 1. Pages 63-64.

When evaluating student’s language proficiency please note the following:
• Assessments should be used cautiously since “bilingual students do not fit monolingual norms due to the nature of bilingualism” (Zacarian, 2011, p. 23).

Created by Stein, 2011.
It is essential to consider an enhanced definition of reading, one that includes English Language Learners. Serpa and Lira (2009) do so when they define reading as a language-based process that uses graphic symbols as a means of communication. Their definition highlights three critical concepts when it comes to defining teaching reading to English Language Learners: “(a) reading is a language-based process, (b) reading is communication, and (c) reading involves the use of graphic symbols (letters) as a means of communication” (pp. 1-2). In other words, ELLs need to speak and understand the language behind the code in their nonnative language.

Rance-Roney (2010) adds another element of literacy instruction to consider when working with ELLs: the “development of background information and cultural schema for reading. . . . ELLs need significantly more intensive and intentional vocabulary instruction than is needed to assist native-speaking struggling readers” (p. 387). This is due to the fact that they are learning a new language from scratch and simultaneously being asked to learn to read it. Rance-Roney also cites studies of students learning to read in their native language that speak to the need for students to have multi-modal exposures to words – oral, visual and in print – multiple times in order for students to gain word meanings (p. 389).

Murphy (2009) explains how hard it is to learn a new language when the student’s native language does not contain the same sounds as the second language:

one way that native English speakers learn to read is by applying phonic skills to sounds so that words on the page match their speaking vocabulary. English speakers can put together the initial sounds – such as /c/ /a/ /t/ - until they recognize the sounds as cat. But if the student doesn’t speak English, the word “cat” might be meaningless if he doesn’t recognize the spoken word. (p. 27)
From a completely different perspective, Willis (2007) makes the point that the experience of reading, or the anticipation of the experience of reading, should be so pleasurable for students that dopamine should be released as a result. She suggests that educators should provide enjoyable reading materials that induce pleasurable states in the brain, pacing lessons at comfortable speeds, giving students opportunities for self-satisfaction and acknowledging authentic achievement. The decodable reading books are often overly-simplistic, and their language sounds unnatural because of the limitations of phonetically decodable vocabulary. Such books lack personal relevance or interest to many young readers. They do not stimulate a student’s interest in reading. (p. 72)

Serpa and Lira (2009) point out that “reading instruction for ELL/CLD starts with teaching oral language as the foundation of learning to read as a meaning making process for students who are both (a) already readers in their first language or (b) who are non-readers in any language (p. 10). Figure 2 provides a visual representation of the elements that are necessary for ELL’s oral language development.
Teachers also need to understand what second language development looks like and that when learning a second language, ELLs go through natural stages of development. These stages, adapted from Stephen Krashen and Tracy Terrell’s *The Natural Approach* (1983), along with the characteristics, approximate time frames, and appropriate teacher prompts for each stage, are presented in Table 4.

Figure 2

*Similarities and differences in learning to read based on language cueing systems used by readers of L1 v L2* (Serpa & Colombo, 2010). Used with permission.
Table 4

Stages of second language acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Approximate Time Frame</th>
<th>Teacher Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preproduction “Silent Period”</td>
<td>The student • Has minimal comprehension • Does not verbalize • Nods “Yes” and “No” • Draws and points</td>
<td>0–6 months</td>
<td>• Show me... • Circle the... • Where is...? • Who has...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Production</td>
<td>The student • Has limited comprehension • Produces one- or two-word responses • Participates using key words and familiar phrases • Uses present-tense verbs</td>
<td>6 months–1 year</td>
<td>• Yes/no questions • Either/or questions • One- or two-word answers • Lists • Labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Emergence</td>
<td>The student • Has good comprehension • Can produce simple sentences • Makes grammar and pronunciation errors • Frequently misunderstands jokes</td>
<td>1–3 years</td>
<td>• Why...? • How...? • Explain... • Phrase or short-sentence answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Fluency</td>
<td>The student • Has excellent comprehension • Makes few grammatical errors</td>
<td>3–5 years</td>
<td>• What would happen if...? • Why do you think...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Fluency</td>
<td>The student has a near-native level of speech.</td>
<td>5–7 years</td>
<td>• Decide if... • Retell...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hill & Flynn, 2011)
Serpa & Lira (2009) report that along with “characteristics of students’ first language and interlingual influences on English level/stage of literacy achieved in the native language” (p. 3) and “students vocabulary in first and second language” (p. 3) teachers need to take “students’ stage of second language acquisition” into account “when teaching reading in English as a new language” (p. 3). This framework aligns with the work of Alford & Nino (2011) in that “knowledge of second language acquisition builds instructional capacity to respond to individual students continuously, creatively, and immediately” (p. 36). With an understanding of “basic tenets of second language acquisition and linguistics” (p. 39) teachers are better prepared “to respond to the needs of ELLs because they understand how to respond to students at varying proficiency levels in creative ways” (p. 39). Alford and Niño (2011) also point out that when teachers have an understanding of the second language acquisition process, they are better able to meet the needs of ELLs:

Once teachers have a solid foundation of the processes of second language acquisition, then teachers are ready to create strategies that respond to the diverse linguistic needs of their students, and then administrators are able to recognize responsive strategies. It is unrealistic to expect that learners will be at identical language proficiency levels in any given classroom. (p. 39)

Second language acquisition is a field of study that is beyond the scope of this research. For more information on the study of second language acquisition, refer to the works of Krashen (1982) and Valdés, Capitelli and Alvarez (2011).

In summary, primary grade level teachers are given the responsibility to teach children to read. As it is likely that primary classrooms include a combination of native and nonnative
English speakers, teachers need to have an understanding of the second language acquisition process in order to teach reading to both ELLs and native speaking students.

It is also important for elementary school principals to understand the second language acquisition process, as they are responsible for supervising and supporting primary teachers in their reading instruction of students on a daily basis. These skill deficits beg the question: How do teachers and principals develop the skills necessary to support ELLs in their quest to learn to read in English. The next section will fully explore this question.

**Preparing Teachers and Principals to work with ELLs**

As the numbers of ELLs in classrooms increase, elementary school teachers and principals are each faced with an overwhelming challenge. Teachers need to be able to teach nonnative speakers to learn to read in English. Principals need to be able to support teachers in the endeavor of teaching ELLs to learn to read in English. These challenges are impacted by the fact that there are teachers and principals who often lack the background, schooling and professional development needed to meet the needs of ELLs. Teachers do not have the skills required to successfully teach an ELL how to read in English and principals do not have the key understandings and critical understandings needed to support teachers in their work with ELLs. This section looks at teachers’ and principals’ needs in the area of gaining skills needed to work with ELLs.

Linda Darling-Hammond (2010) studied the status of teachers’ professional development. She found that “fewer than one-third of U. S. teachers received even eight hours of professional development on strategies for teaching students with disabilities or English Language Learners. Despite the strong desire that teachers voice for more learning opportunities in these areas” (p. 204). She goes on to state that
teachers need to know a lot more to teach today’s diverse students to more challenging learning standards than ever before-including how to teach much more ambitious disciplinary content and cross-disciplinary skills and how to teach special needs learners, English Language Learners, and others who require specialized forms of teaching. (p. 207)

Klingner et al. (2008) also studied this topic. They concluded that in order to provide ELLs with additional oral language instruction, districts and schools “should provide professional development in teaching reading to ELLs, and teachers should do all they can to learn about working with this population of students” (pp. 42-43).

Klingner et al. (2008) write that “teacher preparation should include a focus on the development of cultural and linguistic competence” (p. 111). However, “most classroom teachers in Massachusetts did not acquire the skills and knowledge required to effectively teach English Language Learners and shelter content instruction during their teacher preparation program” (Mitchell, 2010, p. 7).

In response to the new Chapter 71A law, to address the lack of teacher readiness in Massachusetts, the Department of Education developed a series of courses for all teachers that would teach them skills needed to work with English Language Learners. In 2004, then Commissioner of Massachusetts Department of Education, David P. Driscoll identified “four categories of knowledge & skills needed to effectively shelter content instruction and built teacher training modules around each category” (Policy, 2007, p. 3). These include

- Category I: Second Language Learning and Teaching: The objectives of Category I training are that teachers will know the key factors affecting second language acquisition and understand the implications of these factors on classroom instruction.
Teachers will also understand the implications of cultural difference for classroom instruction. Teachers will understand the performance levels in the *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes*. Teachers will be able to analyze their own classrooms as sites for second language acquisition and to modify instruction effectively for students who are in the process of learning English. This course is 10 – 15 hours in length. (Center, 2011)

- **Category II: Sheltering Content Instruction:** The objectives of Category II training are that teachers will know how to plan lessons appropriate for LEP students at the four levels of proficiency described in the *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes*. These lessons will be guided by both content and language objectives aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and will embody the principles of sheltered instruction, differentiating for students at multiple language proficiency levels within the classroom. This course is 30 – 40 hours in length. (Center, 2011)

- **Category III: Assessing Speaking and Listening:** The objectives of Category III are that teachers will be able to administer the MELA-O, an assessment tool designed to evaluate the English language comprehension (listening) and production (speaking) skills of LEP students also known as English Language Learners (ELLs), in grades K–12. This course is 10 hours in length. (Chester, 2010a)

- **Category IV: Reading and Writing in the Sheltered Content Classroom:** The objectives of Category IV training are that teachers will understand the process of literacy development in a new language and will learn a number of strategies for text comprehension, including cross-cultural considerations, text structure exploration,
discourse and syntax knowledge, writing-to-learn practice, and vocabulary building. Teachers will be able to plan and deliver content-area instruction appropriate for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English language reading and writing proficiency. This training is offered in two distinct series – one designed specifically for teachers of elementary students, and one for teachers of secondary students. This course is 15 – 20 hours in length. (Center, 2011)

The combination of all four category trainings prepares teachers to instruct ELLs by providing them with (a) an understanding of second language acquisition; (b) instruction and practice to plan lessons for ELLs by including content and language objectives; (c) knowledge about how to assess listening and speaking skills; and (d) an understanding of how literacy development differs in a nonnative language, specifically in the areas of reading and writing.

A shortage of trained ESL teachers has been plaguing Massachusetts schools for several years. From the Rennie Report (2007) which described a significant shortfall of teachers who lack the training needed to work successfully with English Language Learners to a more recent report to the Massachusetts legislature by Commissioner Mitchell (2010) when it was noted that “we continue to have a critical shortage of licensed ESL teachers in the Commonwealth” (p. i), there is marked lack of qualified teachers to teach ELLs. Commissioner Chester also reported that, of 70,395 educators in Massachusetts, only approximately 20,000 would have received training in one or more of the categories by the end of the 2009-2010 school year (p. 9).

This shortage was also highlighted in a recent letter from the United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division Equal Opportunities Section (USDOJ) to the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (2011): “Our current review has revealed
that the MADESE’s own monitoring since 2004 has identified 275 school districts (70% of those in the Commonwealth) with inadequately trained SEI teachers” (p. 2).

In her study of California principals, Gilliland (2010) found that principals seemed to “recognize that educators are not adequately meeting the needs of English Learners” (p. 83) as well as that “some teachers feel overwhelmed with trying to meet their [English Learners] needs” (p. 83). With this in mind, it is important to note that, “the principal plays a key role in ensuring that all teachers obtain training in ESL methodology” including “instruction and assessment” and the implementation “of differentiation” (Alford & Niño, 2011, pp. 12-13) for ELL students. In Massachusetts this translates into grade-level teachers taking all four ELL Category trainings.

The perspective of teachers on working with ELLs has been studied. Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly and Driscoll (2005) surveyed elementary teachers in California and found that teachers said “they lack sufficient time to do everything they need to do and that students lack adequate time to learn everything they need to learn” (p. 7). Specific frustrations centered around not having enough time to “teach their EL students the regular curriculum, English language development, and to understand and address other students’ needs” as well as indicating that the school day did not allow for necessary small group or individualized instruction (p. 7). Another concern expressed by the teachers in Gándara et al. (2005) was the wide range of language proficiency levels of ELLs in the classroom:

the same teacher might have orally proficient EL students who lack academic English skills, students who have just entered the country and have little or no English but who received education in their native language, native English speakers who have good academic preparation, and other students who have little formal education. In addition,
teachers must address the different academic needs of native and fluent English speakers in the same classroom. (p. 8)

Darling Hammond (2010) also speaks of the potential ramifications of a classroom with a wide range of proficiencies of English Language Learners: “In cases where teachers cannot manage [a] wide range, it can create a reverberating cycle of discouragement and failure for less experienced children who soon perceive that they are behind before they even begin” (p. 35).

To address the needs of teachers in gaining the skills necessary to teach English Language Learners, the Massachusetts 2RTI Working Group (2010b) recommend an outcome of increased teacher quality:

Ensure that teachers are highly qualified in dual language theory and practice, through appropriate pre-service training and in-service professional development, by creating, implementing, and evaluating short- and long-term plans for teacher education and re-licensure (p. 6)

The United States Department of Justice (USDOJ) (2011) has concluded that “the MADESE must mandate SEI training and improve the category training in order to meet its Equal Education Opportunities Act obligation to implement the state-mandated SEI program appropriately and effectively” (p. 3).

In a recent report to the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Office of English Language Acquisition and Achievement (OELAA), Perez-Selles, Cazabon and Mello (2011) agreed with the USDOJ and went one step further by spelling out specific recommendations:

1. Revitalize and re-conceptualize the current SEI Category Trainings.
2. The sequencing and hours allotted to the trainings need to be revised/updated to give teachers the depth and breadth of content, as well as the time necessary to engage deeply and continuously in the subject matter.

3. Create a system of oversight to achieve quality control of trainings and trainers.

4. As OELAA is limited in what it can currently accomplish with the trainings, it should consider outreach to other departments within the MA DESE as well as to the MA Board of Education to find ways to share the responsibility of SEI Category Trainings across departments and governing structures.

5. As there are many limitations and obstacles that districts and schools face regarding the implementation of the trainings, districts need to partner with the DESE, each other, and teacher union leadership to devise a systemic way to make SEI trainings a part of teachers’ ongoing professional development. (pp. 45-47)

In order to close the proficiency gap of ELLs, the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Proficiency Gap Task Force (2010) recommends that the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education:

- strengthen current requirements for the licensure of teachers providing instruction to English Language Learners,
- strengthen in-service professional development for teachers providing instruction to English Language Learners,
- strengthen pre-service requirements for future teachers of English Language Learners and,
• strengthen the meaning of “Highly Qualified Teacher” designation by including in its definition elements of competence related to the culture and language of ELL students. (p. 45)

Further recommendations include what to consider for areas of competence:

• understanding of the laws governing compliance in providing education services to English Language Learners;

• understanding the process of language acquisition and its implications for program development and instruction;

• using data in monitoring enrollment and outcomes of ELLs and in the planning, implementing, and monitoring programs for these students;

• evaluating ELL instruction; and

• developing cultural competence for educators. (Force, 2010, p. 46)

Previously the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model was mentioned as one instructional resource used in sheltered instruction; it is included in the Category Trainings. In a study about providing professional development to teachers on how to use the SIOP model in the classroom, McIntyre, Kyle, Chen, Muñoz and Beldon (2010) concluded that professional development must be presented in a carefully planned way in order to be useful for teachers:

enhancing the teachers’ development as excellent teachers of ELLs will be more likely if the teachers participate in personalized, small group settings in which collaborative relationships and focused dialogue can occur, receive ongoing support and scaffolding of specific instructional strategies, and can connect the professional development to the authentic work and issues they face in their classrooms. (p. 348)
It is apparent that, in the nine years since the changes to the Chapter 71A law, most Massachusetts grade-level teachers are not yet equipped with the proper training to teach ELLs to learn to read English in English. Though the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) has developed four Category Trainings, that will provide them with the knowledge and skills needed to more successfully teach ELLs, a woeful number of teachers have taken all four trainings since DESE has not mandated the trainings.

Elementary school principals are also ill-equipped in their work promoting the instruction of ELLs, specifically in supporting teachers in their instruction of ELLs. Lesaux, Hastings, Kelley, Marietta and Russ (2010) cite the development of “administrators’ knowledge about children’s language and reading to strengthen instructional leadership” (p. 19) as an essential action step in improving reading achievement in young children. Lesaux et al. (2010) report that teachers need “guidance and supervision from knowledgeable administrators and school leaders” (p. 15) and that targeted training for administrators is important since “administrators tend to lack training in efforts directed at supporting instructional improvement; their focus is often removed from the day-to-day learning that goes on in the early education and care or primary grade classroom” (p. 15).

Similar to teachers who need specialized professional development to effectively teach ELLs, elementary school principals need focused professional development to successfully support the teaching of ELLs. Principals in Massachusetts are able to take the DESE Category trainings alongside teachers. As of the 2009 – 2010 academic year, Massachusetts Department of Secondary and Elementary Education Commissioner Mitchell (2010) reported that the Massachusetts Department of Secondary and Elementary Education piloted an administrators’ SEI professional development training that was
based on the skills and knowledge and incorporated data review on English Language Learners’ MEPA and MCAS performance. Principals learned about the factors that influence second language acquisition, research-based strategies specifically designed for ELLs, and lessons based on content and language objectives. This training also facilitated communication between ELL directors and principals regarding equitable education for ELLs. The training was well-received and a second pilot has begun. (p. 10)

In order to be able to support teachers in their work with ELLs, elementary school principals must also have an understanding of how to best educate ELLs. The teachers studied in the research of Gándara et al. (2005) noted “the need for school and district administrators to gain more understanding about the challenges of, and solutions to, working successfully with ELL students” (p. 13). Teachers who work with English Language Learners need principals who understand the process of reading and have developed the skills to be able to support the teachers who are providing reading instruction in a new language that is being learned. In a brief prepared for The Center for Education Policy and Practice, Skinner (2008) adds that “school administrators should be prepared to meet the learning needs of teachers and to implement instructional programs for all students” (p. 4).

Arthur Levine (2005) conducted a multi-layered study on educational leadership programs. He surveyed deans, chairs and directors of U. S. education schools and departments; education school faculty; education school alumni and 1,800 principals (with 41% responding). Levine queried principals “regarding their careers, their experiences in the schools that had awarded their degrees and their attitudes toward education schools generally” (p. 71).

The results of Levine’s (2005) study demonstrated that “principals were very critical of education school programs in general. Almost nine out of 10 survey respondents (89 percent)
said that schools of education fail to adequately prepare their graduates to cope with classroom realities” (p. 28). Forty-one percent of alumni who were surveyed reported that “their programs were fair-to-poor in preparing them to work in diverse school environments and with students from differing socioeconomic groups” (p. 28) and 38% reported “gave their programs fair to poor grades for preparing them to educate multiethnic, multiracial populations” (p. 28).

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2008) calls for the creation of a culture of continuous learning for adults, specifically they state that principals need on-going professional development to “build leadership capacity to communicate knowledgeably and successfully with teachers and other adults about teaching, and to implement learning practices and available resources that will be most effective for student and adult learning” (p. 78).

Torres (2006) found that the principals in her case study “reported limited experience in ELL issues and sheltered instruction” (p. 146) and “mentioned the need for additional training regarding the development and use of content and language objectives. Principals also cited the need that these concerns be addressed at the district level and with teachers in order to develop a ‘common understanding’ of sheltered immersion” (p. 146). A conclusion of her study was the revelation of “the need for principals to have a solid knowledge and understanding of sheltered instruction and ELL issues” (p. 146).

In summary, grade-level primary teachers are charged with teaching students to learn to read. Typical teacher preparation in teaching reading has not included provisions for teaching students who are English Language Learners. Good teaching is not enough; teachers need to understand how English Language Learners learn to read in English as a second language which is being learned. They also need to understand the second language acquisition process. The combination of a growing population of English Language Learners and a lack of teachers
trained in teaching English Language Learners is a recipe for academic disaster as it will result in student failure and teacher frustration. It behooves elementary school principals to develop the same set of skills that teachers do in order to be able to support teachers in their efforts in teaching ELLs to learn to read.

The preceding section has set the stage for information that the elementary school principal needs to know in order to support teachers who work with English Language Learners. It has provided an overview of the history of language learning education and the current laws and policies, an understanding of the differences between teaching a native speaker and a nonnative speaker to learn to read in English and the professional development needs of all educators. The next section will explore connections with this body of literature into a larger context of principal as an instructional leader in order to determine how responsibilities of principals can lead to better support of teachers in their instruction of ELLs.

The Principal as an Instructional Leader

Exploring the broad roles and responsibilities of the principal serve to delineate key skills and strategies that are needed to better support teachers in teaching ELLs learning to read in English. The combination of a growing population of ELLs and a largely untrained teacher workforce reinforce this need.

This section will focus on the work of Marzano, Waters and McNulty (2005) that focused on leadership responsibilities that positively impact student achievement. It will be complemented with work from other leading educational researchers and practitioners.

Marzano et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis of the principal as instructional leader. Many of the studies explored by Marzano, et al. (2005) focused on the perceptions that teachers have of principals. Given their close, regular proximity to principals, teachers are a critical lens...
of principal behavior. The researchers examined 69 studies, published between 1978 and 2001, which focused on leadership as practiced by principals. A typical study computed a correlation between the leadership of the principal and the average achievement of students in a sample of schools (p. 131). The studies included 2082 schools, spanning grades K – 12 (p. 29). A general conclusion of the meta-analysis indicated that “principals can have a profound effect on the achievement of students in their schools” (p. 38). In order to describe how principals can have a profound effect on student achievement, Marzano et al. used the meta-analysis to identify 21 “categories of behaviors” (p. 41) or responsibilities of the school leader (refer to Appendix B for complete list). The responsibilities were listed in alphabetical order in their book to “communicate the message that they are all important” (p. 62).

The following discussion will explore 12 of the responsibilities in order to better understand the critical nature of the elementary school principal as instructional leader supporting ELL students. Marzano et al. (2005) determined “a correlation between general leadership and student achievement” (p. 30). The correlation coefficient is the numerical value associated with the strength of the relationship between, in this case, general leadership and student achievement. The 12 responsibilities will be discussed in the order of correlation with student academic achievement as determined by Marzano et al. (2005). The 12 responsibilities examined as are follows:

1. Situational Awareness (.33)
2. Discipline (.27)
3. Resources (.25)
4. Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment (.25)
5. Input (.25)
6. Change Agent (.25)
7. Intellectual Stimulation (.24)
8. Communication (.23)
9. Ideals/Beliefs (.22)
10. Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment (.20)
11. Visibility (.20)
12. Relationships (.18)

These 12 responsibilities will be defined according to the work of Marzano et al. (2005) and then substantiated with work from other leading educational researchers and practitioners. In order of positive correlation, Situational Awareness will be discussed first.

**Situational awareness (Correlation with Achievement = .33)**

Situational awareness addresses principals’ awareness of the “details and the undercurrents regarding the functioning of the school and their use of this information to address current and potential problems” (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 60). Specific behaviors that were identified as being associated with Situational Awareness were to “accurately [predict] what could go wrong from day to day; [be] aware of the informal groups and relationships among the staff and; [be] aware of issues in the school that have not surfaced but could create discord” (p. 60).

