UNLV | UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

2009

Teacher candidates' attitudes toward immigration and teaching learners of English as a second language

Midena M. Sas
University of Nevada Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations

Part of the Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons, and the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

TEACHER CANDIDATES' ATTITUDES TOWARD

IMMIGRATION AND TEACHING LEARNERS

OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

by

Midena M. Sas

Bachelor of Education
University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
2000

Master of Science in Curriculum and Instruction
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
2002

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Teacher Education
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
December 2009

UNLV
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA LAS VEGAS

THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

We recommend that the dissertation prepared under our supervision by

Midena Maria Sas

entitled

Teacher Candidates' Attitudes toward Immigration and Teaching Learners of English as a Second Language

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
Teacher Education

Sandra Odell, Committee Co-Chair

Steven McCafferty, Committee Co-Chair

John Butcher, Committee Member

Kathleen Krach, Graduate Faculty Representative

Ronald Smith, Ph. D., Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
and Dean of the Graduate College

December 2009

ABSTRACT

**Teacher Candidates' Attitudes Toward Immigration
and Teaching Learners of English
as a Second Language**

by

Midena M. Sas

Dr. Sandra Odell and Dr. Steven McCafferty, Examination Committee Chairs
Professors of Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

While in theory, democratic ideals promise the equal participation of all its

citizens in the decisions that affect them, in practice some populations, i.e., those who do

not possess membership to the dominant cultural group, often miss out on the privileges a

democratic society is supposed to ensure. Critical theorists pointed out that "democracies

like ours exhort equal opportunity but often ignore ways in which our schools operate

unconsciously and unknowingly to guarantee that there will be no real equality"

(McLaren, 2007, p. 176). In the education arena, inequitable treatment has received

significant attention, perhaps due to the glaring repercussions such treatment has on

children. For example, the Committee on Multicultural Education of the American

Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, AACTE (2002), called attention to our

school systems' failure to address the educational needs of culturally and linguistically

diverse students. This study focused on linguistically diverse students, also referred to as

learners of English as a second Language (L2).

In order for teacher educators to prepare teachers who are able to meet the needs of L2 learners, they must have access to several types of information, including what characterizes an effective teacher for L2 learners. In 1996, Garcia conducted a review of such characteristics, among which he identified disposition and affect. Many agree that teachers' dispositions and affective views, also referred to as *attitudes,* influence teaching practice (e.g., Pajares, 1992; Pohan, 1994; Reeves, 2006; Richardson, 1996; Stuart & Thurlow, 2000). In research, teachers' attitudes have been construed differently. This study evaluated teachers' attitudes based on their alignment with the ideals of democratic education, which include equality, participation, access, and opportunity. Due to the absence of research defining attitudes in this way, and the paucity of quantitative measurement in the area of teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners, this study's goals were (1) to design and validate a quantitative instrument to measure teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners; (2) to describe teachers' personal and professional attitudes, in this case, attitudes toward immigration and attitudes toward L2 learners, respectively; and (3) to compare personal and professional attitudes of various demographic groups within the participant pool.

Results indicated that the survey designed for this study was valid and reliable. Findings also showed that nearly one third ($n = 51$) of participants had somewhat negative to negative attitudes toward immigration and one fifth ($n = 32$) of participants had somewhat negative to negative attitudes toward L2 learners. Considering also the demographic characteristics found to be related to more inclusive attitudes, two main recommendations were made for teacher education: (1) teachers should have second language-related experience, such as foreign language study, and (2) teacher preparation

that informs candidates about immigration in the U.S., as well as education about best methods for teaching L2 learners in the mainstream classroom, is essential. This study's results also led to several suggestions for future qualitative and quantitative research in this area.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to dedicate this work to my mother, Lidia, the strongest woman I know.

Having completed both my masters and doctoral work at UNLV, I have had the opportunity to grow professionally under the tutelage of some amazing people. In particular, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Sandra Odell. She has been more than a teacher, a mentor, an impeccable role model, and an incessant source of support and encouragement. During these years together, I have come to value her as a parent.

I have also met Dr. Steven McCafferty in my first semester as a masters student, and he has chaired both my masters and doctoral committee. I am deeply thankful for having the opportunity to learn from such an accomplished individual. With artful mastery, he was always able to reveal the bigger picture to which each lesson learned belonged, so that no matter how much was attained, there was always excitement to pursue further.

Focusing on the professional aspect of this journey, I would also like to recognize Dr. John Butcher and Dr. Kathleen Krach, members of my doctoral committee. I approached Dr. Butcher because of the shared passion we have for the rights and needs of immigrant students. Our lengthy conversations have continually fueled my motivation, and his guidance was able to both broaden and focus my work. Dr. Krach came highly recommended, and she has exceeded her recommendation at every interaction. I have never worked with anyone as efficient, and as clear as her. Every suggestion she offered

was so valuable, that my work would not have been whole without it. I cannot praise enough the precision and clarity that infused each contribution she has made to my progress. On a final professional note, I would like to thank Dr. Maggie Sas, for always making statistics feel easy!

When I committed to this professional endeavor, all my loved ones committed along with me, and their prayers have accompanied me all along. I would like to express my deepest appreciation for my husband, and the unshakeable source of strength he has always been. Without him, nothing would make sense, and I feel eternally blessed to live my life with him.

I would also like to acknowledge the support offered by my large family. My mother has taught me by example, to persevere fearless in the face of insurmountable obstacles. Her repeated triumph in such circumstances has been my living proof of miracles. My father's steadfast convictions have taught me to believe, even when I didn't. His confidence in my talents repeatedly pushed me to achieve beyond my expectation. In addition, my parents' courage and ability to stay positive and grateful in the midst of challenges familiar to most immigrants are characteristics that inspired me to be an advocate for the just treatment of all people.

My immediate family also includes my four brothers and their families. My four brothers have been these excellent travel companions! Our immigration process took us through many countries, cultures, and languages, and in this whirlwind of ever-shifting perception of reality, my four brothers were my stability, my dependable reminder of who I am in spite of change, because of change. And in time, sisters-in-law, nieces and

nephews, expanded this adventure's team. I am grateful for the joy you all brought me, for your belief in my ability to succeed, and for your prayers.

I consider my parents-in-law and my cousins a part of my immediate family as well. My parents-in-law traveled far to be with my husband and I while we were both students; their support during that time was especially valuable, though their encouragement and prayer has accompanied us always. Among my many cousins, whose accomplishment has also been a source of inspiration, I would like to especially acknowledge Angie. She is a first cousin who has been more like a sister, a twin, or an alternate self. She understands me more than I understand myself at times, and our conversations have supported me during some of the most challenging periods. I belong to a family of incredibly strong women, and I am overjoyed to count myself among them at this humbling time.

Most importantly, my intertwined personal and professional life has a powerful thread that has held it all together: Dumnezeu. Without faith, love, and hope I would not be where I am today, would not be who I am today. I am humbled and grateful.

Respectfully,

Midena

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the Gettysburg Address, President Lincoln (1863) recognized the sacrifice of those who had fallen in battle, and urged a continued dedication, on the part of the living, to freedom and democracy, that "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth" (http://showcase.netins.net/web/creative/lincoln/speeches/gettysburg.htm). This memorable speech in American history has cemented the understanding that the essence of democracy can never be separated from the participation of its people. Not only is democracy defined through the participation of its citizens in their own governing, it is also sustained by people's continued dedication to such participation.

Equality and majority rule are additional facets of democracy (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/democracy).   While in a democracy majority rules, minority rights exist to ensure equal opportunity for participation because "rule by the majority is not necessarily democratic: No one, for example, would call a system fair or just that permitted 51 percent of the population to oppress the remaining 49 percent in the name of the majority. In a democratic society, majority rule must be coupled with guarantees of individual human rights" (http://usinfo.state.gov/products/pubs/whatsdem/whatdm2.htm). This understanding is

consistent with the foundations of America's democracy, i.e., the Declaration of Independence, which supports that all people are created equal and have unalienable rights (http://www.ushistory.org/declaration/document/index.htm). Therefore, in a democracy, every citizen is considered equal, has rights that are guaranteed, and must participate.

A vehicle that can support individuals' equal opportunity to participate in democracy is education (Dewey, 1916). In fact, some argue that education holds a decisive, singular role in a democracy because "people whose capacity to create, sustain, and improve that regime [i.e., democracy] depends in large measure on the quality and effectiveness of the educational arrangements through which they pass. In a democracy, it can fairly be said, education enables freedom itself to flourish over time" (Finn Jr., as cited on http://usinfo.state.gov/products/pubs/whatsdem/whatdm6.htm). In other words, education is an integral part of the sustainability and advancement of democracy.

If education is to advance democracy, an important question must be addressed: in what ways can education further democracy? Westheimer and Kahne (2004) reviewed the politics of educating for democracy highlighting conceptualizations of citizenship, which support particular conceptions of democracy. Then, they organized the various perspectives into three categories of citizens, which align with the main frameworks for understanding the type of participation and assumptions present in democratic individuals. Answering the question "what kind of citizen do we need to support an effective democratic society?" (p. 239), Westheimer and Kahne (2004) presented the "personally responsible citizen", the "participatory citizen" and the "justice-oriented citizen" (p. 240). Since each of these three categories of citizens encompass a different

conceptualization of how democracy is maintained and advanced, educating students about citizenship in one of these three ways will produce a particular kind of citizen with a specific understanding of democracy.

The difference among Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) three types of democratic citizens is most clearly evident in these citizens' core assumptions about how to solve social problems and improve society. The personally responsible citizens' participation in democracy is rooted in internal characteristics such as being "honest, responsible and law-abiding members of the community" (p. 240). Participatory citizens' input toward the advancement of democracy centers on active participation and leadership roles within "established systems of community structures" (p. 240). The justice-oriented citizens participate in furthering democracy by questioning, debating and changing "established systems and structures that reproduce patterns of injustice over time" (p. 240). Clearly, depending on which of these types of democratic citizens schools try to shape, "pedagogy, curriculum, evaluation, and educational policy" (p.263) will differ. Deciding which of these types of citizens the public school should prepare is tied to interests of various political groups.

Thus, while education is necessary for maintaining and advancing democracy, what actually occurs in schools is based on different conceptions of democracy, which sometimes compete against each other (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). The competition is mainly between encouraging citizen participation that essentially reproduces established structures, and expecting citizen participation that challenges these structures when injustice is observed. Concern with social justice is actually a significant aspect of democracy, as evidenced powerfully in the American Civil Rights Movement

(http://www.cnn.com/EVENTS/1997/mlk/links.html), which insisted on equal access for all citizens, and resulted in several laws that aimed to guarantee it, for example the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This historical reality chiseled the concept of democracy in an important way: while equal opportunity allows participation, equal access to opportunity ensures social justice. Without the efforts of those who observed injustice and challenged it during the Civil Rights Movement, it is likely that social structures would have remained the same. Clearly, then, when considering how to educate students for democracy, teaching them how to identify injustice and change it are important aspects of remaining true to democratic ideals.

Importantly, Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) research found that educational programs that emphasize participatory citizenship do not necessarily prepare students to analyze and critique social problems, while those that focus on personally responsible citizenship can actually undermine participatory and justice-oriented citizenship. Unfortunately, public schools today generally do not emphasize justice-oriented citizenship, but rather, they prepare personally responsible and participatory citizens, who are conservative and support established social systems (see Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). There is significant literature that expresses concern with the social reproduction observed, as it occurs in schools (e.g., Giroux, 1981; Fairclough, 2001; McLaren, 2007). Whether it is unconsciously done or through a "hidden agenda…[aimed at] the reproduction of class relations and other higher-level social structures" (Fairclough, 2001, p. 33), schools end up digressing from their alignment with democracy because they place particular student populations at a disadvantage in terms of equal opportunity and access.

4

One such student population, which experiences inequitable treatment in schools, includes culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students. The Committee on Multicultural Education of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, AACTE, identified CLD students as those whose culture and/or language are different from the dominant ones in American society. The committee questioned "the purpose of our school systems if the fastest growing segment of their student populations [i.e., CLD students] are consistently unable to complete the program, or unable to graduate with a diploma?" (AACTE, 2002, p. 5). While schools' inability to meet the needs of this minority student population, i.e., CLD students, is worrisome, to narrow the scope of this study, the focus will be on linguistically diverse students, also referred to as learners of English as second language (L2). Research concerning L2 learners reports that in addition to low academic achievement (Ogbu & Simons, 1998), this minority student group also experiences marginalization (Gollnick & Chinn, 2002; Lave & Wenger, 1991) and lack of access to equal opportunity and participation (Spring, 2000; Iddings, 2005; Franson, 1999). Indeed, such a schooling experience is inconsistent with democratic principles and, thus, AACTE's inquiry into the purpose of schooling is timely.

There are laws in place that aim to ensure democratic education for all, including L2 learners. At a federal level, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) is a legislation effective as of 2002, which ensures that all children have the opportunity to succeed, including L2 learners, through the provisions of Title III – Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students (http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html). Additionally, the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the U.S. Department of Education is charged with enforcing Title

VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in federally funded programs and activities. With respect to the schooling of L2 learners, the OCR has produced Title VI Policy on Language Minority Students, which prohibits "denial of equal access to education because of a student's limited proficiency in English" (http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/eeolep/index.html). Also, since the federal role in education is limited in the U.S., each state has its own laws and school district policies (http://www.ed.gov/about/contacts/state/index.html) that specify what provisions are made for L2 learners in order to secure equal opportunity.

Classroom implementation of such laws, which endeavors to align education with democracy, usually translates into significant teacher responsibility. Pertaining to the focus of this discussion, policies related to providing equal opportunity to L2 learners include the mainstreaming of these students upon readiness (http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html). Studies investigating teachers' reactions to this responsibility have identified complaints regarding insufficient training to teach L2 learners, as well as a lack of support, time, and materials for working with L2 learners in the mainstream classroom (e.g., Reeves, 2006; Franson, 1999). In terms of attitudes or feelings related to having L2 learners in their classrooms, teachers reported resentment, resistance and reluctance (Franson, 1999; Reeves, 2006). In the words of an actual teacher, her colleagues felt "incredibly taken advantage of … and despite their feelings about children, about education and entitlement and quite frankly what the law states, they feel like they're being used" (see Franson, 1999, p. 69). Franson (1999) concludes that teachers' personal and professional attitudes related to teaching L2 learners have not been investigated sufficiently. Indeed, considering the central role

teachers have in the application of law catering to L2 learners, research that clarifies issues related to this implementation is imperative.

Research about teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners is of particular importance because attitudes influence teaching practice (Johnson, 1994; Pajares, 1992; Pohan, 1994; Stuart & Thurlow, 2000) and, thus, whether teachers will provide equal opportunity to L2 learners in order to support democratic education will depend, in part, on their attitudes (Franson, 1999). Therefore, research on attitudes is of primary interest, and some have claimed that it may ultimately become one of the most valuable psychological constructs for teaching and teacher education (Fenstermacher, 1979; Pintrich, 1990; Pajares, 1992; Johnson, 1994). In existing research, teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners have been construed in multiple ways (Carter, 1996), and they have been measured in a variety of ways also (e.g., Reeves, 2004; Achinstein & Barrett, 2003; Iddings, 2005). Not surprisingly then, results are indicative of particular conceptualizations of "attitudes" and even of L2 learners, depending on which context the research investigates, i.e., the mainstream classroom or the language classroom. Significantly, while qualitative analysis has revealed in-depth insight into several aspects of teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners, quantitative measurement in this area is scarce. This study participates in filling the existing gap by designing an instrument to measure quantitatively teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners in mainstream classrooms; these attitudes are defined and evaluated in accordance with the democratic principles discussed previously.

Critical pedagogy is an appropriate theoretical framework for this research because it supports the goals of educating for democracy, and because it informs the definitions of the study's constructs, i.e., teachers' attitudes, L2 learners, and mainstream

classrooms. Rooted in critical theory, which embraces the "struggle against domination of all forms" (Darder, Baltodano & Torres, 2003, p. 9), "critical pedagogy is fundamentally committed to the development and evolvement of a culture of schooling that supports the empowerment of culturally marginalized and economically disenfranchised students. By so doing, this pedagogical perspective seeks to help transform those classroom structures and practices that perpetuate undemocratic life" (Darder, Baltodano & Torres, 2003, p. 11). Critical pedagogy demands equal participation and access for all students, and insists on the advancement of social justice within schools (e.g., Giroux, 1981; McLaren, 2007; Shor, 1992). Its alignment with democratic education as outlined above is valuable to this research.

The lack of equal educational opportunity for L2 learners in the context of a democratic society, where education is meant to serve the maintenance and advancement of democracy, and laws exist to ensure this purpose, is problematic. Since teachers are at the core of these laws' implementation, it is practical to begin investigation with them. Additionally, since attitudes serve as filters to practice, teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners are an important variable in research concerned with whether or not L2 learners are receiving equal access to educational opportunities. The goals of this study are:

I.   to design and validate a quantitative instrument to measure teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners

II. to describe teachers' personal and professional attitudes, in this case, attitudes toward immigration and attitudes toward L2 learners, respectively

III. to compare personal and professional attitudes of various demographic groups within the participant pool

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this review is two-fold: (1) to situate this study within the existing literature on teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners, and (2) to elaborate on the framework of critical pedagogy, as it informs the constructs of this study. Ultimately, this review will not only demarcate this study's constructs, i.e., teachers' attitudes, L2 learners, and mainstream classrooms. It will also illumine the perspective through which these constructs are defined, measured and evaluated, i.e., a democratic stance that emphasizes social justice, a perspective also known as critical pedagogy.

Introduction to Teachers' Attitudes Toward L2 Learners

In 1996, Carter wrote a careful review of the existing literature, at that time, on issues related to learning to teach. Being a central question to teacher educators, 'learning to teach' experienced inquiry from numerous standpoints with varying emphases, including emerging conceptions of teachers' knowledge, desired outcomes and actual effects of teacher preparation programs, as well as entering dispositions or the influence of prior experience on teacher learning. Of particular interest is that a decade later, we are challenged by the same inconsistency appearing in research on learning to teach, which was observed by Carter (1996), i.e., constructs such as "attitudes, dispositions,

9

orientations, perspectives, knowledge, concerns, or commitments… are used interchangeably" (p.295). Perhaps due to the complex nature of defining and measuring teachers' attitudes, we are still debating today the impact of attitudes on teacher behavior and student achievement (e.g., Schraw & Olafson, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995), whether teachers' beliefs can be changed (e.g., Groulx, 2001) or not (e.g., Richardson, 1996), and even what teachers' attitudes toward specific, teaching-related domains actually are (e.g., Reeves, 2006).

It is significant that teachers' attitudes have been the forum of such intense scrutiny in teacher education literature, no doubt due to the general consensus that attitudes have a filtering effect on new information about learning and teaching, and that they manifest themselves in classroom practice (Johnson, 1994). It is disconcerting that "teachers hold beliefs about students which lead to differential expectations and treatment, based on race, ethnicity, gender and social status, the result of which is differential student outcomes" (Pohan, 1994, p. 23). In other words, undervaluing diverse students leads to differential treatment and, ultimately, achievement. Indeed, some have claimed that research on teachers' beliefs will ultimately become one of the most valuable psychological constructs for teaching and teacher education (Fenstermacher, 1979; Pintrich, 1990; Pajares, 1992; Johnson, 1994).

Participation in the discussion about teachers' attitudes at this time necessitates a focusing of this construct. To this end, the following sections will summarize how teachers' attitudes have been construed in the past, and what has been found. Concerned with what the literature lacks in this area, this review will spotlight findings regarding teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners and how they have been measured. Finally, I will

propose alternate ways teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners can be identified, and will

suggest a matching measurement approach.

<u>Teachers' Attitudes - An Inconsistent Construct</u>

In 1992, Pajares completed a similar pursuit to the one I attempt here, i.e.

"cleaning up a messy construct" (p. 307), in his case, teachers' beliefs. His review is of

particular relevance because he found that "teachers' attitudes about education – about

schooling, teaching, learning, and students – have generally been referred to as teachers'

beliefs" (p. 316). Since the terms 'beliefs' and 'attitudes' were used interchangeably, it is

important to consider what research has uncovered about both. Pajares' (1992) thorough

analysis of how beliefs had been construed in the education literature led him to the

conclusion that educational beliefs are broad, encompassing, diffuse, ungainly, too

difficult to operationalize, and too context free. Therefore, he recommended speaking in

terms of educational beliefs about specific issues, such as the nature of knowledge (also

known as epistemological beliefs). Consistent with prominent work in the area of

teachers' beliefs, Pajares (1992) supported "a view of belief that speaks to an individual's

judgment of the truth or falsity of a proposition, a judgment that can only be inferred

from a collective understanding of what human beings say, intend, and do" (p. 316).

Upon piecing together a consensus on the definition of beliefs, Pajares recognized the

difficulty in measuring such a construct, since representations of what human beings say,

intend and do are not necessarily accurate reflections of their beliefs. Perhaps due to

challenges in measurement, teachers' attitudes, or beliefs, continued to be a slippery

construct.

In the literature, there are many terms that refer to teachers' attitudes. While, at times, this construct is used interchangeably with beliefs (Pajares, 1992; Pohan & Aguillar, 2001), at other times it appears as a stark contrast to beliefs (Richardson, 1996), and at yet others, similar constructs to it, e.g., frames (Achinstein & Barrett, 2003), have shed light on how teachers' attitudes can be studied. The following is an illustration of the complexity of defining the construct of teacher attitudes.

Richardson (1996) traced the beginnings of the literature on attitudes and beliefs, when leading researchers such as Rokeach used these terms interchangeably, but Fishbein identified the conceptual confusion in doing this and limited 'attitudes' to the affective domain and 'beliefs' to the cognitive. Thus, beliefs are construed as "psychologically held understandings, premises, or propositions about the world that are felt to be true" (p. 103), while attitudes are defined as "learned predispositions to respond to an object or class of objects in a favorable or unfavorable way" (Fishbein as cited in Richardson, 1996, p. 103). Still, the literature has continued to use these terms interchangeably since the 1960s.

For example, in Pohan and Aguilar's (2001) review of the various instruments used to measure attitudes and beliefs toward diversity, a study on the *attitudes* of university freshmen includes a subscale of "cross-cultural beliefs" (p. 162), and a survey of preservice teachers' beliefs has a scale in which "high scores … reflected positive beliefs *and* attitudes" (italics added for emphasis, p. 162). While attitudes and beliefs have been used interchangeably, there are studies that make the distinction clear.

Karabenick and Noda (2004) conducted a large-scale quantitative study of teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward L2 learners, which suggested a clear separation of

12

these two constructs. Since the authors did not define the constructs directly, it was gathered from various descriptors in the study that 'attitudes' referred to being "more versus less accepting of L2 learners" (p. 56), holding certain "predispositions" (p. 62) such as "ambivalence" (p. 62) or "acceptance" (p. 69). 'Beliefs' was used in relation to specific "beliefs about language and cognition" (p. 56), such as "the use of first language (L1) at home interferes with learning a second language (L2)" (p. 62). Karabenick and Noda (2004) drew a connection between 'attitudes' and 'beliefs', where teacher attitudes have "associated beliefs that characterize teachers" (p. 56). For example, "teachers with more positive attitudes toward L2 learners were more likely to believe that L1 is not an impediment" (italics added for emphasis, p. 62). Though it is not clear how attitudes were measured in this study, it is important that a distinction between attitudes and beliefs emerged here, coupled with an insightful relationship between these two constructs.