Principals need to be aware of the attitudes of teachers toward ELLs because negative attitudes hinder instruction and, ultimately, student achievement. Walker, Shafer and Iiams (2004) conclude that “it is important to study and understand the formation of these negative teacher attitudes in order to implement pro-active strategies that will help teachers positively rather than negatively adjust to the new challenges of educating linguistically diverse students” (p. 133). They point out that, no matter how insignificant or obscure, “there is no acceptable amount of negativity in teacher attitudes towards ELLs and that even small percentages of negative attitudes can have detrimental effects and are cause for concern” (p. 139).
Discipline (Correlation with Achievement = .27)

Discipline refers to protecting teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their instructional time or focus (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 48). This is also a concept that Elmore (1999) refers to when he writes that buffering can “protect teachers from outside intrusions in their highly uncertain and murky work” (p. 6). Specific behaviors related to this responsibility include protecting instructional time from interruptions and protecting teachers from internal and external distractions” (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 49). Issues and influences can range from acting out students to additional paper work requests from Central Office, i.e. anything that takes away from a focus on instruction.

Having an understanding of the current educational policy in Massachusetts can lead to the realization of this responsibility; principals can take care of the paperwork that is necessary to complete in reference to the entering, exiting and assessing of ELLs, relieving teachers of that responsibility so they can focus on instruction.

Resources (Correlation with Achievement = .25)

The responsibility of Resources refers to the extent to which the leader provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their duties (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 60). Appropriate materials are essential when it comes to working with ELLs. “when establishing the learning conditions for ELLs, the principal plays a key role in providing resources for quality instruction to meet students needs” (Alford & Niño, 2011, p. 10).

Once the changing needs and wants of students and teachers are identified by a leadership team, they can be connected directly to teacher professional development. “Participation in professional development about reading instruction should help teachers better assess the
strengths and weaknesses of the students and teach them how to use this information to inform instruction” (Shellard & Protheroe, 2001, p. 61). A principal can promote effective professional development by “connecting learning activities to one another, or by linking professional development with larger school goals or the teachers’ own professional goals. In particular, professional development that is connected or related to larger goals has been found to be related to improved teacher learning” (Graczewski, Knudson, & Holtzman, 2009, p. 73).

When planning professional development designed to meet the needs of ELLs and positively impact academic achievement, Alford and Niño (2011) suggest a dual perspective that will, first, accommodate for the large number of teachers who have had no formal training in language development or linguistics and second focus on content-embedded application of language acquisition and linguistics as well as “an examination of the sociopolitical and cultural influences that affect teachers’ beliefs about ELLs and could prevent effective implementation” (pp. 66-67). They further cite the principal as the “lead learner” who must be able to keep both foci in constant perspective, communicate the clear vision of the relationship between language theory and content practice, and facilitate opportunities for faculty members to work together to develop and correlate their instructional skills with their new content knowledge related to language acquisition (pp. 67-68).

**Knowledge of curriculum, instruction and assessment (Correlation to achievement = .25)**

Knowledge of curriculum, instruction and assessment monitoring/evaluating addresses the extent to which the leader is aware of the best practices in these domains (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 54). Quinn’s study (2002) supported the hypothesis that leadership impacts instruction. One of the premises that Quinn studied was that the principal needed to be a visible presence (in addition to being a resource provider, instructional resource and communicator) in order to
impact instruction (p. 450). He found that principals who are strong instructional leaders have more of an impact on classroom instructional practices (p. 455).

One way that principals are made aware of curriculum, instruction and assessment is to be in the classrooms. This can be done through informal walk throughs or more formal teacher observations. Shellard and Proheroe (2001) point out that “the primary objective of teacher observation is to ensure that students are receiving high-quality, effective instruction in a safe and supportive environment” (p. 58).

When in classrooms for formal and informal observations, principals should look for instructional strategies that benefit ELLs such as:

- using visual, graphs, Venn diagrams, and models;
- providing extra time for writing in a second language;
- requiring students to keep a vocabulary journal;
- teaching language phrases that may be difficult;
- teaching multiple meanings of words;
- teaching words with similar meanings;
- building background knowledge of a concept;
- using sentence starters such as “what I like is…”
- providing safe ways to practice English; and
- providing multiple opportunities to engage in discussion. (Alford & Niño, 2011, pp. 28-29)

In their study of Sheltered English Immersion, Echevarria and Short (2008) identified a number of successful strategies that can be seen in a Sheltered English Immersion classroom. Some examples include: a modulation of “the level of English used with and among students” (p.
“making specific connections between the content being taught and students’ experiences and prior knowledge and focus on expanding the students’ vocabulary base” (p. 9); teaching “functional language skills. . . how to negotiate meaning, ask for clarification, confirm information, argue, persuade and disagree (p. 9); and the ability of students to demonstrate their knowledge through use of many modalities.

In a recent dissertation, Porter (2009) found that “principals must have high expectations. . . without high expectations, any efforts to improve the instruction, performance or culture of the school will be futile” (p. 112).

Elmore (1999) goes one step further when it comes to the importance of the relationship between the principal and instruction. He asks,

Why not focus leadership on instructional improvement, and define everything else as instrumental to it? The skills and knowledge that matter in leadership, under this definition, are those that can be connected to, or lead to, the improvement of instruction and student performance. (p. 14)

Principals who understand the importance of including oral language proficiency in the teaching of reading can communicate this knowledge to teachers in two ways: (1) sharing the information during planning and post observation conferences and other supervisory settings, and (2) providing teachers with access to expert-led professional development in the area of teaching ELLs.

**Input (Correlation to achievement = .25)**

Input refers to the extent to which the school leader involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 51). Examples of this are the planning of schoolwide professional development to support the instruction of ELLs.
or the addition of a literacy team that includes an ESL teacher and that reviews relevant research, such as the report of the National Literacy Panel (August, 2006) in order to present it to their colleagues. Actions related to this responsibility include:

- providing opportunities for teacher to be involved in developing school policies,
- providing opportunities for staff input on all important decisions, and
- using leadership teams in decision making. (p. 52)

A principal who facilitates works to provide teachers with opportunities to contribute to what is happening in the school. Seashore Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom and Anderson (2010) found that 91.7% of principals and 66.7% of teachers in the study cited “creating structures and opportunities for teachers to collaborate” (p. 71) as one of the top three important practices to help improve instruction: “principals supported collaboration among teachers by scheduling times for teachers to meet and discuss how they were working through the curriculum” (p. 71).

Sanacore (1997) states, “When administrators and teachers work cooperatively, they increase the chances of creating a shared vision that benefits students. They also develop flexibility in adapting the vision to students’ changing needs and wants” (p. 67). As schools become more populated with ELLs, it is necessary for principals and the teachers of ELLs to work together to revisit the school’s mission to make sure that it speaks to the academic, social and emotional needs of ELLs.

DuFour (2002) highlights the importance of facilitating teams and warns that “to make collaborative teams the primary engine of our school improvement efforts, teachers needed time to collaborate” (p. 14). As a facilitator of teams, the principal will have the responsibility to make sure that time is available for this essential piece and that there is a voice on each team that can effectively and accurately advocate for ELLs.
In their report on studies of instructional leadership, Seashore Louis et al. (2010) concluded “our analysis provides the most extensive empirical test to date of whether instructional leadership, shared leadership, and trust in the principal, when considered together, have the potential to increase student learning” (p. 51).

In order to do accomplish what DuFour (2002) and Seashore Louis et al. (2010) both advocate, the sharing of leadership, principals need to acknowledge the need to relinquish their own power and empower teachers. One way to empower teachers to make collaborative decisions regarding ELLs for principals insure their schools have Literacy Teams that include the representation of an ESL teacher or a grade-level teacher who has taken the Category trainings and can voice an ELL perspective. While Cobb (2005) notes that “there is no one model of a literacy leadership team” (p. 472), she does suggest that the team include the principal, literacy coach or reading specialist, a teacher from both the primary and intermediate levels and a teacher who provides support to students over multiple grade levels, such as an ESL or SPED support teacher. The requirement that the people on the team will be communicating information to their colleagues supersedes the need of having one teacher from every grade level and/or discipline on the team.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2008), points out that in “supporting teachers’ growth and collaboration, principals do more than improve performance in the short term; they build the trust and accountability that can hold learning communities together” (p. 78).

**Change agent (Correlation with achievement = .25)**

Change agent refers to the leader’s disposition to challenge the status quo (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 44). This refers specifically to the following behaviors and characteristics:
• consciously challenging the status quo,
• being willing to lead change initiatives with uncertain outcomes,
• systematically considering new and better way of doing things, and
• consistently attempting to operate at the edge versus the center of the school’s competence (p. 45).

Michael Fullan advocates for the idea of the principal as a change agent in the Foreword he wrote for The Literacy Principal: Leading, Supporting and Assessing Reading and Writing Initiatives (Booth & Rowsell, 2002). Fullan asserts that the functions of being an instructional leader and a change agent are most important when it comes to the connection between a principal and reading: “There are two types of expertise needed in order to seriously improve literacy in schools: one area is expertise in the content of literacy; the other is expertise in leading the change process” (p. 7).

Though principals may be in the position to implement district policy in regards to educational programming of language minority students, having an understanding of what research says are best practices for ELLs can result in district-level changes. Principals can speak to the educational needs of ELLs and reinforce their words with data from a host of experts.

Intellectual stimulation (Correlation to achievement = 24)

Intellectual Stimulation refers to the extent to which the school leader ensures that faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices regarding effective schooling and makes discussions of those theories and practices a regular aspect of the school’s culture (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 52). It is the principal’s responsibility to convey the most current
research about best practices in teaching ELLs to teachers, especially if a number of grade-level teachers have not taken all of the Category trainings.

Seashore Louis et al. (2010) found that 83.3% of the principals surveyed “considered staying current to be a very important part of instructional leadership” (p. 72). These authors go one step further concluding that an important role of the principal, according to 100% of the principals and 84% of the teachers, is to “keep track of teachers’ professional development needs” (p. 71). An implication for policy and practice that they highlight is the key role that principals play in “supporting and encouraging teachers' professional development needs. Leaders have a role to play in keeping track of those needs, as well as providing resources and materials to improve teachers‘ repertoire of instructional practices” (p. 76).

**Communication (Correlation with achievement = .23)**

Communication refers to the extent to which the school leader establishes strong lines of communication with and between teachers and students (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 46). Principals need to be available to teachers who lack experience and training in teaching ELLs in order to give them needed information or to simply listen. This also extends to the parents of ELLs. Simply providing a translator at a meeting or posting a sign that welcomes visitors to school in the languages spoken at the school can indicate to parents the extent to which the principal values the parent and what the parent brings to the table. One caveat: principals need to make sure that they are not using English idioms in conversation. Cox (2011) offers two examples of how confusing common English idioms can be:

Figures of speech such as "getting off on the right foot" are difficult to explain and even more difficult to comprehend if a parent is not familiar with English idioms. Tell a parent
that completing a form will be "a piece of cake," and you are likely to get a puzzled look!

(p. 1)

Marzano et al. (2005) state that “effective communication might be considered the glue that holds together all the other responsibilities of leadership. One might say that effective communication is an implicit or explicit feature of most aspects of leadership” (pp. 46-47).

These authors list the following specific characteristics and behaviors of effective communication:

- developing effective means for teachers to communicate with one another,
- being easily accessible to teachers, and
- maintaining open and effective lines of communication with staff (p. 47).

Henk, Moore, Marinak and Tomasetti (2000) are in agreement with the importance of communication between teachers and their supervisors to improve literacy:

Clearly, communication between teachers of literacy and those who supervise them is paramount for achieving high standards in reading performance. . . without a mutual understanding of what must be accomplished and a common knowledge base of how it can be achieved, true success is not possible. (p. 359)

In order for teachers and principals to develop mutual understandings and to gain a common knowledge base, Henk et al. (2000) recommend regular structured opportunities to engage in dialogue.

**Ideals/beliefs (Correlation with achievement = .22)**

People function most successfully when a foundation of ideals and beliefs is in place. The responsibility of Ideals/Beliefs is demonstrated when the principal explains a decision he/she has made in terms of his/her belief that academic achievement is not the only measure of success
in the school (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 51). The principal needs to embody the belief that all students can be successful. Alford and Niño (2011) point out that “the principal who fosters a culture of academic achievement takes a stand for equity and excellence in both words and actions” (p. 7).

Tung, Uriarte, Diez, Gagnon and Stazesky (2011) concur with the findings of Alford & Niño (2011), that principals must communicate their ideals and beliefs in words and actions. The researchers studied four Boston schools whose practices have led to success for ELL students and concluded that principals in the four schools:

all communicated their visions not only through the written missions and verbally, but also by modeling behaviors and attitudes that they expected teachers to adopt, by asking probing questions of the staff that encouraged reflection, and by establishing respect for their authority. (p. 6)

One value, in particular, that Tung et al. (2011) noted was of cultural competence and the importance of having a staff whose ethnicity and language reflect those of the students. In the event that a school lacked teachers with similar ethnicity or language, the Principal “led a process of prioritizing the cultural competence of teachers whose cultural backgrounds were different from those of ELL students and other minority students at the school” (p. 10).

Marzano et al. (2005) report the following traits associated with Ideas/Beliefs:

- possessing well-defined beliefs about schools, teaching and learning in first as well as a second language;
- sharing beliefs about school, teaching and learning with the staff; and
- demonstrating behaviors that are consistent with beliefs (adapted from p. 51).
A conclusion of Quinn’s (2002) study was that “a strong instructional leader is not necessary in providing exceptional teaching that occurs in isolation. Such leadership is however crucial in creating a school that values and continually strives to achieve an exceptional education for all students” (p. 463).

One important belief identified by Seashore Louis et al. (2010) is the leadership practice of “focusing the school on goals and expectations for student achievement” (p. 71). It is essential to develop a responsive learning environment that speaks to a belief that English Language Learners can succeed. Vialpando, Yedlin, Linse, Harrington and Cannon (2005) make the following recommendations for school leaders who are looking to develop a school community that is responsive to the needs of ELLs:

- School leaders, administrators, and educators recognize that educating ELLs is the responsibility of the entire school staff.
- Educators recognize that ELLs are a heterogeneous group who differ greatly in respect to linguistic, cultural, social, familial, and personal backgrounds.
- Students’ languages and cultures are utilized as a resource for further learning.
- There are strong links connecting home, school, and community.
- ELLs are afforded equitable access to school resources and programs.
- There are high expectations of all ELLs.
- There are qualified teachers who are well-prepared and willing to work with ELLs.
- Language and literacy are infused throughout the educational process, including in curriculum and instruction.
- Assessment is valid and purposeful and includes consideration of both first- and second-language literacy development. (p. 3)
Douglas B. Reeves (2009b) agrees with the sentiment that the heterogeneous make-up of ELLs who bring valuable information, in the form of their cultures, to the classroom. Reeves looks at English language development programs in China and Canada to gain “important insights for teachers and policymakers. A common theme that emerges from the following examples is the power of high-interest cultural content to motivate language learners” (p. 87). He goes on to explain that
teaching English is a complex and challenging endeavor and an explicit focus on culture is not a cure-all. Nevertheless, technical proficiency in an English language program is not sufficient to sustain student interest or create a context for rich language development. Only a holistic approach, including all that schools and students bring to the classroom, can accomplish that. (p. 89)

**Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment (Correlation with achievement = .20)**

This responsibility addresses the extent to which the principal is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment activities at the classroom level (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 53). Alford and Niño (2011) describe “possessing extensive knowledge” as not only being knowledgeable about instructional, curricular, assessment and classroom practices that are effective for ELLs; but also, to be directly involved in assisting teachers in designing curricular activities, addressing assessment issues and addressing instructional issues that pertain to this population (pp. 54-55). The authors go on to affirm that principals need to possess extensive knowledge because the principal “serves as an advocate of student learning through reinforcement of important guiding principles and instructional strategies in teaching ELLs” (p. 26).
DiPaola, Tschannen-Moran and Walther-Thomas (2004) make the point that “[principals as skillful instructional leaders] are continually apprised of current research and are knowledgeable about research on academic and behavioral interventions. They set knowledge and skill expectations for faculty and facilitate contextual learning opportunities to assure continuous professional improvement in their buildings” (p. 4). A principal also needs to be aware of what is lacking in his or her own set of skills. In a school with an increasing population of ELLs, principals need to hire teachers who have the skills necessary to successfully instruct ELLs.

Visibility (Correlation with achievement = 20)

This responsibility addresses the extent to which the school leader has contact and interacts with teachers, students and parents (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 61). The principal needs to be out and about in classrooms, especially in those where a teacher may be struggling. When the principal is in his or her office, it is impossible to support teachers. It is essential for the principal to be in classrooms where ELLs are learning in order to observe what is happening as well as talk to the teachers and students about instruction and learning.

DiPaola et al. (2004) speak to the connection between instructional leadership and the visibility of the principal, “effective instructional leadership is based on knowledge and skills that permit a deep understanding of what is happening in every classroom. Good principals work directly with teachers and students. By spending time in class, they learn about individual and schoolwide professional development needs. They thoughtfully analyze student and teacher performance and address instructional issues directly to promote classroom quality (p. 6).
**Relationships (Correlation with achievement = .18)**

The responsibility of Relationships refers to the extent to which the school leader demonstrates an awareness of the personal lives of teachers and staff (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 58). The authors make reference to Elmore (1999) when they quote that principals should “rely more heavily on face-to-face relationships than on bureaucratic routines” (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 32). The development of this level of relationship leads to stronger emotional ties that will help to support the school community during times of uncertainty.

Building positive relationships also means building connections with students and between teachers and students. The principal does this by providing support and encouragement to students. It may also mean that the principal needs to correct assumptions that teachers have about students. For example, if the belief that “ELL students are at or below average instead of talented” (Alford & Niño, 2011, p. 8) is apparent among educators, the principal is responsible for dispelling the assumption in order to facilitate positive relationships between students and teachers. Alford and Niño (2011) remind the reader that “principals who encourage the growth of ELLs recognize the benefits of the engagement, encourage it, and celebrate it” (p. 10).

Marzano et al. (2005) list the following behaviors as necessary in the area of Relationships:

- being informed about significant personal issues within the lives of staff members,
- being aware of personal needs of teachers,
- acknowledging significant events in the lives of staff members, and
- maintaining personal relationships with teachers (p. 59).

Reeves (2006) describes a “Relational Leader” as one who listens to their colleagues *without interrupting or prejudging* their statements. . . Relational leaders respect confidences,
never betraying a secret or private conversation. . . Relational leaders practice empathy through deliberate inquiry. . . [they] provide the unique attention, feedback and support that each colleague needs. (pp. 40-41)

In a study on the roles of the principal, Graczewski et al. (2009) underscore the work of Reeves (2006) about the importance of the development of relationships between the principal and teachers: “an approach that focuses on students and the classroom absent a conscious effort from school leaders to forge relationships with the instructors themselves, may marginalize adults; so might the devaluing of prior knowledge and teacher input” (p. 93).

Reeves (2006), argues that being aware of one’s own personal needs as a principal can improve one’s working relationships. He encourages the use of reflection, “reflective leaders take the time to think about lessons learned, record their small wins and setbacks, document conflicts between values and practice, identify the difference between idiosyncratic behavior and long-term pathologies and notice trends that emerge over time” (p. 49).

The preceding section connected twelve of the responsibilities that Marzano et al. (2005) researched with skills and knowledge needed to support teachers who work with English Language Learners. Other leading researchers and practitioners were referenced to echo the findings of Marzano et al. (2005).

Situational Awareness was defined as the extent to which the principal knows what is going on in the building in order to be able to anticipate and then resolve issues. Walker et al. (2004) made the point that principals need to follow-up by putting proactive strategies into place since any negative attitudes that teachers may have toward ELLs may result in decreased academic success.
Discipline was defined as protecting teachers from outside influences that impact teaching. Principals can support the teachers in potential administrative tasks that go hand-in-hand with a state-mandated program.

Resources were defined as the combination of materials and professional development that is needed in order for teachers to successfully instruct students. Alford and Niño (2011) noted that the provision of specialized materials for ELLs as one of the most important responsibilities of the principal.

Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment was defined as the extent which principals are aware of best practices. Principals need to have the same knowledge base as teachers when it comes to teaching ELLs to learn to read in English.

Input was defined as the inclusion of teachers in the processes of decision-making and policy development. Sanacore (1997) concluded that students need to be considered when making decisions and developing policies. When ELLs make up a percentage of the school population, special care must be taken to include their perspective and needs.

Change Agent was defined as the extent to which principals challenged the status quo. In schools where ELLs are struggling to meet academic achievement goals, principals may need to bring knowledge of best practices for teaching ELLs to district officials so that alternate educational programming may be considered.

Intellectual Stimulation was defined as the necessity for principals to make sure that teachers are aware of the most up-to-date theories and practices. Graczewski et al. (2009) agreed that one important role of principals is to ensure that teachers have the opportunity to improve their craft through their own learning.
Communication was defined as how well the principal establishes strong lines of communication with and between teachers and students. Henk et al. (2000) advised that literacy teachers need to regularly communicate with principals in order to make sure a common knowledge base is developed.

Ideals/Beliefs was defined as a foundation that is put in place in schools by principals and that needs to speak to the embodiment that all students can achieve in school. Vialpando et al. (2005) indicated that all students must include ELLs, which may indicate that belief systems need to be broadened.

Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment was defined as the extent that principals are actively involved in curriculum, instruction and assessment at the classroom level. Alford and Niño (2011) concludes that it may be the principal who shares instructional strategies with teachers, demonstrating that principals need to have an understanding of how ELL curriculum, instruction and assessment work at the classroom level.

Visibility was defined as the contact and interaction that the principal has with teachers, students and parents. DiPaola et al. (2004) spoke to the connection between the visibility of the principal and instructional leadership, citing the importance of the principal spending time in classrooms, directly with students and teachers.

Relationships was defined as the awareness that principals have with the personal lives of teachers and staff that leads to the development of stronger ties to the school. Alford and Niño (2011) believe that this has to extend to students as well and that by developing relationships with ELLs, principals are correcting teachers’ assumptions about ELLs which would lead to more positive relationships between teachers and students.
In summary, each of the 12 responsibilities of Marzano et al. (2005) is indicative of a single leadership characteristic that any principal would need in order to be successful. Taken collectively and viewed through the lens of working with ELLs, a well-prepared principal comes to life. A principal who successfully supports teachers in their instruction of ELLs has a high level of situational awareness and is cognizant of teachers’ attitudes toward ELL to insure that teacher negativity is not impacting instruction. This principal demonstrates discipline in protecting teachers from outside distractions that can interrupt instruction. Being resourceful, the principal provides teachers with needed materials and professional development. The principal is both knowledgeable of and involved in curriculum, instruction and assessment of ELLs. Through intellectual stimulation, the principal insures that teachers have access to current theories and best practices concerning the teaching ELLs. The principal values the input of teachers in decision making and policy development and, as a change agent, seeks to challenge the status quo and work toward the development of better ELL programming. The principal has the communication skills necessary to connect effectively and build positive relationships with all members of the school community, especially ELLs and their parents. Finally, this principal is one who continually demonstrates his or her beliefs through both words and actions and is a visible presence in and around the building.

Further enhancement of a well-prepared elementary school principal will be delineated in this study, as teachers and principals are asked to share their perceptions of how the leadership characteristics of principals related to the instruction of ELLs.

**Conclusion**

This chapter examined the following fields of literature in order to define what a principal needs to know in order to support teachers in their teaching of ELLs: (1) the history of language
learning education in the United States, (2) current educational policy in Massachusetts, (3) how to teach English Language Learners to learn to read in English, (4) preparing teachers and principals to work with ELLs, and (5) the principal as instructional leader.

The first section reviewed the history of language learning education in the United States, providing principals with an understanding of how immigrants were educated in the United States over time in order to gain a more broad understanding of the current language learning education system and to provide a context for what is currently happening in Massachusetts.

The second section examined current educational policy in Massachusetts, beginning from the earliest known policy through the 2002 passage of Question 2 and the subsequent changes to Chapter 71A law. It included a description of program options and possible outcomes followed. It also provided evidence that the current model most school systems in Massachusetts are using – Sheltered English Immersion - is not the most effective model in lessening the achievement gap; and, that a dual-language model is more effective.

The third section included information on the best practices for teaching ELLs to learn to read English, including the language development of second-language learners. It also highlighted the report of the National Literacy Panel (2006) with an important conclusion about teaching ELLs to read English: it is essential to understand the need to combine instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and text comprehension with oral language teaching.

The fourth section presented glaring lack of training that both teachers and principals have when it comes to instructing ELLs. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has responded by developing and presenting trainings; however, not enough teachers and administrators have taken the opportunity to participate in any or all of the Category trainings.
The final section examined twelve responsibilities of school leaders, based on the meta-analysis of Marzano et al. (2005). The twelve included: Situational Awareness, Discipline; Resources; Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment; Input; Change Agent; Intellectual Stimulation; Communication; Ideals/Beliefs; Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment; Visibility; and Relationships. Based on the definitions presented by Marzano et al. (2005), each responsibility was looked at through the lenses of multiple experts and connected to the principal’s roles in supporting and supervising grade-level teachers who have ELLs in their classrooms.

The collective information reviewed in this chapter is just one facet of the complicated, complex job of a principal. As Kuamoo (2002) concluded, the principal’s role consists of complex responsibilities that include “communicating and modeling expectations, actively participating with and supporting staff, students, parents and community needs, managing diverse groups of people, monitoring and evaluating staff and student achievement, providing resources and funding, and creating a positive school climate” (p. 7). This is a general statement without the overlay of the mandate of educating ELLs. It is clear from the research that no matter what it is called – principal, school leader, instructional leader – the role of the person in charge is all encompassing. Being a support to the teachers in the building means being able to

- know what is happening in the building,
- make changes if needed,
- keep the lines of communication open,
- protect teachers from the distractions that can prevent the teacher from doing his/her work,
work to provide teachers with opportunities to contribute to what is happening in the school as well as opportunities to grow and develop as an educator,

- connect with the teachers in the building in order to develop strong relationships,
- demonstrate a knowledge about curriculum, instruction, assessment and classroom practices,
- design curriculum and address instruction and assessment issues, and
- maintain a presence in and around the building.

The preceding literature review highlighted information that is important for principals to understand in their work with teachers and English Language Learners. For example, in order to help a teacher improve his or her reading instruction of an English Language Learner, it is helpful to know that the National Literacy Panel recommends the inclusion of an oral language component in the literacy process. Knowing details of Chapter 71A gives the principal ammunition when advocating for resources to support teachers and ELLs. Being informed about the literature reviewed above assists principals in their development as educational leaders, and as bilingual/ESL leaders. Kuamoo (2002) points out that “bilingual/ESL leaders have the added responsibilities of providing language support, content knowledge and resources, and advocating for continued community support” (p. 7).

**Chapter Summary**

This review of literature discussed the importance that elementary school principals have an understanding of the history of language learning education in order to build a foundation of empathy for students who are learning English and their families. It presented an argument for principals to be familiar with current legislation and state expectations for education ELLs in order to be able to explain what and why is happening to teachers and parents. It discussed the
need for principals to know what is needed to teach an ELL to learn to read in English is integral knowledge in order to be able to effectively support primary level teachers and lead teachers and themselves to professional development that will help to better meet the needs of their ELLs. The combination of all that is needed to know with an understanding of Marzano et al.’s (2005) 12 responsibilities, can lead to an instructional leader who is well-prepared to support teachers in making sure that ELLs learn how to read in English.

Do such well-prepared instructional leaders exist? It is one thing to read the case studies, laws, histories and research and piece together what a well-prepared instructional leader should be. It is another challenge to develop such a leader. The study described in the next chapter will explore the perceptions of teachers and elementary school principals to determine how principals can better support teachers in their work with ELLs,

This chapter has provided foundational knowledge that is important for principals to know in order to effectively support teachers in their instruction of ELLs. One approach for principals to better understand how they are making a positive impact in these two areas is to ask teachers about their work with them. The study described in the next chapter will query teachers about what they believe their own principal knows and is able to do when it comes to two topics that are directly related to their support: (1) the instruction of ELLs, and (2) instructional leadership. The study will also solicit perceptions of principals in relation to the same two topics. It is the intent of the next chapter to describe the methodology used to implement the study.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the study’s methodology. This chapter will include (a) a brief restatement of the conceptual framework; (b) the three research questions that will guide the study, a rationale for their selection and how they connect with one another; (c) the facets of the study design, including participants and setting, data collection method and, data collection procedure explanation; (d) a statement about the validity of the study; and (e) a description of the study’s limitations, including potential bias and controlling limitations.

Elementary school principals need to have specific knowledge and skills about the instruction of English Language Learners in order to better support teachers who have English Language Learners in their classrooms. As was stated in the previous chapter, this knowledge ranges from a background in the history of bilingual education, both federally and locally to the understanding of what is needed to teach ELLs to learn to read in their nonnative language. Principals also need to consider the reality that most teachers have not had effective professional development to work with ELLs, and because of their own lack of professional development, may struggle with supporting classroom teachers. At the same time, principals must also develop and strengthen the skills necessary to be effective instructional leaders.

The major purpose of this study is to determine how elementary school principals can better support primary level teachers in their work with English Language Learners. The three questions that guide this study are as follows:

1. What do principals need to know and be able to do to better support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (their second language, L2)?

2. What leadership factors contribute to and/or inhibit the support of teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?
3. How can principals, as instructional leaders, better educate and support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?

Both teachers and elementary school principals will be queried about their perceptions regarding the three questions to better understand how principals can better support teachers in improving the achievement of ELL students. More specifically, the study will examine perceptions teachers hold about their principals and perceptions principals hold about themselves. The following section provides a brief restatement of the conceptual framework for the genesis of the study.

**Conceptual Framework**

The ELL population has grown significantly during the last decade. This growth has been seen in the United States and in Massachusetts. In the United States the growth has been at least 7 times the overall national growth rate. Nationwide, ELL enrollment increased 18 percent from 2000 to 2005. Public school educational leaders were responsible for 5 million ELLs in the 2005 – 2006 school year, or 10 percent of the total school-aged population in the United States. (Alford & Niño, 2011, p. 1)

English Language Learners (ELLs) are the fastest-growing group of school-age students in public schools across the nation, and in Massachusetts. In this state, even as the total student enrollment declines slightly, the number of ELLs grows steeply. They number 68,820 in the 2010-2011 school year, an increase of 9,662 from the year before. (Serpa, 2011, p. 7)

Juxtaposed with this influx of ELLs, is the fact that teachers and elementary school principals are woefully unprepared to work with ELLs. The Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Chester
Mitchell (2010) reported that “most classroom teachers in Massachusetts did not acquire the skills and knowledge required to effectively teach English Language Learners and shelter content instruction during their teacher preparation program” (p. 7).

That being said, preparation of educators to meet the needs of ELLs falls to post-graduate professional development. Linda Darling-Hammond (2010) has studied teachers’ professional development and has found that “fewer than one-third of U. S. teachers received even eight hours of professional development on strategies for teaching students with disabilities or English Language Learners. Despite the strong desire that teachers voice for more learning opportunities in these areas” (p. 204). She goes on to state that teachers need to know a lot more to teach today’s diverse students to more challenging learning standards than ever before-including how to teach much more ambitious disciplinary content and cross-disciplinary skills and how to teach special needs learners, English Language Learners, and others who require specialized forms of teaching. (p. 207)

Klinger, Hoover and Baca (2008) has spent time studying this topic, also. They concluded that although the developmental processes are similar when learning to read in a first or second language, there are also important differences that must be taken into account when planning for instruction and assessing student progress. For example, ELLs benefit from additional oral language instruction. Districts and schools should provide professional development in teaching reading to ELLs, and teachers should do all they can to learn about working with this population of students. It is not enough, for example,
to have a master’s degree in Reading if the graduate program did not include a focus on ELLs. (pp. 42-43)

Specific consideration has been given to principals by Lesaux, Hastings, Kelly and Marietta (2010). They cited the development of “administrators’ knowledge about children’s language and reading to strengthen instructional leadership” (p. 19) as an essential action step in improving reading achievement in young children. The authors state that administrators need to appreciate the complexity of reading development, correctly interpret student data on language and reading and can translate their understanding into corresponding instructional practice. Research has shown us an important solution to the problems of improving practice and retaining teachers in early education and care settings and elementary schools: Guidance and supervision from knowledgeable administrators and school leaders should be a staple of daily professional life. . . we have historically focused our professional development about language and reading on teachers. Our administrators tend to lack training in efforts directed at supporting instructional improvement; their focus is often removed from the day-to-day learning that goes on in the early education and care or primary grade classroom. (p. 15)

Professional development can be a powerful tool in providing teachers and principals with skills and strategies that are needed to improve instruction. It is only one tool, however, and it is not efficient or effective to depend on only one tool. This study is based on two assumptions: (1) that teachers have a variety of needs when it comes to being able to teach an ELL how to learn to read in English and (2) that principals neither know what teachers’ needs nor do they know how to support teachers’ needs.
One way to determine if principals are supporting teachers effectively is to ask teachers. This study relies on teacher perceptions of (1) the principal’s role in teaching English to ELLs, and (2) the principal’s leadership characteristics in relationship to ELLs. Teacher perceptions are used since “teachers are thought to provide the most valid information because they are the closest to the day-to-day operations of the school and the behaviors of the principal” (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 30). Based on a meta-analysis of 69 teacher perception studies, Marzano et al. (2005) delineated 21 responsibilities in relation to student learning. This study examined 12 of the responsibilities in relation to the principal’s role supporting teachers attempting to assist ELLs trying to learn to read in English. The 12 responsibilities include the following:

1. Situational Awareness
2. Discipline
3. Resources
4. Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment
5. Input
6. Change Agent
7. Intellectual Stimulation
8. Communication
9. Ideals/Beliefs
10. Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment
11. Visibility
12. Relationships
Research Questions

The three research questions were designed to respond to two research hypotheses that were determined by the author of this study. These two research hypotheses are

1. There is a difference between teacher perceptions of what a principal knows and is able to do with regard to working with English Language Learners and principal self-perceptions of what knowledge and skills are necessary in working with ELLs.

2. There is a difference between teacher perceptions of the leadership skills necessary for success with ELLs and principal self-perception of leadership skills necessary for successful work with ELLs.

These hypotheses came directly out of the author’s experience as an elementary school principal with a small, and growing, ELL population of students in the primary grades. The research questions, once answered, are meant to get to the crux of the issue: how can principals best support teachers in their instruction of ELLs? The research questions are

1. What do elementary school principals need to know and be able to better support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (their second language, L2)?

2. What leadership factors contribute to and/or inhibit the support of teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?

3. How can elementary school principals, as instructional leaders, better educate and support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?

The questions are related to each other because they build on each other. The first question is a basic one: What knowledge and behaviors should elementary school principals possess in order to better support teachers? Next, there needs to be an understanding of the factors that add to, or detract from, teacher effectiveness. When both of those questions are asked
and answered, the next step is to determine how to put it all together to do what needs to be done to support teachers. It is not enough to simply have a knowledge base. It is essential to be able to apply the knowledge base to day-to-day situations. Principals may report that they have the knowledge base necessary to support teachers in their instruction of ELLs. However, if teachers have not observed or experienced this, what is the point of having the knowledge base? That is what this study will seek to understand - does what the principals report to know and understand about supporting teachers who are teaching ELLs to learn to read in English match what teachers believe they need and believe they are getting?

**Study Design**

The research approach chosen for this study was a survey research design using on-line questionnaires to elicit teacher perceptions and principal self-perceptions about principal knowledge, understanding and behaviors in relationship to the instruction of ELLs. The elicitation of teacher perception mirrors the work of Marzano et al. (2005) in that it will also draw conclusions from teacher perceptions. This will be done, as a mixed method approach, analyzing data quantitatively (with t-test data comparing teacher and principal perceptions) and qualitatively (with statements made by participants).

The following sections describe the specifics of the study, including the selection of participants, the collection of data, and an identification of the limitations.

**Participants and setting**

Teachers and elementary school principals from eight Massachusetts elementary schools will be asked to participate by completing on-line questionnaires. Schools are chosen based on the 2010 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s District Analysis and Review Tool (DART). These schools all are “considered ‘comparable’ based on student
enrollment and demographics (Chester, 2011, p. 2). While there are a total of eleven schools in this particular group of schools, only eight were used in the study. Personnel from one school did not reply to multiple requests; one was used as a pilot and the last is the school at which the author is employed as the principal.

Since students are taught to learn to read primarily in the early grades, only teachers in Kindergarten – Grade 3 were asked to participate. Teachers who were identified as ESL teachers were also asked to participate. Principals from each of the schools were contacted.

Contact to both teachers and principals was primarily via email (seven teachers were sent letters when email bounced back). Initial email included an introduction to the study, including consent information, as well as a letter of introduction from the Assistant Professor and Coordinator of the Ph.D. Program in Educational Studies: Educational Leadership Specialization at Lesley University. Subsequent to the initial email communication, I sent out several reminder emails to potential participants. All letters or emails described in this chapter can be found in Appendix D.

Primary teachers and elementary school principals were asked, using on-line instruments, to reflect on their current knowledge base and understanding of reading instruction, language acquisition, current policy and practice, and ideas concerning teacher supervision. Length of time to complete the questionnaire was, according to pre-pilot and pilot participants, between 10 and 30 minutes.

The research approach chosen for this study was a survey research design, utilizing on-line questionnaires. This approach was chosen in order to connect with a larger number of teachers and principals than a qualitative study would have done. It had been hoped that some of
the principals surveyed would have consented to be interviewed face to face; none agreed to such an interview.

**Data collection methods**

Two questionnaires were designed for this study. The teacher questionnaire, Leading to Read: Teachers’ Perceptions of Principals, will be abbreviated LTR-T; the principal questionnaire, Leading to Read: Principals’ Self Perceptions, will be abbreviated LTR-P. The questionnaires used in the study were designed and accessed through SurveyMonkey. Both questionnaires consisted of three parts: an information section, a section asking questions about the role of principals in teaching ELLs to Learn to Read and a section asking questions on leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with ELLs. Questionnaire items consisted of multiple choice questions, answered using a Likert scale, and open-response questions that called for narrative responses.

At the onset of the study, the null hypothesis was assumed; specifically an assumption that there would be no significant difference between the means of the teachers’ responses compared to the means of the principals’ responses.

The questionnaires can be found in *Appendix E*. The idea of collecting teacher perceptions is based on the work of Marzano et al. (2005) whose meta-analysis focused on studies of teacher perceptions of principals’ leadership abilities. The format that the questionnaires are based on was used by McNinch and Richmond (1977), who studied teachers' perceptions of principals’ administrative or supervisory behavior in the area of reading. McNinch and Richmond (1977) compared teachers’ perceptions of what principals do and what principals should do. Neither the work of Marzano et al. (2005) nor the work of McNinch and
Richmond (1977) includes information on principals’ perspectives; this study goes beyond both to include principal perceptions and to compare the perceptions of teachers and principals.

Data collection procedures

The initial invitation to participate in the study was sent out in mid-December, 2010 to teachers and principals in these eight schools. Principals received two reminder emails, first during the first week in January, 2011 and, second, during the first week in February, 2011. Teachers received three reminder emails: first during the first week in January, 2011, second during the first week in February, 2011 and third, during the first week in March, 2011. The entire length of time that the questionnaire was available online was 3 months.

Tables 5 and 6 indicate teacher and principal participation:
### Table 5

**Teacher Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>ESL</th>
<th>Total Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Participation</td>
<td>19% K</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Principal Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Contacted 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Contacted 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Contacted 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Contacted 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Contacted 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Contacted 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Contacted 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Contacted 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Contacted 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Participation</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 1 – 8 on both teacher and principal questionnaires asked professional qualifying questions such as length of time as a teacher or principal and indicating what type, if any, of ELL training. The next set of questions asked respondents if they had taken each of the Massachusetts ELL Category trainings. If the answer was yes, then a series of questions on the knowledge and skills/observable outcomes of each of the ELL Category Trainings (Driscoll, 2004) followed. The third part of the questionnaire included questions that were based on the meta-analysis of Marzano, et al. (2005) and their identified list of 21 Responsibilities of a School Leader. A complete list of the 21 responsibilities can be found in Appendix B. Although there
are many scholars who have studied educational leadership, Marzano et al. (2005) were chosen because of the thoroughness of their meta-analysis and because the studies they explored were based on teacher perceptions. The researchers examined 69 studies that spanned 23 years. They explain their reasons for surveying teachers:

We used teacher ratings of principal leadership instead of ratings by the principals themselves or their supervisors. . . teachers are thought to provide the most valid information because they are the closest to the day-to-day operation of the school and the behaviors of the principal. (p. 30)

This study applies the research methodology of Marzano et al. (2005) to better understand teacher perceptions of principal leadership, in this case as the leadership relates to the instruction of ELLs.

In order to establish content validity for the two questionnaires (i.e. “when you want to know whether a sample of items truly reflects an entire universe of items in a certain topic” by asking “Mr. or Ms Expert to make a judgment that the test items reflect the universe of items in the topic being measured” (Salkind, 2008, p. 113)), each was drafted and pre-piloted, voluntarily, in an elementary school and with several elementary school principals. Questions have been reviewed and approved by a panel of experts on ELLs and reading. These experts include the Director of English Language Learners for an urban school district; an assistant professor from a Boston-area college who currently is researching the literacy development of children from immigrant and bilingual homes and a doctoral candidate in Human Development and Education at another Boston-area college who is currently researching reading assessment of primary-aged ELL students.
Once the two questionnaires were developed and reviewed by experts, it was disseminated to a group of K – 3 and ELL teachers at the author’s school as a pre-pilot study. Following that, K – 3 and ELL teachers of the schools in the 2010 DART model that is located in the same community as the author’s school was given the questionnaire as a pilot; it was taken on a volunteer basis. Simultaneously, all elementary school principals in the community of the author’s school were given an option to complete the questionnaire. Teachers and principals were contacted via email; participation is described in Table 7.

Table 7

*Teacher and Principal Questionnaire Participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K-3 and ELL Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of Participation</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Percentage of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Pilot</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>Already participated in pre-pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to protect teachers and principals in their participation in the questionnaire, the following statement was included in introduction letters: “The confidentiality of all participants is guaranteed; no school district or person will be referred to by name. In addition, all raw data will be destroyed upon the conclusion of the study.” Introduction letters can be found in Appendix D.

**Data collection analysis strategies and techniques**

This study was based on two research hypotheses that were determined by the author of this study. Having worked as a principal in an elementary school, the author has grappled with how best to meet the needs of ELL students and their teachers. This author sees the teacher as
critical in informing administrators in what is needed for effective supervision and support. One way to discover what teachers think is to elicit their perceptions through questionnaires. The research hypotheses are

1. There is a difference between teacher perceptions of what a principal knows and is able to do in regard to working with English Language Learners and principal self-perceptions of what knowledge and skills are necessary in working with ELLs.

2. There is a difference between teacher perceptions of the leadership skills necessary for success with ELLs and principal self-perception of leadership skills necessary for successful work with ELLs.

An analysis of the data will determine if there is a “positive (or direct) or negative (or indirect)” (Salkind, 2008, p. 37) correlation between the two variables. Once data is collected from the on-line questionnaire responses, means of each question will be determined, through use of SPSS, a computer program used for statistical analysis. Then a t-test for the significance of the correlation coefficient will be done on each question in order to determine the statistical significance between the teacher responses and the principal responses. This t-test is done because the study is an examination of a relationship between variables (teacher responses and principal responses) and the participants are asked to complete a survey only one time.

**Validity**

Maxwell (2005) refers to validity as “the correctness or credibility of a description, conclusion, explanation, interpretation, or other sort of account” (p. 106). The validity of this study relies on the connection between the research questions and the answers that are concluded from the perceptions of teachers and principals. It has been stated previously that teachers provide “the most valid information” (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 30) on principals’ behaviors. This
study is based on teacher perceptions of principals coupled with principals’ self-perceptions. The strength of the conclusions of this study is based on the credibility of the perceptions of teachers and principals.

One major threat to the validity of this study is the small number of teachers and principals who responded to the on-line questionnaires. What leads to the implausibility of this particular threat is the level of evidence that has been found through the combination of a comprehensive literature review and a thorough analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. Through these two means, a significant amount of evidence leading to what principals need to know and be able to do to support teachers in their instruction of ELLs has been established.

**Limitations**

The purpose of the study is to determine what teachers need from principals in order to meet the needs of ELLs. It is possible that there will be limitations to this study and those results and conclusions of the study will be wrong for a number of reasons. One potential weakness of the study is that not enough teachers and/or principals will volunteer to participate. Potential respondents may be put off by the length of the questionnaire. In addition, though the instruments will be piloted with a small number of teachers and principals, the tool is in the initial phases of development and reliable and validity have not been established.

Another potential limitation is the unknown variable of the history and previous experience of the questionnaire respondents; it will not be possible to determine what history and previous experience influences the respondents’ answers to the study’s queries. Related to this is another potential limitation: it is possible that none of the participants will be bilingual and/or bicultural.
Another possible limitation is that results of the study are primarily based on first person reports of teachers and principals. Marzano, Waters and McNulty (2005) used teacher ratings of principals instead of ratings determined by principals or their supervisors because “teachers are thought to provide the most valid information because they are the closest to the day-to-day operations of the school and the behaviors of the principal” (p. 30).

This study does not include a way for principals to reflect on teacher performance nor does it include student data, such as formal or informal literacy assessments. These are potential weaknesses of the study, as each would supply additional information about the current context of what is happening in the classroom.