The ways teachers' attitudes have been measured can also reveal facets of how attitudes are defined. Based on Goffman's work on frame analysis (1974), Achinstein and Barrett (2003) used frames to define ways of seeing the world since we "'frame' reality in order to make sense of our everyday lives, negotiate our world, and choose appropriate actions" (p.3). Frames are similar to attitudes when they are understood as perspectives (see Pohan & Aguillar, 2001), rather than beliefs. Achinstein and Barrett (2003) determined that teachers used three frames to interpret classrooms: a managerial frame, a human relations frame, and a political frame. From a managerial frame, one views the classroom, for example, as efficient organization; from a human relations frame, one views the classroom as a caring family; from a political frame, one views the classroom as a democratic community. As discussed previously, democracy can be understood

13

differently (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) so viewing the classroom as a democratic community can mean different things for different respondents. However, the concept of frames is still useful in narrowing the conceptualization of attitude, since it becomes a linguistics task to tease out specific definitions for words that are synonymous, i.e., attitudes, beliefs, opinions, views, perspectives. Truly, Richardson's (1996) clarification that beliefs are felt to be true similar to facts, while attitudes are affective in nature becomes especially helpful in understanding the subtle distinction between referring to the sample political frame as: 'it is someone's point of view that classrooms should be democratic communities', rather than 'one believes classrooms are democratic communities'. Measuring attitudes through frames allows access to teachers' interpretations of their professional context, as well as their perspectives about it.

It has been difficult to define and measure teachers' attitudes because it is a broadly encompassing construct, segments of which researchers identify separately; it is a slippery construct in that it is a shifting entity influenced by numerous factors such as cultural background, upbringing, schooling, and role models, to name a few; and it is a sensitive construct that makes self-report problematic. Due to the inherent challenges of this construct, we continue to need "clear conceptualizations, careful examination of key assumptions, consistent understandings and adherence to precise meanings, and proper assessment and investigation" (Pajares, 1992, p. 307) in this area. This research will respond to the need apparent in the literature by providing a well-supported conceptualization of teacher attitudes, which will be measured carefully as suggested.

In spite of disagreement on which term to use for the construct of teachers' attitudes, significant research has been conducted in this area, tackling not only what teachers' attitudes are, but also how these attitudes form, what relationship exists between attitudes and teaching practice, whether attitudes can change, and what problems arise if teachers' attitudes do not change. In order to conduct further investigation in this area, it is helpful to understand the information currently available on this topic. In conducting this review, I searched the multiple terms used to refer to teachers' attitudes, i.e., teachers' beliefs, dispositions, orientations, perspectives, views, commitments, values, and opinions. Earlier reviews in this area, such as those conducted by Pajares (1992), Kagan (1992), and Richardson (1996), have proved especially helpful, while recent research on this topic has revealed current concerns and directions for future work. The following section is a survey of what we know about teachers' attitudes.

Findings have been mostly unanimous since the 1950s on what the majority of preservice teachers' attitudes are toward teaching, learning, learning to teach, curriculum, and students. Most reviews of research on teachers' attitudes and beliefs will report that preservice teachers are unrealistically optimistic and confident about their ability to teach (Carter, 1996; Kagan, 1992, Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996). Also termed erroneous and simplistic beliefs about teaching (Stuart & Thurlow, 2000), preservice teachers believe that affective traits, such as liking and caring for children, suffice to teach well (Kagan, 1992). Incomplete and dysfunctional views of teaching also include images of teacher as guide, friend (Calderhead, 1987 as cited in Carter, 1996), or expert (Britzman, 1986). When preservice teachers imagine themselves teaching, they picture standing

before a group of students lecturing (Feimen-Nemser & Remillard, 1996). They believe

teaching is a process of transmitting knowledge from teacher to student (Feimen-Nemser

& Remillard, 1996; Kagan, 1992; Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996). It is perhaps not

surprising, then, that they find approaches to instruction that encourage student

collaboration to be unsettling (Feimen-Nemser & Remillard, 1996).

Consistent with their attitudes toward teaching, preservice teachers equate

learning to memorizing information in the curriculum and practicing skills (Feimen-

Nemser & Remillard, 1996; Richardson, 1996). In terms of attitudes toward learning to

teach, findings indicate that preservice teachers have an utilitarian focus, expecting to

learn motivating strategies and techniques for classroom instruction (Stuart & Thurlow,

2000) because they believe that teaching is best learned through experience (Richardson,

1996). They have also been found to have a custodial view about student control (Kagan,

1992). In addition, findings indicate that preservice teachers hold a positivistic view

toward curriculum, in that they believe there is one correct answer for every question

(Richardson, 1996) because subject matter is a fixed collection of facts (Feimen-Nemser

& Remillard, 1996).

Finally, attitudes toward students include contradictory beliefs, i.e. treating

students fairly means treating them all the same, but also as individuals with unique

needs. Preservice teachers have been found to change their expectations of students based

on stereotypes, which they are willing to accept as explanations of differential student

behavior (Feimen-Nemser & Remillard, 1996). They have simplistic explanations for

gender and ethnic differences in achievement (Richardson, 1996), believing some

students are not capable of learning basic literacy and mathematical skills, and confusing

low achievement with lower class (Feimen-Nemser & Remillard, 1996). Though rather negative, preservice teachers' attitudes toward teaching, learning, learning to teach, curriculum, and students reported here inform teacher educators in important ways.

Importantly, Richardson (1996) drew teacher educators' attention to the fact that there are individual and whole group differences in preservice teachers' attitudes and developmental levels. For example, elementary preservice teachers have been found to be more child-oriented, more tolerant of student behavior problems, and more anxious about mathematics, than their secondary preservice teachers counterparts who are more interested in subject-matter content, have a higher self-concept and higher cognitive level of development in math, and have more complex explanations for achievement differences based on ethnicity and gender. Also, elementary and female teachers have demonstrated more positive attitudes toward students than secondary and male teachers. The most significant group difference, however, has been identified between traditional and nontraditional preservice teachers, i.e. "students who have had a gap in their formal educational studies, either from having pursued another career or homemaking" (Richardson, 1996, p. 108). The latter framed conceptions of teaching based on experience with the schooling of their children rather than on their own schooling, and they understood complexities of teaching and learning more. In contrast, traditional preservice teachers were surprised by the diversity they found in classrooms and did not feel they needed to adapt instructions or materials for different students. Investigating individual and group attitudes in such ways will reveal a more concise image of preservice teachers' perspectives.

Aside from what preservice teachers' attitudes actually are, research reveals with equal consistency how these attitudes are formed. Preservice teachers' attitudes and beliefs are rooted in their own experience as students (Carter, 1996; Kagan, 1992; Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996; Stuart & Thurlow, 2000). Their recollections of exemplary teachers have a profound impact on their definitions of teaching, while their own experiences as learners impact their definition of learning. They assume that the students they will teach "will possess aptitudes, problems, and learning styles similar to their own" (Kagan, 1992). This is especially problematic when they encounter students from a background that is different from their own. Unlike other professions, such as medicine or law, education affords a familiar context to preservice teachers when they enter their workspace (Schutz, 1970 as cited in Pajares, 1992); in fact, preservice teachers are apprenticed into the teaching profession from an early age (Lortie, 1975). It is not surprising, then, that preservice teachers have such deep-rooted beliefs and attitudes. In addition, they come, in a large majority, from a similar background, i.e., they are white, middle-class females (Richardson, 1996). Therefore, since attitudes are rooted in experience, and preservice teachers have similar experiences with schooling, the consistency in their attitudes is predictable.

Significantly, the consistent preservice teachers' attitudes reviewed above coincides with what Schraw and Olafson (2002) categorized as the realist world view, one of three epistemological world views these authors identify. Teachers with a realist world view believe that they are the experts who must confidently take over a classroom and transmit content to students, from a curriculum which is fixed because it includes truths everyone agrees on. Those with a contextualist world view expect students, whom

they view as unique, to construct their own understanding, while the teacher structures

the class in such a way as to allow students to reach the best understandings possible.

Teachers with a relativist world view prepare students to think independently, to question

the knowledge and authority of others because today's truth will be viewed with

suspicion tomorrow. Schraw and Olafson (2002) summarized beliefs about knowledge,

curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, reality and standards for judging truth, constructivism,

the role of the teacher, the role of the student, and the role of peers, characteristic of each

world view. They collected quantitative and qualitative data from 24 teachers with one to

15 years of experience to determine if teachers endorse one of the three world views

identified above, or other world views absent from this classification system, and if there

is a link between epistemological world view and classroom practice. Schraw and

Olafson (2002) found that 95% of their participants endorsed the contextualist world

view, and none of the participants' world views differed substantially from one of the

three described, i.e., realist, contextualist, and relativist. Notably, they found few clear

links between epistemological world view and teaching practice. In fact, while 95% of

participants reported support for the contextualist world view, most teachers adopted

practices consistent with the realist world view.

　　　Since Schraw and Olafson (2002) have found teachers' practice to be consistent

with predictions of previous literature on teachers' attitudes, perhaps there is a

relationship between teachers' attitudes and their practice; but the problem with

measuring attitudes persists and begets uncertainty. As others have pointed out (Hofer,

2002; McCombs, 2002), Schraw and Olafson's (2002) findings may be more a reflection

of their measurement, rather than a true lack of relationship between teachers' beliefs and

19

practices. Schraw and Olafson (2002) did not actually observe teaching practice; they used self-report to measure both teaching practice and beliefs. Self-report is difficult to use because research participants wish to please, and provide socially acceptable answers (Reeves, 2006). As noted earlier, especially on a sensitive, highly personal topic such as beliefs, measurement is a real challenge. Therefore, research continues to examine how teachers' attitudes influence their practice. While some have found inconsistencies between teachers' beliefs and practices (Shraw & Olafson, 2002; Levin & Ammon, 1991 as cited in Kagan, 1992), many have found "that teachers' beliefs and attitudes drive important decisions and classroom practice" (Renzaglia, Hutchins & Lee, 1997 as cited in Stuart & Thurlow, 2000, p. 113; also see Pajares, 1992; Pohan, 1994). More precise measurement of attitudes and of practice, then, can reveal more accurately the relationship among them.

If attitudes and beliefs can affect classroom practice, it is important to know if attitudes can change. In Wideen, Mayer-Smith, and Moon's (1998) review of 97 studies on learning to teach, they identified teachers' beliefs and stressed a consistent finding in this area: beliefs are difficult, if not impossible to change. Their finding is consistent with other reviews in this area (Carter, 1996; Pajares, 1992; Richardson, 1996). In Kagan's (1992) review of 40 learning-to-teach studies, 23 dealt with teacher's beliefs or attitudes. Of these 23, 14 studies reported little to no change in teachers' attitudes, while only 9 identified change. In three of the nine studies that reported change in beliefs, the change occurred in a negative direction. For example, one teacher started out as student-centered and inquiry-oriented, but changed to assume the role of a policeman (Bullough & Knowles, 1990, as cited in Kagan, 1992) in his classroom. Considering the teacher

attitudes identified above, the difficulty in changing attitudes poses a real challenge for teacher educators.

Research has also identified which beliefs and attitudes are more likely to change, and how that change can occur. Based on the studies he reviewed, Pajares (1992) concluded that "the earlier a belief is incorporated into the belief structure, the more difficult it is to alter" (p. 325). Therefore, newly acquired beliefs are changed more easily. Drawing on the work of Green, 1971, Cooney, Shealy and Arvold (1998) differentiated between evidentially and nonevidentially held beliefs. In short, nonevidentially held beliefs refer to those held against reason or contrary to evidence. Such beliefs cannot be changed by presenting evidence or reason; they cannot be rationally criticized. Conversely, evidentially held beliefs can be modified. This is an important distinction, which can serve teacher educators well. In addition, Kagan's (1992) conclusions from her review indicated that change occurs as a result of "cognitive dissonance and the concomitant mitigation of preexisting images" (p. 147). She suggested placing preservice teachers with cooperating teachers whose beliefs and practices are starkly different, in order to onset the dissonance. According to Cooney et al. (1998), this approach would be effective for modifying evidentially held beliefs and attitudes about teaching and learning.

Holding a general idea about what teachers' attitudes are, and knowing that these attitudes are difficult to change, what concerns arise if this situation persists? When extant norms and values of teaching practice are reinforced and perpetuated, they are maintained through a process of reproduction of school structure (Britzman, 1986; Kainan, 1995). A significant concern is that this process of reproduction preserves the

21

status quo (Pajares, 1992), which is "unacceptable given that the student population has dramatically changed and that many of the beliefs teachers and children hold are counterproductive to the teaching-learning process" (Stuart & Thurlow, 2000, p. 119). This concern has generated more focused research into teachers' attitudes toward diversity. Even among these studies, however, not many identify teachers' attitudes toward linguistically diverse students, i.e., L2 learners. Since this is a growing student population in the U.S., it is crucial to uncover teachers' attitudes toward them, so that teacher educators can be better advised in this area.

<u>Teachers' Attitudes Toward L2 Learners</u>

Drawing on their own experience, [preservice teachers] develop assumptions about the learning and thinking of others that fit with their own. Even more problematic is the tendency to interpret differences in approaches or orientations to learning or schooling as indicators of limited cognitive ability or lack of motivation (Feimen-Nemser & Remillard, 1996, p. 69).

L2 learners fall into a student category that may have different approaches or orientations to learning or schooling compared to their teachers and peers because they often come from significantly different backgrounds. It is indeed problematic if teachers interpret this difference as limited aptitude and motivation. It is important to clarify the distinction between attitudes and beliefs in order to classify what the research already says about attitudes toward linguistically diverse students. Research related to this area specifically investigates teachers' attitudes toward having L2 learners in their classrooms and toward bilingual education (Karabenick & Noda, 2004, p. 56), or toward contextual variables associated with language attitudes, such as "experience with linguistically

diverse students, region of the country, formal training in second-language learning, graduate education, and grade level taught" (Byrnes, Kiger, & Manning, 1997, p. 637). Few studies address affective views, as attitudes are defined here, toward L2 learners.

An important contribution in this area surfaced in Reeves' (2006) study of L2 learners' inclusion. She administered a survey to 279 high school teachers to measure attitudes toward the inclusion of L2 learners in mainstream classrooms. She found a discrepancy between teachers' general attitudes toward the inclusion of L2 learners and their attitudes toward specific aspects of this inclusion. For example, while teachers reported a welcoming attitude, they also strongly agreed with the statement "L2 learners should not be mainstreamed until the students had attained a minimum level of English proficiency" (p. 136). Reeves (2006) explained that the discrepancy may be an indication of the respondents' desire to provide socially acceptable answers, or of the complexity of teachers' attitudes toward the inclusion of L2 learners in mainstream classrooms. To exemplify the latter possibility, while teachers may have a genuinely positive attitude toward L2 learners, they may have little training and experience working with this student population and, therefore, may lack confidence in working with them.

In addition to teachers' attitudes toward the inclusion of L2 learners in mainstream classrooms, Reeves (2006) also found that teachers expressed concern with the equitability of modifying coursework for L2 learners, that they demonstrated ambivalence toward professional development for working with L2 learners, and that they work under misconceptions about how a second language is learned. Reeves' (2006) analysis indicated that sheltered instruction may be a technique that addresses teachers' concern with coursework modification because it can enhance instruction for both

language learners and mainstream students. The author also provided viable explanations for teacher's ambivalence toward professional development, in spite of their report of feeling unprepared to address the needs of L2 learners. She drew on previous research to explain that teachers may consider language teachers to be responsible for educating L2 learners, that they are cynical of all professional development due to disappointing history with it, and that they may believe they do not need special training to work effectively with L2 learners. Reeves (2006) indicated that successful professional development has been found to include active teacher participation, school-wide commitment to long-term change, and strong university-school partnerships. Finally, teachers' misconceptions related to language learning included that L2 learners should learn English within two years and that they should not use their native language while studying English. Importantly, such misconceptions "may color [teachers'] attitudes toward L2 learners and L2 learners' inclusion, leading educators to misdiagnose learning difficulties or misattribute student failure to lack of intelligence or effort" (p. 139). It follows that mainstream teachers should have a basic understanding of the language learning process.

Positioned well within existing literature on teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners, Reeves' (2006) findings are supported by other research. Looking at L2 learners through "deficit lenses" (Milner, 2005, p. 771), whereby teachers attribute difficulties with language to inferior intelligence, for example, rather than teachers' own misconceptions and lack of knowledge about the language learning process (Byrnes, Kiger & Manning, 1997) were common findings. Also, teachers' reluctance to work with

L2 learners appears in numerous reports (e.g., Groulx, 2001; Byrnes et al., 1997; Milner, 2005).

An additional consensus in this research concerns the characteristics found to describe teachers who have positive attitudes toward L2 learners and are effective in teaching these students. These characteristics include: believing that first language proficiency and bilingualism are beneficial to the student and do not hinder second language learning, knowing that lack of fluency in a second language does not equate lack of intelligence or comprehension, considering that L2 learners are not a burden on district resources and teacher time, believing that modification of coursework and testing of L2 learners is fair practice, having high self-efficacy for teaching L2 learners and a mastery rather than performance or competitive approach to teaching, acquiring formal training in second-language learning and teaching, having high expectations of all students, facilitating a strong and caring relationship among class members, and providing cultural and linguistic validation in their classrooms (Karabenick & Noda, 2004; Garcia, 2006; Byrnes, Kiger & Manning, 1997). Though not extensive, research related to teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners is highly informative.

An additional influential study in this area is Youngs and Youngs (2001) who revealed predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners. A survey was administered to 143 junior high/middle school mainstream teachers, which identified neutral to slightly positive attitudes toward teaching more L2 learners in the future. Importantly, the results from the survey support a multi-predictor model of teachers' ESL-related attitudes. Youngs and Youngs (2001) found that the following serve as predictors of teachers' attitudes: (1) completion of foreign-language or multicultural

25

education courses, (2) teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) training, (3) experience abroad, (4) work with diverse ESL students, and (5) gender. Consequently, the authors recommend exposure to cultural diversity as a prerequisite for working with L2 learners. While some studies challenge and expand upon Youngs and Youngs' (2001) predictors, several studies confirm that the factors Youngs & Youngs (2001) identified do predict teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners.

For example, Montero and McVicker (2006) found that formal training in ESL-related issues and earning a graduate degree improves teachers' perceptions of L2 learners. In fact, they found a strong correlation where the more credit hours earned in the area of teaching L2 learners, the more positive the attitudes toward these learners became. They recommend that teacher education include courses related to addressing the needs of L2 learners, since they found such courses to have a significant impact on teachers' attitudes. Similarly, Dogancay-Aktuna (2005) found that intercultural communication integrated with methodology training can improve sociocultural awareness and reflection on preconceived notions of L2 learners.

Johnson's (1994) findings, however, did not fully support Youngs and Youngs' (2001) first and third predictors. She conducted a qualitative analysis of four, preservice ESL teachers' perceptions and feelings about experiences during their practicum in an ESL classroom. Importantly, the four participants had extensive second and/or foreign language instruction at both secondary and university-level; they also lived and studied abroad for a long period of time. According to Youngs and Youngs' (2001) predictors, these four preservice teachers would have positive attitudes toward L2 learners. Yet, even though these teachers communicated excitement about working with language learners,

their instructional practices proved "ineffectual" (p. 450). This was due to the fact that they based their teaching practice on their own experience with language learning. Consistent with previously reviewed literature on how teachers' attitudes and beliefs form, basing teaching practice on your personal apprenticeship of observation only ensures a reproduction of the status quo, which is not necessarily teaching that benefits diverse learners. For the latter to occur, Johnson (1994) recommended that second language teacher education programs expose preservice teachers to alternative instructional practices, where alternative images of second language teachers can be accessed, and new attitudes and beliefs about second language teachers and teaching can form. Thus, according to Johnson (1994), completion of foreign-language courses and experience abroad may predict positive attitudes toward L2 learners, but not necessarily effective teaching in ESL contexts.

All in all, while numerous studies have identified information related to teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners, few have measured the affective aspect of attitudes toward L2 learners themselves. In Reeves' (2006) study, measuring teachers' attitudes toward inclusion of L2 learners in mainstream classrooms referred to enrollment of L2 learners in these classes (p. 132). Therefore, in this framework, the affect, or emotion elicited was toward enrollment issues, not the L2 learners themselves. For example, one survey item used to determine whether or not the respondent has positive attitudes toward inclusion stated "ESL students should not be included in general education classes until they attain a minimum level of English proficiency" (Reeves, 2006, p. 134). Respondents may strongly agree with this statement because they are concerned that enrolling L2 learners in a general education class before they are comfortable enough with the English

language may actually be detrimental to their learning. In fact, Franson (1999) found that "language and learning needs of EAL [English as an Additional Language] pupils are not always well served by 'mainstreaming'" (p. 59). In the case where the survey respondent is concerned with L2 learners' opportunity to learn, marking 'strongly agree' is indicative of a positive attitude toward this student population. However, on Reeves' (2006) survey, strongly agreeing with this item indicated having an attitude that does not support the inclusion of L2 learners, thus a negative attitude. Clearly, it is more accurate to say that the item exemplified above measured attitudes toward mainstreaming L2 learners. Similarly, other studies reviewed in this section measured attitudes toward professional development in the area of working with L2 learners, while most actually measured teachers' beliefs about L2 learners' intelligence, about the language learning process, and about language teaching. The studies that identified characteristics of teachers who are successful in working with L2 learners and predictors of positive attitudes toward working with L2 learners are also useful, but they do not provide precedent for measuring attitudes toward L2 learners themselves. What seems to be missing is research that focuses on the affective aspect of attitude, to be able to distinguish it from the term 'belief', and that identifies teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners themselves, rather than toward issues related to L2 learners.

Toward a Deeper Understanding Of Teachers' Attitudes Toward L2 Learners: Bourdieu's

Habitus

Bourdieu's (1999) '*habitus*' not only distinguishes the term 'attitude' from 'belief' by focusing on its affective nature, it also provides a holistic approach to its definition, which gives it more depth. Understanding attitude within the framework of

habitus is a contextual approach, which supports that attitudes are rooted in context (Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005). Indeed, teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners do not exist in a void and, thus, cannot be separated from their context, which is why this holistic approach yields a more thorough conceptualization of attitude.

In his introduction to *Language and Symbolic Power*, Thompson (as cited in Bourdieu, 1999) provides an excellent summary of the concept of *habitus* as:

> a set of dispositions which incline agents to act and react in certain ways. The dispositions generate practices, perceptions and attitudes which are 'regular' without being consciously co-ordinated or governed by any 'rule'. The dispositions which constitute the habits are inculcated, structured, durable, generative and transposable (p.12).

Since these dispositions are inculcated since childhood, they become second nature, which is why they do not seem to be governed by a rule; they simply co-exist with the agent. They are structured by the social conditions in which they are learned; naturally, the dispositions learned in rural Iowa will be different from those learned in Berkeley Hills. The inculcated, structured dispositions are durable, as they are pre-conscious and thus not readily modified. They are also transposable or generative, in the sense that these dispositions continue to generate practices and perceptions that are consistent with the conditions of existence in which the *habitus* was originally formed. Understanding teachers' affective attitudes toward linguistically diverse students as *habitus* allows recognition of the fact that these attitudes are rooted in the structural context of these teachers' lives, and reflective of those contexts since childhood.