**Potential bias**

Another threat to the validity of this study is the potential bias of the main researcher of this study. It is essential to disclose that the main researcher of this study is currently an elementary school principal working in a school with a population of ELLs. This being stated, this researcher has personal assumptions, beliefs and opinions about teachers’ and principals’ work with all students, especially ELLs.

**Controlling Limitations**

The question of how to control for the potential limitations and personal bias of this study is an important one. It is difficult, if not impossible, for any researcher to control limitations that have to do with human beings, i.e. potential participants. The best that any researcher can do is to be upfront about potential limitations and allow the reader to draw his or her conclusions.

In order to respond to potential limitations in the questionnaire, a pre-pilot and a pilot study were done, both were voluntary. The pre-pilot took place at the author’s school and the pilot was given to another school in the same district that had been identified through the
DESE’s 2010 DART model. Feedback about questions was considered and updates were made. Questions have been reviewed and approved by a panel of experts on ELLs and reading. These experts include the Director of English Language Learners for an urban school district; an assistant professor from a Boston-area college who currently is researching the literacy development of children from immigrant and bilingual homes and a doctoral candidate in Human Development and Education at another Boston-area college who is currently researching reading assessment of primary-aged ELL students.

One uncontrollable limitation that may have impacted the response rate was the weather during the timeframe of the study. There were multiple snowstorms resulting in many snow days at the different schools focused on in the study. Missing multiple days of schools is a stressor on teachers and principals; so much so that perhaps a number of potential participants did not respond to stress level.

One of the most difficult limitations to control is the personal bias that the author possesses. It will be necessary to focus and reflect on the data that is generated from the questionnaires.

The results of this study will either support or challenge the two hypotheses that were stated above. Since teachers and principals will be completing the questionnaire, a statistical analysis of the responses will be able to determine if there is a difference between teacher perceptions and principal perceptions when it comes to ELL knowledge and leadership.

Delimitations

This study did not attempt to verify the correlations presented by Marzano et al. (2005).
Chapter Summary

Chapter Three explains the study’s methodology. It began with a brief restatement of the conceptual framework: the seriousness of the problem caused by an increased number of ELLs in classrooms, and the decreased number of educators able to effectively instruct them. The three research questions were listed: a rationale given for their selection, a discussion of how they connect with one another, and the relationship between them. Then the three questions were related to two research hypotheses. The methods that would be used to elicit responses from teachers and principals were described; these included a description of how participants were identified, as well as the process that was undertaken in order to gain consent and responses from participants. Finally, the validity of the study was examined, including a discussion of potential limitations.

In the next chapter of the study, results gathered from the raw data of the both teacher and principal questionnaires will be analyzed and compared in order to determine the relationship between teachers’ and principals’ perceptions.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS

Chapter Four presents an explanation of the methods used to analyze three types of data and the analyses of those three data sources. Parts 2 and 3 relate the data to the study’s three research questions. The three parts include (1) descriptive data to inform the reader about the study participants, (2) quantitative data from teacher and principal questionnaires, and (3) qualitative data that was gleaned from teacher and principal responses to short answer questions.

Elementary teachers and elementary school principals responded to on-line questionnaires that resulted in both quantitative (multiple choice questions using a Likert scale) and qualitative (open response questions) responses. Results will be shown in three parts. The first part will provide an analysis of the actual study participants and the qualifier data they shared about themselves. The second will show results and an analysis, as they pertain to each research question. The third part will focus on teacher and principal comments. To reiterate, the research questions are as follows:

1. What do elementary school principals need to know and be able to do to better support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (their second language, L2)?
2. What leadership factors contribute to and/or inhibit the support of teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?
3. How can elementary school principals, as instructional leaders, better educate and support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?

Part One: Analysis of Participants

The data from Part One of LTR-T and LTR-P are analyzed to summarize the information that teachers and elementary school principals shared about their current role, licensure, number of years in the field, number of years working with ELLs and ELL professional development
experiences. Most are simple percentages (e.g. 80% of the teachers possess elementary licenses and 19.0% of the principals possess elementary licenses). If they shared that they had taken Category I or IV trainings, teachers and elementary school principals were asked to reflect on the skills that they had learned. Data are analyzed based on a five-point Likert scale and are presented in percentages, based on the number of teachers or principals who responded. Since such a small number of principals participated in the study, the actual number of respondents was listed.

**Teachers**

Twenty-six teachers from eight schools accessed LTR-T. All 26 respondents answered questions; 21 responded to most questions and five responded only to the short answer questions. Teachers included a cross section of primary level teachers (see Table 8) who hold a variety of educator licenses (see Table 9). Teachers had been in the profession for between 1 and 26+ years (see Table 10) and had the same range of years of teaching English Language Learners (see Table 11). All teachers who participated were white; with 100% reporting they spoke English, 10% reporting they spoke Spanish, 10% reporting they spoke French and 20% reporting they spoke Italian.

Table 8

*Grade levels taught by teacher participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Kindergarten</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

*Educator licensure held by teacher participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Special Needs</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Special Needs</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

*Years in the field as a teacher*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 25</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 and over</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

*Years working with English Language Learners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 25</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 and over</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers were asked about participation in professional development to support them in their work with English Language Learners. Results indicate that most teachers surveyed
received non-Category, professional development to support their work with English Language Learners from either school district ELL training or graduate level ELL coursework. Table 12 indicates teachers’ non-category ELL professional development.

Table 12

*Teachers and non-category ELL training participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Building Level ELL Training</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Level ELL Training</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Conference or Workshop</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Elementary and Secondary Education sponsored course</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate level ELL coursework</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate level ELL coursework</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate level coursework</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When it came to answering the questions about participating in the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Category Trainings data is skewed. There was not one of those questions that all 21 teachers responded to. In fact, for Categories II – VI, 7 or fewer respondents answered. Table 13 indicates teachers and ELL Category Training participation.
Table 13

*Teachers and ELL category training participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents who have taken the course</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category I: Introduction to Second Language Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>16 of 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category II: Sheltering Content Instruction</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>7 of 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category III: Assessing Speaking and Listening</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4 of 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category IV: Teaching Reading and Writing to Limited English Proficient Students</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5 of 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly enough, 15 of 21 respondents answered questions about the knowledge and skills they had gained from taking both Category I and Category IV. Category I does make sense as 16 teachers indicated that they had taken Category I training. Though 16 teachers skipped the question asking if they had taken the Category IV, 16 teachers responded to the questions about knowledge and skills they had gained from Category IV training. Tables 14 and 15 detail what teachers’ self-perceptions of knowledge and skills learned in Category Trainings.
### Table 14

**Teachers’ self-perceptions of knowledge and skills learned in Category I training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expertly</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Not so well</th>
<th>No, not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand key factors that affect second language.</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the implications of the key factors on classroom organization and instruction.</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the implications of cultural difference for classroom organization and instruction.</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the organization, content, and performance levels in the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to analyze your own classroom as a site for second language acquisition and make appropriate adjustments.</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to use knowledge of factors affecting second language acquisition to modify instruction for students who are having difficulty in learning English and/or subject matter content.</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Teachers’ self-perceptions of knowledge and skills learned in Category IV training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expertly</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Not so well</th>
<th>No, not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand the basic concepts of linguistics, including phonology and syntax of English.</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand significant theories and practices for developing reading skills and reading comprehension in English for limited English proficient students who are at different English proficiency levels.</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know a variety of strategies for teaching vocabulary.</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands approaches and practices for developing writing skills in limited English proficient students.</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand initial reading instruction, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension. The differences in initial reading instruction in English designed for those students who have no or limited oral proficiency in English compared to those who do have oral proficiency in English.</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the performance criteria and scoring system used in the MEPA (Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment) and based on the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to plan and deliver reading instruction appropriate for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English language proficiency.</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and deliver writing instruction and activities for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English proficiency.</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am able to use the scoring rubric and test results of the MEPA to plan reading and writing instruction for limited English proficient students who are at different proficiency levels.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6.7%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>53.3%</th>
<th>33.3%</th>
<th>6.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am able to plan and deliver early literacy instruction for students who have no or limited oral proficiency or literacy in English.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13.3%</th>
<th>26.7%</th>
<th>40.0%</th>
<th>13.3%</th>
<th>6.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Principals**

Four elementary school principals from eight schools accessed LTR-P. The four principals all worked in schools that had grades K – 3; one reported the inclusion of a pre-kindergarten program. All principals surveyed have been a principal between 1 and 5 years and hold a Principal/Assistant Principal license. Multiple licenses were held including Elementary Teacher, Early Childhood Educator and Literacy Coordinator, K – 2. Half of the principals reported that ELLs had been included in their schools for between 6 – 10 years and half reported that ELLs had been included in their schools for between 11 – 15 years. All principals who participated were white, with 100% reporting they spoke English; and one principal reporting to speak Spanish.

The elementary school principals were asked about participation in professional development to support them in their work with English Language Learners. Results indicate that all principals surveyed received non-Category, professional development to support their work with English Language Learners from either school building ELL training, school district ELL training or DESE sponsored course. Refer to Table 16 and 17 for specifics on what trainings principals took and what licensures are held by participating principals.
Table 16

*Principals and non-category ELL training participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Building Level ELL Training</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Level ELL Training</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Conference or Workshop</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Elementary and Secondary</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education sponsored course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate level ELL coursework</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate level ELL coursework</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate level coursework</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

*Educator licensure held by principal participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Assistant Principal</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Special Needs</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was the case with the teachers, principals answered questions about the knowledge and skills they had gained from taking both Category I and Category IV. Category I Training does make sense, as two principals indicated that they had taken Category I Training. Though no principals skipped the question asking if they had taken the Category IV, 16 teachers responded to the questions about knowledge and skills they had gained from Category IV Training. Table 18 shows the details of the number of participating principals who took Category Trainings.
Table 18

*Principals and ELL category training participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category I: Introduction to Second Language Learning and Teaching</th>
<th>Respondents who have taken the course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category II: Sheltering Content Instruction</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category III: Assessing Speaking and Listening</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category IV: Teaching Reading and Writing to Limited English Proficient Students</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 shows principals’ self-perceptions of knowledge and skills gained in Category I Training.
Table 19

*Principals’ self-perceptions of knowledge and skills learned in Category I training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expertly</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Not so well</th>
<th>No, not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand key factors that affect second language.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the implications of the key factors on classroom organization and instruction.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the implications of cultural difference for classroom organization and instruction.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the organization, content, and performance levels in the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to analyze your own classroom as a site for second language acquisition and make appropriate adjustments.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to use knowledge of factors affecting second language acquisition to modify instruction for students who are having difficulty in learning English and/or subject matter content.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 shows principals’ self-perceptions of knowledge and skills gained in Category IV Training.
Table 20

*Principals’ self-perceptions of knowledge and skills learned in Category IV training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expertly</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Not so well</th>
<th>No, not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand the basic concepts of linguistics, including phonology and syntax of English.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand significant theories and practices for developing reading skills and reading comprehension in English for limited English proficient students who are at different English proficiency levels.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know a variety of strategies for teaching vocabulary.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands approaches and practices for developing writing skills in limited English proficient students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand initial reading instruction, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension. The differences in initial reading instruction in English designed for those students who have no or limited oral proficiency in English compared to those who do have oral proficiency in English.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the performance criteria and scoring system used in the MEPA (Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment) and based on the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to plan and deliver reading instruction appropriate for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English language proficiency.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and deliver writing instruction and activities for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English proficiency.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to use the scoring rubric and test results of the MEPA to plan reading and writing instruction for limited</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English proficient students who are at different proficiency levels.

| I am able to plan and deliver early literacy instruction for students who have no or limited oral proficiency or literacy in English. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

**Part Two: Analysis of Study Results**

One focus of this study was to compare the perceptions that teachers have of principal behavior with the perceptions that principals have of themselves. Each statement called for a Likert-scale response: strongly agree, agree, don’t know, disagree or strongly disagree. During the analysis of the data, each response category was assigned a number, 1 – 5. After assigning numerical values, it was possible to determine the mean response to each statement (mean responses can be found in *Appendix F*). In order to compare the means, a t-test measure was used. The t-test is the statistical measure that compares the means of two dependent variables. The results were determined using a two-tailed test, since directionality wasn’t a contributing factor to potential differences in ratings. In this case, the means of the teacher responses are compared to the means of the principal responses on all 39 statements of the questionnaires.

Part Two will provide the reader with an analysis of the data from the on-line questionnaires. Data was analyzed using a t-test for the significance of the correlation coefficient. This analysis is done on each question of the instrument used with teachers (Leading to Read: Teachers Perceptions of Principals) and principals (Leading to Read: Principals’ Self Perceptions) in order to determine the statistical significance between the teacher responses and the principal responses. This t-test was done because the study is an examination of a relationship between variables (teacher responses and principal responses) and the participants are asked to complete a survey only one time.
In addition to t-test results, results from Levene’s Test for Equal Variances are included. Levene’s Test for Equal Variance is needed because teacher and principal samples are not the same size. When the Levene test for equal variances indicated a statistical significance ($< 0.05$) between the two groups, the t-test results that are shown are for groups where equal variance is not assumed. When the Levene test for equal variances is $> 0.05$, then it is assumed that the two variables are approximately equal and t-test results for assumed equal variance are used.

For purposes of this analysis, the critical values that are associated with the degree of freedom (or Df, as it is referred to on the tables) at a two-tailed test significance of 0.05 are used. If the t-test value is greater than the critical value, the conclusion is that the null hypothesis is rejected. If the t-test value is less than the critical value, the null hypothesis is accepted. Since the Df values range between 20 and 24 for this study, the critical values range between 2.064 and 2.086.

The assumption at the onset of the study was that there would be no significant difference between the means of the teachers’ responses compared to the means of the principals’ responses. For example, one statement on the questionnaire calls for participants to reflect on how “Principal understands the stages of second language acquisition.” The null hypothesis assumes that teachers and principals would either both agree (the principal understands the stages of second language acquisition) or disagree (the principal does not understand the stages of second language acquisition).

Tables 21 – 25 show the results from the questionnaires’ Part 2: Roles of Principals in Teaching ELLs to Learn to Read. Tables 26 - 30 report the findings of the questionnaires’ Part 3: Leadership Characteristics of Principals in Relationship to Their Work with ELLs (author’s note: principals’ work with ELLs refers to their support of teachers’ instruction of ELLs).
Table 21 indicates statistical relationships between teachers’ perceptions and principals’ self-perceptions in statements concerning the roles of principals in the teaching of ELLs learning to read, related to second language acquisition.
Table 21

*Roles of Principals in the Teaching ELLs to Learn to Read: Second Language Acquisition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal understands The stages of second language acquisition</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal understands Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal knows the difference between second language acquisition and learning issues. Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal knows the difference between BICS and CALP. Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal analyzes teachers’ classrooms as a site for 2nd language and advises about appropriate adjustments Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal uses knowledge of factors affecting 2nd language acquisition to support teachers in modifying instruction for students who are having difficulty learning to read in English. Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>10.578</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 indicates statistical relationships between teachers’ perceptions and principals’ self-perceptions in statements concerning the roles of principals in the teaching of ELLs learning to read, related to reading assessment.
Table 22

*Roles of Principals in the Teaching ELLs to Learn to Read: Reading/Assessment*

| Principal makes sure that teacher is able to conduct early and ongoing assessment of children’s second language learning and reading skills development. | Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | F | Sig. | t | Df | Sig (2-tailed) | Mean Differences |
| Principal makes sure that teacher is able to conduct early and ongoing assessment of children’s second language learning and reading skills development. | Equal variances not assumed | 15.304 | .001 | -2.210 | 20.000 | .039 | -.6190 |
| Principal makes sure that teachers know the difference between teaching native speakers to learn to read in English and ELLs to learn to read in a second language. | Equal variances not assumed | .7830 | .010 | -3.3873 | 20.000 | .001 | -1.000 |
| Principal makes sure teachers use research based strategies to support children’s language learning and reading development. | Equal variances not assumed | 5.129 | .033 | -2.726 | 20.000 | .021 | -.9643 |
| Principal makes sure that all students have access to language-rich, | Equal variances not assumed | 11.224 | .003 | -1.190 | 20.000 | .071 | -.4286 |
Table 23 indicates statistical relationships between teachers’ perceptions and principals’ self-perceptions in statements concerning the roles of principals in the teaching of ELLs learning to read, related to cultural responsiveness.
### Table 23

**Roles of Principals in the Teaching ELLs to Learn to Read: Cultural Responsiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal has made appropriate connections with parents of ELLs.</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>12.799</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal provides translators for meetings with parents of ELLs.</td>
<td>1.777</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.193</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal understands the influence of ELL students’ cultures in his/her learning and behavior.</td>
<td>2.186</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 indicates statistical relationships between teachers’ perceptions and principals’ self-perceptions in statements concerning the roles of elementary principals in the teaching of ELLs learning to read, related to teacher support.
Table 24

*Roles of Principals in the Teaching ELLs to Learn to Read: Teacher Support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal provides teachers with access to appropriate and relevant PD about working with ELLs.</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Mean Differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal provides teachers with access to appropriate and relevant PD about working with ELLs.</td>
<td>9.514</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-2.257</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.4286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal supports teachers in the work with ELLs in order that students achieve at grade level in reading.</td>
<td>9.034</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-1.896</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.3810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 indicates statistical relationships between teachers’ perceptions and principals’ self-perceptions in statements concerning the roles of elementary principals in the teaching of ELLs learning to read, related to policy.
Table 25

Roles of Principals in the Teaching ELLs to Learn to Read: Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Description</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal has explained to teachers how/why ELLs were placed in their class.</td>
<td>F = .046, Sig. = .832, df = 23, t = -.429, Sig (2-tailed) = .672</td>
<td>Mean Differences = -.2619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal has explained the MA law around educating ELLs to teachers.</td>
<td>F = .010, Sig. = .921, df = 23, t = -.561, Sig (2-tailed) = .581</td>
<td>Mean Differences = -.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal uses data to drive instructional decisions.</td>
<td>F = .086, Sig. = .772, df = 23, t = .612, Sig (2-tailed) = .546</td>
<td>Mean Differences = .3452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal oversees that an effective reading schedule is implemented.</td>
<td>F = .684, Sig. = .417, df = 22, t = -.915, Sig (2-tailed) = .370</td>
<td>Mean Differences = -.5714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal conducts formal observations and informal walkthroughs during reading.</td>
<td>F = .134, Sig. = .718, df = 23, t = -.890, Sig (2-tailed) = .383</td>
<td>Mean Differences = -.4524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal keeps staff informed of current school, district and state policies re: education of ELLs.</td>
<td>F = 3.287, Sig. = .083, df = 23, t = -1.619, Sig (2-tailed) = .119</td>
<td>Mean Differences = -.8214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26 indicates statistical relationships between teachers’ perceptions and principals’ self-perceptions in statements about the leadership characteristics of elementary principals in their work with ELLs concerning second language acquisition.
Table 26

_Leadership Characteristics of Principals in Relation to Their Work with ELLs: Second Language Acquisition_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of principal being directly involved in instruction of ELLs at the classroom level.</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of principal’s awareness of best practices in ELL curriculum.</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 indicates statistical relationships between teachers’ perceptions and principals’ self-perceptions in statements about leadership characteristics of principals in their work with ELLs concerning reading assessment.
Table 27

*Leadership Characteristics of Principals in Relation to Their Work with ELLs:*

*Reading/Assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Principal being directly involved in assessment activities of ELLs at the classroom level.</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.402</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Principal being aware of best practices in the instruction of ELLs.</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>24.177</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Principal’s awareness of best practices in assessment of ELLs.</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>14.651</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 indicates statistical relationships between teachers’ perceptions and principals’ self-perceptions in statements about the leadership characteristics of elementary principals in their work with ELL concerning cultural responsiveness.
Table 28

*Leadership Characteristics of Principals in Relation to Their Work with ELLs: Cultural Responsiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Principal sharing beliefs.</th>
<th>Equal variances not assumed</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>Mean Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Principal sharing beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.540</td>
<td>-5.137</td>
<td>21.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Principal having contact with ELL students and parents.</td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>21.196</td>
<td>-3.578</td>
<td>21.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 indicates statistical relationships between teachers’ perceptions and principals’ self-perceptions in statements about leadership characteristics of elementary principals in their work with ELLs concerning teacher support.
### Table 29

**Leadership Characteristics of Principals in Relation to Their Work with ELLs: Teacher Support**

| Importance of Principal establishing strong lines of communication with and between teachers and ELLs and families. | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | Sig. | T | df | Sig (2-tailed) | Mean Differences |
| Equal variances not assumed | 17.333 | .000 | -4.161 | 21.000 | .000 | -.5909 |
| Importance of Principal protecting teachers from issues/interferences that would detract them from instructional time or focus. | .587 | .451 | -.560 | 24 | .580 | -.2273 |
| Equal variances assumed | | | | | | |
| Importance of Principal providing teachers with materials and PD necessary for successful execution of their duties. | 19.540 | .000 | -5.137 | 21.000 | .000 | -.6363 |
| Equal variances not assumed | | | | | | |

Table 30 indicates statistical relationships between teachers’ perceptions and principals’ self-perceptions in statements about the leadership characteristics of elementary principals in their work with ELLs concerning policy.
Table 30

*Leadership Characteristics of Principals in Relation to Their Work with ELLs: Policy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Principal</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Principal explaining decisions made in terms of beliefs that academic achievement is not the only means of success in school.</td>
<td>4.836</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Principal involving teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies.</td>
<td>17.333</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Principal ensuring that faculty/staff are aware of the current theories/practices regarding effective education of ELLs.</td>
<td>2.152</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Principal making sure that discussion of current theories and practices re: effective education of</td>
<td>1.652</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELLs, are a regular aspect of school culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Principal to monitor the effectiveness of school practices in terms of their impact on student achievement.</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>1.118</th>
<th>.310</th>
<th>-.505</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>.618</th>
<th>-.1591</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Principal to establish a set of standard operating policies and routines.</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>-.0455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above results show a range of results, both statistically significant and statistically insignificant. Given the initial assumption of the null hypothesis at the onset of this study, finding both statistically significant and statistically insignificant results leads to the conclusion that there are areas in which teacher and principal perceptions are different, in addition to areas in which teacher and principal perceptions are similar. Therefore, the null hypothesis can be rejected for a number of the questionnaires’ statements, leading to the possibility that the perceptions of teachers and principals are not that predictable.

The following section lists each research question and the on-line questionnaire statements associated with it. The t-test and 2-tailed significance values associated with each statement are also listed. Listed first are those statements whose results led to accepting the null hypothesis by not having significantly different means (< 0.05), according to the results of the t-test. Following those are the questions whose results did demonstrate statistically significance (>
between means, between means, indicating that the null hypothesis can be rejected and that the difference is due to systematic influence, providing implications for practice.