Importantly, an interpretation of teachers' attitudes as *habitus* is consistent with the literature reviewed above. It explains why teachers' beliefs have been found to be durable or resistant to change (Richardson, 1996). It is now understandable why the "10 000 hours of apprenticeship" (Lortie, 1975) as a student seem to have more of an impact than teacher education programs: *habitus* is transposable. Ultimately, understanding teachers' attitudes as *habitus* allows researchers to investigate deeper facets of this construct, as they can delve into the context which creates and supports attitude and gain richer representation, a more accurate measurement.

Considering the context that creates and supports attitude opens the door to the social conditions in which teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners are rooted. Thus, identifying teachers' attitudes as expressions of broader values or political views, such as their stance on immigration, recognizes the locus of these attitudes within the whole person, and actually would not be far removed from the topic of interest, i.e., attitudes toward L2 learners. Second language learners are often immigrants. In fact, 90% of recent immigrants come from non-English-speaking countries (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2008). Therefore, being accepting of immigrants would also mean being accepting of L2 learners. Being open to immigration would also mean being open to L2 learners. Having a positive attitude toward immigration would also mean having a positive attitude toward L2 learners; maybe not toward L2 learners' enrollment in mainstream classrooms before having fair fluency in the English language, but toward the L2 learners themselves.

This study will test the relationship between attitudes toward immigration and attitudes toward L2 learners, because if this relationship exists, there would be an

alternate way to measure teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners, which may circumvent respondents' inclination to provide socially acceptable answers or, in this case, teachers' inclination to provide professionally acceptable answers. In other words, teachers may be reluctant to state an opinion that contradicts what is professionally expected, while stating a personal opinion that is not seen as related to the teaching profession is done more readily. In fact, many have observed the value of separating personal and professional attitudes for the purpose of measurement (e.g., Franson, 1999; Pohan & Aguilar, 2001). Bourdieu's *habitus* predicts a connection between personal and professional attitudes, so teachers' attitudes toward immigration, a personal view, and their attitudes toward L2 learners, their professional view may be linked.

As a matter of fact, Beaton, Tougas, Clayton and Perrino (2003) explained that according to the principled conservatism theory, conservative values play a determining role in the perceptions, attitudes and behavior of individuals. These authors measured conservative values, neo-racism, and traditional racism, to determine their influence on attitudes toward immigration. They discovered that traditional racism influences opposition to immigration indirectly, while neo-racism and conservative values affect it directly. Similarly, a conservative value such as opposing immigration may affect attitudes toward L2 learners more directly than racism. Surveying teachers' attitudes toward immigration aims to unearth more precise facets of teachers' affective perceptions of L2 learners.

<div align="center">Teachers' Attitudes Toward L2 Learners – A Summary</div>

For the purpose of understanding the lineage *teachers' attitudes* has had in research, this review includes information found on closely related constructs, such as

31

teachers' beliefs, dispositions, orientations, perspectives, commitments, values, and views. The review reveals that teachers have attitudes and beliefs about teaching, learning, learning to teach, students and curriculum, which are formed mainly based on their own experience as students. Due to a long apprenticeship of observation, these attitudes are deeply set and difficult if not impossible to change. There have been discrepant findings on the relationship between teachers' attitudes and their teaching practice, but since many believe attitudes influence behavior significantly, research has also investigated the conditions under which attitudes can change. Importantly, if extant teachers' attitudes do not change, the status quo will be maintained under a continual process of reproduction of school structure. Such an event works to the detriment of the increasingly diverse student population.

While the needs of minority students have been brought into sharper focus during recent research, those of the linguistically diverse student population require much more investigation. For example, current information on teachers' attitudes toward issues related to L2 learners suggest that teachers hold pervasive misconceptions about the language learning process and often use a deficit approach to explain lack of fluency in English. In spite of reporting lack of preparedness to work with L2 learners, many teachers are ambivalent toward professional development that would improve their skills. Characteristics of teachers who experience success in working with L2 learners and predictors of teachers' positive attitudes toward this student population have been identified.

However, an enduring concern is that while most teachers report neutral or welcoming attitudes toward having L2 learners in their classrooms, this characterization

conflicts their reports on more specific attitudes, such as when an L2 learner should join a mainstream classroom. Similar to all research on attitudes, measuring this construct is a true challenge, mainly due to respondents wishing to provide socially acceptable answers. I suggest here that measuring attitudes toward immigration may be a way to circumvent an enduring problem in the measuring of teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners. Deflecting respondents' attention away from the immediate topic of interest, i.e., attitudes toward L2 learners, may elicit more accurate responses. Importantly, immigration is not a topic far removed. In fact, when understanding teachers' attitudes as *habitus*, as defined by Bourdieu (1999), we learn that these attitudes are rooted in a much larger socio-cultural context, which creates and supports attitudes in the first place. Identifying the locus of teachers' attitudes in the context which breeds them allows for more focused measurement of this construct.

Ultimately, more clear conceptions and measurement of constructs can advance our knowledge of any topic in significant ways. In spite of disagreement on the conceptualization of teachers' attitudes, the research has revealed a basic body of information, which has enjoyed some confirmation over time. Persistent is the ongoing call, however, and certainly relevant at this time, for insight into how to prepare teachers for the continued linguistic diversification experienced by U.S. schools (Reeves, 2006). As early as 1996, Garcia identified disposition and affect as important characteristics of effective teachers for language minority students. Accurate measurement of teachers' attitudes as defined here, i.e., affective views contextualized as *habitus*, will open the way to more precise evaluations of the filtering effects of attitudes, as well as their relationship to teaching practice. Equipped with a clearer construct of teachers' attitudes,

a theoretical framework is necessary to further ground constructs for this study and provide a lens for their analysis.

Introduction to Critical Pedagogy as a Framework for a Democratic Analysis of Teachers' Attitudes Toward L2 Learners

This section begins by bringing attention again to democracy as the underpinning of education. Since cultural and linguistic diversity is widespread in the U.S., the identification of a dominant culture, which is both intentionally and unconsciously reproduced is problematic. Critical pedagogy recognizes the hegemony that occurs and offers frameworks for ensuring democratic education for all. The community of practice framework (Lave & Wenger, 1991) is particularly useful for examining power relationships as they occur in mainstream classrooms. The formation of teacher power and the L2 learners category is reviewed. All of this information offers a clearer portrait of teaching that includes and teaching that excludes, which defines the concern of the study at hand. The section ends with situated definitions of this study's constructs.

School Systems in a Democratic Society

There is a fundamental relationship among justice, democracy and education. Dewey, a well-known educational theorist, wrote about this relationship. In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey (1916) asserted that democracy is devoted to education and offers two explanations for it. Educating the populace that it may elect and obey successfully is a superficial explanation, in his view. Dewey (1916) describes a deeper purpose for the connection of democracy and education. He explains that democracy is not only a form of government; "it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated

experience" (p. 87). In working toward common goals, participants in a democratic society need to refer personal actions to those of others, which is "equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory" (p. 87). In other words, constructing experience cooperatively should not be hindered by differences. In fact, Dewey (1916) argued that a society stratified by difference will cease to be democratic and, thus, it "must see to it that intellectual opportunities are accessible to all on equitable and easy terms" (p. 88). Though not an easy task, Dewey's (1916) explanation suggested that in a democratic society equity must be the purpose of schooling. It is right then, for AACTE's committee on multicultural education to question the purpose of the American school systems if inequitable education occurs. Inequitable education is unjust and, therefore, not democratic.

That democratic education is also necessarily equitable becomes apparent again when considering the association of democracy with egalitarianism. In *Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society*, a text used in teacher education programs, Gollnick and Chin (2002) stated that "egalitarianism is a key principle on which democracy is based" (p. 21). Mass participation, in which everyone has a voice and no group forever dominates economically, politically, socially or culturally, contributes to a "steady advancement toward a more prosperous and egalitarian society" (p. 22). If education fails minority students, such as the culturally and linguistically diverse, these students' voice and participation in the American democracy is jeopardized. They will continue to comprise the group that is dominated, thus making an egalitarian society impossible. In this way, inequitable education does not allow democracy to advance toward egalitarianism.

In considering the relationship among justice, democracy and education, it is clear that school systems, as institutions in democratic societies, must align with the purpose of democracy itself, i.e., equality. Equitable education is thus mandatory in a democracy (Dewey, 1916). Yet, AACTE has found that U.S. school systems do not meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Why is it so difficult to provide this student population equal opportunities in school? The next section will examine who, exactly, these students are.

<center>Cultural Diversity in the U.S.</center>

The AACTE report identifies CLD students as ones with cultures and languages that are different from the dominant ones in the U.S. (AACTE, 2002). It is important to zoom in on this diversity and demystify the dominance that occurs in order to examine the consistency of CLD students' perceived failure, and to understand the challenge diverse students pose to the American school system.

Currently, the presence of linguistic diversity in the U.S. is abundant. In 1990, the Census Bureau identified 329 languages spoken in the U.S. Cultural difference is an even more complex area of variance. Kramsch (2001) defined culture as "membership in a discourse community that shares a common social space and history, and a common system of standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating and acting" (p.127). When thinking about culturally diverse students as having such membership, it is also useful to consider that cultural identity is based on "traits and values learned as part of our ethnic origin, [race], religion, gender, age, socioeconomic status, primary language, geographic region, place of residence (e.g., rural or urban), and abilities or exceptional conditions" (p. 18). All these influences on cultural identity embody distinct cultural patterns, which

<center>36</center>

Gollnick and Chinn (2002) refered to as *microcultures*. Kramsch (2001) also recognized

that even when belonging to one community of discourse, members of that community

experience additional influences, which make each cultural identity unique. "Geographic

mobility, professional change, and the vagaries of life may give a person multiple social

identities that all get played out alternately on the complex framings and reframings of

daily encounters" (Kramsch, 2001, p. 83). This suggests that *microcultures* interact and

influence each other continuously, to create distinct cultural identities. History and

dominant groups also shape cultural identities. Bearing in mind the number of possible

microcultures that influence cultural identity, the diversity that can result out of different

combinations, degrees of impact, and other factors is vast.

<div align="center">Dominant Culture Reproduction</div>

In view of the large spectrum of diversity present, and the existence of a dominant

group (e.g., Giroux, 1981; Fairclough, 2001), it is appropriate to pursue how dominance

is established. Gollnick and Chinn (2002) explain that "U.S. political and social

institutions have evolved from a Western European tradition" (p. 11). Since these

institutions include such formal entities as governments, schools, social welfare, banks

and businesses, the Western European tradition holds monopoly over the majority of

societal exchanges in the daily lives of U.S. populace. Therefore, the Western European

culture dominates. This dominance comes with privilege and power for persons who are a

part of this culture (McLaren, 2007). Conversely, those who do not belong to the

dominant cultural group do not benefit from the same privileges and power. Due to the

injustice of this exclusion, non-dominant groups have been referred to as *oppressed*

groups (Freire, 2005). While the initial establishment of Western European influences is

known, the perpetuation of this cultural dominance, even at the expense of oppressing other groups, is uncharacteristic of democratic ideology.

Giroux (1981) demystifies the process of dominant culture reproduction in a democratic society. Through *hegemony*, a process of ideological control, the dominant culture can be perpetuated systematically.

Dominant beliefs, values, and social practices are produced and distributed throughout a whole range of institutions such as schools, the family, mass media, and trade unions. As the dominant ideology, hegemony functions to define the meaning and limits of common-sense as well as the form and content of discourse in a society. It does so by positing certain ideas and routines as natural and universal (Giroux, 1981, p. 94).

The complexity and perhaps success of the process of hegemony lie in exerting control through subtle means, rather than "political coercion and physical repression" (p. 95). For example, through the education system, "formally defined credentials or qualifications become a mechanism for creating and sustaining inequalities, in such a way that the recourse to overt force is unnecessary" (Bourdieu, 1999, p. 24). In such a system, obtaining a credential seems fair, the natural result of hard work, so it is justified; there is no reason for retort. What is concealed, however, is "the link between the qualifications obtained by individuals and the cultural capital inherited by virtue of their social background" (Bourdieu, 1999, p. 24). As long as this uneven playing field remains unacknowledged, hegemony is maintained seamlessly. People, teachers included, transmit the norms they learn without being aware necessarily, thus maintaining and reproducing the status quo (Britzman, 1986; Johnson, 1994; Kainan, 1995; Pajares,

1992). Exposing the populace throughout their schooling experience to the dominant culture as the norm, and supporting that exposure through such powerful means as mass media (Fairclough, 2001), have proven to be effective means of reproducing the dominant culture.

If schools serve as a primary vehicle for the perpetuation of the dominant culture, however, students from minority groups may suffer negative effects, such as marginalization and poor achievement. Marginalization (Lave & Wenger, 1991) occurs when students from minority groups are required to learn the culture and history of the dominant group without the opportunity to validate the importance of their own history and lived experiences. This is a way to ensure that only the dominant culture has value as cultural capital, i.e., "knowledge, skills, and other cultural acquisitions" (Bourdieu, 1999, p. 14). Thus, for L2 learners, not only does marginalization make them feel that they do not belong (Gollnick & Chinn, 2002), it also bars these students from having cultural capital. An additional negative impact of hegemony in schools is the poor achievement the AACTE (2002) report presented, i.e., while some CLD students were unable to complete their education, others graduated, but without a diploma that might offer possibilities such as advantageous employment. Although contentious, an important contribution to the research on poor academic performance of minority groups includes Ogbu's distinctions among minority groups, and explanations for differential performance in schools (Ogbu & Simons, 1998).

In a review of the 28-year study of minority education and performance, Ogbu and Simons (1998) elaborated on Ogbu's cultural-ecological theory of school performance and typology of minority groups, which can be used as "a heuristic device

for analysis and interpretation of differences among minority groups in school experience" (p. 155). Ogbu defines minority status as holding a subordinate power position in society. This definition coincides with the one expounded here, i.e., the position of oppressed groups. He classifies minority groups into (1) autonomous, (2) voluntary (immigrant), and (3) involuntary (nonimmigrant).

Autonomous minorities belong to small groups, identifiable by a unique race, ethnicity, religion, or language. For example, Amish persons are autonomous minorities. This group's academic achievement does not vary from that of the dominant group, even though it may be subjected to discrimination and oppression. Voluntary (immigrant) minorities are groups who have moved to the U.S. willingly and do not interpret their presence in the U.S. as forced upon them. Immigrant groups "do not experience long-lasting school performance difficulty and long-lasting cultural and language problems" (p. 164). Involuntary (nonimmigrant) minorities were forced against their will to become a part of the U.S. through being conquered, colonized, or enslaved, and interpret their presence in the U.S. as forced on them by white people. "Involuntary minorities are less economically successful than voluntary minorities, usually experience greater and more persistent cultural and language difficulties, and do less well in school" (p. 166). Since voluntary and involuntary minorities, rather than autonomous ones, experience differential academic performance, these two groups' attitudes toward school, and the dominant group's attitudes toward voluntary and involuntary minorities were examined.

In Ogbu's cultural-ecology theory, minority school performance is explained through the impact of the ecology or the environment, in this case the dominant group in American society, and by the culture of various minorities, or the way minorities see their

40

environment (Ogbu & Simons, 1998). An important contribution of Ogbu's theory is to clarify that not all minority groups are disadvantaged to the same extent in U.S. schools. Furthermore, it is not only the treatment of dominant groups that will negatively affect minority groups' academic performance, but also the perspectives of various minority groups themselves. Naturally, this is not to hold minority groups responsible for their disadvantaged status. Rather, Ogbu and Simon's (1998) study revealed the source of differential academic performance of clearly classified minority groups, which brings educators closer to responding to the specific needs of CLD students.

Considering the various nuances of cultural diversity present in the U.S., and the hegemony identified, the school system does not seem to align with the democratic goals set forth (Dewey, 1916). In order to offer CLD students an equitable education, an equal opportunity for success, American schools must cease to perpetuate the dominant culture (Fairclough, 2001; Giroux, 1981; McLaren, 2007), which forces CLD students into unprivileged, oppressed groups.

Spring (2000) explained the problematic nature of the equality of opportunity intended for American school systems. Though it was believed that equality of opportunity would increase industrial efficiency by matching talents to occupations, and that schools would be the objective sites that support the matching process through scientific measurement, a failure to produce human capital equitably occurred. The problem was that social class and racial discrimination tainted the objective selection process schools were supposed to accommodate. Ultimately, Spring (2000) cautioned that even attempts to provide equality of opportunity are influenced by dominant groups who

41

control schools that reproduce current inequalities. However, some educators believe critical pedagogy offers a viable path to the pursuit of equitable education.

Is Critical Pedagogy the Answer?

Critical theorists offer critical pedagogy as a tool to break the perpetuation of dominance and oppression. Through fostering critical thinking skills, theorists such as Freire and Giroux propagate empowerment and emancipation as the goals of equitable education. Freire (1982) summarized the role of the critical in education in an important way:

> The pedagogy of the oppressed [is] a pedagogy which must be forged with, not *for*, the oppressed (be they individuals or whole peoples) in the incessant struggle to regain their humanity. This pedagogy makes oppression and its causes objects of reflection by the oppressed, and from that reflection will come liberation (p.25).

An emphasis present in Freire's work is his concern for the participation of oppressed groups in the reformed education offered them. Clearly, distrusting minority populations' reflections and contributions to reform continues to deny them equal opportunity. Inequity in public schools, which has led to negative impacts on L2 learners, is based on marginalizing the voice of minority groups (Ogbu & Simons, 1998). Soliciting their participation is an excellent beginning to the reconstruction of schools and society (Darder, Baltodano & Torres, 2003; Freire, 1982).

Freire (1982) also believed that oppressed groups can use their knowledge of the dominant culture as a strength in efforts to reconstruct the systems that oppress. Apple,

42

Gandin and Hypolito (2003) offer a translation of one of Freire's Portuguese publications in their presentation of his work.

> It is necessary that, in learning the so-called 'norm', [the students] understand that they are learning it not because their language is ugly and inferior, but because in mastering the 'norm' they acquire tools to [use in] the struggle for the necessary reinvention of the world (Freire as cited in Apple, Gandin & Hypolito, 2003, p. 131).

While the "reinvention of the world" is a daunting task, Freire (1982) suggested tools to tackle it. A rebellion against the dominant culture risks to work in the detriment of oppressed groups. Using knowledge about the dominant culture to deconstruct inequitable power distribution from "within", so to speak, is a more promising approach. Lisa Delpit (1995) supports this view. She argued,

> To act as if power does not exist is to ensure the power status quo remains the same… I prefer to be honest with my students. I tell them that their language and cultural style is unique and wonderful but that there is a political power game that is also being played, and if they want to be in on that game there are certain games that they too must play (pp. 39-40).

Teaching L2 learners the "game" and how to play it seems to be a realistic way to ensure their participation in society and, thus, to limit the dominance of the present, skewed participation.

Delpit's (1995) focus on CLD students' inclusion and participation is consistent with the North American adoption of critical pedagogy. Pennycook (2001) explains that

> North American critical literacy is most centrally concerned with the *voices* of marginalized students, arguing that the dominant curricula and teaching practices

of mainstream schools silence the ideas, cultures, languages and voices of students from other backgrounds (p. 100).

Pennycook (2001) described the North American approach to critical literacy as one that focuses on the inclusion of marginalized students because "the voicing of their lives may transform both their lives and the social system that excludes them" (p. 101). For critical theorists, there is a foundational commitment to justice for all and, therefore, the urge to provide L2 learners students, in this case, with voice. Full participation of the populace transforms a society with systems of dominance and oppression to an equitable one.

Of particular relevance to the linguistically diverse, critical genre literacy weaves into language instruction the teaching of forms of powerful language. Pennycook (2001) names Cope, Kalantzis, Delpit, Bernstein and Halliday, some of the writers who "argue that disadvantaged students need explicit education (formal teaching) in the powerful forms of language…the focus is not on some monolithic structure called *standard English* but rather on particular strategies and language uses" (p. 97). Such focus exposes not only the power structures that exist, but also specific forms of language that can empower minority students. Learning the language of power, L2 learners can bring a more informed voice to their participation in the ultimate equitable distribution of power in schools and beyond.

Giroux (1981) spotlights teacher education programs due to their unique potential to influence the deconstruction of dominance in schools. He believes that,

seeds exist within teacher education for developing 'critical intellectuals' who can begin the task of generating a more radical and visionary consciousness among their fellow workers, friends, and students. (p. 156)

Giroux (1981) recognized that only critical intellectuals can accomplish the reinvention of the world Freire (2005) proposed, and that teachers are positioned in a way that allows them to impact the empowerment of numerous citizens. In light of this, it is appropriate to examine how teacher education programs have attempted to prepare teachers to address the needs of diverse students, and to evaluate whether attempts have aligned with empowerment of minority groups or perpetuation of the dominant culture.

This past section has explored what characterizes CLD students, the categories of minority groups that experience differential achievement in schools, the systematic reproduction of the status quo, also termed oppression (Freire, 2005), that denies them equal opportunity and perpetuates their unprivileged positioning in relation to the dominant group, and the empowerment and emancipation to be expected from an education rooted in critical pedagogy. The following section will present how Lave and Wenger's (1991) 'communities of practice' framework has proven useful in conducting research that investigates access to equal opportunity and the intricacies of power or privileged positions in classrooms. Positioning explained in such ways will allow for further delineation of this study's constructs, i.e. teachers' attitudes, L2 learners, and mainstream classrooms.

<div align="center">Examining Power Relationships in the Classroom</div>

Lave and Wenger's (1991) community of practice framework can facilitate the analysis of teacher power and student agency manifestations in classrooms. The research adduced in this section exemplifies manifestations of power and agency through reference to the concepts of (1) de/territorialization (Inda & Rosaldo, 2002), which frames the explanation of the formation of teacher power, (2) categories that "make up people"

(Hacking, 1990), which allows for a deeper understanding of language student

positioning in the community of practice that is the classroom, and (3) abjection

(Ferguson, 2002), which facilitates analysis of teaching practice. This section will

ultimately aid the narrowing down of constructs used in this study, i.e., teacher attitudes,

L2 learners, and mainstream classrooms.

As Norton (2001), Iddings (2005), and others have argued, Lave and Wenger's

(1991) community of practice framework provides a useful lens for investigating

classroom interaction, and allows for a more in-depth analysis of language learning and

teaching practice. This is because "in contrast with learning as internalization, learning as

increasing participation in communities of practice concerns the whole person acting in

the world" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 49). Therefore, this framework is compatible with

the multi-dimensional nature of language learning and teaching, and takes into account

the multiple forces that influence teachers and L2 learners, their power and agency.

Use of the terms power and agency in this discussion draws mainly from the work

of Hall (1996) and Lave and Wenger (1991). The latter define the concept of *legitimate*

peripheral participation through which newcomers gain fuller participation within a

community of practice. They explain:

> The key to legitimate peripheral participation is access by newcomers to the
>
> community of practice and all that membership entails. … To become a full
>
> member of a community of practice requires access to a wide range of ongoing
>
> activity, old-timers, and other members of the community; and to information,
>
> resources and opportunities for participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.100).

According to this framework, to the extent teachers can grant L2 learners access to entities that facilitate acquisition of full membership within a community of practice, teachers have power. In other words, in as much as language teachers are gatekeepers to the discourse of a community of practice, to a particular way of representing the world, which entails privilege and other advantages (Hall, 1996, p. 202), teachers have power. Agency is defined through juxtaposition to power, as defined above. As such, L2 learners exert agency when they resist being denied access to the target community of practice and they construct alternate ways to gain access.