For purposes of this analysis, the author uses the critical values that are associated with the degree of freedom (or Df, i.e. approximate sample size) at a two-tailed test significance of 0.05. If the t-test value is greater than the critical value, the conclusion is that the null hypothesis is rejected. If the t-test value is less than the critical value, the null hypothesis is the most reasonable explanation for the observed differences. Since the Df values range between 20 and 24 for this study, the critical values range between 2.064 and 2.086. Please note that, although the t-test may be listed as a negative number on the table, the absolute value is used in discussion and analysis.

**Research Question 1**

What do elementary school principals need to know and be able to do to better support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (their second language, L2)? Null hypothesis is accepted:

- Principal knows the difference between BICS and CALP. The t-test value is 1.436 with a 2-tailed significance of .165.
- Principal has been trained in the MELA-O. The t-test value is 1.027 with a 2-tailed significance of .315.
- Principal understands the influence of ELL students’ cultures in his/her learning and behavior. The t-test value is 1.400 with a 2-tailed significance of .175.
- Principal uses data to drive instructional decisions. The t-test value is .612 with a 2-tailed significance of .546.
• Principal oversees that an effective reading schedule is implemented. The t-test value is .915 with a 2-tailed significance of .370.

• Principal conducts formal observations and informal walkthroughs during reading. The t-test value is .890 with a 2-tailed significance of .383.

• Importance of principal’s awareness of best practices in ELL curriculum. The t-test is .429 with a 2-tailed significance of .672.

• Importance of Principal to establish a set of standard operating policies and routines. The t-test is .141 with a 2-tailed significance of .889.

Null hypothesis is rejected:

• Principal understands the stages of second language acquisition. The t-test value is 2.239 with a 2-tailed significance of .035.

• Principal knows the difference between second language acquisition and learning issues. The t-test value is 2.313 with a 2-tailed significance of .030.

• Principal has been trained in teaching reading and writing to ELLs. The t-test is 4.664 with a 2-tailed significance of .000.

• Principal has made appropriate connections with parents of ELLs. The t-test is 2434 with a 2-tailed significance of .024.

• Importance of Principal being directly involved in assessment activities of ELLs at the classroom level. The t-test is 2.659 with a 2-tailed significance of .014.

• Importance of Principal being aware of best practices in the instruction of ELLs. The t-test is 4.695 with a 2-tailed significance of .000.

• Importance of Principal’s awareness of best practices in assessment of ELLs. The t-test is 5.631 with a 2-tailed significance of .000.
• Importance of Principal sharing beliefs. The t-test is 5.137 with a 2-tailed significance of .000.

• Importance of Principal having contact with ELL students and parents. The t-test is 3.570 with a 2-tailed significance of .002.

• Importance of Principal explaining decisions made in terms of beliefs that academic achievement is not the only means of success in school. The t-test is 5.898 with a 2-tailed significance of .000.

Research Question 2

What leadership factors contribute to and/or inhibit the support of teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)? Null hypothesis is accepted:

• Principal makes sure that all students have access to language-rich, rigorous and engaging reading curricula, including materials appropriate for ELLs. The t-test is 1.190 with a 2-tailed significance of .071.

• Principal provides translators for meetings with parents of ELLs. The t-test value is .976.

• Principal support inclusion of ELLs’ ways of knowing into the curriculum. The t-test value is 1.518 with a 2-tailed significance of .143.

• Principal keeps staff informed of current school, district and state policies re: education of ELLs. The t-test value is 1.619 with a 2-tailed significance of .119.

• Importance of Principal protecting teachers from issues/interferences that would detract them from instructional time or focus. The t-test is .560 with a 2-tailed significance of .580.
Null hypothesis is rejected:

- Importance of principal being directly involved in instruction of ELLs at the classroom level. The t-test is 2.199 with a 2-tailed significance of .038.

- Importance of Principal involving teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies. The t-test is 4.161 with a 2-tailed significance of .000.

- Importance of Principal to monitor the effectiveness of school practices in terms of their impact on student achievement. The t-test is .505 with a 2-tailed significance of .000.

Research Question 3

How can elementary school principals, as instructional leaders, better educate and support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)? Null hypothesis is accepted:

- Principal supports teachers in the work with ELLs in order that students achieve at grade level in reading. The t-test value is 1.896 with a 2-tailed significance of .072.

- Principal has explained to teachers how/why ELLs were placed in their class. The t-test value is .424 with a 2-tailed significance of .672.

- Principal has explained the MA law around educating ELLs to teachers. The t-test value is .561 with a 2-tailed significance of .581.

- Importance of Principal ensuring that faculty/staff are aware of the current theories/practices regarding effective education of ELLs. The t-test value is .930 with a 2-tailed significance of .362.
• Importance of Principal making sure that discussion of current theories and practices re: effective education of ELLs, are a regular aspect of school culture. The t-test value is .644 with a 2-tailed significance of .526.

Null hypothesis is rejected:

• Principal analyzes teachers’ classrooms as a site for 2nd language and advises about appropriate adjustments. The t-test value is 3.488 with a 2-tailed significance of .002.
• Principal uses knowledge factors affecting 2nd language acquisition to support teachers in modifying instruction for students who are having difficulty learning to read in English. The t-test value is 5.294 with a 2-tailed significance of .000.
• Principal makes sure that teacher is able to conduct early and ongoing assessment of children’s second language learning and reading skills development. The t-test value is 2.210 with a 2-tailed significance of .039.
• Principal makes sure that teachers know the difference between teaching native speakers to learn to read in English and ELLs to learn to read in a second language. The t-test value is 3.3873 with a 2-tailed significance of .001.
• Principal makes sure teachers use research based strategies to support children’s language learning and reading development. The t-test value is 2.726 with a 2-tailed significance of .021.
• Principal provides teachers with access to appropriate and relevant professional development about working with ELLs. The t-test value is 2.257 with a 2-tailed significance of .035.
• Importance of Principal establishing strong lines of communication with and between teachers and ELLs and families. The t-test value is 4.161 with a 2-tailed significance of .000.

• Importance of Principal providing teachers with materials and professional development necessary for successful execution of their duties. The t-test value is 5.137 with a 2-tailed significance of .000.

There is no pattern to the results. The null hypothesis is accepted and rejected in both the role of principals in teaching ELLs and the leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with ELLs in all three research questions. To summarize the results, Table 31 lists each research question and indicates how many of the statements associated with them have accepted or rejected null hypotheses.

Table 31

Comparing Conclusions by Research Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Accept the null hypothesis</th>
<th>Reject the null hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do elementary school principals need to know and be able to do in order to support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (their second language, L2)?</td>
<td>Role of principals in teaching ELLs = 6</td>
<td>Role of principals in teaching ELLs = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with ELLs = 2</td>
<td>Leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with ELLs = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What leadership factors contribute to and/or inhibit the support of teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?</td>
<td>Role of principals in teaching ELLs = 4</td>
<td>Role of principals in teaching ELLs = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with ELLs = 1</td>
<td>Leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with ELLs = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can elementary school principals, as instructional leaders, better educate and support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English?</td>
<td>Role of principals in teaching ELLs = 3</td>
<td>Role of principals in teaching ELLs = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with ELLs = 2</td>
<td>Leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with ELLs = 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results listed above are based on the 39 questions from two on-line questionnaires that compare teachers’ and principals’ perceptions of principals’ behaviors. Eighteen of the 29 questions that participants responded to had t-test scores with a statistical significance of greater than the listed critical value, indicating an acceptance of the null hypothesis. The other 21 t-tests had a statistical significance of less than the critical value, indicating that the null hypothesis should be rejected. This leads to the conclusion that the difference between the perceptions of teachers’ and the self-perceptions of principals is not due to chance and must be due to other factors. Possible factors will be discussed in Chapter Five.

Part Three: Short Answer Responses

The data from Part 3 of the LTR-T and LTR-P questionnaires are reported word for word in order to elaborate on the questionnaire data that was reported in Parts 1 and 2 of the questionnaires. Since both teacher and principal responses vary greatly, all responses are transcribed.

There were six questions asked at the end of Part 2 of LTR-T and 3 questions asked at the end of LTR-P. Teachers’ short answer responses are reported in Table 32.

Table 32
Teacher Responses to Short Answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are your ELL students making effective progress in the area of reading?</td>
<td>Yes. In guided reading groups I take running records, monitor comprehension using retelling stories and use Dibels and Rigby leveling books to measure progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are your ELL students making effective progress in the area of reading?</td>
<td>Yes. We use a leveled guided reading approach and my students are making progress at increasing levels and are able to comprehend the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are your ELL students making effective progress in the area of reading?</td>
<td>Yes and no. Some of my ELL students are making effective progress (particularly those that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have parents that are able to speak English at home?</td>
<td>Have parents that are able to speak English at home) while others are not - this is evident through informal observation, DIBELS results, and the results from the STAR early literacy assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you sure?</td>
<td>Not sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you teach and assess your ELL students?</td>
<td>Yes. I teach and assess my ELL students (I am the ELL teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you use Dibbles for fluency and the Benchmark Assessment System?</td>
<td>No. We use Dibbles for fluency and the Benchmark Assessment System. My one ELL student also has some learning disabilities and he is not making adequate progress at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you administer the DRA at least twice a year?</td>
<td>Yes. Ongoing assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any ELL students?</td>
<td>I do not have any ELL students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see an increase in both DIBELS and DRA scoring?</td>
<td>Yes. I see an increase in both DIBELS and DRA scoring where my ELL student had hit the benchmark established by both assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you assess throughout the year?</td>
<td>Yes. Assessments throughout the year show growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have some students who are fluent in English and some who are not</td>
<td>Not sure. Some are, and some, no. In Kindergarten, we begin with letters, sounds and lots of phonological awareness. Pictures support everything. When students leave for an extended trip to Brazil, they return often forgetting what was already taught and we need to start over again. It is very frustrating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you say no to one student?</td>
<td>No. I only say no to one student, however, she is severely disabled and is also part of what we call our Developmental program, for students with very low IQs and have other severe learning disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you collect a variety of data on a regular basis?</td>
<td>Yes. We collect a variety of data on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have extended absences due to traveling to Brazil for 2+ months during the school year?</td>
<td>No. Extended absences due to traveling to Brazil for 2+ months during the school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are our ELL teacher provides materials and resources for our ELL students, or suggests</td>
<td>Yes. Our ELL teacher provides materials and resources for our ELL students, or suggests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with the materials that you are provided with in order to teach your ELL students to speak and read?</td>
<td>Yes. We just adopted new reading series called Journeys which has a lot of ELL support materials included for the classroom teacher as well as the ELL tutors at our school. Not sure. I have not been specifically provided with materials for working with ELLs in my classroom... However, I have used classroom monies to order materials that I use w/ELLS. No. Anything I have as resources are from a grant that I wrote. Otherwise, I have NO budget. No. We wanted to purchase a reading comprehension intervention kit but it cost too much money. Yes. Yes. Yes. No. We are not provided with materials, I create my own. Yes. Yes. I have an abundance of materials because it is kindergarten and we have lots of beginning materials. Yes. I am piloting Journeys reading program this year and I LOVE all of the extra ELL materials the program provides!! No. I would like more materials for teaching common vocabulary. Yes. No. Yes. We have a variety of materials and support for the staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials that might be available. It would be helpful to have money to purchase additional materials.</td>
<td>Yes. School and district wide assessments Not sure Yes. Fluency and comprehension assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your school implement a Response to Intervention (RtI) model?</td>
<td>23 Responses  &lt;br&gt; 88% = Yes  &lt;br&gt; 8% = No  &lt;br&gt; 4% = Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your ELL students have access to RtI in your school?</td>
<td>23 respondents.  &lt;br&gt; 83% = yes  &lt;br&gt; 16% = no  &lt;br&gt; 1% = Not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| What kind of feedback have you received from your principal in response to a formally or informally observed reading lesson that included ELL students? | My principal has been completely supportive of the reading instruction that she has observed. She taught first grade for 12+ years before becoming our principal so she is extremely knowledgeable about reading instruction.....and also did a lot of work through Lesley's Collaborative Reading Instruction groups.  <br> I have not yet been observed by our current principal. My previous principal provided feedback to suggest minor differentiation strategies to better support my ELL students.  <br> I have never received direct feedback about ELL students in my room.  <br> My principal has not observed such a lesson.  <br> Wonderful and helpful.  <br> Positive feedback.  <br> n/a  <br> My principal is in her first year at my school. I am not being formally observed this year and she has not yet been in my classroom for informal observations or visits.  <br> I do not have any ELL students, nor have I had any in the last 4 years.  <br> Very positive.  <br> n/a  <br> None  <br> None really.  <br> None.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What skills, supports and/or professional development do you need from</td>
<td>I'd love to receive the other ELL category trainings that I have not yet had the opportunity to take! I've taken the MELA-O Training and the Teaching Strategies IV training only and I have so much more to learn!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your principal to make you more effective in working with ELLs?</td>
<td>The principal could learn more about the variety of cultures that we celebrate at our school, as opposed to making generalizations or inadvertently reinforcing stereotypes of various cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have friends in [another district] who have taken the &quot;Sheltering Content Instruction&quot; classes and have found it very valuable. I would love to be given that opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I suppose I'd know more if I had more ELL students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication to parents, translators, and help in altering the teacher who will not budge his/her opinion of ELL students (and the teacher's need to provide differentiated instruction. - ELLs are not 'sped kids'!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think I should take the next Category training, but it appears that in my district Cat 1&amp;2 seem to be offered together. I've already take Category 1 so I'm not sure what to do, yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have only taken the Level I course for ELL instruction, which is basically just an overview. I have asked to be included in the next group of teachers, who are trained in Level II, which I believe is much more pragmatic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 and 3 training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to get familiar with the new common core standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent offerings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be nice if they knew how hard we work to give these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students extra support. Often times, these students need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so much that they take away from the other students in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common planning time with the ELL teacher perhaps, so we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can all be on the same page!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary materials would be helpful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Category IV training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, guest speakers, articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are given the necessary P.D. through our ELL and Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers in the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More specific ELL student interventions, not just literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and math interventions. More support for families.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow me more flexibility with my scheduling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no ELL students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To finish the category trainings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principals’ short answer responses are reported in Table 33.
Table 33

**Principals’ Responses to Short Answers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are your ELL students making effective progress in the area of reading?</td>
<td>Not sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. I have checked the assessments and spoken to ELL director as well as teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Both benchmark testing within the curriculum, Rigby, Dibels...etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of feedback have you given to your teachers in response to a formally or informally observed reading lesson that included ELL students?</td>
<td>Formal write-up. Face to face conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal write-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face to face conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What skills, supports and/or professional development do you give to your teachers to support them in working effectively in working with ELLs?</td>
<td>District has planned Category Trainings on Saturdays - no interest among teachers for weekend class. Superintendent will plan Category Trainings during school days and get subs, but the process will be very slow due to the limited number of subs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our ell director is always checking in w/ teachers. Not enough though!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>No response</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to an ELL teacher and an ELL tutor, who comes into their classrooms and holds individual sessions with the students, our reading Specialist helps with all struggling readers....ELL or not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis was assumed at the onset of the study; there was an assumption that teachers’ and principals’ perceptions of principals’ behaviors and understanding of what it takes to educate ELLs effectively would be similar. That is not what happened in this study. While the results of 18 questions do lead to the conclusion that that the perceptions are similar, the results of 21 questions lead to the conclusion that there is something else responsible for the difference.
Reviewing the comments made by teachers tell a similar story. Six of 23 teachers indicated that they did not get any feedback from his or her principal in response to a formally or informally observed reading lesson that included ELL students. Many teachers commented on their need for more professional development, including specifying Category trainings, to prepare them for their work with ELLs. A sample of their comments include: “I’d love to receive the other ELL category trainings that I have not yet had the opportunity to take! I’ve taken the MELA-O Training and the Teaching Strategies IV training only and I have so much more to learn!” “I have friends in [another district] who have taken the "Sheltering Content Instruction" classes and have found it very valuable. I would love to be given that opportunity.” “More specific ELL student interventions, not just literacy and math interventions. More support for families.” These comments clearly demonstrate that teachers understand their specific needs when it comes to working with ELLs.

Teachers expressed the following sentiments about their principal: “The principal could learn more about the variety of cultures that we celebrate at our school, as opposed to making generalizations or inadvertently reinforcing stereotypes of various cultures.” “Communication to parents, translators, and help in altering the teacher who will not budge his/her opinion of ELL students (and the teacher's need to provide differentiated instruction. - ELLs are not 'sped kids'!” “It would be nice if they knew how hard we work to give these students extra support. Often times, these students need so much that they take away from the other students in the classroom.” These comments by teachers clearly demonstrate a need for principals to change their behaviors when it comes to working with ELLs.
Chapter Summary

Chapter Four presented an analysis of three types of data: (1) descriptive data that informed the reader about the study participants; (2) quantitative data from two questionnaires that asked about perceptions of principal behavior, which were discussed as they related to the three research questions; and (3) qualitative data that was gleaned from teachers’ and principals’ responses to short answer questions.

Descriptive data indicated that 26 teachers responded to a questionnaire that asked about their perceptions concerning the role of principals in teaching ELLs to learn to read and their perceptions about the leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work with ELLs. Respondents reported they had been in the profession for between one and 26+ years and had the same range of years of teaching English Language Learners. All teachers who participated were white, and yet they reported a wide range of languages spoken: 100% spoke English; and, 10% spoke Spanish, 10% spoke French and 20% spoke Italian. Sixty-eight percent of the teachers who participated in the study taught at the Kindergarten or Grade 1 level. Eighty percent held elementary teacher licenses; fifteen percent held ESL teacher licenses. Over 80% teachers reported to have had either school or district-level ELL training. Sixteen of twenty-one teachers reported to have taken Category I Training; seven of the twenty-one have taken Category II. None report having taken Category III or IV.

Four elementary school principals responded to a questionnaire that asked them to define themselves on the same demographic topics. Respondents reported they had been a principal for between 1 and 4 years. Principals reported that ELLs had been included in their school populations for between 11 and 15 years. All principals who participated were white; with 100% reporting they spoke English; one principal reported speaking Spanish. Multiple licenses were
held, including Elementary Teacher, Early Childhood Educator and Literacy Coordinator, K – 2. Two thirds of principals reported to have had either school or district-level ELL training. Two principals reported to have taken Category I Training.

The null hypothesis was assumed at the beginning of the study. With the acceptance of the null hypothesis, the results of the questionnaire should lead to the conclusion that teachers and elementary school principals have similar perceptions of principals’ behaviors and understanding of what it takes to educate ELLs effectively. This is not what happened. In twenty-one areas the null hypothesis was rejected, meaning that there is something else responsible for the difference between teachers’ and principals’ perceptions.

Qualitative data supported the mixed results that were observed in the quantitative data. For example, while six teachers reported that they got little or no feedback from their principals, all principals indicated that they give feedback to their teachers, whether in writing or face to face. Additionally, principals and teachers are not on the same page when it comes to determining the skills, supports and/or professional development that teachers need to support them in working effectively in working with ELLs. Principals’ ideas are less specific than teachers, mentioning Category trainings, tutors for children and support from a district-level person. Teachers were very specific about their support needs. Specific examples included: cultural awareness support, help communicating with parents, common planning time with the ESL teacher and vocabulary support.

Chapter Four presented an explanation of the methods used to analyze the three types of data and the recorded analyses of those three data sources. Parts 2 and 3 related the data to the three research questions. The three types of data included (1) descriptive data to inform the reader about the study participants, (2) quantitative data from teacher and principal
questionnaires, and (3) qualitative data that was gleaned from teacher and principal responses to short answer questions.

Chapter Five will provide an overall summary of the study, including a discussion of the conclusions, based on the results, and theoretical and practical implications for school leaders. Limitations of the study will be reviewed and recommendations will be made about possible future research topics stemming from this study.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter places the study in a larger professional context. It includes (1) a summary of the study, (2) a discussion of the results of the data, (3) conclusions based on the study’s findings, (4) theoretical and practical implications, (5) limitations and delimitations of the study, and (6) possible future research opportunities.

Overview of Study

Two factors co-exist in American schools today that pose a major challenge: (1) there are an increasing number of English Language Learners are entering schools who are faced with the prospect of learning to read in English, and (2) there are very few highly trained general education classroom teachers teaching ELLs to learn to read. Overseeing the schools are principals who are not consistently able to support teachers in their teaching of ELLs because of their own lack of training. The following research questions were developed to better understand potential solutions to the problem of how elementary school principals can support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English:

1. What do elementary school principals need to know and be able to do in order to better support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (their second language, L2)?

2. What leadership factors contribute to and/or inhibit the support of teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?

3. How can elementary school principals, as instructional leaders, better educate and support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?
In order to determine what an elementary school principal needs to know and be able to do in order to support teachers in their work with English Language Learners (ELLs), the following topics were explored through research and literature: (1) the history of language learning education in the United States, (2) current educational policy in Massachusetts, (3) how to teach English Language Learners to learn to read in English, (4) preparing teachers and principals to appropriately instruct ELLs, and (5) the principal as instructional leader.

The last section of the review of literature, focusing on the principal as instructional leader, was based largely on the work of Marzano, Waters and McNulty (2005), who conducted a meta-analysis of 69 studies, that focused on principal leadership practices correlated to student learning. The reason that this work was used as a lens to view leadership in this study is that the main source of data from the multiple studies analyzed was culled from teacher interviews and questionnaires. This was based on the premise that given teachers’ close, regular proximity to principals they are experts on principal behavior.

Data were collected via on-line questionnaires. Each questionnaire had three parts: (1) Teacher or Principal Information, (2) Roles of Principals in Teaching ELLs to Learn to Read, and (3) Leadership Characteristics of Principals in Relationship to Their Work with ELLs. Each of the latter two parts was divided into five sections: Second Language Acquisition, Reading and Assessment, Cultural Responsiveness, Teacher Support and Policy.

Primary-level teachers and elementary school principals from eight schools were identified through the 2010 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s District Analysis and Review Tool (DART). These schools were comparable, based on student enrollment and demographics. Thirty-one percent of the 83 teachers who were invited to participate did so; 50% of the eight principals who were invited participated.
Discussion of results

The purpose of the study’s hypothesis was to determine if there was a statistical significance between the perceptions of teachers and the self-perceptions of elementary school principals in two areas: (1) the roles of principals in support of teachers of ELLs learning to read in English, and (2) the leadership characteristics of principals in relation to their work promoting the instruction of ELLs. A null hypothesis, or no statistical significance between the perceptions of teachers and principals, was assumed. Statistical analysis of the results, using a t-test to examine the relationship between teacher responses and principal responses, indicated otherwise for 22 of 39 statements.

Seventeen of the 39 statements asked in the questionnaires (See Appendix E) resulted in t-test scores of less than 0.05, leading to an acceptance of the null hypothesis. These seventeen statements are those areas that teachers and elementary school principals agree are important for principals to know and be able to do. They include knowing the difference between BICS and CALP; being trained in the MELA-O (the former tool used in Massachusetts to assess listening and speaking skills); understanding the influence of ELL students’ cultures in his/her learning and behavior; using data to drive instructional decisions; overseeing that an effective reading schedule is implemented; and conducting formal observations and informal walkthroughs during reading.