The next area of review begins with a more detailed depiction of Lave and Wenger's (1991) community of practice framework. Key elements of their theory are outlined because they aid the analysis of power and agency manifestations that will be described hereafter.

<u>Mainstream Classrooms as Communities of Practice</u>

Lave and Wenger's (1991) *communities of practice* take into account the influence of any given social situation on learning, a relationship also identified as situated learning. In this framework, learning occurs through an apprenticeship-type model where newcomers to a particular community interact with the old-timers and, as they become increasingly experienced in the practices of the community, they progressively gain fuller participation. This gradually increasing participation, also called legitimate peripheral participation, necessitates above all opportunity for participation, or access. Without access, peripherality becomes marginality. These important terms distinguish between a small amount of participation or even non-participation, which occurs at the beginning of the learning process when the newcomer is not familiar with

47

the practices of the new community and, therefore, being at the periphery is legitimate, and non-participation that is a result of being barred access, an illegitimate act of marginalization.

Educational researchers (e.g., Norton, 2001; Iddings, 2005; Canagarajah, 2004) agree that the community of practice framework is particularly appropriate for mainstream classrooms since these contexts contain a marked population of old-timers and newcomers. In the mainstream classroom, students who are learning the English language are clearly newcomers to the English discourse, while those for whom English is their native language, such as teachers and classmates, are necessarily experts or old-timers to the English discourse. The mainstream classroom as community of practice functions on two levels because it influences L2 learners' participation in two communities. The first community is the classroom itself where full participation, which includes learning English, depends on access "to information, resources and opportunities for participation" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.100) as they exist in a classroom. The second community is the larger community of practice to which the L2 learner is a newcomer, i.e., the interaction outside the classroom in U.S. society, where the teacher and some classmates again occupy the old-timer role. The L2 learners' participation in this second community of practice is also dependent on access as granted by the old-timers they meet in the classroom because, again, "to become a full member of a community of practice requires access to a wide range of ongoing activity, old-timers, and other members of the community" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 100). The teacher, especially, as an old-timer with more authority in the classroom context, is in a unique position, then, to either grant or constrict L2 learners' access to participation in both the classroom, and the U.S.

society. While many other factors are involved in having access, this study will focus on the role of the old-timer, in this case, the teacher, and that of the newcomer, in this case, the L2 learner.

A final element of the communities of practice framework, which is applicable to this review, is the *imagined community*. An imagined community is the result of "a creative process of producing new images of possibility and new ways of understanding one's relation to the world that transcend more immediate acts of engagement" (Norton, 2001, p.163-164). Imagined communities are the link between the two levels on which mainstream classrooms function as communities of practice, i.e., (1) the class where English is learned, and (2) the U.S. society. In the classroom, the "immediate acts of engagement" (Norton, 2001, 163) include participation in activities that facilitate language learning, as provided by the immediate community of practice. However, these acts of engagement, learning English through various class activities, carry the additional purpose of gaining the ability to participate in the larger community of practice, i.e., U.S. society, however the learner defines that participation. The learner defines that participation in his or her imagined community. Here, again, the teacher, as an old-timer of the immediate, larger, and imagined community of practice, can either grant or constrict access.

It is clear that the community of practice framework allows for deeper analysis of the interactions that occur in mainstream classrooms, since it provides a framework for identifying old-timers and newcomers, for distinguishing between legitimate forms of non-participation based on availability of access, and for understanding the impact of L2 learners' access to classroom participation as connected to the access that can be

imagined outside the classroom and to the actual access to be had in the U.S. society as well. Due to the multi-faceted impact of the access granted by the teacher to L2 learners in the mainstream classroom, and the inseparable connection between having access to participation and social justice as expected in a democracy, this study will focus on the teachers' attitudes construed as inclusiveness, i.e., how willing teachers are to grant L2 learners access to participation.

<p align="center">The Formation of Teacher Power</p>

As mentioned previously, power in this review refers to being in a position to grant or constrict access to a community of practice. In the mainstream classroom, teachers have this position. How teachers use this position of power depends on multiple factors, including (1) their own attitudes toward L2 learners, shaped by the categories allotted these students (as examined in the next section), (2) teacher preparation, and (3) the politics that influence this profession. These factors will be examined below in order to unpack particular aspects of teacher power formation.

Significant research exists in the area of teachers' attitudes (e.g., Richardson, 1996), which has suggested that due to over 10,000 hours of observation during their own schooling experience, those entering the teaching profession possess attitudes and beliefs about teaching which are difficult to change. This finding is consistent with the de/territorialization concept, which supports that while cultural subjects may be dislodged, there is always a "reinsertion of culture in new time-space contexts" (Inda & Rosaldo, 2002, p. 11). This means that while preservice teachers are removed from their K-12 student role when they enter a teacher preparation context, they carry the attitudes formed in their previous culture into the new context. Bourdieu's (1999) *habitus* explains

this occurrence as well, since he has found attitudes to be transposable and generative in new contexts. While some modifications occur during the reterritorialization process (Inda & Rosaldo, 2002), educational research presents the relative lack of malleability of teachers' attitudes. This becomes a concern if pre-service teachers develop negative attitudes toward L2 learners prior to enrolling in a teacher education program.

While some enter teacher education programs equating the teacher role with being an authority figure, researchers have argued that it is during their formal training that teachers are taught the authority discourse. Popkewitz asserted:

> what is ignored are the ways in which teacher education imposes work styles and patterns of communication which guide individuals as to how they are to reason and to act in their relationships in the setting of schooling. The language, material organization, and social interactions of teacher education establish principles of authority, power and rationality for guiding occupational conduct (as cited in Giroux, 1981, p. 146).

Hollihan (2000) provides a detailed account of how a teacher education program accomplishes the inculcation of power and authority discourse in its graduates. He investigated the ways three teacher education programs produced definable identities "infused with institutional values and norms" (p. 172). Using Foucault and van Gennep's theories, Hollihan (2000) investigated the influences of student separation from native context, examinations during the program, and the awards associated with expected performance. The separation process he described echoes the de/territorialization concept in that students in these programs needed to physically move to the locations where teacher preparation was offered. In addition, a more symbolic separation occurred in that

institutional regulations existed to single out teacher education students in the community. While some student characteristics remained unaffected, such as their attitudes, as reterritorialization predicts, strenuous assignments and tough examinations ensured student compliance with institutional norms. To further encourage compliance, various forms of awards were granted, including reports of student achievement in local newspapers. Ultimately, "in the acute institutional atmosphere, carefully constructed desires were forged, each pulling in a similar direction, one that sought the creation of a teacher identity reflecting institutional imperatives" (Hollihan, 2000, p. 184). Though attitudes may remain relatively fixed, if teacher preparation institutions largely shape occupational conduct, it is important to consider whether the "principles of authority, power and rationality for guiding occupational conduct" (Popkewitz, as cited in Giroux, 1981, p. 146) that the institution imposes align with a democratic approach that recognizes the importance of social justice.

Being a part of the larger society, the teacher education institution is influenced by a greater agenda, the leading power relations of society or, as some would say, by politics (Giroux, 1981); "teachers at all levels of schooling are part of an ideological region that has enormous importance in legitimizing the categories and social practices of the dominant society" (p.149). Naturally, legitimizing democratic practices of the dominant society is part of maintaining a democracy, which is a desirable goal. However, if advancement of democracy is also a goal, and if social justice is incorporated into the conceptualization of democracy, then reproduction of existing social practices as they are risks the continuance of possible illegitimate, unjust practices. Therefore, teacher education programs cannot legitimize existing political agendas. Yet, "neo-conservative

think tanks enjoy a powerful influence on college campuses throughout the United States… [while] …the public uproar these days … is all about so-called liberal bias on college campuses destroying the traditional foundations of American society" (McLaren, 2007, p. 186). If the push for teachers and schooling is to maintain traditional, conservative practices, the teacher must possess the authority and necessary methodology to make this happen, while teacher education programs must instill an authoritative role in teachers and prepare them with effective methodology to enforce it.

Tsing (2002) explained the mechanism of transference of political agendas into daily practice. "Marxist scholars have shown how bourgeois governments and social institutions have promoted market thinking to naturalize class and other social distinctions. By training the attention of citizens on the equalities and opportunities of circulation and exchange, they justify policies of domination and discrimination" (p. 462). A striking example of such endorsement of the notion of equality of opportunity presents itself in a speech made by President G.W. Bush on January 7th, 2004:

> Every generation of immigrants has reaffirmed the wisdom of remaining open to the talents and dreams of the world. And every generation of immigrants has reaffirmed our ability to assimilate newcomers – which is one of the defining strengths of our country.

> (http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/01/20040107-3.html)

While President G. W. Bush emphasizes American openness to immigration, he praises 'our ability to assimilate newcomers'. Assimilation entails conformity to the "social practices of the dominant society" (Giroux, 1981, p. 149). Thus, as in Tsing's (2002)

explanation of the transference process, while attention is drawn to opportunity, domination is reinforced.

Observing this transference in the public education sphere, especially as it relates to teachers and L2 learners, let us consider the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), legislation passed in 2002. While this legislation is supposed to ensure that all children have the opportunity to succeed, i.e., that no child is left behind, L2 learners are administered the same tests as those who are native speakers of English, regardless of their English fluency level. If they fail these tests for a set number of times, their school loses government funding. A dominating preoccupation of teachers, then, becomes to support L2 learners assimilation into American schooling. Therefore, while the legislation appears to provide opportunity, it discriminates against specific student populations and directly influences teacher behavior.

So, how is teacher power produced? As Hall (1996) explains, "discourse is about the production of knowledge through language. But it is itself produced by a practice: 'discursive practice' – the practice of producing meaning" (p.201). As argued above, teacher education programs conduct a discursive practice that instills authority instincts rather than critical roles for teachers. Aronowitz (as cited in Giroux, 1981, p. 147) stated that "this approach to the curriculum [of teacher preparation programs] has contributed to the training of several generations of elementary and secondary school teachers whose main skill has become maintaining control over the class", while Giroux (1981) lamented that "too many courses in these programs are silent about the assumptions embedded in these varied approaches, not to mention the interests they serve or the ethical consequences of their use" (p.146). As a result, influenced by their own attitudes toward

L2 learners, trained in commanding an authoritative role, and expected to assimilate minorities into the dominant American context, teachers inherit a position of power. This study is concerned with how teachers feel about this power; do they intend to use it to grant L2 learners access to equal opportunity, or to constrict access by aiming to assimilate L2 learners into the dominant structures of society, which to be maintained require L2 learners to remain in unprivileged positions.

L2 Learners (Second Language Learners) – An Intriguing Student Category

L2 learners inherit characterizations that are consistent with the categories that delineate their participation in the immediate and the larger communities of practice, as discussed above. There are numerous examples where the categories that define L2 learners do not facilitate these students' inclusion in the immediate or the larger community of practice (e.g., Iddings, 2005), and do not support their academic achievement (e.g., de Haan & Elbers, 2005; Norton, 2001). There are also examples of how L2 learners use agency in ways that assist their inclusion (e.g., Canagarajah, 2004). The description that follows illustrates how this student category is being made, how L2 learners make their own category, and how this process impacts their participation in various communities of practice.

How the "L2 Learners" Category is Being Made

Hacking (1990) explained that "social change creates new categories of people" (p. 70), a process that simultaneously opens and limits ways for people to be. An example he provides is that a person can be a *garçon de café* at a specific time, in a specific place, in a specific social setting, but he cannot choose to be one during the medieval period. Thus, the social setting, the time, and the place, with the categories extant therein outline

the possibilities of who we can be. In other words, "our spheres of possibility, and hence ourselves, are to some extent made up by our naming and what that entails" (Hacking, 1990, p. 87). This begs the question, how are L2 learners made?

Harklau (as cited in Canagarajah, 2004) found that immigrant students are being assigned the stereotypical "ESL student" identity, which categorizes them as culturally alien and socially handicapped. When they resist such roles, "they earn the displeasure of their teachers and become failures. In the face of power of this nature, students are caught between two bad alternatives – that is, to conform or to fail" (p.120). Being made in this context includes real forms of coercion, which aim to ensure that L2 learners fit in the prescribed category.

Fitting in the L2 learners category, however, entails detrimental repercussions for these students, in terms of their academic achievement. Iddings (2005) cites several researchers who identified the "casting of an inferior status" (p. 168) on L2 learners. In these instances, L2 learners were treated as inferiors by their English-monolingual peers, a practice resembling one de Haan and Elbers (2005) identified in the Netherlands where Dutch students took on tutor roles while minority students were assigned dependent tutee roles. Such assignment "implies an asymmetric division of responsibilities between students with clear ethnic boundaries" (p. 316) declared deHaan and Elbers (2005), who, echoing Iddings' (2005) findings, reveal that language minority students are involved in tasks below their capabilities, while the dominant group learns leadership skills, along content knowledge and other intellectual advancements.

It is important to note that both teachers and old-timer students do the "casting", "assigning", or "making up" of L2 learners, the effects of which marginalize L2 learners

within their new community of practice. Iddings (2005) found that teachers underestimated L2 learners, giving an example of a teacher referring to this student population as the "low learners" (p. 181). This inferior status restricted "the advancement of L2 learners [second language learners] toward meaningful participation in the practices of classroom communities" (p. 168). Teachers using reductive pedagogy as a result of the extant category for L2 learners ended up negatively affecting these students' academic achievement.

In addition to the marginalization brought about by teachers and peers in their new community of practice, L2 learners can also put themselves at an academic disadvantage through specific forms of resistance. Ogbu and Simmons (1998) studied minority student resistance and made an important distinction between voluntary and involuntary minorities, as noted earlier. They distinguished between those who have become minorities by choice and those upon whom the minority status has been imposed. While this distinction can be observed clearly in those who have migrated to the U.S. by choice as opposed to those who have been brought here as slaves, a milder example of this distinction can be observed in those who choose to immigrate to the U.S., and those who do not immigrate by choice, such as the children of adults immigrants. In terms of student resistance, Ogbu and Simmons (1998) found that, in general, voluntary minorities are more open and motivated to assimilate into the new context, while involuntary minorities resist assimilation. Their resistance can be seen as occurring on a continuum from poor performance in school at one extreme, to dropping out of school at the other. This type of resistance is obviously working to the detriment of these students because the students, themselves, limit their economic choices by neglecting their schooling.

An additional example of language learner resistance to assigned categories that results in impediments for the student appears in Norton's (2001) ethnography of language classrooms as communities of practice. One of her participants revolted at the idea of "acquiescing to the identity 'immigrant' without struggle" (p. 162). This participant was so angry that her English teacher recommended that she does not take a computer course because her fluency was not 'good enough', since it was 'immigrant English', that she dropped out of the English class, thus excluding herself from the immediate community of practice altogether. In Norton's (2001) research, "non-participation was not an opportunity for learning from a position of peripherality, but an act of resistance from a position of marginality" (p.165). This participant's resistance resulted in the loss of access to free English instruction. Far from suggesting that this student should have accepted the insult and the limitations the teacher tried to impose on her access to the immediate and the larger community of practice, it is important to note that resistance to being made can lead to loss of privilege in the language classroom.

L2 Learners Making Themselves

In addition to being made, Hacking (1990) clarified that we also make ourselves. He explained this two-way process by reference to two vectors. "One is the vector of labeling from above, from a community of experts who create a 'reality' that some people make their own. Different from this is the vector of the autonomous behavior of the person so labeled, which presses from below, creating a reality every expert must face" (p. 84). The first vector refers to being made, while the second refers to our individual contribution to the making process, how we make ourselves. Of relevance to this analysis, how are L2 learners making themselves?

While the categories that make up L2 learners place them in an inferior position, often at a disadvantage in various communities of practice, L2 learners also participate in making themselves, creatively using their agency to push from below. In Iddings' (2005) study, being marginalized by the teacher, L2 learners created a parallel community of practice to that of the mainstream classroom, which was English-dominant. In the parallel community, L2 learners helped each other to gain access to the English-dominant classroom community. Iddings (2005) asserted that L2 learners "often seemed to use their sense of solidarity strategically and to make use of their common language to facilitate access to classroom activities in which they participated together with native English speakers" (p. 178). In this instance, L2 learners found ways to gain some access, even though limitations demarcated by the teacher through reductive pedagogy were not fully circumvented.

Similarly, Canagarajah (2004) found that L2 learners strategically build "safe houses" for themselves where "a culture of underlife behavior" (p. 121) develops, which these students use to their advantage. Safe houses refer to sites in the academy that are free of authoritative surveillance, where L2 learners can build "identities desirable to themselves without getting penalized by the academy" (p. 133). Spatiotemporal domains of such sites include asides between students in the classroom, playgrounds outside the classroom, and e-mail in cyberspace. Canagarajah (2004) argued that "the practice of safe houses enables certain complex forms of legitimate peripheral participation" (p. 133). Furthermore, Canagarajah (2004) saw safe houses as the sites where L2 learners can keep alive a vision of the possibilities inherent in imagined communities and identities. He supported imagined communities because he believed they can "be very functional as

59

they develop roles, discourses, and values that counter the dominant institutions and prepare the oppressed to adopt these when the time is ready for change" (p. 134). As in Iddings' (2005) example above, through solidarity in safe houses and imagined communities, L2 learners seek out ways to involve themselves and each other in the dominant community of practice.

These displays of L2 learners' creative use of agency to infiltrate themselves in the target community of practice attest to ways people can "create a reality [that] every expert must face" (Hacking, 1990, p. 84), and thus, participate in their own making rather than simply submitting to being made. As Canagarajah (2004) summarizes, "if the tactic of the dominant institutions is to root out any signs of protest or to eliminate any space for the breeding of oppositional ideologies and identities, safe houses represent an outsmarting of the powers that be" (p. 134). Thus, while the categories that make up language learners can work toward their marginalization, L2 learners can participate in the making process in ways that facilitate their inclusion. Still, if L2 learners need to seek out creative ways to gain access, equality of opportunity does not exist.

<u>Teaching that Includes and Teaching that Excludes</u>

Exploration of the formation of teacher power and of the categories that define L2 learners' prospects has already revealed subtle intricacies in the dynamics of power that work to include and exclude these students from the immediate, larger, and imagined communities of practice. The relationships that emerge among teachers assuming their authority, L2 learners who learn about their categories and submit or resist them, as well as native English speaking students who are sometimes a part of the L2 learners' immediate community of practice validate the amount of access L2 learners end up

having. In other words, the type of teaching that emerges out of a context populated with the characters described above makes sense or is predictable.

So, how can teachers use their power to facilitate L2 learners' access to the larger community of practice? Both Oxford (2001) and Larkin (1975) described three teaching approaches, the autocratic/authoritarian, democratic/participatory, and laissez-faire (low teacher power use), which influence students' interpretation of teacher power on a continuum that inscribes oppressiveness at one end, and legitimate authority on the other. Larkin (1975) found that if the teacher proves to her students that she is working in their interest, by showing affection and being helpful, she will "transform power into legitimate authority" (p. 401). This is a desirable outcome since students who believe their teacher's authority is legitimate will participate in the classroom in ways that benefit their learning, while students who interpret their teacher's use of power as oppressive, as in the case of authoritarian classroom climates, experience decreased morale, and increased aggression, i.e., forms of resistance which marginalize their participation and learning.

Research indicates that teaching L2 learners seems to be characterized generally by inclusion into the immediate community of practice but exclusion from the larger community of practice. While some teachers make great efforts to seek out ways to facilitate L2 learners' mastery of the English language (e.g., Iddings, 2005), they can limit L2 learners' access to the larger community of practice, i.e., participating in U.S. society, by using reductive pedagogy, which creates a large gap between the academic achievement of L2 learners and their native English-speaking peers (deHaan & Elbers, 2005). Unless teachers understand their positioning as old-timers of the larger community

61

of practice, and unless they are willing to grant L2 learners access to it without categorizing them into an inferior status within it, they are carrying out an act of abjection. Ferguson (2002) explained that "abjection refers to a process of being thrown aside, expelled, or discarded. But its literal meaning also implies not just being thrown out but being thrown down" (p. 140). Marginalizing students and assigning them inferior status is not only an act of being excluded from a community of practice but also of abjection. Tying such teaching practice back to the political framework within which this social practice exists, Iddings (2005) noted,

> this split in the course of L2 learners' learning trajectory within the classroom community in many ways mirrored processes of marginalization and oppression found in the larger U.S. society, which may be rooted in the difficulty of access by language and/or ethnic and racial minority groups to the language and activities reserved for dominant groups (p. 180).

The present study concerns itself with identifying whether teachers are willing to grant L2 learners access to the language, activities, and privilege enjoyed by dominant groups in the immediate community of practice, i.e., the mainstream classroom, and the larger community of practice, i.e., U.S. society.

Summary

While in theory, democratic ideals promise the equal participation of all its citizens in the decisions that affect them, in practice some populations, i.e., those who do not possess membership to the dominant cultural group, often miss out on the privileges a democratic society is supposed to ensure. As McLaren (2007) and others pointed out "democracies like ours exhort equal opportunity but often ignore ways in which our

schools operate unconsciously and unknowingly to guarantee that there will be no real equality" (p. 176). In the education arena, inequitable treatment has received significant attention, perhaps due to the glaring repercussions such treatment has on children (e.g., AACTE, 2002). Critical pedagogy is an approach to education that recognizes inequities and empowers students "to become agents of transformation and hope" (McLaren, 2003, p. 184). Since L2 learners often fall into Freire's (2005) *oppressed* category, this review has addressed how critical pedagogy supports a democratic education focused on justice, by ensuring access. Lave and Wenger's *communities of practice framework* was used to unpack the mechanisms of the formation of teacher power, the effects of categories on L2 learners, and the impact of exclusive teaching practice on L2 learners' academic achievement. The dynamics of power present in the mainstream classroom as a tri-fold community of practice surfaced, and the main characters in this interaction emerged with clearly situated definitions.

In the U.S. school system, teachers have power with which they can grant and constrict access to participation in numerous communities of practice. Thus, in this study, teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners are construed based on how they feel about giving this access; are teachers open, are they willing to include L2 learners, to give them access to equitable participation? L2 learners are defined in large measure by this context also; in fact the very category of Second Language Learner is based on being a newcomer to a school system where this student does not speak the language. The judgment calls about this student category, whether it is seen through a deficit lens or through an equitable one, depends on who is casting the judgment. To the extent teachers see L2 learners through deficit lenses, they have attitudes that do not accommodate inclusion, or access to

language and other privileges. Finally, the mainstream classroom also draws its demarcation from the context in which it occurs. It is to be distinguished from a language classroom, where L2 learners receive language instruction. The mainstream classroom, also referred to as the general classroom (Reeves, 2006), is where newcomers and old-timers come together, and the question of access becomes paramount because it determines the level of justice present in that interaction. If old-timers receive more access than newcomers, dominance structures are maintained and the status quo is reproduced. If the nature of access the newcomer receives aims to assimilate the newcomer into extant norms, again hegemony is maintained.