The teacher and elementary school principal also agree that principals need to be aware of the best practices in ELL curriculum. They also agree that the principal needs to establish a set of standard operating policies and routines, such as determining how to best place ELL students in classrooms and frequent informal and formal observations.
The null hypothesis was rejected for 22 questions (See full questionnaire in Appendix E), ones in which the statistical significance between the means of teachers’ and elementary school principals’ perspectives were greater than the critical value. This led to the conclusion in this study that the perceptions of teachers and principals are not that predictable, indicating that there may be implications for principal’s professional practice. The areas in which teacher and elementary school principal perceptions are dissimilar include: understanding the stages of second language acquisition; knowing the difference between second language acquisition and learning issues; being trained in teaching reading and writing to ELLS; and, making appropriate connections with parents of ELLs.

Teachers and elementary school principals also disagree when it comes to the following: being directly involved in assessment activities of ELLs at the classroom level, being aware of best practices in the instruction and assessment of ELLs, sharing the belief that academic achievement is not the only measure of success in the building, having contact with ELL students and parents, and explaining decisions made in terms of beliefs that academic achievement is not the only means of success in school.

The number of areas in which teachers’ perceptions were different than principals’ is troubling, since it was noted in the literature review by Gándara et al. (2005) that there is a “need for school and district administrators to gain more understanding about the challenges of, and solutions to, working successfully with EL students” (p. 13). The above list of areas that were in disagreement indicates that there is a clear lack of understanding between teachers and principals.

The factors that teachers and elementary school principals agree contribute and/or inhibit the promotion and support of teachers in teaching students to learn to read in nonnative language
include (1) making sure that all students have access to language-rich, rigorous and engaging reading curricula, including materials appropriate for ELLs; (2) providing translators for meetings with parents of ELLs; (3) supporting inclusion of ELLs’ ways of knowing into the curriculum; and (4) keeping staff informed of current school, district and state policies regarding the education of ELLs. Teachers and elementary school principals also agree that it is important that principals protect teachers from issues and interferences that would detract them from instructional time or focus.

Elementary school principals and teachers did not agree on two factors. Principals believe they should be directly involved in the instruction of ELLs at the classroom level; teachers disagree. Principals report that they involve teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies, and that they monitor the effectiveness of school practices in terms of their impact on student achievement; teachers disagree.

Teachers and elementary school principals agree that principals, as instructional leaders, can best educate and support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English by doing the following: (1) assisting teachers in the work with ELLs in order that students achieve at grade level in reading, (2) explaining to teachers how and why ELLs were placed in their class, and (3) explaining the MA law to teachers concerning the education of ELLs. In addition, teachers and principals agree that it is important for principals to ensure that faculty and staff are aware of, and have discussions about, current theories and practices regarding effective education of ELLs.

There is a disconnect between teacher and elementary school principal perceptions in determining how to best educate and support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English. In Part Two of LTR-P, elementary school principals reported that they
• analyze teachers’ classrooms as a site for 2nd language and advises about appropriate adjustments,

• use knowledge factors affecting 2nd language acquisition to support teachers in modifying instruction for students who are having difficulty learning to read in English,

• make sure that teacher is able to conduct early and ongoing assessment of children’s second language learning and reading skills development,

• make sure that teachers know the difference between teaching native speakers to learn to read in English and ELLs to learn to read in a second language,

• make sure teachers use research based strategies to support children’s language learning and reading development, and

• provide teachers with access to appropriate and relevant professional development about working with ELLs.

In Part Three of LTR-P (see Appendix E), elementary school principals reported that they

• establish strong lines of communication with and between teachers and ELLs and families, and

• provide teachers with materials and professional development necessary for successful execution of their duties.

Teachers’ responses indicate the opposite; that principals do not do everything they say they do. This is problematic. In the area of professional development, for example, Alford and Niño (2011) noted that “the principal plays a key role in ensuring that all teachers obtain training in ESL methodology” including “instruction and assessment” and the implementation “of
differentiation” (Alford & Niño, 2011, pp. 12-13) for ELL students. This study shows that teachers do not believe that principals are providing appropriate professional development.

The above mentioned narrative describes eleven principal roles and eleven principal leadership characteristics that do not have similar teacher and principal responses. The large numbers of responses with statistical significance beg the question: Why are teachers and principals not in agreement for so many of these indicators? While a specific answer to that question is not readily available, there are lessons to be learned for principals. Looking at the results, at face value, is the first step. It is important for principals to consider the areas that teachers and principals agree on as well as the areas where discrepancies are noted. The latter set of results need to be looked at reflectively and thoughtfully. Principals will need to let go of their own perceptions to see what teachers think and make changes in their behavior to improve their support and supervision of teachers.

In addition to responses from LTR-T, teachers had the opportunity to respond to short answer questions. The short answer responses allow for a deeper understanding of teacher perceptions as they support the statistical findings. Six of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire reported that they did not get any feedback from elementary school principals when he or she did a formal or informal observation. Many teachers indicated that they needed more specialized professional development or resources in order to better meet the needs of ELLs in their classrooms. Other opinions shared by teachers in the short answer questions demonstrated that teachers did not think that principals were aware of the different cultures at the school that principals did not communicate well and that principals did not acknowledge the work that the teachers do in the classroom.
A different picture is apparent when looking at elementary school principal responses. Principals seemed to assess themselves high, without the more critical perceptions of the teachers, whether they had specific training or not. Of the four out of eight principals who responded to the questionnaire, only two had taken Category I (Second Language Learning and Teaching) training. In response to questions about Category I, one principal’s self assessment was “very well” when it came to understanding the key factors that affect second language. The other principal’s self assessment was “well.” A similar split of one for “very well” and one for “well” were found in the following two areas: (1) understanding the implications of the key factors on classroom organization and instruction; and (2) understanding the organization, content, and performance levels in the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.

Both principals selected “very well” for understanding the implications of cultural difference for classroom organization and instruction and for using knowledge of factors affecting second language acquisition to modify instruction for students who are having difficulty in learning English and/or subject matter content. This type of response echoes the finding of Tung et al. (2011), who note that “in culturally competent schools, culture permeates every aspect of the elementary schools, from mission and vision, to organization, to curriculum and instruction, to professional development, to family and community relationships” (p. 18).

Both principals indicated a rating of “well” for being able to analyze the teacher’s classroom as a site for second language acquisition and suggesting appropriate adjustments.

Only one of the elementary school principals who responded to the questionnaire participated in Category IV (Reading and Writing in the Sheltered Content Classroom) training. The principals’ self-assessments for all questions asked ranged between “very well” and “well.”
The indicators included: understanding the basic concepts of linguistics, including phonology and syntax of English; understanding significant theories and practices for developing reading skills and reading comprehension in English for limited English proficient students who are at different English proficiency levels; knowing a variety of strategies for teaching vocabulary; understanding initial reading instruction, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension; and being able to plan and deliver reading instruction appropriate for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English language proficiency and being able to plan and deliver early literacy instruction for students who have no or limited oral proficiency or literacy in English.

Why is it that elementary school principals rate themselves with high scores without having any formal training in the area of working with ELLs? It is hard to tell as there was no question included about more informal methods of professional development. Perhaps the principals who participated in the study have done reading of research and/or professional journals related to ELLs. Perhaps the principals have connected with experts in their own school district who have taught them about working with ELLs. It is not possible to answer these questions within the scope of this research but they should be considered for future research.

**Conclusions**

Based on the review of the literature and the findings discussed above, the researcher offers the following conclusions in relation to the research questions.

**Research Question 1**

What do elementary school principals need to know and be able to do to better support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (their second language, L2)?
The review of the literature explored five areas that elementary school principals need to be familiar to support teachers’ work with ELLs. Following the review of literature, this researcher concluded:

1. It is important for elementary school principals to be familiar with the history of language learning education in order to have a built-in foundation of empathy for students who are learning English and their families. An important resource for learning about language learning education is “A Brief History of Bilingual Education in the United States” by David Nieto (2009). This article takes the reader from the beginning of school systems in the U.S. to the present, including the perspectives of parents and other advocacy groups that fought for the best education for ELLs.

2. It is important for elementary school principals to be familiar with current legislation and state expectations for the education of ELLs so that they are able to explain the whats and whys to teachers and parents. Not only should principals become familiar with the most current iteration of the language learning law in Massachusetts but they should also seek out, and familiarize themselves with, the contents of reports commissioned by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. This is an important step since, at times, laws and policies may not connect.

3. There is a benefit to elementary school principals knowing what is needed to teach an ELL to learn to read in general and in English in particular; they are then able to effectively support primary level teachers in the instruction of ELLs. An important resource for principals to refer to is the National Literacy Panel’s report, *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on*
language-minority children and youth (August, 2006). This Report offers principals information on how to support the instruction of ELLs to learn to read in English.

4. It is essential for elementary school for principals to understand what is necessary to instruct ELLs effectively in order to provide professional development that will help to meet the needs of ELLs more productively. Principals can look to resources such as Perez-Selles et al. (2011) to help plan for professional development: “A critical recommendation offered by all groups include the need for follow up supports for teachers after the trainings [i.e. ELL Category Trainings], such as, coaching and/or study groups, as well as alignment with evaluation and other instruments used to observe classroom practice” (p. 44).

5. It would be helpful for elementary school principals to become familiar with the recent work of Tung et al. (2011) which highlights effective practices that lead to success of ELLs. In particular, principals are charged with developing, embodying and communicating the mission and values of the school. Specific practices described were the “principal having and communicating a clear vision for ELL education, using state academic standards as a guide and having high academic expectations” (p. 6).

6. Integrating 12 responsibilities described by Marzano et al. (2005) with the understandings and actions that are specific to the successful instruction of ELLs lead to well-prepared instructional leader. More specifically, elementary school principals who are better able to support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English. For example, a principal who successfully supports teachers in their instruction of ELLs has situational awareness and is cognizant of teachers’ attitudes toward ELLs in order to insure that teacher negativity is not impacting instruction. Through intellectual
stimulation, the principal insures that teachers have access to current theories and best practices when it comes to teaching ELLs. Such a principal values the input of teachers in decision making and policy development, continually demonstrates his or her beliefs through both words and actions and is a visible presence in and around the building.

**Research Question 2**

What leadership factors contribute to and/or inhibit the support of teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?

The factors that contribute to the support of teachers in their work with ELLs are the roles of principals that are described in Part Two of the questionnaire. These factors were gleaned from the review of literature and included foci of Category I – IV trainings and findings from the National Literacy Panel (August & Shanahan, 2006a) and other researchers.

What inhibits the promotion and support of teacher success in teaching students to learn to read in their nonnative language? Answers to this question can be found in the significantly significant responses in Part Two of LTR-T and LTR-P. In short, there seems to be a lack of a shared knowledge base about ELLs and their learning needs. This was demonstrated in differing responses in the following areas: understanding second language acquisition; understanding the difference between language acquisition and learning issues; and having been trained in teaching reading and writing to ELLs to being able to use those skills in analyzing classrooms as sites for effective language acquisition and supporting teachers in making appropriate modifications in their work teaching ELLs to learn to read. If teachers do not believe that elementary school principals are able to fulfill their roles in this area effectively then they do not feel that principals can adequately support them; more specifically, making sure that all teachers use research based
strategies to support language learning, and providing teachers with appropriate and relevant professional development about working with ELLs.

The statistically significant differences reported in this study indicate that teachers’ perceptions do not always match principals’ self-perceptions. This leads to one of the following competing conclusions: that teachers do not have an accurate perception of principals’ knowledge and actions or principals have an inflated perception of their own knowledge and actions. The former conclusion is interesting since one of the reasons that teachers were asked to respond to the questionnaire is that teachers are seen as able to “provide the most valid information because they are the closet to the day-to-day operation of the school and the behaviors of the principal” (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 30). If teachers do not have an accurate perception of principals, principals need to do a better job of communicating what they understand and are able to do through formal and informal conversations, actions and communications.

The conclusion that points to principals having an inflated sense of self is a plausible explanation. Principals are the number one, go to person in their buildings and it would be easy to fall into a “know it all” kind of mindset. In fact, there are some who believe, with or without any basis, the principal does know it all.

Both possibilities, that teachers are not as perceptive as they are thought to be, or that principals have inflated opinions of their abilities, should lead to elementary school principals looking at solving the problems internally and reflectively, rather than externally and thoughtlessly. It is essential for principals to take feedback for what it is and learn and grow from it.
Research Question 3

How can elementary school principals, as instructional leaders, better educate and support teachers of ELLs learning to read in English (L2)?

Answers to this question are found in the areas that were addressed in Part Three of LTR-T and LTR-P (see Appendix E). These factors were taken directly from the findings from Marzano et al. (2005) on the responsibilities of principals. Just as in the response to Research Question 2, answers to Research Question 3 can be found by looking at the responses from teachers that were statistically significant when comparing the teachers’ responses with the principals’ responses. There is a lack of connection between teacher perceptions and principal self-perceptions in leadership characteristics. Varied responses include the principals’ awareness and involvement in best practices in assessment and instruction of ELLs to the principal sharing his or her beliefs; explaining and involving teachers in the design and implementation of decisions to the principals connections with ELLs and their families.

The statistically significant differences between teacher perceptions and principal self-perceptions indicate that teachers’ beliefs do not match principals’ beliefs. This is one of the most serious conclusions of the findings of this research. How can ELL students’ needs be met successfully if teachers and principals are not in agreement when it comes to principals’ actions around supporting teachers? I would argue that they cannot be met. It is essential for there to be a common set of understandings and beliefs about ELLs between teachers and elementary school principals. It can certainly happen at the building level. This alignment would be facilitated by the principal and would need to be an on-going process as research and information about ELLs and their learning needs is published.
Change in how school systems educate ELLs needs to start at the state level, with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education providing proper guidance for districts. The MADESE needs to bring together the state-wide school committee, superintendent and principal organizations along with the state-wide teacher unions to develop and agree upon common set of understandings and beliefs about ELLs, based on the most recent research and recommendations that are available. These understandings and beliefs can then be shared at district and school levels, resulting in the decrease in the ELL achievement gap that was referred to in “Halting the Race to the Bottom” (2009).

Teachers and elementary school principals need to have a common philosophy about educating ELLs, one that is based in research about language learning education and best practices for instructing ELLs. Sharing a common belief system is as important as providing quality professional development. Darling Hammond (2010) agrees, “overcoming inequality will require not only equalizing tangible resources, but also dealing with educators’ views and behaviors” (p. 65). Without a real concern for the education of ELLs, attending professional development can simply be an exercise that is done because it has to be done. Professional development and materials are technical solutions to the adaptive problem. This will be discussed further in the theoretical implications section.

The data described above demonstrate a disconnect between what has been researched and written about what principals need to know and be able to do when it comes to supporting teachers of English Language Learner learning to read in English and what actually happens on a daily basis. This was shown in the difference between the principals’ self-perceptions of understandings and behaviors of what is needed to support teachers and the differing perceptions of teachers as they live the day-to-day life supported by principals.
Theoretical and Practical Implications

The results of the study can now be applied to theory and practice in order to determine what can be learned from what has been found. Theoretical implications will discuss the findings as they relate to the literature review. Practical implications will discuss new instructional insights gained from the results of the study.

Theoretical Implications

The amount of information explored in the review of literature section was massive. Each time a new area was looked at the potential to go off on related tangents became almost impossible to ignore. For example, given the depth of the review of literature, each section could certainly stand on its own. The principal’s need to grasp all of that knowledge in order to best support teachers of ELLs is daunting.

1. The history of language learning education in the United States is truly a living history as it spans from colonial times to just months prior to the completion of this study when the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice (USDOJ) completed an Equal Education Opportunities Act Compliance audit of several Massachusetts communities.

2. Educational policy in Massachusetts is like the history of language learner education in that it is on-going and ever-changing. The results of the study indicate that teachers have the perception that principals are keeping staff informed of current school, districts and state policies re: education of ELLs (t-test value = 1.1619; 2-tailed significance of .119) and that principals have explained the MA law around educating ELLs to teachers (t-test value = .561; 2-tailed significance of .581).
3. Teaching English Language Learners to learn to read in English requires more than just good teaching. Elementary school principals need to be aware of the report of the National Literacy Panel (2006a) which emphasized the importance of the inclusion of oral language literacy along with phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension to better support teachers of ELLs in their classrooms. Teachers and elementary school principals do not always have the same perceptions of principals’ knowledge, understanding and skills in this area. Results of the study indicated that teachers and principals have similar perceptions in several areas: (a) elementary school principals knowing the difference between BICS and CALP, with a t-test value of 1.436, and 2-tailed significance of .165; (b) elementary school principals being trained in the MELA-O, with a t-test of value 1.027, and 2-tailed significance of .315; and (c) elementary school principals knowing the best practices in ELL curriculum, with a t-test value of .429, and a 2-tailed significance of .672.

Results of the study indicated differing perceptions in several areas that include (a) principals’ understanding the stages of second language acquisition, with a t-test value of 2.239, and a 2-tailed significance of .035; (b) principals’ knowledge the difference between second language acquisition and learning issues, with a t-test value of 2.313, and a 2-tailed significance of .030, and (c) principals’ training in teaching reading and writing to ELLs, with a t-test of 4.664, and a 2-tailed significance of .000.

4. Researchers and practitioners as well as the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education that, document the lack of preparation for both teachers and principals preparing teachers and principals to appropriately instruct ELLs. Results indicate that most teachers and elementary school principals surveyed received non-
Category, professional development to support their work with English language learners from either school district ELL training or graduate level ELL coursework (see page 118 for teachers and page 122 for principals). With some of the professional development planned at the building, it is reassuring that the results of the study indicated that teachers and principals have similar perceptions in their belief about the importance of the principal insuring that (a) faculty/staff are aware of the current theories/practices regarding effective education of ELLs, with a t-test value of .930, and a 2-tailed significance of .362; and (b) discussion of current theories and practices re: effective education of ELLs, are a regular aspect of school culture, with a t-test value of .644, and a 2-tailed significance of .526. Results of the study indicated differing perceptions in several areas that include (a) elementary school principals providing teachers with access to appropriate and relevant professional development about working with ELLs, with a t-test of 2.257, and a 2-tailed significance of .035; and (b) the importance of the elementary school principals providing teachers with materials and professional development necessary for successful execution on their duties, with a t-test of 5.137, and a 2-tailed significance of .000. Responses to the short answer questions indicated that teachers profess a need for specialized professional development that would help them in the instruction of ELLs. Many teachers commented on their need for more professional development to prepare them for their work with ELLs, including specifying Category trainings.

5. The last area looked at through the literature review was the principal as instructional leader. Results of the study indicated that teachers and principals have similar perceptions in several areas that include the following leadership behaviors: (a)
establishing a set of standard operating policies and routines, with a t-test value of .141, and a 2-tailed significance of .072; and (b) protecting teachers from issues/interferences that would detract them from instructional time or focus, with a t-test is .560, and a 2-tailed significance of .580. Results of the study indicated differing perceptions in several leadership behaviors: (a) establishing strong lines of communication with and between teachers and ELLs and families, with a t-test value is 4.161, and a 2-tailed significance of .000; (b) sharing beliefs, with a t-test is 5.137, and a 2-tailed significance of .000, (c) involving teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies, with a t-test of 4.161, and a 2-tailed significance of .000, (c) monitoring the effectiveness of school practices in terms of their impact on student achievement, with a t-test value of .505, and a 2-tailed significance of .000, and (d) having contact with ELL students and parents, with a t-test value of 3.570, and 2-tailed significance of .002.

Practical Implications

Practical implications will discuss new insights gained from the results of the study in the areas of professional development, policy and professional practice.

Professional Development.

1. The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MADESE) has been commissioning groups to gather information on educating ELLs for many years. At some point, it will be necessary for the DESE to seriously consider supporting school districts to implement some of the research-based recommendations that have been made. For example, the English Language Learners Sub-Committee of
the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Committee on the Proficiency Gap (2009) highlight the following urgent interventions:

(1) the development and implementation of student centered programs appropriate for the age and English proficiency of LEP students; (2) stronger requirements for professional development of teachers providing instruction to LEP students; (3) the development of stronger capacity at the district level for data-driven monitoring of the progress of ELLs and for planning, monitoring, and evaluating programs for English learners; (4) improvement in the identification, assessment, and placement of LEP students; and (5) enriching the professional development of educational leaders across the state in relation to the education of ELLs (p. 23).

2. MADESE also needs to develop and mandate appropriate professional development for administrators to a more broad audience; principals should consider taking the currently offered Category COURSES trainings. In the interim, principals need to take the current Category trainings. Having the same information as teachers one way to help support them. New learning can be discussed in planning and post observation conferences as well as during informal conversations about students and practice with teachers.

3. It is important for elementary school principals to be familiar with the information that was explored in the review of literature. This researcher has gone through both principal and superintendent licensure programs; and, with the exception of research and readings on leadership, and a quick overview of current laws, I was not presented with much that would help me to support teachers who work with ELLs. The process
by which educators are trained to be administrators needs to be examined and changes need to be made to provide graduating principals with the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to become better prepared for the changing demographics of schools.

Policy.

1. The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education will need to heed the recommendations of two very recent communications: (1) the letter from the United States Department of Justice (McCarthy, 2011) which speaks to immediate needed improvements in the training of teachers of ELLs and (2) the report from Perez-Selles et. Al. (2011) *Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) Category Trainings, Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MA DESE) Report* that spells out specific actions that will improve the quality of the training of teachers to work with ELLs. The MADESE needs to develop professional development and relicensure requirements that better address the needs of ELLs.

2. The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education should embrace the recommendations of the recent report entitled, “Bridging Special and Language Learning Education to Ensure a Free and Appropriate Education in the Least Restrictive Environment for ELLs with Disabilities in Massachusetts” (Serpa, 2011). Determining whether a student has special education needs or is struggling because of second language issues is a task that often falls to the oversight of principals. The MADESE needs to be able to advise principals and school districts on how to proceed to insure that SPED referrals for ELLs are appropriate.
3. For those elementary school principals who are already leading school communities, it will be necessary for professional groups, such as the National Association of Elementary School Principals to work with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and school districts to provide accessible professional development to principals in this area. This professional development could be in the form of journal articles, on-line courses or face-to-face workshops.

**Practice.**

1. It has been noted repeatedly that the growing population of ELLs in Massachusetts has changed the make-up of our communities, schools and classrooms. Elementary School principals need to be current in order to meet the needs of the students populating their classrooms. Darling-Hammond (2010) reminds us that “if teachers, principals, superintendents, and other professionals do not share up-to-date knowledge about effective practices, the field runs in circles” (p. 196). Implementing the most up-to-date knowledge about effective practices will lead to the elimination of the achievement gap.