Supporting a democratic system centered on justice, I wish to measure mainstream teachers' attitudes in a way that identifies the type and amount of access they are willing to grant L2 learners. To that end, I have designed a survey, whose validation I describe in chapter 3. The results reported in chapter 4 are interpreted in chapter 5 based on the understanding of democratic education expounded here. Ultimately, I envision that the instrument I introduce in this research will serve as a useful tool to identify the attitudes that are active in granting and constricting access to just participation in schools. In order to build democratic schools that prepare citizens for democratic interaction in the larger society, it is useful for teacher educators to be able to identify exclusionary attitudes for the purpose of designing teacher education curriculum that can support transformative experiences for teacher candidates, who play a key role in the amount of access L2 learners receive, throughout their teaching career.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Rationale

The Committee on Multicultural Education of the American Association of

Colleges for Teacher Education, AACTE (2002), called attention to our school systems'

failure to address the educational needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students.

To narrow this sizeable student population, this study focused on linguistically diverse

students, also referred to as Second Language (L2) Learners. In order for teacher

educators to prepare teachers who are able to meet the needs of L2 learners, they must

have access to several types of information, including what characterizes an effective

teacher for L2 learners.

In 1996, Garcia conducted a review of such characteristics, among which he

identified disposition and affect. Many agree that teachers' dispositions and affective

views, also referred to as attitudes, influence teaching practice (Pajares, 1992; Pohan,

1994; Reeves, 2006; Richardson, 1996; Stuart & Thurlow, 2000). In research, teachers'

attitudes have been construed differently. This study aimed to evaluate teachers' attitudes

based on their alignment with democratic education. Due to the absence of research

defining attitudes in this way, and the paucity of quantitative measurement in the area of

teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners, this study's main goal was (I) to design and

validate a quantitative instrument to measure teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners. The second goal of this study was (II) to describe teachers' personal and professional attitudes, in this case, attitudes toward immigration and attitudes toward L2 learners, respectively. The final goal of this study was (III) to compare personal and professional attitudes of various demographic groups within the participant pool. Therefore, this study used survey, correlational research design (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001) to answer the following research questions

1.a. What are current teacher candidates' attitudes toward L2 learners?

1.b. What are current teacher candidates' attitudes toward immigration?

2. Is there a relationship between teacher candidates' attitudes toward L2 learners and their attitudes toward immigration?

3.a. Do demographic variables, such as age and gender, influence teacher candidates' attitudes toward L2 learners?

3.b. Do demographic variables influence teacher candidates' attitudes toward immigration?

3.c. Is there an interaction in differences in teacher candidates' attitudes toward immigration and L2 learners, among various demographic groups?

Operational Definitions of Variables

Teachers' Attitudes toward L2 Learners

Teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners is a variable that refers to teachers' willingness to prepare themselves academically to be able to meet the needs of L2 learners; this variable also refers to respondents' openness toward this student population.

To grasp respondents' conceptualization of preparedness, the measurement of this variable included survey items that assess respondents' preparedness to work with L2 learners; i.e., do respondents value L2 learners, do they feel prepared to include them in the mainstream classroom in equitable ways, do they view L2 learners through deficit lenses, or do they feel prepared to assimilate these students. Defined in this way, a positive attitude toward L2 learners would be one that denotes willingness to include, openness toward this student population demonstrated through valuing L2 learners, being welcoming and accepting of them. Conversely, a negative attitude toward L2 learners implies an exclusionary stance toward this student population, exemplified through voicing lack of value for L2 learners, considering them inferior or deficient, and being reluctant to include them, being unwelcoming.

Teachers' Attitudes toward Immigration

This variable is construed as openness to immigration and inclusiveness of immigrants. It was measured by probing teachers' willingness to allow immigration to this country, fairness, and acceptance of the present immigration influx. Being fair can be expressed in this survey by feeling that job opportunity should be based on qualification rather than immigration status. In terms of inclusiveness, this variable was gauged based on respondents' willingness to grant immigrants access to American privileges, such as education and employment. Thus, a positive attitude toward immigration, as defined here, would be manifested through being open, fair, and inclusive, while a negative attitude would be expressed through an exclusionary stance.

Demographic Variables

The demographic variables that were solicited are ones that have been identified in the literature as having an influence on teachers' attitudes (e.g., Karabenick & Noda, 2004; Garcia, 2006; Byrnes, Kiger & Manning, 1997; Youngs & Youngs, 2001; Montero & McVicker, 2006). They include: age, gender, foreign language study, level of education (undergraduate/graduate), and education major (elementary/secondary). Information was also solicited about the region the participant is from, and what experience they had with immigrants (positive/negative). In addition, I expected that minority status can also influence attitudes toward L2 learners and immigration. Therefore, I included the respondent's native language, place of birth, identification with the immigrant identity, and ethnicity as variables to be measured in this category.

Methods

Participants

The population of interest in this study included teachers who had completed the coursework in their teacher preparation program, but had not taught for a significant period of time. Walker, Shafer & Iiams (2004) report that attitudes can actually worsen as one gains more teaching experience, which may be due to the influence of school climate. To control for such influences, teacher candidates enrolled in their student teaching experience was an appropriate sample. Student teachers have their coursework completed, so they received the preparation offered by their teacher education program to teach L2 learners in mainstream classrooms. At the time data was collected, participants were required to take two courses which included topics related to teaching L2 learners;

one course was "Introduction to (Elementary or Secondary) Education" and the second course was "Valuing Cultural Diversity". Since these two courses were mandatory for all students in the education program, participants could respond to the survey items related to preparedness. At the same time, their attitudes cannot be significantly influenced by school climate since they have limited experience teaching. In terms of sample size, this study aimed to have at least 150 respondents, since measurement "precision increases rather steadily up to sample sizes of 150 to 200. After that point, there is a much more modest gain from increasing the sample size" (Fowler, 2002). A total of 159 participants completed the survey, in addition to the 36 respondents who participated in the pilot study.

<center>Procedures</center>

First, I contacted the director responsible for field experiences at a large southwestern urban university by e-mail and telephone to receive preliminary approval to solicit student teachers' participation in this study. Since student teachers were enrolled in a campus course concomitantly with completing their student teaching experience, I contacted the instructors of these courses as well, to enlist their support for the study. Once IRB approved the study, the instrument and the letter of consent were copied and ready for distribution. Since the survey addressed a sensitive topic, anonymity was a crucial aspect of this study. When I introduced myself to the participants and solicited their participation, I explained to them the measures I took to ensure their anonymity, which included having no way to match a completed survey to a participant's name, since consent forms and surveys were submitted separately. In addition, original completed

<center>69</center>

surveys would be shredded after three years of being stored in a secure location, which also ensured confidentiality of the anonymous participants.

Each student teacher who volunteered to participate received two copies of the informed consent letter, one to sign and return to me and the other to keep for his/her record. Each participant also received a stapled survey packet that included the survey with three sections (instrumentation section below will provide details related to this survey). Each page of the survey packet had a number code that repeated on each page in that packet. For example, a survey packet with code number 1, had "#1" written on the top right-hand corner of the page, on each page of the packet. This was done to make sure that once the pages of the packet were separated, they could be placed back together so that responses on the three sections of the survey were attributed to the same participant. The participant was identified by the number code only, not by name, since the informed consent letter on which the participant's name appeared was submitted separately and did not have a number code. A self-administered survey with no identifier ensures anonymity.

Participants were asked to submit Part I of the survey upon completion, by tearing that section from the packet and giving it to me. As such, Part I of the survey was submitted separately from Part II and III. This submission system aimed to avoid giving participants the opportunity to change a response based on information suspected later in the survey. For example, as the survey continued, the participant may have suspected that the socially desirable response was to report accepting attitudes toward immigration and change a response to reflect this. However, I wished to access genuine attitudes, and therefore hoped to reduce the possibility of responding in socially desirable ways. In

addition, "counterbalancing" (Keppel, 1991, p. 336) was also used to avoid carryover effect on responses. Counterbalancing was applied by administering Part I of the survey before Part II to 50% of participants; I refer to this administration order as Survey A. I administered Part II before Part I to the remaining 50% of participants, so that each assessment was administered first equally; I refer to this administration order as Survey B. Once participants completed the survey, they submitted it to me.

There were three data collection periods, during three consecutive semesters. Each semester, I solicited the participation of teacher candidates enrolled in student teaching. Since all participants completed the prerequisites that preceded student teaching enrollment, and were only enrolled once in the student teaching experience, which lasts one semester, the duration of participants' classroom experience did not vary across the three data collection periods. Data collected in the first period was used for the pilot study. Data collected in the remaining two periods was used in the main study. After I collected all the data necessary for the statistical analyses I wished to run, I entered it in a Microsoft Excel document, and analyzed it using SPSS.

<div align="center">Instrumentation</div>

Description

Since existing surveys of teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners do not measure attitudes as defined in this study (e.g., Reeves, 2006, Karabenick & Noda, 2004; Walker, Shafer & Iiams, 2004;Youngs & Youngs, 2001; Pohan & Aguilar; 2001; Byrnes, Kiger & Manning, 1997), I developed a survey instrument, entitled "Survey of Teacher Candidates' Attitudes" (see Appendix 1). The survey had three parts: "Part I Attitudes toward Immigration," "Part II Teacher Preparedness to Work with L2 Learners," and

"Part III Demographic Information" – I refer to this as Survey A. As the procedures

section above indicates, Part I and Part II were administered in reverse order to 50% of

the participants, for the purpose of counterbalancing. As such, Survey B embodied the

following order: "Part I Teacher Preparedness to Work with L2 Learners," "Part II

Attitudes toward Immigration," and "Part III Demographic Information." While the order

of the survey's parts differed, the content of each section was identical. Simply, one

section measured attitudes toward immigration, another section measured attitudes

toward L2 learners, and a final section gathered demographic information about the

participant. I will refer to each survey section as it is labeled in Survey A, i.e., Part I

(immigration), Part II (L2), Part III (demographics).

Parts I and II of the survey are introduced by instructions, definitions, and then the

survey items follow. Instructions summarize the submission protocol, i.e., to detach Part I

of the survey upon completion and submit it prior to continuing with Parts II and III.

Instructions also clarify that the comment box next to each survey item can be used to

expand one's response or give feedback on the item. Instructions end with thanking the

participants for their time and input. Definitions include, in Part I, "immigration" and

"immigrants"; the definitions provided highlight the fact that this survey refers to legal

immigration. In Part II, definitions clarify that "L2 Learners" refers to learners of English

as a second language, "Native language" refers to first language or mother tongue, and

"mainstream classroom" refers to one where both native speakers of English and L2

learners are enrolled. Within the survey items, also for clarification purposes, every time

the word "not" is used, it is underlined. Part III has simple questions requesting

demographic information.

Survey Items

Survey items were formatted as statements, rather than direct questions, and they aimed to evoke an affective response. For example, survey item 1 in Part I states "there is too much immigration to the U.S." – respondents did not need to know the actual influx of immigration into the U.S. because precise, factual information was not sought; instead, the survey solicited personal impression, an affective reaction, how the respondent feels about each statement. Consequently, the survey items were constructed in subjective terms, using expressions such as "too much" and "should". In the previous example, if the respondent felt that there is *too much* immigration, this implies that he/she wished there would be less, regardless of how many immigrants *actually* enter the country each year. It is the affective nature of each response that qualifies responses as attitudes.

Across the three survey parts, there are a total of 42 survey items and 6 feedback questions. In Part I, there are 16 survey items, which measure level of agreement with statements that evoke attitudes toward immigration. Since attitude was construed as openness and inclusiveness, survey items address various facets of this construct, which include openness toward and acceptance of the immigration influx (survey items 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15), as well as willingness to grant immigrants access to privileges in the U.S., such as education and employment (survey items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16). Each survey item in Part I is accompanied by a comment box, where participants may comment in an open-ended format. "Part I Feedback" section follows, where three questions gauge participants' comfort in responding honestly, their estimation of the readability of survey items, and their general comments regarding the survey's layout, content and any additional impressions.

In Part II of the survey, there are 15 survey items, which measure attitudes toward L2 learners. Attitude in this section was also operationalized as openness and inclusiveness, though in this case, openness is demonstrated through willingness to prepare oneself to meet the needs of L2 learners (survey items 1, 4, 6, 13, 15), and inclusiveness refers to the type of preparation teachers feel they have, i.e., are they prepared to include L2 learners in the mainstream classroom in equitable ways (survey items 3, 7, 8, 10,12) or are they prepared to assimilate these students through exclusionist practices which do not grant L2 learners access to the same benefits and privileges mainstream students receive (survey items 2, 5, 9, 11, 14). As in Part I, each survey item has a comment box for open-ended comments, and "Part II Feedback" follows, which includes the same three questions as the feedback section in Part I.

Part III of the survey includes 11 survey items, constructed as questions that elicit demographic information. Demographics include age (survey item 1), gender (survey item 2), foreign language study (survey item 6), and level of education (survey item 10). These variables have appeared in previous literature as significant influences on attitude. I also wanted to know if the participants were enrolled in the elementary or secondary education program (survey item 11) and whether their experience with immigrants has been positive or negative (survey item 7). In addition to these, I established a demographic variable titled "minority status" which is composed of the following descriptors: the participant's native language (survey item 8), place of birth (survey item 3), identification with the immigrant identity (survey items 4 and 5), and ethnicity (survey item 9). Unless the participant's native language is English, he/she is born in the

U.S., does not consider himself/herself an immigrant, and is "White non-Hispanic", he/she is assigned minority status, for the purposes of this study.

Importantly, 8 of the 11 demographic variables in Part III are categorical. Based on the responses to the remaining three variables (survey items 1, 4, 6), I created categories, which allowed me to turn the original data into categorical groups in the following manner. Based on responses to survey item 1 which requests the participant's age, I divided answers into four age categories: 20s, 30s, 40s, 50s+. Survey item 4 asks where the participant is from, to be entered as "city/state/country." I assigned the responses to seven region categories: Northeast, Midwest, South, and West for the U.S. participants, and Europe, Asia, South America for remaining respondents. I assigned the seven regions based on the responses given, which is why Europe is a category, while Africa is not, for example. This is because there were no participants from Africa, while there were several from Europe. Since the majority of participants were from the U.S., I assigned these participants' responses to four categories, i.e., Northeast, Midwest, South and West, which I determined based on the census regions used by the U.S. Census Bureau

(http://www.census.gov/econ/census07/www/geography/regions_and_divisions.html).

Additional geographical divisions are possible, but I used the regions outlined by the U.S. Census Bureau because it was a familiar source, and because participant response did not vary so greatly as to necessitate further regional breakdown. As such, (1) the Northeast region includes Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania; (2) the Midwest region includes Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota,

Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota and South Dakota; (3) the South region includes Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas; and (4) the West region includes Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon and Washington. Finally, survey item 6 inquires about how many languages the participant speaks; I created two categories with the following codes: 1 was for one language, and 2 was for two or more languages spoken. I assigned codes to all variables for the purpose of analysis, not to order the responses based on value judgment or otherwise.

Scale

In Parts I and II of the survey, measurement of items produced ordinal data through a 4-point, Likert-type scale. As Fowler (2002) explained, "for the most part respondents are asked to provide nominal and ordinal data about subjective states… The ordinal question is, 'Where along this continuum do your feelings, opinions, or perceptions fall?'"(p. 90). As such, response options allowed participants to express their opinions as placed along a continuum of agreement, from agree (4), somewhat agree (3), somewhat disagree (2), to disagree (1). The number codes were assigned prior to data entry, and were used for the purposes of analysis. The scale purposely does not include a "neutral" or "undecided" option. I felt that such an option affected my ability to call the attitude variable truly continuous, since being undecided is not more valuable than agreeing or disagreeing, so assigning more or fewer points to it would not be appropriate scoring. For example, if I would place the "undecided" option in the middle of the scale,

76

scoring options could be (5) agree, (4) somewhat agree, (3) undecided, (2) somewhat disagree, (1) disagree; in such a case, if a participant answers one question with agree (5), and one with disagree (1), the mean score would be 3, which in this scale means undecided. This is problematic because the respondent is actually strongly decided on the issue, and on opposite ends of the continuum, which is important. Excluding the "undecided" option allows the scale to be continuous, so that responses reflect level of agreement.

Scoring

When recording the data, responses were entered using the codes mentioned above, i.e., 4 (agree), 3 (somewhat agree), 2 (somewhat disagree), 1 (disagree). No number code was entered when the participant (a) expressed no opinion by providing no response for an item, (b) provided a response which was contradicted by a comment made in the comment box next to the item, or (c) entered a neutral option in the middle or at the end of the scale provided. Leaving these items blank, rather than calculating them in the analyses with a code of zero, is important because in the continuous scale, zero would reflect an extreme disagreement, and having no opinion is neither disagreement nor agreement. There were several reverse-coded items, i.e., 1 (agree), 2 (somewhat agree), 3 (somewhat disagree), and 4 (disagree). Part I, survey items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 were reverse-coded; in Part II, survey items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, and 15 were reverse-coded.

When interpreting the scores, the higher the score, the more positive the attitude, where being positive reflects being open, inclusive, or willing to grant access to equal privilege. Therefore, a mean Part I attitude score of 2.76 ($SD = .58$) during the main data

collection period indicates that participants' attitude toward immigration is more positive

than negative; participants are somewhat open to immigration, slightly more inclusive

than exclusive, on average more willing than not to grant access to equal privilege.

Similarly, a mean Part II attitude score of 2.78 (SD = .41) during the main data collection

period means that participants' attitude toward teaching L2 learners is more positive than

it is negative.

Reliability

Several steps aimed to ascertain the survey's reliability and validity. Establishing

reliability of the survey entailed determining whether individuals' scores were internally

consistent across items on the instrument (Creswell, 2005); I used "coefficient alpha" (p.

164) to evaluate the survey's level of reliability because this is the recommended

approach when survey items are scored as continuous variables. For Part I of the survey,

concerning participants' attitudes toward immigration, Cronbach's Alpha was .885,

which shows strong reliability. This was an improvement from the reliability score

obtained for Part I during the pilot study, at which point Cronbach's Alpha was .832. For

Part II of the survey, relating to participants' attitudes toward L2 learners, Cronbach's

Alpha was .723; if the survey were administered without survey item 5 in Part II,

reliability score would be .770, which would be stronger reliability. At the pilot phase,

Cronbach's Alpha for Part II of the survey was .357 (calculated without survey item 1 in

this section). As such, the survey benefited greatly from being piloted, since resulting

modifications of survey items improved reliability scores for both parts of the survey.

Validity

In terms of instrument validity, I report two types of validity: internal validity and construct validity. To ensure internal validity, survey questions were designed carefully to measure attitudes as they are defined in this study, informed by democratic principles. I consulted three content area experts, all with Ph.D.s and significant experience in the area of teacher education and TESL, and two measurement experts, both with Ph.D.s in educational psychology and well versed in quantitative research. They critiqued the level of match between survey items and the variables they intended to measure. Five revisions occurred based on the experts' critique. In addition, a pilot study solicited participants' completion of the survey, as well as their feedback on its readability and their level of comfort in providing honest answers. Instrument revisions occurred based on pilot findings as well; these revisions are discussed in the pilot section that follows.

Internal validity can also be confirmed through counterbalancing, which is used to avoid carryover effect on responses, ensuring that the items measure what they intend to measure. At the pilot phase (see Table 1), GLM MANOVA showed no statistically significant difference in the linear combination of the dependent variables of timing, Part I (immigration) mean score and Part II (L2 learners) mean score between version A ($n = 13$) and B ($n = 15$) of the survey ($F (3, 24) = 2.18$, $p = .116$). However, tests of between-subjects effects indicated a statistically significant difference between timing scores at the pilot phase ($F (3, 24) = 6.26$, $p = .019$ or $p < .05$), $\eta^2 = .19$, power $= .67$. Mean completion time for version A during the pilot was 7.07 minutes ($SD = 2.1$) and for version B it was 9.73 minutes ($SD = 3.2$). Since it took participants a significantly longer time to complete survey version B, I would recommend administering survey version A in future research, especially because there was no significant difference in mean scores.

Part I mean score for version A was 2.5 (SD = .47) and for version B it was 2.4 (SD =

.57). Part II mean score for version A was 2.7 (SD = .36) and for version B it was 2.7 (SD

= .27). Since there was no statistically significant difference in Part I and Part II mean

scores between survey version A and survey version B at the pilot phase, there was no

significant carry over effect on participants' response, which means survey items

measured what they intended to measure, regardless of administration order of survey

parts.

During the main data collection period, the counterbalancing process re-

confirmed that there was no statistically significant difference in Part I and Part II mean

scores between survey version A and survey version B (see Table 2). GLM MANOVA

showed no statistically significant difference in the linear combination of the dependent

variables of timing, Part I (immigration) mean score and Part II (L2 learners) mean score

between version A (n = 61) and B (n = 61) of the survey (F (3, 118) = .73, p = .53).

While there was no significant difference in timing during the main data collection

period, it took participants almost one minute longer to complete survey version B. And

since there was no statistical difference in the attitude score obtained in the two versions

of the survey, I continue to recommend that survey version A be administered in future

research.

One can substantiate construct validity by examining inter-correlations of survey

items (Creswell, 2005). I calculated correlations between each survey item and the

participants' average score for Part I (immigration) and Part II (L2 Learners) of the

survey. At the pilot phase, correlations were not as strong as the ones present in the data

obtained during the main data collection period. Table 3 shows individual correlation

levels of each Part I survey item mean score with overall Part I mean score appearing in

the pilot data. At the pilot phase, correlations between mean score on each Part I item and

overall Part I mean score (survey item 12 was not included in the mean) indicated that

most items possessed statistically significant moderately strong to strong positive

correlations with the mean score, ranging from .366 to .845, except for survey items 6, 13

and 14. The latter had no correlation, while survey items 6 and 13 showed weak positive

correlations, but not statistically significant. Survey item 12 showed negative correlation,

which is why I excluded it from analysis and from the revised survey administered during

the main data collection period.

Table 4 presents individual correlation levels of each Part II survey item mean

score with overall Part II mean score appearing in the pilot data. Correlations between

mean score on each Part II survey item and overall Part II mean score (survey item 1 was

not included in the mean) indicated that items 4 through 9 possessed statistically

significant moderately strong to strong positive correlations with the overall mean score,

ranging from .371 to .636, and items 2 and 3 showed weak positive but not statistically

significant correlations. Item 1 showed no correlation, which is why I excluded it when

calculating the mean, and all subsequent calculations of pilot results.

Based on pilot results, I made several changes to the survey, which improved

correlations between survey items and mean scores in both Parts I and II of the survey;

the stronger correlations increased support for the survey's construct validity. Table 5

displays individual correlation levels of each Part I survey item mean score with overall

Part I mean score appearing in the main data. In the main data, all survey items had

statistically significant moderately strong to strong positive correlations with the overall

mean score, ranging from .323 to .782. The average correlation across all survey items was .604, which is a strong correlation, and an improvement over the average correlation across all survey items in Part I of the pilot, i.e., .508. Table 6 indicates that, in the main data, for 56% (9 items) of Part I survey items, there was a strong correlation, while for 38% (6 items) a moderately strong correlation was found.

Table 7 shows individual correlation levels of each Part II survey item mean score with overall Part II mean score of the main data. In the main data, a majority of survey items had statistically significant positive correlations ranging from .221 to .731. Survey item 5 was an exception; it had a negative correlation. This was likely due to the survey item being interpreted as including "multiple questions" (Fowler, 2002, p. 84). Therefore, I recommend the survey be administered without survey item 5, or if survey item 5 is kept, it be changed to: "L2 learners come from education systems that are <u>not</u> as advanced as the American education system." Without survey item 5, the average correlation across all survey items in Part II was .494, which is a moderately strong correlation, and an improvement over the pilot average correlation, which was .359. In addition, Table 8 indicates that for 27% (4 items) of Part II survey items, there was a strong correlation, and for 47% (7 items) there was a moderately strong correlation. Overall, the instrument has strong validity.

Pilot

<u>Pilot Survey</u>

At the pilot phase, the survey differed slightly in format, it solicited more feedback on layout, content and overall survey completion experience, and it had fewer

survey items (see Appendix 2). In terms of format, direction was given that not only response to content was important in this survey, but also commenting on readability, layout, and comfort in giving honest responses. This difference was designed specifically for the pilot phase, so it was not included in the revised survey. At the pilot stage, I was looking not only for potential trends in data, but more importantly, for feedback on the survey itself, so that I would be able to improve it. An important difference in format was also the placement of definitions related to Part I and Part II. The definitions were placed directly under the title of each section, with five stars prior to each definition, and the entire text capitalized. I hoped this would make the definition stand out significantly. However, among the 36 pilot participants, three commented that they were not clear if the survey referred to legal or illegal immigrants, and two participants asked what L2 learners meant. As a result, I revised the survey's format and placed definitions in a separate section, immediately following the instructions (see Appendix 1).

In the Feedback sections following Part I and Part II of the pilot survey, questions inquired into whether (a) the layout of the survey was confusing, (b) the participant felt confident that answers were anonymous, (c) the participant felt comfortable being honest, and (d) the participant had additional comments on layout, content or feelings related to the survey. In Part I of the survey, addressing attitudes toward immigration, all participants felt the survey was not confusing, 1 participant was not confident the answers were anonymous, and 2 participants were not comfortable being completely honest in their responses. As a result, I emphasized the measures I took to ensure participant anonymity during the main data collection phase, hoping that confidence about anonymity would improve comfort in being honest as well.

The qualitative comments provided as response to Part I Feedback item (d) in the pilot survey can be categorized as follows: (1) in terms of feelings about the survey, three persons praised the clarity of the survey items – one such comment stated "The questions in this survey were very clear and I contend that they are important questions that need to be asked and answered." (2) Pertaining to survey layout, five persons requested a neutral, undecided, or no opinion option in the response scale. As mentioned previously, I did not wish to disrupt the continuity of the response scale, so I did not modify the survey in this respect. In fact, I remain convinced that teacher candidates must determine their position on issues related to their immigrant students and L2 learners; they cannot be undecided on their attitude toward this student population. Equitable teaching practice demands that they be inclusive of these students. If they do not have an opinion when they complete the survey, absence of a "neutral" option will be an indicator that they need to make up their minds. One person suggested that, "questions should be worded so all positive and negative have same answer yes or no." I did not make modifications based on this suggestion either, because I believe that in such a case, it would be easier for participants to check off responses without reading survey items carefully.

In Part II of the survey, relating to attitudes toward L2 learners, 1 participant felt the pilot survey layout was confusing, 1 participant was not confident the answers were anonymous, and all participants were comfortable being completely honest in their responses. In Part II, Feedback item (d) generated four positive comments related to feelings about the survey. One participant expressed the following: "I think this survey will help to support new teachers as well as veteran teachers understand the importance of reaching and teaching to L2 students." In terms of feedback on layout, one participant

suggested to "space out questions a little more." Since the survey administered during the main data collection did not request as much feedback, such as the question accompanying each survey item in the pilot, asking about readability, the layout does appear more spaced out. An additional comment in this section pointed to survey items' content; a participant stated, "It is hard to answer a question that I only believe half of." Due to this comment, I reviewed all survey items to make sure that I modify any items that include two statements in one; revisions occurred when necessary.

Survey items' readability was also evaluated at the pilot phase by including a comment box to accompany each survey item; the comment box solicited the following: "was this question easy to read?" and "comments about this question." In Part I, 27 participants indicated that all items were easy to read. The remaining 9 participants indicated that the following survey items were difficult for them: 2, 4 (mentioned twice), 6 (mentioned twice), 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, and 17. The inter-item correlations (see Table 3) corroborate that two of these items, namely survey item 6 and 12, are problematic. Survey item 6 had a low positive correlation with the overall Part I mean score, while survey item 12 actually had a negative correlation. As a result, these two items were deleted from the survey. Open-ended comments to individual Part I survey items included two participants asking for clarification of the definition of immigrant status, one participant indicated that survey item 1 was too broad, one participant stated that he/she did not understand survey item 4, and one participant expanded on survey item 4 by stating "The Great Wall of China did not work; why do they think this wall would?" As mentioned previously, when I revised the survey I positioned construct definitions in a

more visible way; I also improved survey items which participants commented on by changing the phrasing slightly to make it more readable.

In Part II of the pilot survey, 25 participants stated that all items were easy to read. The remaining 11 participants indicated that the following survey items were not easy to read: 1 (mentioned thrice), 3, 4 (mentioned twice), 5 (mentioned thrice), 6, 7 (mentioned twice), and 9. The inter-item correlations (see Table 5) support that survey items 1 and 3 have very weak positive correlations with the overall Part II mean score. I revised Part II significantly following the pilot; these revisions are discussed in the "pilot survey items" section that follows.

Part II generated several open-ended comments to individual survey items. In response to survey item 1, two participants asked what L2 learners are. In response to survey item 3, one participant stated, "I don't feel I received any specific preparation to teach L2 learners." Responding to survey item 4, two participants indicated that they want L2 learners to learn American customs and values but not for the purpose of blending in. Four comments to survey item 5 centered on the question being "difficult" and "leading", and also that "many other countries have more advanced education systems" and all students need to "catch up." Responding to survey item 6, one participant asked for the definition of "assimilate" and one commented that the item was leading. Responding to survey item 7, one participant stated that "it would be better to suggest bilingual instruction," while another participant suggested that native speakers of a language would already know their native language and would, therefore, not need additional instruction in it. Finally, in response to survey item 9, one participant mentioned "all students benefit" from learning about foreign cultures. All participants'

comments were taken into account when revising survey items for the main data

collection.

<div align="center">Pilot Survey Items</div>

Since the main goal of this study was to validate a new survey, reliability and

validity indicators were most important, especially at the pilot phase, which informed the

revisions that followed. For Part I of the survey, concerning participants' attitudes toward

immigration, Cronbach's Alpha at the pilot phase was .832. Survey item 12 in this

section was particularly problematic; paired sample T test showed statistically significant

difference between average score on Part I with survey item 12 ($M = 2.45$, $SD = .51$) or

without survey item 12 ($M = 2.48$, $SD = .56$) ($t = -2.38$, $p = .02$). Without survey item 12,

Cronbach's Alpha was .858, which shows strong reliability for Part I of the survey. For

Part II of the survey, relating to participants' attitudes toward L2 learners, Cronbach's

Alpha at the pilot phase was .357 without survey item 1 in this section; this is moderate

reliability. I excluded survey item 1 in this section from reliability and other calculations

because participant feedback indicated that this item was not understood.

As a consequence of the reliability analysis and participant feedback at the pilot

phase, I made several changes to the survey. I shortened the instructions and the

Feedback portions, I deleted 4 survey items, I added 9 survey items, and I scrambled the

order of the survey items in both Parts I and II of the survey. I would like to mention that

the goal and theme of the survey's content remained unchanged; the survey items I added

expanded on the constructs the survey intends to measure. In Part I, "Attitudes toward

Immigration," I deleted original survey item 6 and original survey item 12, and I added

one survey item (currently survey item16). I scrambled the order of the survey items in

the following way: survey item 1 remained 1, 2 remained 2, 3 remained 3, 4 became 9, 5 remained 5, 7 became 6, 8 became 15, 9 became 8, 10 became 7, 11 became 4, 13 became 10, 14 became 12, 15 became 13, 16 became 14, and 17 became 11. Based on feedback, I revised seven of the original survey items in Part I, i.e., original survey items 1, 4, 8, 10, 11, 14, and 16.

In Part II of the pilot survey, "Teacher Preparedness to Work with L2 Learners," I deleted original survey item 1 and original survey item 6, and I added eight survey items (currently numbered 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15). I scrambled the order of the items in the following way for Part II: item 2 became 1, 3 became 4, 4 became 2, 5 remained 5, 7 became 8, 8 became 11, and 9 became 14. Changes, such as introducing the word "university" next to "program" in original survey item 3, were made to two of the original items in Part II (original survey item 4 and 8). In Part III, I made a small change to survey item 10: every second answer choice has the word "completed" inserted at the end. As such, answer choice "bachelor's degree" now reads: "bachelor's degree completed." This was to clarify for participants that if they select that option, it means they have completed their bachelor's degree.

Basically, in total for the entire pilot survey, I deleted 4 survey items and I added 9. As mentioned earlier, the added items were based on the original constructs the survey attempts to measure. The purpose of these changes was to improve the survey's reliability; improved Cronbach Alpha values for the main data, .885 for Part I and .770 for Part II, demonstrate that the changes were positive, and the pilot was extremely useful.

Additional analysis of the pilot data aimed to answer as many of this study's research questions as possible, considering the number of participants, to provide more accurate expectation of the trends to be obtained in the main data. Pilot results and commentary are organized in the order of the research questions themselves.

The first research question, in two parts, inquired into current teacher candidates' attitudes toward (a) L2 learners and toward (b) immigration. Mean scores on Part I and II of the survey provided information in this direction. The pilot data rendered a mean score of 2.48 ($SD = .56$) for Part I, and a mean score of 2.76 ($SD = .30$) for Part II. Since these scores must be considered on a continuum of agreement, where 4.0 shows strong agreement and 1.0 is strong disagreement, we can say that 2.48 is closer to disagreement than it is to agreement, while 2.76 is closer to agreement. Agreement signifies a more positive attitude, in the sense that one is more open, inclusive and willing to grant access to equal privilege. Therefore, pilot mean scores indicated that participants had a more inclusive attitude toward L2 learners than they did toward immigration. In fact, attitudes toward immigration leaned toward being more exclusive than inclusive. It is interesting that participants reported a more inclusive attitude toward L2 learners than toward immigration, when L2 learners are, in fact immigrants. Such report may be an indication of a desire to provide socially acceptable answers in Part II; the larger participant pool of the main data collection period ascertains if this trend is significant.

In addition to mean scores, descriptive statistics such as percentages can be used to summarize trends in data on a single variable, such as teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners or toward immigration. I divided participants' mean scores into four ranges of

attitude in the following way: mean scores between 3.00 and 4.00 represent positive attitude, scores between 2.50 and 2.99 represent somewhat positive attitudes, scores between 2.01 and 2.49 represent somewhat negative attitudes, and scores between 1.00 and 2.00 represent negative attitudes. Table 9 shows that attitudes toward immigration were fairly evenly distributed among pilot participants across the four attitude ranges. While 33% ($n = 12$) of participants reported somewhat positive attitudes, nearly one fourth of participants, i.e., 22.2% ($n = 8$) reported negative attitudes toward immigration. When reporting attitudes toward L2 learners, however, only 1 out of 36 participants reported negative attitudes, and a large majority of participants expressed somewhat positive (50%, $n = 18$) or positive (36.1%, $n = 13$) attitudes. The attitude range breakdown allows us to see more clearly what overall Part I and Part II mean scores indicate, that a majority of pilot participants (86.1%, $n = 31$) reported mainly positive attitudes toward L2 learners, while almost half of the participants (47.2%, $n = 17$) expressed mainly negative attitudes toward immigration.

Research question 2 asked if there is a relationship between teacher candidates' attitudes toward L2 learners and their attitudes toward immigration; Pearson correlation can ascertain whether a relationship exists between Part I and II of the survey. Pilot data indicated that there was a statistically significant moderately strong positive correlation of .419 between Part I and Part II mean score ($p = .011$). Participants who scored higher on Part I of the survey tended to score higher on Part II of the survey, with Part I mean score being 2.48 ($SD = .56$) and Part II mean score being 2.76 ($SD = .30$). ANOVA showed a statistically significant difference between Part II mean scores of those with Part I mean scores of 2.5 or under ($n = 18$) and those scoring above 2.5 on Part II ($n =$

18), ($M = 2.63$, $SD = .30$ vs. $M = 2.88$, $SD = .26$, respectively), $F(1, 36) = 6.4$, $p = .016$), $\eta^2 = .15$, power = .69. GLM MANOVA then showed that survey item 6 in Part II showed a statistically significant difference, where low Part I scorers achieved mean Part II scores of 1.70 ($SD = 6.8$) while high Part I scorers achieved mean Part II scores of 2.33 ($SD = .76$), $F(1, 33) = 6.48$, $p = .016$, $\eta^2 = .16$, power = .69.

ANOVA showed statistically significant difference between the mean Part I scores of those with mean Part II scores of 2.75 or under ($n = 19$) and those scoring above 2.75 on Part II ($n = 13$), ($M = 2.32$, $SD = .51$ vs. $M = 2.70$, $SD = .55$), $F(1, 36) = 4.55$, $p = .04$, $\eta^2 = .11$, power = .54. Part I survey items 2, 8 and 15 seemed to have contributed to this most, with means of 2.68 versus 3.38 for item 2; 2.0 versus 2.76 for item 8; and 2.73 versus 3.53 for item 15. GLM MANOVA then showed that Part I survey items 2, 8, and 15 showed a statistically significant difference, where low Part II scorers achieved the following: (a) Part I survey item 2 - mean Part I scores of 2.68 ($SD = .88$) while high Part II scorers achieved mean Part I scores of 3.38 ($SD = .76$), $F(1, 32) = 5.36$, $p = .02$), $\eta^2 = .15$, power = .61; (b) Part I survey item 8 - mean Part I scores of 2.0 ($SD = .81$) while high Part II scorers achieved mean Part I scores of 2.76 ($SD = 1.16$), $F(1, 32) = 4.84$, $p = .036$), $\eta^2 = .139$, power = .567; (c) Part I survey item 15 - mean Part I scores of 2.73 ($SD = 1.09$) while high Part II scorers achieved mean Part I scores of 3.53 ($SD = .66$), $F(1, 32) = 5.52$, $p = .025$), $\eta^2 = .156$, power = .624.

The fact that a positive relationship exists between Parts I and II of the pilot survey indicates that scores on Part I are a good predictor of scores on Part II. In addition, it was significant to find that survey items 2, 8 and 15 in Part I, as well as survey item 6 in Part II were strong participants in the mentioned relationship. The revised survey

included all of these strong survey items, except for survey item 6 in Part II which, even though it proved strong in various statistical analyses, participant feedback indicated that it was leading and knowing the definition of "assimilate" was a prerequisite to providing a valid answer. All in all, the statistically significant positive relationship between Parts I and II of the survey led to the expectation that main data will support a relationship in the same direction.

Research question 3 inquired into whether demographic variables influence teacher candidates' attitudes toward (a) L2 learners and (b) immigration. The statistical analysis that can address this research question is backward selection linear regression. The results to this test, however, are intended to provide a general impression of what to expect during the main data collection phase, since the number of participants in the pilot study was only 36. Table 10 outlines the distribution of pilot participants among various demographic groups. Of note is that 80.5% ($n = 29$) of participants were White, while in most similar studies (e.g., Richardson, 1996, Milner, 2005), this ethnicity constituted a larger majority. Also, 20.6% ($n = 7$) of participants reported that they had negative experiences with immigration; to me, this was a strong indication of participants' willingness to share candid opinion. The demographic information gathered at the pilot phase included the following: (1) age, (2) gender, (3) whether the participant is U.S. born, (4) U.S. region participant is from, (5) whether the participant is an immigrant, (6) how many languages the participant speaks, (7) the participant's experience with immigrants, (8) the participant's native language, (9) ethnicity, (10) university coursework enrollment: undergraduate or graduate. Due to participant distribution among these

variables at the pilot phase, and the nature of the variables themselves, only variables 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, and 10 were used in the regression analysis.

Backward regression analysis ascertained which demographic variables might predict attitudes toward immigration, measured in Part I of the survey, and toward L2 learners, measured in Part II of the survey. The only variable that had a significant ($p < .01$) zero-order correlation with attitudes toward immigration was the participant's experience with immigrants (see Table 11), namely, the more negative the participant's experience with immigrants, the more negative or exclusionary the participant's attitude toward immigration. However, the participant's experience with immigrants, gender, and how many languages the participant speaks are predictors that had significant ($p < .05$) partial effects in the full model. The three predictors were able to account for 33% of the variance in attitude toward immigration, $F(3, 29) = 4.75$, $p < .001$ (see Table 12). In terms of describing the effects of gender and the number of languages spoken, males and participants who spoke more than one language had more positive, inclusive attitudes toward immigration at the pilot phase.

When analyzing which demographic variables had an influence on attitudes toward L2 learners only one was significant. Gender had a significant ($p = .05$) zero-order correlation with attitudes toward L2 learners (see Table 11), and a significant partial effect in the full model ($F(1, 31) = 2.89$, $p = .09$), accounting for 8.5 percent of the variance in these attitudes (see Table 12). Apparently, females had more positive or inclusive attitudes toward L2 learners. However, it is important to note that there were only four male participants, so evidence of gender's effect on these attitudes was not

conclusive at the pilot phase; main data results confirm whether gender has a significant influence on attitudes toward L2 learners.

The final research question of this study, question 3(b), asked if there is an interaction in differences in teacher candidates' attitudes toward immigration and L2 learners, among various demographic groups. MANOVAs can provide such answers; though participants were not numerous in the sub-groups based on demographic variables at the pilot phase, several comparisons were possible. First, GLM MANOVA showed no statistically significant difference in the linear combination of the dependent variables of Part I scores and Part II scores between participants with negative experiences with immigration and those with positive ones ($F(2, 31) = 3.06$, $p = .06$). However, tests of between-subjects effects indicated a statistically significant difference between those with positive ($n = 27$) and those with negative ($n = 7$) experiences with immigration on Part I of the survey, but not on Part II ($F(2, 31) = 5.8$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2 = .15$, power = .64). Participants who had positive experiences with immigration scored higher on Part I, 2.57 ($SD = .48$) on average, versus those with negative experiences, who scored an average of 2.07 ($SD = .43$). While not statistically significant, participants who had positive experiences with immigration did have higher scores on Part II, with an average of 2.81 ($SD = .27$), while those with negative experiences scored an average of 2.62 ($SD = .41$), on Part II ($F(2, 31) = 2.1$, $p = .15$). This means that participants who reported positive experiences with immigrants had more positive, or inclusive attitudes toward immigrants, while participants with negative experiences had more negative attitudes; this was a statistically significant finding. The nature of reported experience with immigrants did

not have a statistically significant relationship with attitudes toward L2 learners, at the pilot phase.

Secondly, GLM MANOVA showed no statistically significant difference in the linear combination of the dependent variables of Part I scores and Part II scores between White, non-Hispanic participants ($n = 29$) and all other ethnicities grouped together ($n = 7$), ($F(2, 33) = .29$, $p = .74$, $\eta^2 = .01$, power = .09). Since participants in each ethnic group other than the "White, non-Hispanic group" were few, these participants were placed in an ethnic minority group, for the purpose of analysis. On Part I of the pilot survey, the mean score of White participants was 2.49 ($SD = .59$), and the mean score of ethnic minority participants was 2.41 ($SD = .41$). On Part II of the pilot survey, the mean score of Whites was 2.78 ($SD = .31$), and the mean score of the ethnic minority group was 2.67 ($SD = .27$). While not statistically significant, it is interesting that the attitude of ethnic minority participants was less inclusive of immigrants and L2 students, than the attitude of Whites.

A final comparison possible with the pilot data was a GLM MANOVA which showed no statistically significant difference in the linear combination of the dependent variables of Part I scores and Part II scores between participants enrolled in the bachelor's program ($n = 30$) and those enrolled in the masters program ($n = 6$), (F(2, 33) $= .01$, $p = .98$, $\eta^2 = .00$, power = .05). On Part I of the survey, the mean score of undergraduates was 2.45 ($SD = .45$), and the mean score of graduate students was 2.42 ($SD = .79$). On Part II, the mean score of undergraduates was 2.76 ($SD = .31$) and the mean score of graduate students was 2.75 ($SD = .28$). This finding was inconsistent with previous studies' results, which indicated that graduate students had more positive

attitudes than undergraduates (e.g., Byrnes, Kiger, & Manning, 1997). Main data can ascertain whether previous findings are contradicted in this area.

In sum, there were eight findings based on pilot data that led to several expectations of main data. I expected that attitudes toward L2 learners reported during the main data collection phase would be more positive or inclusive than attitudes toward immigration. Also, there would be a positive correlation between Part I and Part II mean scores, which would mean that attitudes toward immigration are a good predictor of attitudes toward L2 learners. Based on pilot results, I expected that negative experiences with immigration would be correlated with exclusionary attitudes toward immigration, but not toward L2 learners. In addition, males and participants who speak more than one language would have more inclusive attitudes toward immigration, and females would have more inclusive attitudes toward L2 learners. While not significant, it was interesting that the pilot data showed that ethnic minorities had slightly less inclusive attitudes toward immigration and toward L2 learners than Whites. Increased participation during the main data collection can ascertain if this is a significant trend. Finally, pilot data showed that graduate students did not have more positive attitudes than undergraduates, in spite of previous findings that predict that they do. These pilot results provided interesting expectations of the main data.

Data Analysis

Data analysis included descriptive statistics for research questions 1a and 1b, and inferential statistics for questions 2, 3a, 3b, and 3c (Creswell, 2005, p. 181). Descriptive statistics such as percentages can be used to summarize trends in the data on a single

variable, such as teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners or toward immigration. Percentages of how many participants have positive attitudes, as opposed to somewhat positive, for example, are reported in chapter 4. In addition, mean scores on Part I, reflecting attitudes toward immigration, as well as mean scores on Part II, relating to attitudes toward L2 learners, can also describe the findings appropriately. These descriptive statistics answered research questions 1a and 1b.

Pearson correlation was conducted for research question 2, which was used to determine the relationship between participants' attitudes toward L2 learners and their attitudes toward immigration. A positive correlation would indicate that participants with positive attitudes towards immigration also have positive attitudes toward L2 learners. This analysis gave insight into the instruments' level of construct validity, as well as subjects' consistency in their attitudes towards the two issues. For research questions 3a and 3b, two backward selection linear regression analyses were run, one to determine which demographic variables predict attitudes toward immigration, and a second one to determine which variables predict attitudes toward L2 learners.

Analysis for research question 3c included a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), and a factorial MANOVA, to compare teacher candidates' attitudes toward immigration and L2 learners, among various demographic groups. These tests analyze if demographic variables play a role in respondents' attitudes, or in other words, if there is a difference between a Hispanic teacher candidate, and a White one, for example, in terms of their attitudes toward immigration. Such analysis can also show how people who only speak one language compare to those who speak multiple languages, in terms of their attitudes toward L2 learners. Based on the demographic variables measured, demographic

groups were determined. For example, based on the gender variable, a male group and a female group can be compared to see which group has more positive attitudes toward immigration and toward L2 learners. This comparison needs a MANOVA. What is especially interesting is to examine if attitudes of females, for example, of a particular ethnicity, who speak multiple languages and for whom English is a native language, have more positive attitudes than those in other demographic categories. The factorial MANOVA allows us to make these more complex comparisons. Of course, this analysis is only possible when there is a sufficient number of participants in various demographic categories. One or more factorial MANOVAs is needed depending on how many factors are appropriate to include based on number of participants in subgroups, and which subgroups make sense to be compared together. Since male participants are in the minority, gender may not be able to be used in these comparisons. However, the demographic data collected produced enough variance on native language, for example, and ethnicity, that such analysis was possible. I think such analysis is valuable not only for the information it reveals, but also for the demonstration it offers, in terms of how this survey can be used.