2. Elementary school principals need to take a serious, reflective look at their own practices when it comes to their support of teachers in working with ELLs. One way to do this would be to ask teachers to respond to Part Two of the questionnaire, Roles of Principals in Teaching ELLs to Learn to Read. Analyzing this data will give principals information on teachers’ perceptions of principal’s knowledge and actions related to teaching ELLs to learn to read. Principals should individually determine if the responses are the result of teachers not having an accurate perception of the principal’s knowledge and actions, or if the principal has an inflated perception of his
or her own knowledge and actions. It may be that the principal needs to share his or her knowledge with teachers through action or discussion. It may be that the principal thinks he or she has done this; but, when confronted with teacher data, sees that communication has not been effective. It is helpful to apply the work of Ronald Heifetz (1994) to describe one potential solution to the disconnect between teacher and principal perceptions. Heifetz describes two types of work: technical and adaptive. “Problems are technical in the sense that we already know how to respond to them” (p. 71); they are problems that are “somewhat mechanical: one can actually go to somebody and ‘get it fixed’” (p. 74). Heifetz defines adaptive work as requiring a “change in values, beliefs and behavior” (p. 22). In trying to determine how principals can best support teachers in their work with ELLs, it is not enough to have the knowledge and skills, the technical solutions to fix the problem. Principals must also be willing to change their own mindset, i.e. provide an adaptive solution to the problem. In this study, the change in mindset necessary for principals is to ask for and seriously consider teachers’ perceptions of their daily practice so that they can work toward correcting the problem.

3. Another necessary step would be for principals to review the Leadership Characteristics of Principals in Relationship to Their Work with ELLs and determine the best way to (1) develop and/or strengthen these characteristics, and (2) communicate a commitment to working with ELLs to the school community. It is essential for the school community, through the leadership of the principal to have a shared philosophy. After this has been implemented, the status can be checked by asking teachers to participate in Part Three of the questionnaire.
4. The importance of principals sharing their beliefs and values has been mentioned throughout this study. This researcher relied on Marzano et al. (2005) with support from other authors and researchers in the leadership field to articulate a framework for leadership when working with ELLs. All elementary school principals are encouraged to determine the most effective and passionate way to articulate their own definition of leadership that can be personally adopted and shared with teachers, students and families.

5. Another way that elementary school principals can improve their practice would to shadow ELL students. Shari Farris (2011) did this in her low-incidence Spokane, Washington elementary school (8.4% Limited English Students) when she followed a student by immersing herself “in his routines, interactions, and relationships throughout a school day” (p. 21) to see if “there was more to Yasir’s behavior issues and poor school performance than simply a lack of effort, classroom disruptions, and arguments on the playground” (p. 21). After only one day, Ms. Farris was able to come to the following conclusions about teachers’ work with ELL students:

   it seemed clear that classroom teachers need more opportunities to learn about ways to engage and motivate students who are learning English. Yasir’s teachers, while concerned about his progress, had no observable framework that could guide their instructional repertoires. When instructive was ineffective, it was easy to resort to blaming students rather than probing their instructional decisions. With teachers as co-planners, I believe that professional learning will help teachers see for themselves how to adjust reading materials for more levels of challenge
both in a learner’s first language and in English. . . I would like to help teachers understand why it is important to strengthen students’ first language while providing support for developing English. (p. 23)

Imagine how much information could be gleaned by teachers if they could join principals in their observation of ELLs throughout the course of the school day.

**Limitations/Delimitations**

The purpose of this study was to determine what principals can do to best support teachers in order to best meet the needs of ELLs. There were limitations to the study that may have impacted the results.

One potential weakness of the study is that teachers and elementary school principals from only eight Massachusetts schools were contacted to participate in the study. Subsequently, only 26 of 83 teachers and only four of eight principals participated in the study. The questionnaire was three parts long and could have put off potential participants by its length. In addition, though the instruments were piloted with a small number of teachers and principals, the tool was in the initial phases of development and reliability and validity had not been established. The strength in this research is in the opportunity that was given to teachers and principals to assess and reflect on principals’ practices. Since participants were drawn from schools in Massachusetts with a low-incidence of ELL students enrolled in classrooms, principals from schools with a similar ELL enrollment can learn from the analysis of the results. Comments made in the short answer section of the teacher questionnaire speak further to the authentic nature of the questionnaire as teachers wrote what seemed to be thoughtful and heartfelt responses. Not having a larger sample respond to either questionnaire is definitely a weakness.
but the results of the study can be seen as a representative sample of primary teachers and elementary school principals from low-incidence ELL schools.

The potential limitation could be the conclusion that teachers either don’t have an accurate picture of what principals know or are able to do is not a valid one. Marzano et al. (2005) note that “teachers are thought to provide the most valid information because they are the closest to the day-to-day operations of the school and the behaviors of the principal” (p. 30). Collecting data on teacher perceptions of principals makes sense; it is a risk, but principals should be encouraged to ask teachers about their perceptions of principals’ behaviors and abilities. The data generated from such an endeavor should be studied by principals so that they may change their own practice in order to improve as professionals. I would also argue that when teachers have an accurate picture of what principals know and are able to do then they would feel more confident in the support they are getting from principals.

Teachers and principals were overwhelming white and monolingual. The questionnaire did not ask many qualifying questions other than work history, education and languages spoken so there was no way to determine how participant history and previous experience influenced answers to the study’s queries.

This study did not include a way for principals to reflect on teacher performance nor did it include student data, such as formal or informal literacy assessments. Such information would have supplied additional information about the current context of what was happening in the classrooms of the study’s participants.

Another limitation that may have impacted the response rate was the weather during the timeframe of the study. There were multiple snowstorms resulting in many snow days at the different schools participating in the study. Missing multiple days of schools is a stressor on
teachers and principals; so much so that perhaps a number of potential participants did not respond to the request to participate.

A delimitation was that the verification of the correlations presented by Marzano et al. (2005) was not in the scope of the study.

Future Research

In addition to the lessons that can be learned from the results of this study, there are potential additional lessons that can be learned from additional research.

This study should be carried out with a much larger sample. In Chapter Three study limitations were discussed, the first being the small population of teachers and principals who responded to the questionnaire. This researcher wanted to analyze responses from teachers and principals who had a similar student population to the researcher’s school. Study sites were identified using the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s District Analysis and Review Tool (DART). The pool of participants that were originally accessed, 83 teachers and 8 principals from 8 schools, would have provided more data. However, with 31% of the teachers and 50% of the principals participating, there was still enough data to come to reasonable conclusions, especially when content of the short answer responses is considered. It is clear that participants took time to respond to questions thoughtfully. The main way to address the small population limitation would be to send the questionnaire out to more teachers and principals. It would be necessary to delineate between high and low ELL incidence schools as access to materials, professional development and resources may be different for high incidence schools and therefore impact results. Certainly each group could learn from the other so having two separate studies done could benefit the ELL population.
It may be helpful for an additional study to be done, focusing on principals’ knowledge about ELL learning in general, and about teaching ELLs to learn to read in English. Results of such a study may determine how principals are gaining the knowledge and why principals might have an over-inflated perception of their knowledge and actions.

Another potential area for future research would be to pose the questionnaire to intermediate and secondary teachers and principals. They also encounter the increased number of ELLs, with the distinctly different pressure of the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), the state-wide assessment hanging over their heads. Determining educator needs will lead to addressing student needs more effectively.

Two additional populations to access for perceptions about principals’ knowledge and actions concerning working with ELL students are ELL students and parents of ELLs. Certainly ELL students will have a unique perspective of how teachers are working with them. Both teachers and principals could find a great deal of information in how students perceive their daily instruction and their place in the school community. Asking parents for their insights will bring two-fold results: (1) information about how parents perceive their children’s education and what parents feel is their place in the school community and (2) the development and/or strengthening of the relationship between the parent and the principal.

It has been stated that a delimitation of the study was there was no attempt to verify the correlations presented by Marzano et al. (2005). Verifying the correlations in relation to principals supporting teachers of ELLs is an area of potential future research.

**Chapter Summary**

There is a changing demography in elementary classrooms. This changing demography has required educators to look at how to better meet the learning needs of English Language
Learners in schools, especially since No Child Left Behind requires ELLs to learn grade level content. Since there is no way around the length of time it takes an ELL student to acquire an academic language in his or her second language, five to seven years, educators must look at variables over which they have control: for teachers, it is their instruction and for principals it is how they support teachers.

The major purpose of this study was to identify how principals can better support teachers in their instruction of ELLs. The author explored what has been researched and written about what principals need to know and be able to do when it comes to supporting teachers in teaching English Language Learner to learn to read in English and compared it to what teachers and principals perceive happens on a daily basis. The author demonstrated, through a review of research and literature that while there may be a lack of knowledge and skills the real disconnect, found by using data from the perceptions of teachers and principals, is a lack of communication between principals and teachers when it comes to what is known and understood about teaching ELLs. It was found that principals and teachers agree on some aspects of the daily practice of principals in relationship to ELLs but differ on many major areas. Critical discrepancies are apparent in the many differences of perceptions that teachers and principals have when it comes to determining the roles of principals in the teaching ELLs to learn to read and in exploring the leadership characteristics of principals in relationship to their work in support of ELLs. As the leading educational leaders of one’s school, it behooves elementary school principals to use feedback from teachers, and to honestly look at their own practice, in order to develop the skills necessary to effectively support and teachers.
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Appendix A

Category Training refers to the training recommended for teachers of ELLs by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. There are four categories:

- Category 1: Introduction to Second Language Learning and Teaching,
- Category 2: Sheltering Content Instruction,
- Category 3: Assessing Speaking and Listening, and
- Category 4: Teaching Reading and Writing to Limited English Proficient Students.

(Achievement, 2006, p. 2)

Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) refers to a person who is culturally and linguistically diverse. (Group, 2010a, p. 2)

English Language Learners (ELL) refers to students who are from “language backgrounds other than English and whose English proficiency is not yet developed to the point where they can truly profit from English-only instruction.” (August & Shanahan, 2008, p. 13)

English as a Second Language (ESL) refers to explicit and direct instruction about the English language intended to promote English language acquisition by ELL students and to help them “catch up” to their student peers who are proficient in English. It includes learning outcomes in speaking, listening comprehension, reading and writing. ESL instruction is a required part of an academic program for ELL students. ESL instruction should be based on an ESL curriculum and appropriate ESL textbooks and other materials. In effective ESL classrooms, learning takes place when there is sustained verbal interaction, often in small groups, as the students complete carefully designed academic tasks that include speaking, listening, reading and writing. Effective ESL instruction is often characterized by the use of thematic units, project-based instruction, and language instruction closely aligned with grade-appropriate content standards. Students should receive between 1 and 2.5 hours of ESL instruction per day, depending on proficiency level.

(Policy, 2007, p. 3)
L1 refers to a person’s first, or native, language. (Group, 2010a, p. 18)

L2 refers to a person’s second language.

**Limited English Proficient (LEP)** refers to the legal term for a person who has not mastered the English language. (Group, 2010a, p. 19)

**Phonemes** refer to the smallest units composing spoken language. ((NRP), 2000, p. 7)

**Phonics Instruction** refers to a way of teaching reading that stresses the acquisition of letter-sound correspondence and their use in reading and spelling. ((NRP), 2000, p. 8)

**Sheltered content instruction** refers to instruction that includes approaches, strategies and methodology that make the content of the lesson more comprehensible to students who are not yet proficient in English. Although it is designed for ELLs who have an intermediate level of proficiency in English, ELLs with less than an intermediate level of proficiency can benefit from sheltered content instruction. Sheltered content classes are characterized by active engagement by ELLs. Such classrooms are characterized by lesson plans that include language objectives which address the linguistic requirements of the content to be taught (e.g. content vocabulary) and content objectives based on standards from the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. (Policy, 2007, p. 3)

**Sheltered English Immersion (SEI)** refers to the program model required for most English Language Learners in Massachusetts’s public schools since the change in the law in 2002. School district implementation of sheltered English immersion (SEI) began in school districts in September 2003 and has two components, English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction and sheltered content instruction taught in English, with all printed classroom materials in English. ("Report to the legislature: English language acquisition professional development," 2008, p. 3)
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**Affirmation** refers to the extent to which the leader recognizes and celebrates school accomplishments – and acknowledges failures. (p. 41)

**Change agent** refers to the leader’s disposition to challenge the status quo. (p. 44)

**Contingent rewards** refer to the extent to which the school leader recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments. (p. 45)

**Communication** refers to the extent to which the school leader establishes strong lines of communication with and between teachers and students. (p. 46)

**Culture** refers to the extent to which the leader fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation among staff. (p. 48)

**Discipline** refers to protecting teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their instructional time or focus. (p. 48)

**Flexibility** refers to the extent to which leaders adapt their leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and are comfortable with dissent. (p. 49)

**Focus** refers to the extent to which the leader establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school’s attention. (p. 50)

**Ideals and/or beliefs** are demonstrated when the principal explains a decision he has made in terms of his belief that academic achievement is not the only measure success in the school. (p. 51)
**Input** refers to the extent to which the school leader involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies. (p. 51)

**Intellectual stimulation** refers to the extent to which the school leader ensures that faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices regarding effective schooling and makes discussions of those theories and practices a regular aspect of the school’s culture. (p. 52)

**Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment** addresses the extent to which the principal is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment activities at the classroom level. (p. 53)

**Knowledge of curriculum, instruction and assessment** addresses the extent to which the leader is aware of the best practices in these domains. (p. 54)

**Monitoring/Evaluating** refers to the extent to which the leader monitors the effectiveness of school practices in terms of their impact on student achievement. (p. 56)

**Optimizer** refers to the extent to which the leader inspires others and is the driving force when implementing a challenging innovation. (p. 56)

**Order** refers to the extent to which the leader establishes a set of standard operating principles and routines. (p. 56)

**Outreach** refers to the extent to which the leader is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders. (p. 58)

**Relationships** refer to the extent to which the school leader demonstrates an awareness of the personal lives of teachers and staff. (p. 58)
**Resources** refer to the extent to which the leader provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their duties. (p. 60)

**Situational awareness** addresses leaders’ awareness of the details and the undercurrents regarding the functioning of a school and their use of this information to address current and potential problems. (p. 60)

**Visibility** addresses the extent to which the school leader has contact and interacts with teachers, students and parents. (p. 61)

(Marzano et al., 2005)
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Technical Note 4: Methods Used to Compute Correlations in the Meta-Analysis

The basic purpose of our meta-analysis was to examine the relationship between leadership (at both general and specific levels) and student academic achievement. The correlation coefficient was used as the index of relationship. In more specific terms, the product-moment correlation was used to quantity the linear relationship between leadership and academic achievement. The formula for the product-moment correlation is

\[
 r_{xy} = \frac{\text{Summation } Z_x Z_y}{(N-1)}
\]

where:

- \( r_{xy} \) stands for the product-moment correlation between variable x and variable y,
- \( Z_x \) = the Z score or standard score for a given raw score on variable x,
- \( Z_y \) = the Z score or standard score for a given raw score on variable y, and
- \( N \) = the number of pairs of scores in the set. (Note that the formula above estimates the population correlation. When a correlation is intended as a descriptive statistic for a set of data, \( N \) as opposed to \( N-1 \) is used as the denominator in the equation).

Stated in words, the product-moment correlation might be described as the average product of the Z scores for pairs of raw score.

One of the uses of the product-moment correlation is to predict an individual’s score on one variable based on the knowledge of the individual’s score on the other variable. The equation for such a prediction is

\[
 Z'_y = r_{xy} Z_x
\]
Described in words, this equation states that the predicted Z score or standard score on the variable y (indicated by the apostrophe) is equal to the correlation between x and y multiplied by the Z score or standard score on x.

(Marzano et al., 2005, pp. 133-134)
December 5, 2010

Dear Colleague,

Ms. Nadene Stein is a student in the Educational Leadership PhD. Program at Lesley University. The Educational Leadership PhD. program at Lesley University is designed to inspire imagination and nurture practitioner-scholars to reflect, translate theory into practice, construct new knowledge, be courageous, initiate, facilitate, support and sustain the improvement of teaching, learning, leading, and the conditions in which they occur.

Ms. Stein is conducting research to determine teacher perceptions regarding the role of principals in promoting teacher efficacy in teaching reading to English Language Learners. Ms. Stein is an experienced school leader who understands the realities of working as a school leader and views leadership as a powerful means for increasing student learning. Ms. Stein, through the use of questionnaires and follow-up interviews, will ask current principals in Massachusetts the various ways they help teachers improve reading for English Language Learners. The resulting information will be used as part of her doctoral dissertation.

Ms. Stein’s research has the potential to make a significant contribution to the fields of leadership as well as teaching reading to ELL students. I hope you will agree to participate in this important research study. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Stephen Gould. Ed.D.

Program Director for Educational Leadership
Initial email letter to principals:

December, 2010

Dear Principal;

My name is Nadene B. Stein and I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Educational Leadership at Lesley University. I am conducting research on the connection between school leadership and what is needed to promote and support teacher efficacy in teaching English Language Learners (ELLs) to learn to read in their non-native language in order to prevent school failure or special education referrals. My title is Leading to read: the role of school leaders in promoting teacher efficacy in teaching English Language Learners to learn to read.

As the principal of an Elementary School in a Massachusetts town, I have become increasingly concerned about the ELLs in my building and their struggles academically. I am also worried about how I can best help the teachers in my building in their work with ELLs. This is what has driven me to this particular research.

The following questions will guide my research:

1. What do principals need to know, understand and be able to do in order to support teachers in teaching ELLs learning to read English (their second language, L2)?
2. What factors contribute and/or inhibit the promotion and support of teacher efficacy in teaching students to learn to read in nonnative language (L2)?
3. How can principals, as instructional leaders, best educate and support teachers who are teaching ELLs to learn to read in English?

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in an on-line questionnaire and a follow-up interview regarding your role as an elementary principal in a building that includes English Language Learners in the primary grades (K – 3). I anticipate that
the interview will be no longer than one hour. I will travel to your school and/or conduct the interview via the telephone.

The confidentiality of all participants is guaranteed; no school district will be referred to by name. In addition, all raw data will be destroyed upon the conclusion of this study.

At the conclusion of this study you will receive a copy of my findings. I am hopeful that you will share the information with your district leaders in order that it will inform their leadership. Taking part in this project is entirely voluntary and if you decide to participate, you may stop at any time. In addition, you may ask to have your data withdrawn from the study after the research has been conducted.

If you want to know more about this research project, please contact me at nadene.stein@gmail.com or 781-373-1720. In addition, my Senior Advisor from Lesley University is John Ciesluk, Ed.D. He can be reached at jciesluk@lesley.edu. This project has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at Lesley University. Information on Lesley University policy and procedure for research involving humans can be obtained from William Stokes, Ed.D., Chair of the Institutional Review Board. He can be contacted at wstokes@lesley.edu.

If you consent to participate in this project, please reply to this email. Once you do, you will be sent the link that will take you directly to the questionnaire at Survey Monkey. Your name will also be added to a drawing for a $100 Staples gift card.

Thanks, in advance, for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. . . your responses will be instrumental in helping other principals to understand how to best support teachers in their work with ELLs!

Sincerely,

Nadene B. Stein
Principal email reminder # 1

Subject: Snow Days Lead to Mass Havoc
Hello, Principal!

We have had 6 snow days in our district so far this winter. It has been a real pain for teachers to keep up with all that needs to be done with and for students when we have not had a full week of school since before the Christmas vacation. I, too, have experienced trying to stay up-to-date with school responsibilities.

On another personal note, I believe that the snow days have impacted the response rate of the principal questionnaire that I have developed. I am looking to connect with at least 4 of the 9 principals who the DESE’s DART model indicates are similar to my school, Northeast Elementary School. I am hoping that you would consider being one of those 4 (and who qualify for the drawing for the $100 Staples gift card).

I am hoping that what I learn from the combination of principals and teachers’ responses will help us better support us in our work with teachers who have students who are English Language Learners.

Reply to this email and I will send you a link to the questionnaire. It will only take 10 minutes to complete and though it is not shoveling your driveway, cleaning off your roof, reading, watching “The Sopranos” or any of the other fun activities that you may have been enjoying over the past snow days, it could certainly make a difference in how we can support our teachers in working with ELLs.

Many thanks!
Nadene B. Stein

Principal email reminder # 2
Subject: Questionnaire Reminder
Hello, Principal,

I trust this email finds you winding down from a hectic week beginning with Valentine’s Day and ending with the 100th day and the day before vacation. I am quite sure that anyone who does not work in an elementary school has no idea how important February vacation is.

Before you head off to what I hope is a restful and enjoyable week off, I hope you will consider responding to my questionnaire. I am hoping that what I learn from your responses will help us better understand teachers’ work with English Language Learners.

Please reply to this email by March 1st and I will send you a link to the questionnaire. It will only take 10 minutes to complete and it could certainly make a difference in how we support our teachers in working with ELLs.

I would greatly appreciate your participation. Thank you so much,
Sincerely,
Nadene Stein
Initial email letter to teachers:

December 2010

Dear Teacher;

My name is Nadene B. Stein and I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Educational Leadership at Lesley University. I am conducting research on the connection between school leadership and what is needed to promote and support teacher efficacy in teaching English Language Learners (ELLs) to learn to read in their non-native language in order to prevent school failure or special education referrals. My title is *Leading to read: the role of school leaders in promoting teacher efficacy in teaching English Language Learners to learn to read.*

As the principal of an Elementary School in a Massachusetts town, I have become increasingly concerned about the ELLs in my building and their struggles academically. I am also worried about how I can best help the teachers in my building in their work with ELLs. This is what has driven me to this particular research.

The following questions will guide my research:

1. What do principals need to know, understand and be able to do in order to support teachers in teaching ELLs learning to read English (their second language, L2)?
2. What factors contribute and/or inhibit the promotion and support of teacher efficacy in teaching students to learn to read in nonnative language (L2)?
3. How can principals, as instructional leaders, best educate and support teachers who are teaching ELLs to learn to read in English?

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to respond to an on-line questionnaire regarding your perceptions of your principal’s role in your past or current instruction of English Language Learners in learning to read. I anticipate that the questionnaire will take between 10 - 15 minutes.
The confidentiality of all participants is guaranteed; no school district will be referred to by name. In addition, all raw data will be destroyed upon the conclusion of this study.

At the conclusion of this study you will receive a copy of my findings. I am hopeful that you will share the information with your principal in order that it will inform his or her leadership. Taking part in this project is entirely voluntary and if you decide to participate, you may stop at any time. In addition, you may ask to have your data withdrawn from the study after the research has been conducted.

If you want to know more about this research project, please contact me at nadene.stein@gmail.com or 781-373-1720. In addition, my Senior Advisor from Lesley University is John Ciesluk, Ed.D. He can be reached at jciesluk@lesley.edu. This project has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at Lesley University. Information on Lesley University policy and procedure for research involving humans can be obtained from William Stokes, Ed.D., Chair of the Institutional Review Board. He can be contacted at wstokes@lesley.edu.

If you consent to participate in this project, please reply to this email. Once you do, you will be sent the link that will take you directly to the questionnaire at Survey Monkey. Your name will also be added to a drawing for a $100 Staples gift card.