<center>Limitations</center>

Limitations of this study include (a) convenience sampling, (b) sample size, and (c) response rate. The sampling process narrowed the study's attention on teacher candidates, specifically those completing their student teaching at the end of their teacher education program. While thousands of students match this category, I sampled from a city in the southwest of the U.S., where three major institutions offer teacher education

<center>98</center>

programs. The fact that I solicited participation only from teacher candidates at one of the three institutions makes my sample one of convenience. However, the sample remains representative of students choosing a teacher education program in the southwest. Considering sample size, an increase can only benefit the accuracy of portrayal. While this study's participation was sufficient to support statistical analyses, increasing sample size is advantageous.

Finally, response rate must be considered. At the pilot phase, there was a 94.7% ($n = 36$) response rate, while during the main data collection stage, 91.9% ($n = 159$) of teacher candidates solicited chose to participate. While no reason was provided for non-participation, I estimate time constraint was a main factor. Since the survey was administered at the end of a teacher candidates' seminar, they could choose to participate in the study or go home. The ones who did not participate left, which indicates that time may have been the determining factor. To the extent that non-participation was due to other reasons, such as a reluctance to voice opinion on a sensitive topic, this study's results lack a thorough representation of attitude.

In addition, among the teacher candidates who participated in the survey, some chose not to answer certain survey items. Participant feedback on the survey suggests that some of the reasons participants chose not to respond to particular items were that (1) they were undecided or did not have an opinion about the topic, (2) they were unsure about the meaning of certain survey items, and (3) they had a lack of confidence in the anonymity of their response. In terms of reasons (2) and (3), I partially addressed these concerns during the main data collection period by improving clarity of the survey items, and by providing additional verbal explanation of how I ensured the anonymity of

participation. As for reason (1) that arose from participants' comments, that non-response can also be explained by the absence of the "undecided" option, this remains a limitation of the study. As I explained in subsection "Scale," under "Instrumentation" in this chapter, providing an undecided option invalidates the Likert-type scale in this study. I also chose not to provide this option because I believe L2 learners cannot afford to have teachers who are undecided about whether or not to grant them equal access to privilege in the classroom; from a critical pedagogy perspective with a focus on democratic education, being undecided may be as harmful as holding an exclusionary stance toward L2 learners. Additional, unreported reasons may exist as to why participants chose not to respond to certain items. Generalizability is limited by all the factors mentioned above.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The analysis of survey data gathered during the main data collection period included both quantitative measures and a qualitative assessment of participants' feedback. I organized the results according to the research questions of this study, prefaced by the demographic information obtained from participants, and followed by the qualitative report. Below, I state the findings of my analyses, and provide a brief explanation of what they mean, since I will discuss my interpretation of these results in chapter 5.

Demographic Information

The demographic descriptors that the literature has identified to have an influence on teachers' attitudes include age, gender, foreign language study, level of education (undergraduate/graduate), and education major (elementary/secondary) (see Table 13). A total of 159 respondents participated in this study; however, some participants chose not to answer every question. Therefore, Table 13 indicates the number of participants who responded each demographic question. The average participant age was 26.69 ($SD = 7.33$). Among the 153 participants who responded to the gender question, there were 115 female participants (75.2%) and 38 males (24.8%). In terms of foreign language study, 38

participants (24.8%) spoke two or more languages. A majority of participants (83.7%, $n =$ 128) were enrolled in the undergraduate education program, while 16.3% ($n = 25$) were enrolled in the masters in education program. Of the 73 participants who reported their education major, 34.2% ($n = 25$) were in the elementary education stream, 52.1% ($n = 38$) were in the secondary education program, and 13.7% ($n = 10$) reported enrollment in both elementary and secondary. The latter case occurs typically for students majoring in physical education or art education.

Since this study also solicited teacher candidates' attitudes toward immigration, some of the demographic descriptors are variables that I expected might be connected to these attitudes, or attitudes toward L2 learners. I solicited information about the experience participants had with immigrants; 115 participants (83.9%) reported positive experiences with immigrants, and 22 participants (16.1%) reported negative experiences. Based on participants' responses to where they were from, I formed 7 regions, as described in chapter 3. A large majority (73.8%, $n = 110$) were from the Western U.S., 20.2% ($n = 30$) of participants were from the Northeast, Midwest and South of the U.S., and the remaining 6% ($n = 9$) of participants were from outside the U.S. (see Table 13).

In addition, I expected that minority status could also influence attitudes toward L2 learners and immigration. Among participants who responded to all questions related to minority status, 37.3% ($n = 57$) were minorities while 62.7% ($n = 96$) had non-minority status. Minority status was based on the respondent's native language, place of birth, identification with the immigrant identity, and ethnicity. Basically, participants with English as their native language and U.S. as their place of birth, who did not identify with being an immigrant and were White were considered non-minority. Fourteen

participants (9.2%) had a language other than English as their native language, twelve

participants (7.8%) were born in a place other than the U.S., eight participants (5.2%)

considered themselves immigrants, and 53 participants (36.6%) had an ethnicity other

than White. Many demographic variables appear in the statistical tests used to analyze the

data, based on the number of participants in each demographic sub-group.

Research Question 1

1.a. What Are Current Teacher Candidates' Attitudes Toward L2 Learners?

Descriptive statistics, i.e., mean scores and percentages, aid the report of

participants' attitudes toward L2 learners. Mean attitude score on Part II of the survey

was 2.78 ($SD = .41$, $n = 158$), which is similar to the pilot mean score, i.e., 2.76 ($SD =$

.30, $n = 36$). Score range established that "4" signifies agreement and "1" disagreement,

so "2.5" is the pivot point between agreement and disagreement. In this scale, the more a

participant agrees, the more positive the attitude, where being positive reflects being

open, inclusive, or willing to grant access to equal privilege. Therefore, a mean score of

2.78 indicates that participants' attitude toward teaching L2 learners was more positive

than it was negative; participants were somewhat open to having L2 learners in the

mainstream classroom, slightly more inclusive than exclusive, on average more willing

than not to prepare themselves to teach L2 learners.

In addition to mean scores, I used percentages to summarize trends in data on a

single variable, in this case teacher candidates' attitudes toward L2 learners. Reproducing

the pilot phase analysis, I divided participants' mean scores into four ranges of attitude in

the following way: mean scores between 3.00 and 4.00 represent positive attitude, scores

between 2.50 and 2.99 represent somewhat positive attitudes, scores between 2.01 and

2.49 represent somewhat negative attitudes, and scores between 1.00 and 2.00 represent

negative attitudes. Table 14 shows that attitudes toward L2 learners were positive in a

large majority; 32.3% ($n = 51$) of participants reported positive attitudes, while almost

half of all participants, i.e., 47.5% ($n = 75$), reported somewhat positive attitudes. That is

a total of 79.8% ($n = 126$) with somewhat positive to positive attitudes. Few participants,

only 7 out of the total 159, reported negative attitudes, while the remaining 15.8% ($n =$

25) of participants had somewhat negative attitudes. The attitude range break down

indicated that 20.2% ($n = 32$), or one fifth of participants had somewhat negative or

negative attitudes toward teaching L2 learners. This was a slight increase from the pilot,

where 13.9% ($n = 5$) of participants reported such attitudes.

1.b. What Are Current Teacher Candidates' Attitudes Toward Immigration?

Attitudes toward immigration were measured in Part I of the survey. The mean

score on Part I was 2.76 ($SD = .58$, $n = 158$), which is an improvement compared to the

pilot where the mean score was 2.48 ($SD = .56$, $n = 36$). Again, if the pivot point between

agreement and disagreement was 2.5, participants in the main study were on the

agreement side, as opposed to the pilot ones who were on the disagreement side. This

may be due to the improvement of the instrument itself, based on pilot results and pilot

participants' feedback. Importantly, the main study's mean attitude score toward

immigration, i.e., 2.76, was very similar to the main study's mean attitude score toward

L2 learners, i.e., 2.78. This indicated that participants' attitude toward immigration was

nearly equally positive to their attitude toward L2 learners. A mean attitude score of 2.76

signifies that participants' attitude toward immigration was more positive than negative;

participants were somewhat open to immigration, slightly more inclusive than exclusive, on average more willing than not to grant access to equal privilege.

I also used percentages to summarize trends in the main data on teacher candidates' attitudes toward immigration. Table 14 shows that a majority of participants had positive (39.2%, $n = 62$) or somewhat positive (28.5%, $n = 45$) attitudes toward immigration, for a total of 67.7% ($n = 107$) with somewhat positive to positive attitudes. However, nearly one third of participants (i.e., 32.3%, $n = 51$) reported somewhat negative (22.2%, $n = 35$) or negative (10.1%, $n = 16$) attitudes. Mimicking the pilot phase, more participants reported negative or somewhat negative attitudes toward immigration (i.e., one third during the main study) than toward L2 learners (i.e., one fifth during the main study), even though the two entities refer to the same population, i.e., L2 learners are immigrants.

Research Question 2

2. Is There a Relationship Between Teacher Candidates' Attitudes Toward L2 Learners and Their Attitudes Toward Immigration?

Pearson Correlation reveals if there is a relationship between teacher candidates' attitudes toward L2 learners (survey Part II) and their attitudes toward immigration (survey Part I). The correlation of average Part I and Part II scores was .546 ($p = .01$), which is a significant moderately strong positive correlation. This relationship was in the expected direction, since pilot data showed a statistically significant moderately strong positive correlation of .419 ($p = .01$). As in the pilot data, though more strongly so in the main data, participants who scored higher on Part I of the survey tended to score higher

on Part II of the survey as well, with Part I mean score being 2.76 ($SD = .58$) and Part II

mean score being 2.78 ($SD = .41$).

Research Question 3

3.a. Do Demographic Variables, Such as Age and Gender, Influence Teacher Candidates'

Attitudes Toward L2 Learners?

I used backward selection linear regression to determine what demographic

information gathered during the main study influenced teacher candidates' attitudes

toward L2 learners. The demographic variables included the following: (1) age, (2)

gender, (3) whether the participant was U.S. born, (4) U.S. region participant was from,

(5) whether the participant was an immigrant, (6) how many languages the participant

spoke, (7) the participant's experience with immigrants, (8) the participant's native

language, (9) ethnicity, (10) university coursework enrollment: undergraduate or

graduate, (11) education major (elementary/secondary). In addition, I formed a variable

called (12) minority status, which included variables 3, 5, 8, and 9. Due to participant

distribution among these variables, and the nature of the variables themselves, I used only

variables 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, and 12 in the regression analysis (see Table 15).

I found that gender, how many languages one spoke, and experience with

immigrants had significant zero-order correlations with attitudes toward L2 learners, and

significant partial effects in the full model $F(3, 131) = 8.6$, $p < .001$ (see Table 16),

accounting for 16.5% of the variance in attitudes toward L2 learners. In terms of

describing the effects of these three variables on attitude toward L2 learners, females had

more inclusive attitudes than males. This finding supported the tendency noted in the

pilot data. Also, the more positive the participants' experience with immigrants, and the more languages the participants spoke, the more positive their attitude toward L2 learners.

More specifically, only gender, how many languages one spoke and experience with immigrants made a statistically significant contribution with a regression coefficient B of 3.255. The corresponding effect size for the proportion of variance in attitudes toward L2 learners uniquely predictable from each of the three variables was obtained by squaring the value of part correlation of these variables with the mean attitude toward L2 learners to yield .1197, .0216, and .0234 (see Table 16), which means that 11.97% of the variance in attitude toward L2 learners can be attributed to gender, 2.16% of the variance can be explained by how many languages one spoke, and 2.34% of the variance can be attributed to experience with immigrants, after controlling for all other variables entered.

3.b. Do Demographic Variables Influence Teacher Candidates' Attitudes Toward Immigration?

I used backward selection linear regression analysis to ascertain which demographic variables mentioned above predict teacher candidates' attitudes toward immigration. I found that how many languages one spoke, experience with immigrants, university coursework (undergraduate/graduate), and minority status had significant zero-order correlation with attitudes toward immigration. However, only experience with immigrants, and how many languages one spoke were predictors that had significant ($p <$ .05) partial effects in the full model. These two predictors accounted for 23.8% of the variance in attitude toward immigration, $F(2, 132) = 20.58$, $p < .001$ (see Table 16). The prediction can be described as follows: the more negative the experience with

immigrants, the more negative or exclusive the attitude toward immigration; the more

languages one spoke, the more positive the attitude toward immigration.

More specifically, only how many languages one spoke, and experience with

immigrants made a statistically significant contribution with a regression coefficient B of

3.314. The corresponding effect size for the proportion of variance in attitude toward

immigration uniquely predictable from how many languages one spoke and experience

with immigrants was obtained by squaring the value of part correlation of these two

variables with the mean attitude toward immigration to yield .046 and .1814, which

means that 4.6% of the variance in attitude toward immigration can be attributed to how

many languages one spoke and 18.14% of the variance in attitude toward immigration

can be attributed to experience with immigrants, after controlling for all other variables

entered.

3.c. Is There an Interaction in Differences in Teacher Candidates' Attitudes Toward
Immigration and L2 Learners, Among Various Demographic Groups?

To investigate the interaction in differences of attitude among various

demographic groups, it was important to note the number of participants in the

demographic sub-groups created. Based on number of participants, I conducted a 2x2

factorial MANOVA and a GLM MANOVA. The 2x2 factorial MANOVA results (see

Table 17) showed that there was a statistically significant main effect of gender ($F(2,$

$148) = 8.22$, $p = .000$, $\eta^2 = .10$, observed power $= .958$) and minority status ($F(2, 148) =$

3.24, $p = .042$, $\eta^2 = .042$, observed power $= .61$) on the linear combination of Part I and

Part II mean scores, i.e., attitudes toward immigration and attitudes toward L2 learners

(see Table 18). With respect to the effect of gender, findings indicated that 10% of

dependent variable variance can be explained by gender, and that one can expect the same result 95.8% of times the survey is administered. As for the effect of minority status, 4.2% of attitude variance can be explained by minority status, and due to observed power, one can expect the same result 61% of times the survey is administered.

More specifically, the test of between-subjects effects showed that there was a significant difference ($F(1, 149) = 11.56$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .072$, observed power = .922) between males and females on Part II mean scores (see Table 19). This means that 7.2% of variance in attitudes toward L2 learners can be explained by gender, and one can expect this same result 92.2% of times the survey is administered. Females had more positive attitudes toward L2 learners ($M = 2.85$, $SD = .37$) than males ($M = 2.56$, $SD = .43$) (see Table 17).

There was also a statistically significant difference between minority and non-minority participants on Part I mean scores ($F(1, 149) = 6.48$, $p = .012$, $\eta^2 = .042$, observed power = .715) (see Table 19). This means that 4.2% of variance in attitude toward immigration can be explained by minority status, and one can expect the same result 71.5% of times the survey is administered. More specifically (see Table 17), minority participants had more positive attitudes toward immigration ($M = 2.92$, $SD = .53$) than non-minority participants ($M = 2.69$, $SD = .58$). Furthermore, there was no statistically significant interaction effect of demographic variables, which means that females will have more positive attitudes toward L2 learners than males, regardless of their minority status, and minorities will have more positive attitudes toward immigration than non-minorities, regardless of gender.

GLM MANOVA (see Table 20) showed a statistically significant difference on the linear combination of Part I and Part II mean scores between those who spoke one language, and those who spoke more than one language ($F(2, 150) = 3.34$, $p = .038$, $\eta^2 = .043$, observed power $= .625$) (see Table 21). This means that 4.3% of variance in attitude toward immigration and toward L2 learners can be explained by how many languages one speaks; this result can be expected 62.5 % of times. Tests of between-subjects effects indicated that there was a difference on both Part I mean score ($F(1, 151) = 5.63$, $p = .019$, $\eta^2 = .036$, observed power $= .655$) and Part II mean scores ($F(1, 151) = 4.48$, $p = .036$, $\eta^2 = .029$, observed power $= .557$) (see Table 22). Specifically (see Table 20), participants who spoke one language ($M = 2.71$, $SD = .56$) had more negative attitudes toward immigration than those who spoke more than one language ($M = 2.97$, $SD = .59$). Participants who spoke one language ($M = 2.74$, $SD = .41$) also had more negative attitudes toward L2 learners than those who spoke more than one language ($M = 2.90$, $SD = .36$).

Qualitative Report

The qualitative response I solicited on the survey included, (1) comments on individual survey items, and (2) feedback sections following Part I and Part II of the survey. With respect to the comments on individual items, I instructed participants to use the comment box accompanying each survey item (see Appendix 1) to expand their response, or to give feedback on the clarity of the survey item itself. I will discuss participants' feedback to Part I and to Part II separately.

When conducting the qualitative analysis, I used content analysis, a process that "involves the simultaneous coding of raw data and the construction of categories that capture relevant characteristics of the document's content" (Merriam, 2001, p. 160). As I read the raw data, I focused on the frequency and variety of messages present, which I sorted into categories. In that sense, I used "emergent categories" (Creswell, 2007, p. 152), rather than pre-existing codes, since the categories, or themes, emerged from comparing participants' comments and grouping them together based on commonalities among them. This process led to two themes present in participants' comments to Part I survey items, and three themes present in participants' comments to Part II survey items, all of which I outline below.

<u>Part I (attitudes toward immigration): Comments on Individual Survey Items</u>

In Part I, I identified two main themes in participants' comments to individual survey items: (a) viewing legal immigration as illegal versus viewing legal immigrants as American, and (b) voicing an exclusionary and imposing stance versus voicing openness and focus on fairness. With respect to theme (a), there were 19 comments, which demonstrated that the participant interpreted specific survey items' reference to "immigration" as illegal immigration. An example of such a comment is: "tax payers should have more rights than non-tax payers." In this statement, the participant referred to immigrants as non-tax payers, which implies the immigrant was working illegally. Also, in response to survey item 16 in Part I that states, "when an American and an immigrant apply for a job in the U.S., the American should be hired, even if the immigrant is more qualified," a participant asked in the comment box "is the immigrant of legal status?" The participant's question denoted uncertainty about the legality of

immigrants mentioned in the survey. Such uncertainty, as well as the opposite definition of immigration some participants used when completing the survey strongly contrasts with the definition of immigration provided in the survey (see Appendix 1), as well as the verbal clarification I provided prior to administering the survey, i.e., that all uses of the terms 'immigration' or 'immigrant' in the survey refer to *legal* immigration and *legal* immigrants. Among participants completing the same survey, with the same written and verbal definition of immigration provided, there were 10 who commented that legal immigrants are American. This suggests that the definition of immigration I provided in oral and written form was accessible and clear. Therefore, participants who viewed all immigration as illegal did not do so due to lack of an accessible definition.

The second theme that emerged from participants' comments to individual survey items in Part I was (b) the exclusionary versus the open stance toward immigration. The exclusionary stance surfaced in a total of 18 comments related to having tougher restrictions on immigration (5 comments) through such methods as "better screening." To oppose this view, one participant mentioned preference for "global thinking," and another stated that "U.S. is a nation of immigrants." And while 7 participants thought building a fence along the U.S. and Mexico border was a good idea, even suggested "a wall" instead, 9 participants referred to such an effort as "disgusting" and "crazy talk." With respect to survey item 14, which posits that Americans have more privileges than immigrants, 6 participants supported the idea through such comments as, "we can't give all privileges to everyone. No country can." Such support also included arguing for assimilation, saying that it is for the immigrants' "benefit," while other participants saw assimilation as "unfair and inappropriate." Furthermore, 2 participants suggested that

112

immigrants learn the English language as anyone going to a "new country" would, while 4 participants indicated that the government should not assist immigrants in learning English. In stark contrast to the imposing, non-supportive, exclusionary comments, there were 16 comments making reference to being "fair."

<p style="text-align:center;"><u>Part I (attitudes toward immigration): Feedback Section</u></p>

In the feedback section following Part I, questions inquired into (a) whether the participant felt comfortable being honest, (b) whether the survey items were easy to read (and to list the number of the survey item that was not), and (c) whether the participant had additional comments on layout, content or feelings related to the survey. In Part I of the survey, addressing attitudes toward immigration, 16 participants indicated that they were not comfortable providing honest answers, while 8 participants felt the survey items were not easy to read and listed survey items 4, 11, and 14 in that category. Also, one participant indicated that "all" survey items were difficult to read, while another participant stated that "all [were] very clear." Responses to feedback item (c) were open-ended; I will summarize the comments thematically, based on pre-existing codes inherent in the feedback item.

Part I feedback item (c) requested comments on (i) layout, (ii) content, and (iii) feelings related to the survey, which are essentially pre-existing codes for the qualitative analysis necessary here. In terms of (i) survey layout, there were 9 requests for a "neutral" or "undecided" option. Also, participants offered 5 negative comments about the survey items, stating that they are "vague" and needed re-reading many times, as well as 5 positive comments, saying that the survey was "well organized and clear." When commenting on (ii) survey content, the issue of viewing immigration as illegal came up

again. Five participants stated that they interpreted references to immigration as illegal immigration, while 8 participants understood immigration as legal and made welcoming comments. The following two statements, made by two different participants, summarize the issue well. One participant said: "Although you explained the definition of 'immigrant', it still is seen as illegal immigration." This comment confirms what I mentioned previously, that some persons saw immigration as illegal, even when they were instructed with an opposing definition. As for the participants who were accepting of legal immigration and welcomed it, the following participant represents them well: "I think that legal immigration is wonderful and should be encouraged! :) The U.S. is a nation of IMMIGRANTS. No one is really American except for NATIVE Americans. Moreover, those who enter illegally are probably doing so because they seek refuge and opportunity in this country; however, they should be required to seek citizenship." Finally, for (iii) feelings related to the survey, one participant stated "I don't like answering questions like this," another suggested the survey "should be more simplistic," and a third participant wanted "more chances to explain" responses.

Part II (attitudes toward L2 learners): Comments on Individual Survey Items

In Part II of the survey, relating to attitudes toward L2 learners, I categorized participants' comments to individual survey items into three themes: (a) participants demonstrated preparedness to teach L2 learners or lack of knowledge in this regard; (b) participants expressed willingness to be prepared to teach L2 learners or reluctance; and (c) participants voiced interest in being equitable and prepared regardless of cost, or cost mattered. (a) Preparedness was manifested in 27 comments, while lack of knowledge about teaching L2 learners was evident in 18 comments. Preparedness was demonstrated

through comments such as "fluency in first language builds fluency in second language," while lack of preparedness was apparent in statements such as, native language instruction is not necessary because "they already know their language." In terms of theme (b), 17 comments denoted willingness to undergo preparation to teach L2 learners, through statements such as "setting the example as the teacher in the classroom includes being a life-long learner" and, more directly, "if you're mandating inclusion, then teach us properly." Twelve participants indicated reluctance to preparing themselves to teach L2 learners explaining: "we're really busy," or such preparation is "not an issue in upper level science class." As for theme (c), while most comments (19) supported equitable teaching of L2 learners, and becoming prepared to teach L2 learners regardless of cost because "if we are to provide education, we should do it well," 14 comments expressed that cost matters, specifying that there should be spending to support L2 learners "only if [the L2 learners] are legal."