Thanks, in advance, for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. . . your responses will be instrumental in helping principals to understand how to best support you in your work with ELLs!

Sincerely,

Nadene B. Stein

Nadene B. Stein
Teacher email reminder # 1
Subject: Snow Days Lead to Mass Havoc

Hello!

We have had 6 snow days in our district so far this winter. It has been a real pain for teachers to keep up with all that needs to be done with and for students when we have not had a full week of school since before the Christmas vacation. I, too, have experienced trying to stay up-to-date with school responsibilities.

On another personal note, I believe that the snow days have impacted the response rate of the teacher questionnaire that I have developed. I sent out about 100 requests and need to have 25 – 30 responses to validate the data. Only 8 teachers have responded so far. I am writing to urge you to be one of those 25 – 30 participants who respond (and who qualify for the drawing for the $100 Staples gift card).

I am hoping that what I learn from teachers’ responses will help me and my fellow principals better support you in your work with English Language Learners.

Reply to this email and I will send you a link to the questionnaire. It will only take 10 minutes to complete and though it is not shoveling your driveway, cleaning off your roof, reading, watching “The Sopranos” or any of the other fun activities that you may have been enjoying over the past snow days, it could certainly make a difference in how principals support their teachers in working with ELLs.

Many thanks!

Nadene B. Stein

Teacher email reminder # 2
Subject: Questionnaire Reminder

Hello, Teacher,

I trust this email finds you winding down from a hectic week beginning with Valentine’s Day and ending with the 100th day and the day before vacation. I am quite sure that anyone who does not work in an elementary school has no idea how important February vacation is.

Before you head off to what I hope is a restful and enjoyable week off, I hope you will consider responding to my questionnaire. I am hoping that what I learn from your responses will help me and my fellow principals better understand your work with English Language Learners.

Please reply to this email by March 1st and I will send you a link to the questionnaire. It will only take 10 minutes to complete and it could certainly make a difference in how principals support their teachers in working with ELLs.

I would greatly appreciate your participation. Thank you so much,

Sincerely,
Hello, Teacher,

I will be closing the 'Teachers' Perspectives on Principals' support with ELL students' questionnaire this week. If you, by any chance, are interested in participating, please send along an email response. It is through this questionnaire that I will learn what will help me and my fellow principals better understand your work with English Language Learners.

If not, please accept my wish for a positive and productive school year.

I would greatly appreciate your participation. Thank you so much,

Sincerely,

Nadene Stein
Appendix E

Principal Questionnaire

LEADING TO READ: PRINCIPALS’ SELF PERCEPTIONS

Thank you for responding to this survey!

Please read each item carefully and answer candidly based on your experience working with English Language Learners.

1. What grade(s) are in your school (check all that apply)?
   - Pre-K
   - K
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - Other: __________

2. In what areas are you licensed (check all that apply)?
   - Principal/Assistant Principal
   - Supervisor/Director
   - Elementary Education
   - English as a Second Language
   - Early Childhood Education
   - Moderate Special Needs
   - Intensive Special Needs
   - OTHER ______

3. How many years have you been a principal (including the present year)?
   - 1 – 5
   - 6 – 10
   - 11 – 15
   - 16 – 20
   - 21 – 25
   - 26 and over

4. How many years have ELLs been included in your school?
   - 1 – 5
   - 6 – 10
   - 11 – 15
   - 16 – 20
   - 21 – 25
   - 26 and over

5. What type(s) of ELL training have you participated in (check all that apply):
ELL Category I: Introduction to Second Language Learning and Teaching
If so, please rate your ability to:
1. Analyze your own classroom as a site for second language acquisition and make appropriate adjustments.
2. Use knowledge of factors affecting second language acquisition to modify instruction for students who are having difficulty in learning English and/or subject matter content.

ELL Category II: Sheltering Content Instruction

ELL Category III: Assessing Speaking and Listening

ELL Category IV: Teaching Reading and Writing to Limited English Proficient Students
If so, please rate your ability to:
1. Plan and deliver reading instruction appropriate for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English language proficiency.
2. Plan and deliver writing instruction and activities appropriate for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English language proficiency.
3. Use the scoring rubric and test results of the MEPA to plan reading and writing instruction for limited English proficient students who are at different proficiency levels.
4. Plan and deliver early literacy instruction for students who have no or limited oral proficiency or literacy in English.

6. Where did you receive your training?
   - District Level ELL Training
   - School Level ELL Training
   - ELL Conference or Workshop
   - Undergraduate level ELL coursework: Number of credits earned: ________________
   - Graduate level ELL coursework: Number of credits earned: ________________
   - Post-graduate level coursework: Number of credits earned: ________________

PART ONE: Roles of Principal in Teaching English Language Learners to Learn to Read:
Please rate what you do as a principal when it comes to understanding and supporting teachers in the process of teaching an ELL to learn to read. Use the following scale:
   SA = Strongly Agree   A = Agree   N = Don’t Know   D = Disagree   SD = Strongly Disagree

SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Self-Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand the stages of second language acquisition.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know the difference between second language acquisition and learning issues</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the difference between BICS (social language proficiency) and CALP (academic language proficiency)</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze teachers’ classrooms as sites for second language acquisition and advises about appropriate adjustments.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use knowledge of factors affecting second language acquisition to support my teachers in modifying instruction for students who are having difficulty in learning to read in English.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TEACHER SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I...</th>
<th>Self-Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide my teachers with access to appropriate and relevant professional development about working with ELLs.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support my teachers in their work with ELL students in order that students achieve at grade level in reading.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### READING/ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I...</th>
<th>Self-Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make sure that my teachers able to conduct early and ongoing assessment of children’s second language learning and reading skills development.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure that my teachers know the difference between teaching students who are native speakers to learn to read in English and teaching ELLs to learn to read in a second language.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure that teachers use research based strategies to support children’s language learning and reading development.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure that all of our students have access to language-rich, rigorous and engaging reading curricula, including materials appropriate for ELLs.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have been trained in teaching Reading and Writing to ELL students.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am trained in the MELA-O (Massachusetts English Language Assessment – Oral).</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I...</th>
<th>Self-Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have made appropriate connections with the parents of ELL students</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide translators for meetings with parents of ELL students.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the influence of ELL students’ cultures in his or her learning and behavior.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support inclusion of ELL students’ ways of knowing into the curriculum.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I...</th>
<th>Self-Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have explained to my teachers how/why ELLs were placed in their classrooms.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have explained the Massachusetts Law around educating ELL students to my teachers.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use data to drive instructional decisions</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and see that an effective reading schedule is implemented.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct formal observations and informal walk-throughs during reading classes.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep staff informed of current school, district and state policies related to the education of ELL students.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am an effective instructional leader</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are your ELL students making effective progress in the area of reading? Check one:
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure   How do you know?

What kind of feedback have you given to your teachers in response to a formally or informally observed reading lesson that included ELL students?

What are the skills and supports do you give to your teachers to support them in working effectively with ELLs?

PART TWO: Please rate the importance of these responsibilities of principals as they relate to working with ELL students using the following scale:

SR = Strongly related   R = Related   N = Don’t Know
SLR = Slightly related   NR = Not related at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Language Acquisition</th>
<th>In relationship to ELL students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is it important for me to. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be directly involved in the instruction of ELL students at the classroom level.</td>
<td>SR R N SLR NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be aware of the best practices in ELL curriculum.</td>
<td>SR R N SLR NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading/Assessment</th>
<th>In relationship to ELL students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is it important for me to. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be directly involved in assessment activities of ELL students at the classroom level.</td>
<td>SR R N SLR NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be aware of the best practices in the instruction of ELL students.</td>
<td>SR R N SLR NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be aware of the best practices in assessment of ELL students.</td>
<td>SR R N SLR NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Responsiveness</th>
<th>In relationship to ELL students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is it important for me to. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster shared beliefs.</td>
<td>SR R N SLR NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have contact with teachers, ELL students and ELL parents.</td>
<td>SR R N SLR NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Support</th>
<th>In relationship to ELL students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is it important for me to. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish strong lines of communication with and between teachers and ELL students and their families.</td>
<td>SR R N SLR NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their instructional time or focus.</td>
<td>SR R N SLR NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their duties.</td>
<td>SR R N SLR NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>In relationship to ELL students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain decisions I have made in terms of my belief that academic</td>
<td>SR    R    N    SLR    NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement is not the only measure success in the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve teachers in the design and implementation of important</td>
<td>SR    R    N    SLR    NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions and policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories</td>
<td>SR    R    N    SLR    NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and practices regarding effective education of ELL students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure that discussions of current theories and practices</td>
<td>SR    R    N    SLR    NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regarding effective education of ELL students are a regular aspect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the school’s culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor the effectiveness of school practices in terms of their</td>
<td>SR    R    N    SLR    NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact on student achievement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a set of standard operating principles and routines.</td>
<td>SR    R    N    SLR    NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A pdf copy of the actual principal survey can be requested from the author.
Teacher Questionnaire

LEADING TO READ: TEACHERS’ PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS

Thank you for responding to this survey! Please read each item carefully and answer candidly based on your experience working with English Language Learners.

Part One: Teacher Information

1. What grade(s) do you teach?
   - Pre-K
   - K
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - Other: ____________

2. In what areas are you licensed to teach?
   - Elementary Education
   - English as a Second Language
   - Early Childhood Education
   - Moderate Special Needs
   - Intensive Special Needs
   - OTHER _____

3. How many years have you been teaching (including the present year)?
   - 1 – 5
   - 6 – 10
   - 11 – 15
   - 16 – 20
   - 21 – 25
   - 26 and over

4. How many years have you been teaching ELLs?
   - 1 – 5
   - 6 – 10
   - 11 – 15
   - 16 – 20
   - 21 – 25
   - 26 and over

5. What is your race? Check all that apply.
   - White
   - Black
   - Hispanic
   - Asian
   - Native American
6. What language(s) do you speak? Check all that apply.
- [ ] English
- [ ] Spanish
- [ ] Portuguese
- [ ] Haitian Creole
- [ ] French
- [ ] Greek
- [ ] Italian
- [ ] Arabic
- [ ] Cantonese
- [ ] Mandarin
- [ ] Other (please specify)

7. Where have you received non-Category professional development to support your work with ELLs?
- [ ] School Building Level ELL Training
- [ ] School District Level ELL Training
- [ ] ELL Conference or Workshop
- [ ] Department of Elementary and Secondary Education sponsored workshop
- [ ] Undergraduate level ELL coursework
- [ ] Graduate level ELL coursework
- [ ] Post-graduate level coursework
- [ ] Number of credits earned:

8. Have you taken ELL Category One: Introduction to Second Language Learning and Teaching?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If answered yes,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since you have participated in ELL Category I: Introduction to Second Language and Teaching, please rate your ability to:</th>
<th>Expertly</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Not so well</th>
<th>No, not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand key factors that affect second language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the implications of the key factors on classroom organization and instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the implications of cultural difference for classroom organization and instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the organization, content, and performance levels in the MA English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to analyze my own classroom for second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
language acquisition and make appropriate adjustments.

I am able to use knowledge of factors affecting second language to modify instruction for students who are having difficulty in learning English and/or subject matter content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Have you taken ELL Category Two: Sheltering Content Instruction?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Have you taken ELL Category Three: Assessing Speaking and Listening?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Have you taken ELL Category Four: Teaching Reading and Writing to Limited English Proficient Students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If answered yes,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since you have participated in ELL Category IV: Teaching Reading and Writing to Limited English Proficient Students, please rate your ability to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the basic concepts of linguistics, including phonology and syntax of English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand significant theories and practices for developing reading skills and reading comprehension in English for limited English proficient students who are at different English proficiency levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know a variety of strategies for teaching vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand approaches and practices for developing writing skills in limited English proficient students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand initial reading instruction, including phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension. The differences in initial reading instruction in English designed for those students who have no or limited oral proficiency in English compared to those who do not have oral proficiency in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the performance criteria and scoring system used in the MEPA (Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment) and based on the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am able to plan and deliver reading instruction appropriate for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English language proficiency.

I am able to plan and deliver writing instruction and activities for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English proficiency.

I am able to use the scoring rubric and test results of the MEPA to plan reading and writing instruction for limited English proficient students who are at different proficiency levels.

I am able to plan and deliver early literacy instruction for students who have no or limited oral proficiency or literacy in English.

---

Part Two: Roles of Principals in Teaching English Language Learners to Learn to Read

Please rate what your principal does when it comes to understanding and supporting the process of teaching an ELL to learn to read. Use the following scale:

SA = Strongly Agree   A = Agree   N = Don’t Know   D = Disagree   SD = Strongly Disagree

1. **SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Principal. . .</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understands the stages of second language acquisition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the difference between second language acquisition and learning issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the difference between BICS (social language proficiency) and CALP (academic language proficiency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes your classroom as a site for second language acquisition and advises about appropriate adjustments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses knowledge of factors affecting second language acquisition to support you in modifying instruction for students who are having difficulty in learning to read in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. READING/ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Principal . . .</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure that I am able to conduct early and ongoing assessment of children’s second language learning and reading skills development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure that I know the difference between teaching students who are native speakers to learn to read in English and teaching ELLs to learn to read in a second language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure I use research based strategies to support children’s language learning and reading development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure that all of my students have access to language-rich, rigorous and engaging reading curricula, including materials appropriate for ELLs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been trained in teaching Reading and Writing to ELL students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is trained in the MELA-O (Massachusetts English Language Assessment – Oral).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Principal . . .</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has made appropriate connections with the parents of ELL students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides translators for meetings with parents of ELL students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the influence of ELL students’ cultures in his or her learning and behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports inclusion of ELL students’ ways of knowing into the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. TEACHER SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Principal . . .</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides me with access to appropriate and relevant professional development about working with ELLs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports me in my work with ELL students in order that students achieve at grade level in reading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 5. POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Principal</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has explained to me how/why ELLs were placed in my classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has explained the Massachusetts Law around educating ELL students to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses data to drive instructional decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans and sees that an effective reading schedule is implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts formal observations and informal walk-throughs during reading classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps staff informed of current school, district and state policies related to the education of ELL students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Are your ELL students making effective progress in the area of reading? Check one:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Not sure
   How do you know?

7. Are you satisfied with the materials that you are provided with in order to teach your ELL students to speak and to read?
   Check one: [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not sure

8. Does your school implement a Response to Intervention (RtI) model?
   Check one: [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not sure

9. Do your ELL students have access to RtI? Check one: [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Not sure

10. What kind of feedback have you received from your principal in response to a formally or informally observed reading lesson that included ELL students?

11. What skills, supports and/or professional development do you need from your principal to make you more effective in working with ELLs?

Part Three: Leadership Characteristics of Principals in Relationship to ELL students:
Please rate the importance of these responsibilities of principals as they relate to working with ELL students.
1. Second Language Acquisition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent is it important for the Principal, in relationship to ELL students, to...</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be directly involved in the instruction of ELL students at the classroom level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be aware of the best practices in ELL curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Reading/Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent is it important for the Principal, in relationship to ELL students, to...</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be directly involved in assessment activities of ELL students at the classroom level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be aware of the best practices in the instruction of ELL students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be aware of the best practices in assessment of ELL students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Cultural Responsiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent is it important for the Principal, in relationship to ELL students, to...</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster shared beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have contact with teachers, ELL students and ELL parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Teacher Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent is it important for the Principal, in relationship to ELL students, to...</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish strong lines of communication with and between teachers and ELL students and their families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their instructional time or focus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent is it important for the Principal, in relationship to ELL students, to...</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain decisions s/he has made in terms of his/her belief that academic achievement is not the only measure success in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices regarding effective education of ELL students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure that discussions of current theories and practices regarding effective education of ELL students are a regular aspect of the school’s culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor the effectiveness of school practices in terms of their impact on student achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a set of standard operating principles and routines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thanks for taking the time to complete this survey... your responses will be instrumental in helping principals to understand how to best support you in your work with ELLs!

A pdf copy of the actual teacher survey can be requested from the author.
Table 1A

*Teacher Questionnaire Part 2: Roles of Principals in Teaching ELLs to Learn to Read*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: The Principal. . .</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mean Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understands the stages of second language acquisition.</td>
<td>3.0952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the difference between second language acquisition and learning issues.</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the difference between BICS (social language proficiency) and CALP (academic language proficiency).</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes your classroom as a site for second language acquisition and advises about appropriate adjustments.</td>
<td>2.5714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses knowledge of factors affecting second language acquisition to support you in modifying instruction for students who are having difficulty in learning to read in English.</td>
<td>2.8095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>READING/ASSESSMENT: The Principal. . .</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mean Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure that I am able to conduct early and ongoing assessment of children’s second language learning and reading skills development.</td>
<td>3.3810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure that I know the difference between teaching students who are native speakers to learn to read in English and teaching ELLs to learn to read in a second language.</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure I use research based strategies to support children’s language learning and reading development.</td>
<td>3.3810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure that all of my students have access to language-rich, rigorous and engaging reading curricula, including materials appropriate for ELLs.</td>
<td>3.6190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been trained in teaching Reading and Writing to ELL students</td>
<td>2.7619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is trained in the MELA-O (Massachusetts English Language Assessment – Oral).</td>
<td>3.0476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS: The Principal. . .</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mean Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has made appropriate connections with the parents of</td>
<td>3.4286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELL students</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides translators for meetings with parents of ELL students.</td>
<td>3.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the influence of ELL students’ cultures in his or her learning and behavior.</td>
<td>3.6190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports inclusion of ELL students’ ways of knowing into the curriculum.</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEACHER SUPPORT: The Principal. . .**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mean Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides me with access to appropriate and relevant professional development about working with ELLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports me in my work with ELL students in order that students achieve at grade level in reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY: The Principal. . .**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mean Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has explained to me how/why ELLs were placed in my classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has explained the Massachusetts Law around educating ELL students to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses data to drive instructional decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans and sees that an effective reading schedule is implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts formal observations and informal walk-throughs during reading classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps staff informed of current school, district and state policies related to the education of ELL students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table 2A

*Teacher Questionnaire Part 3: Leadership Characteristics of Principals in Relationship to Their Work with ELLs*

**SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: To what extent is it important for the principal, in relationship to ELL students, to. . .**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mean Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be directly involved in the instruction of ELL students at the classroom level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be aware of the best practices in ELL curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**READING/ASSESSMENT: To what extent is it important for the Principal, in relationship to ELL students, to. . .**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mean Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be directly involved in assessment activities of ELL students at the classroom level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be aware of the best practices in the instruction of ELL students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be aware of the best practices in assessment of ELL students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESSNESS: To what extent is it important for the Principal, in relationship to ELL students, to...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster shared beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have contact with teachers, ELL students and ELL parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER SUPPORT: To what extent is it important for the Principal, in relationship to ELL students, to...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish strong lines of communication with and between teachers and ELL students and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their instructional time or focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY: To what extent is it important for the principal, in relationship with ELL students, to...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain decisions s/he has made in terms of his/her belief that academic achievement is not the only measure success in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices regarding effective education of ELL students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure that discussions of current theories and practices regarding effective education of ELL students are a regular aspect of the school’s culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor the effectiveness of school practices in terms of their impact on student achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a set of standard operating principles and routines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3A

Principal Questionnaire Part 2: Roles of Principals in Teaching ELLs to Learn to Read
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understand the stages of second language acquisition.</th>
<th>4.2500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know the difference between second language acquisition and learning issues.</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the difference between BICS (social language proficiency) and CALP (academic language proficiency).</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze teachers' classrooms as a site for second language acquisition and advises about appropriate adjustments.</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use knowledge of factors affecting second language acquisition to support my teachers in modifying instruction for students who are having difficulty in learning to read in English.</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>READING/ASSESSMENT: I . . .</strong></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure that teachers are able to conduct early and ongoing assessment of children’s second language learning and reading skills development.</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure that teachers know the difference between teaching students who are native speakers to learn to read in English and teaching ELLs to learn to read in a second language.</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure teachers use research based strategies to support children’s language learning and reading development.</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure that all of the students in our school have access to language-rich, rigorous and engaging reading curricula, including materials appropriate for ELLs.</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have been trained in teaching Reading and Writing to ELL students.</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am trained in the MELA-O (Massachusetts English Language Assessment – Oral).</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS: I . . .</strong></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have made appropriate connections with the parents of ELL students</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide translators for meetings with parents of ELL students.</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the influence of ELL students’ cultures in his or her learning and behavior.</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support inclusion of ELL students’ ways of knowing into the curriculum.</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER SUPPORT: I . . .</strong></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide my teachers with access to appropriate and relevant professional development about working with ELLs. | 4.0000
---|---
Support teachers in their work with ELL students in order that students achieve at grade level in reading. | 4.0000
**POLICY: I. . .** | Mean Response
---|---
Have explained to teachers how/why ELLs were placed in their classrooms. | 3.5000
Have explained the Massachusetts Law around educating ELL students to teachers. | 3.2500
Use data to drive instructional decisions | 3.7500
Oversee that an effective reading schedule is implemented. | 4.6667
Conduct formal observations and informal walk-throughs during reading classes. | 4.5000
Keep staff informed of current school, district and state policies related to the education of ELL students. | 4.2500

### Table 4A

**Principal Questionnaire Part 3: Leadership Characteristics of Principals in Relationship to Their Work with ELLs**

| SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: To what extent is it important for you, in relationship to ELL students, to. . . | Mean Response
|---|---
Be directly involved in the instruction of ELL students at the classroom level. | 4.2500
Be aware of the best practices in ELL curriculum. | 4.5000

| READING/ASSESSMENT: To what extent is it important for you, in relationship to ELL students, to. . . | Mean Response
|---|---
Be directly involved in assessment activities of ELL students at the classroom level. | 3.5000
Be aware of the best practices in the instruction of ELL students. | 5.0000
Be aware of the best practices in assessment of ELL students. | 5.0000

| CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS: To what extent is it important for you, in relationship to ELL students, to. . . | Mean Response
|---|---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foster shared beliefs.</th>
<th>5.0000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have contact with teachers, ELL students and ELL parents.</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER SUPPORT: To what extent is it important for you, in relationship to ELL students, to . . .</strong></td>
<td>Mean Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish strong lines of communication with and between teachers and ELL students and their families.</td>
<td>4.4095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their instructional time or focus.</td>
<td>4.2727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their duties.</td>
<td>4.5455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY: To what extent is it important for you, in relationship with ELL students, to . . .</strong></td>
<td>Mean Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain decisions s/he has made in terms of his/her belief that academic achievement is not the only measure success in the school.</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies.</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices regarding effective education of ELL students.</td>
<td>4.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure that discussions of current theories and practices regarding effective education of ELL students are a regular aspect of the school’s culture</td>
<td>4.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor the effectiveness of school practices in terms of their impact on student achievement.</td>
<td>4.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor the effectiveness of school practices in terms of their impact on student achievement.</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>