<center>Part II (attitudes toward L2 learners): Feedback Section</center>

In the feedback section following Part II, the same questions as in Part I Feedback appeared; they asked (a) whether the participant felt comfortable being honest, (b) whether the survey items were easy to read (and to list the number of the survey item that was not), and (c) whether the participant had additional comments on layout, content or feelings related to the survey. In Part II of the survey, addressing attitudes toward L2 learners, 5 participants indicated that they were not comfortable providing honest answers, while 23 participants felt the survey items were not easy to read and listed survey items 1, 2, 3, 8 (listed four times), 10 (listed six times), 11 (listed two times), and 13 in that category.

Part II feedback item (c) solicited comments on (i) layout, (ii) content, and (iii) feelings related to the survey, which provide the pre-existing codes necessary for this qualitative report, again. In terms of (i) survey layout, 3 participants requested a "neutral" or "undecided" option. There were 6 negative comments about the survey items, stating that they are "very complicated" and difficult to answer, as well as 11 positive comments about layout, organization, and survey items themselves. When addressing (ii) survey content, 4 comments focused on the importance of this topic and can be summarized in this participant's words: "teacher preparation to teach L2 learners is very important. Thank you for calling attention to this important educational topic." Another participant said, "so glad you're working to change negative attitudes against ELLs." A third participant reported the following effect of the survey: "really makes you think about yourself teaching L2 students." Lastly, when reporting (iii) feelings evoked by the survey, 4 participants expressed a new awareness of the "need to be more prepared" to teach L2 learners. Considering responses to (ii) and (iii), 8 participants expressed the need for preparation to teach L2 learners.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This research began with the premise that lack of equal educational opportunity

for L2 learners is problematic in the context of a democratic society, and that teachers'

attitudes, which serve as filters to practice, are important to investigate when concerned

with whether or not L2 learners are receiving equal access to opportunity. Critical

pedagogy, a perspective committed to social justice, informed the framing of this

research; it has also shaped the interpretation of this study's results. I discuss and frame

the outcomes of this study around the three goals of the study. Recommendations for

further analysis follows each of the results.

Goal I: To Design and Validate a Quantitative Instrument to Measure Teachers' Attitudes

Toward L2 Learners

Since I outlined the design and validation of my survey in chapter 3, the results I

refer to for the discussion in this section appear primarily in chapter 3, though I make

reference to results reported in chapter 4 as well, when relevant to this discussion. The

literature review revealed that teachers' attitudes are difficult to measure; I aimed to

design an instrument that measures (a) attitude, as opposed to belief, and (b) attitude

toward L2 learners themselves, not issues related to L2 learners. To focus on (a) the affective nature of attitude, rather than "facts" one believes to be true, I designed survey items in the form of statements to which agreement or lack thereof is indicative of how much one values L2 learners (e.g., feeling that L2 learners are your responsibility in the mainstream classroom because their needs are important, regardless of additional burden of preparation it is for you), and also indicative of how fair one is toward this student population (e.g., feeling that L2 learners deserve equal opportunity regardless of financial cost). Findings related to survey's validity and reliability indicate that this instrument does measure what it intends, and it does so consistently. Experts' and participants' qualitative feedback led to revisions of survey items, which improved validity, as evidenced by the inter-correlations of survey items with individuals' mean score, which were stronger in the main data than at the pilot phase.

I also wanted this instrument to measure (b) attitude toward L2 learners themselves, as opposed to issues related to this student population. Previous literature (e.g., Reeves, 2006) has found that participants' desire to give socially acceptable answers makes it difficult to access specific attitudes. I attempted to circumvent this problem by measuring not only attitudes toward L2 learners, but also attitudes toward immigration, since immigrants are, in fact, L2 learners, so I was still measuring attitudes toward L2 learners themselves. However, attitudes toward immigration are not typically viewed as related to teaching; they are viewed as a political perspective, which falls into the personal rather than professional realm. Therefore, I hoped participants would not be as inclined to provide socially acceptable answers to questions regarding their attitudes toward immigration, since the social context in which these answers were provided (i.e.,

their student teaching seminar) was directly connected to their professional stance not to their political views.

I believe I was successful in this endeavor for two reasons. First, Part I of the survey (attitudes toward immigration) enjoyed a stronger Cronbach's Alpha score, i.e., .885, than Part II (attitudes toward L2 learners) where Cronbach's Alpha was .723. These reliability scores indicate to what extent individuals' attitude scores were internally consistent across survey items. This means that whether participants were positive or negative, they were more consistently so when stating their attitudes toward immigration than when sharing their attitudes toward L2 learners. This may be an indication of participants being more hesitant to respond to questions related to L2 learners. Secondly, counterbalancing results showed that there was no statistically significant difference between attitudes toward immigration and attitudes toward L2 learners in version A and version B of the survey, which indicates that there was no carry-over effect on response. This means that whether participants answered survey items related to immigration before items related to L2 learners, or vice-versa, their attitude score would not be different; so answers related to immigration do not influence answers related to L2 learners. And since, as described in chapter 4, attitudes toward immigration were more negative than towards L2 learners (i.e., nearly one third of participants (32.3%, $n = 51$) reported negative or somewhat negative attitudes toward immigration while only one fifth of participants (20.2%, $n = 32$) reported such attitudes toward L2 learners), clearly participants were not as concerned about giving socially acceptable answers when it came to attitudes toward immigration.

As chapter 3 specifies, counterbalancing also showed that it took longer to complete version B of the survey, when attitudes toward L2 learners were measured before attitudes toward immigration. At the pilot phase, mean completion time for version A was 7.07 minutes ($SD = 2.1$) and for version B it was 9.73 minutes ($SD = 3.2$); this was a statistically significant difference in timing. During the main study, mean completion time for version A was 10.4 minutes ($SD = 4.07$) and for version B it was 11.1 minutes ($SD = 4.57$); while there was not a statistically significant difference in timing, it took participants almost one minute longer to complete version B. The difference in timing may be due to participants speculating the connection between the two parts of the survey more so in version B than in version A; this supposition is substantiated by the fact that participants reported slightly more positive attitudes toward both immigration ($M = 2.81$, $SD = .63$) and toward L2 learners ($M = 2.84$, $SD = .38$) in version B. Since in version B, attitudes toward L2 learners were measured first, participants started out responding to questions related to their profession, and may, therefore, have felt the pressure to provide socially appropriate answers more so than those who started out responding to questions about personal, political views, i.e., attitudes toward immigration. Such pressure can explain the increased time participants took to complete version B, and the slightly more positive responses in version B. In future research using this instrument, I recommend administering survey version A because it takes less time to complete, and because attitude scores do not differ in a statistically significant way from version B.

The validating process for this instrument included three phases, which have ultimately produced a valid survey, ready for use. During the first phase, the instrument's

original design, five experts' repeated review led to the construction of a strong instrument, with a Cronbach's Alpha score of .832 for Part I (attitudes toward immigration), and .357 for Part II (attitudes toward L2 learners), based on pilot data. During the second phase, after the pilot administration of the instrument, revision occurred based on the experts' advice, the pilot participants' qualitative feedback, and the various statistical tests on the pilot data. These revisions led to an increase in reliability scores during the main data collection period, i.e., Cronbach's Alpha score for attitudes toward immigration (.885), and for attitudes toward L2 learners (.723). During the third phase, after the main data collection period, additional participant feedback and analysis of inter-correlations lead to my recommendation that the instrument be administered without survey item 5 in Part II, or if survey item 5 is kept, it be changed to: "L2 learners come from education systems that are not as advanced as the American education system." It is important that administration of the survey without survey item 5 in Part II yields Cronbach's Alpha .770, which is improved reliability for Part II (with survey item 5, Cronbach's Alpha is .723).

This instrument is a significant contribution to the study of teaching and teacher education. We already know that attitudes influence teaching practice (e.g., Richardson, 1996); in order to explore accurately how attitudes influence teaching, we must have strong measures of the attitudes themselves. When we know what the attitudes are, we can structure more precise ways to observe how attitudes affect practice. For example, once one identifies groups of teachers with inclusive and exclusive attitudes, one can conduct observations of teachers in classrooms, noting how they relate to students, and analyzing if there is a match between reported attitudes and teaching practices. In

addition, teacher education programs can benefit from such an instrument. Knowing that exclusive attitudes can affect teaching, this instrument can be used to identify the presence of such attitudes in order to discover the teacher preparation segments necessary to mediate the harmful attitudes (see Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). The same instrument can then be used to evaluate improvement in attitude.

Future directions of this instrument can include a computerized version of the survey, which would likely increase the efficiency of its administration, though perhaps not the response rate. Since this survey was only administered to preservice teachers in Southwest U.S., additional research can expand the participant pool, and thus, our understanding of this issue. It would be interesting to know how the attitudes identified in this study compare to attitudes across the U.S. and internationally. Also, how do preservice teachers' attitudes toward immigration and L2 learners compare to attitudes of seasoned teachers? Furthermore, the survey itself can be expanded to include survey items that allow us to identify attitudes toward particular groups of immigrants. For example, do teachers' attitudes vary toward immigrants of varying socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or religion? The instrument validated in this study informs all the lines of research mentioned here.

Goal II: To Describe Teachers' Personal and Professional Attitudes, in This Case,

Attitudes Toward Immigration and Attitudes Toward L2 Learners, Respectively

Data collected during the main period provides several ways to describe the participants' attitudes toward immigration and toward L2 learners, as detailed in chapter 4. Mean attitude scores give us a general impression of reported attitudes, while the

attitude range break down allows us to understand more clearly the percentage of participants with positive and negative attitudes. Attitudes toward immigration had an average of 2.76 ($SD = .58$), which indicates an attitude that is slightly more positive than negative, that participants are somewhat open to immigration, slightly more inclusive than exclusive, on average more willing than not to grant access to equal privilege. Similarly, participants' attitude toward L2 learners had a mean score of 2.78 ($SD = .41$). Considering that the scale's pivot point between being positive and being negative is 2.5, we can also describe this attitude average as more positive than negative.

Generally, it is positive that attitudes are more positive than negative. Practically, it is disconcerting that teacher candidates are torn about granting immigrants, or L2 learners, access to equal privilege. Evidently, teachers' non-inclusive attitudes toward L2 learners must be addressed. This study provides additional support for Lucas and Grinberg's (2008) propositions of "structural … [and] process strategies to prepare teachers to teach ELLs" (p. 619). A structural strategy Lucas and Grinberg (2008) recommend is to add a course or to "modify existing courses and field experiences to infuse attention to teaching ELLs across the curriculum" (p. 619). For example, the teacher preparation program in which this study's participants were enrolled offers two courses in TESL theory and methods, which are considered "value added" courses by the school district, and which increase teacher candidates' chances of being hired upon graduation. After the data collection was completed for this study, these two courses became mandatory in the program. In addition to such courses, where more emphasis on immigration can be added, introductory courses to education as well as extant courses on diversity issues, such as the two that were required for the participants in this study, can

be modified to include emphasis on immigration in a more significant way. A discussion of immigrants, with focus on the historic value and contribution of immigrants in this country, coupled with hardships they have traditionally faced and challenges they currently encounter is crucial to teacher candidates' understanding of this population. Addressing misconceptions about L2 learners and about immigrants, by exposing the way this population is presented in the media, in political spheres, and in local communities, is an important component in tackling this issue. I recommend an intervention, such as modification of current courses as suggested here, as a possibility to attend to existing negative attitudes.

The percentage break down of reported attitudes provides a clearer picture. Results show that 67.7% ($n = 107$) of participants reported positive or somewhat positive attitudes toward immigration, while 32.3% ($n = 51$) had negative or somewhat negative attitudes toward immigration. Nearly one third of teacher candidates had somewhat negative attitudes toward immigration. As for attitudes toward L2 learners, 79.8% ($n = 126$) of participants had positive or somewhat positive attitudes, while 20.2% ($n = 32$) had negative or somewhat negative attitudes. This means that only one fifth of participants had somewhat negative attitudes toward L2 learners. While it is alarming that any teacher candidate would have non-inclusive attitudes toward L2 learners, from a democratic education perspective, it is important that fewer teacher candidates reported negative attitudes toward L2 learners, than toward immigration because this may be an indication that teacher candidates are inclusive of L2 learners even if they take an exclusionary stance toward immigration. Qualitative research would be an appropriate venue to investigate this dynamic, if it exists.

124

However, it is also possible that participants felt less pressure to provide socially acceptable answers when discussing immigration, as compared to discussing, in a student teaching seminar, the inclusion of a specific student population. The latter interpretation is supported by the relationship between attitudes toward immigration and attitudes toward L2 learners, a Pearson correlation score of .546 ($p = .01$), which is a significant moderately strong positive correlation. This relationship indicates that participants who reported positive attitudes on Part I of the survey tended to report positive attitudes on Part II of the survey as well. I expected that such a relationship exists because L2 learners *are* immigrants. This would suggest that attitudes toward these two entities, which are in fact, one, should be similar, in which case, the difference can only be explained by the inclination to provide socially acceptable answers to professional questions when asked in a professional context.

This finding shows that measuring attitudes toward immigration is a good way to access teacher candidates' candid feelings about immigrants, which can ultimately inform us about the complexities of teachers' "reluctance to work with particular ELLs" (Reeves, 2006). Further research in this area can include the study of correlations between teachers' attitude toward immigration and their classroom practice, as well as teachers' attitude toward L2 learners and their classroom practice; such research would allow for a triangulation of information, so that more than the positive correlation between attitudes toward immigration and toward L2 learners will support the argument that a teacher's attitude toward immigration is related to the attitude toward and treatment of L2 learners.

The qualitative data led to findings about teacher candidates' attitudes toward immigration and toward L2 learners, which reveal the nature of preparation teacher candidates need in order to gain more inclusive attitudes. As described in chapter 4, a theme that surfaced in participants' comments to individual survey items in Part I was that some participants ($n = 19$) viewed legal immigration as illegal, in spite of verbal and written definitions that stated otherwise. If seeing all immigrants as illegal was the reason these participants expressed exclusionary attitudes toward immigration and L2 learners, there may be a simple solution to this problem. If teacher candidates are educated about the processes of immigration to this country, and the purpose and benefits of it, they will understand legal immigration, which is likely an important step toward being accepting of it. Follow up research can ascertain if such education indeed improves attitude.

A second theme that emerged from participants' comments to Part I survey items was the voicing of an exclusionary stance towards immigration ($n = 18$), which included tougher restrictions on immigration, support for building a fence between the U.S. and Mexico, and offering less privilege and opportunity to immigrants. Again, being educated about the role of immigrants in this country, teachers may have more inclusive attitudes toward them. If they will have an exclusionary stance toward immigration even when they understand it, the problem may be more deeply rooted. If discrimination is the reason participants are intolerant of legal immigration, it is more difficult to eradicate it, though some suggest ways to accomplish this (e.g., Sleeter, 2008). Aligned with my theoretical framework, based in democratic education practices, I believe there is no place for discrimination in the teaching profession; therefore, I would recommend that instruments, like the one presented here, are used to identify exclusionary attitudes,

which then need to be addressed with transformative experiences during teacher preparation.

With respect to attitudes toward L2 learners, recommendations based on my qualitative findings echo many studies (e.g., Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Reeves, 2006) that insist on the preparation of all teachers to address the needs of L2 learners. There were some participants ($n = 8$) who recognized the importance of this topic in education, and expressed their new awareness of the "need to be more prepared" to teach L2 learners. Indeed, 18 participants demonstrated a lack of basic knowledge about language teaching and learning. However, as of 2008, only four states had "policies that require all teachers in preservice programs to have an understanding of how to teach ELs effectively: Arizona, California, Florida, and New York" (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2008, p.10). This study indicates that preservice teachers lack this knowledge in more than these four states. I recommend that preservice teachers across the U.S. receive preparation to teach L2 learners because this is the fastest growing student population in this country (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2008).

An unfortunate finding was that some participants ($n = 12$) expressed reluctance to becoming prepared to teach L2 learners, and 14 participants indicated that cost played a role into whether or not they would accept additional preparation, and into whether or not they would consent to providing equitable teaching to L2 learners. While the expressed reluctance was not surprising, since others (e.g., Reeves, 2006, Franson, 1999) identified this phenomenon as well, the fact that cost played such a definitive role in some participants' willingness to become prepared to teach L2 learners can be a good sign. If such preparation were integrated seamlessly as part of the core teacher education

127

program, as it is in the four states mentioned, teacher candidates would not view it as an additional expense. In fact, if current courses were modified to include a focus on immigration and L2 learners as I suggested above, the integration would be seamless.

Goal III: To Compare Personal and Professional Attitudes of Various Demographic Groups Within the Participant Pool

The literature indicates that certain demographic descriptors have an influence on teachers' attitudes; this study's findings confirm previous findings, and add to the literature as well. As mentioned in chapter 4, I used backward selection linear regression to identify which demographic variables are predictors of attitudes toward immigration, and which of attitudes toward L2 learners. Results showed that (1) how many languages the participant spoke was a predictor of attitudes toward immigration, and of attitudes toward L2 learners. In fact, a GLM MANOVA also indicated that participants who spoke more than one language had more positive attitudes toward immigration and towards L2 learners, than those who spoke only one language. Previous literature has shown that foreign language study predicts positive teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners (e.g., Youngs & Youngs, 2001); the present study adds that knowing more than one language also predicts positive attitudes toward immigration. Consequently, I support Lucas and Grinberg's (2008) recommendation that teachers should have language-related experiences, including studying a foreign language and having contact with people who speak languages other than English. Such exposure promises to influence how positive, inclusive and welcoming teachers' attitudes are toward L2 learners and toward immigration.

A second demographic variable, (2) the participant's experience with immigrants, was also a significant predictor of teacher attitudes toward L2 learners and toward immigration. This variable has been defined in various ways in the literature as, for example, intercultural communication (Dogancay-Aktuna, 2005) or personal experience with foreign culture (Youngs & Youngs, 2001); essentially, a similar construct was measured, and was found to play a role in attitude toward L2 learners. While it is not necessarily surprising that "experience with immigrants" was a predictor of attitudes toward immigration, it is interesting that this variable had such a strong influence on participants' attitudes' toward L2 learners. Basically, whether or not participants wanted to provide socially acceptable answers, if they reported a negative experience with immigrants, they did not have reservations about stating a negative attitude toward L2 learners. Since "experience with immigrants" was such an influential variable, it is important to learn more about how participants determined what qualified as positive and negative experience. A qualitative investigation in this area would be useful for our deeper understanding of how and why negative experience with immigration is a predictor of exclusionary attitude toward immigration, and especially how and why it influences attitude toward L2 learners.

In addition, gender was a predictor of attitude toward L2 learners, but not of attitude toward immigration. Since this is a repeated finding (see Youngs & Youngs, 2001), it is definitely advisable to investigate why females have more positive attitudes than males toward L2 learners. This finding appeared not only in the backward selection linear regression but also in a 2x2 factorial MANOVA. It is important to note that only 24.8% of participants ($n = 38$) were male in this study; even though this is nearly one

forth of all participants, perhaps an even participation of males and females can represent this phenomenon more accurately. It is also possible that females reported more positive attitudes toward L2 learners than males because, stereotypically, females are expected to have more nurturing attitudes. It would also be interesting to examine how reported attitudes are related to teaching practice, and if this relationship differs between males and females. I believe that qualitative inquiry in this area can explore the source of this difference further.

Finally, the 2x2 factorial MANOVA also indicated that minorities have more positive attitudes toward immigration than participants who were not of minority status. Participants were assigned minority status, unless their native language was English, they were born in the U.S., did not consider themselves immigrants, and were "White non-Hispanic." The fact that minorities had more inclusive attitudes toward immigration can be explained by a potential compassion for the shared condition of not being part of the mainstream. It is interesting, however, that minority status did not have a significant influence on attitudes toward L2 learners. Further research should investigate the intricacies in the attitudes of minority teacher candidates, and how these attitudes play out in teaching practice. Again, teacher preparation that clarifies the immigration process and best methods for teaching L2 learners would benefit all teacher candidates. As Feimen-Nemser and Remillard (1996) explained, "drawing on their own experience, [preservice teachers] develop assumptions about the learning and thinking of others that fit with their own" (p. 69). In this case, whether the teacher candidate is a minority or not, he/she cannot develop teaching skills based on assumptions about learning and thinking, but rather, based on appropriate teacher preparation.

Summary and Conclusions

Quantitative and qualitative results of this study have supported some previous findings and chimed into previous recommendations; they have also led to the introduction of a validated instrument for identifying teachers' attitudes toward L2 learners and immigration, as well as several suggestions for teacher education and further research in this field. Through addressing the first goal of this study, I introduced an instrument that can serve teacher education by offering a way to accurately identify teacher candidates' attitudes toward immigration and toward L2 learners; this identification allows teacher educators to draft preparation to teach L2 learners that matches the needs of teacher candidates. In addition, the instrument can be used to evaluate the effect of teacher preparation in terms of attitude improvement. A future direction for the instrument includes a computerized version of it.

When attending to this study's second goal, finding that nearly one third ($n = 51$) of participants had somewhat negative to negative attitudes toward immigration and one fifth ($n = 32$) of participants had somewhat negative to negative attitudes toward L2 learners, led to the recommendation that more targeted teacher education is necessary to prepare teacher candidates to teach L2 learners. I recommended that modifications be made to current general education and TESL courses to include a detailed emphasis on immigration and L2 learners. The future inquiry I suggested in this area was qualitative research that can examine if, in practice, teachers are inclusive of L2 learners even if they hold an exclusionary stance toward immigration. Qualitative methodology can also investigate the correlation between attitudes toward immigration and teaching practice, as well as the relationship between attitudes toward L2 learners and teaching practice, so

131

that this information can be triangulated for the purpose of understanding this phenomenon more deeply.

While addressing the third goal of this study, findings led to two main recommendations for teacher education. Teachers should have second language-related experience such as foreign language study, since speaking more than one language is related to more inclusive attitudes toward L2 learners and toward immigration. And, again, teacher preparation that informs candidates about immigration in the U.S., as well as education about best methods for teaching L2 learners in the mainstream classroom, is essential. All teachers are teachers of language; integrating literacy across the curriculum means understanding the function of language in the classroom. This study advises teacher educators that teacher candidates need a deeper knowledge base about language, L2 learners, immigration, and diversity. The suggestion for future research that emerged from findings related to this study's third goal includes a deeper investigation into the intricacies of attitudes held by minority teacher candidates – why does their minority status influence their attitudes toward immigration but not toward L2 learners? Also, how do minority teachers' attitudes play out in teaching practice, as compared to their non-minority colleagues.

The presence of L2 learners in mainstream classrooms cannot be ignored; addressing their needs is not a fad that will temporarily crowd teacher candidates' already packed teacher education programs. Immigration and the presence of L2 learners in schools is a reality in many countries. Those interested in democratic education, which insists on equal participation and access for all students, must take a closer look at teachers' attitudes; while generally inclusive, the fact that one fifth of the participants in

this study expressed somewhat negative attitudes toward L2 learners, and one third of participants reported somewhat negative attitudes toward immigration, is critical. Future research must expand on instructional implications of such attitudes, most efficient ways to integrate preparation to teach L2 learners in teacher education programs, as well as evaluation of the success experienced in preparing teachers to teach L2 learners.

TABLES

Table 1

Pilot: Survey Order - Mean Scores and Completion Time

	Survey A		Survey B	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*
No. of participants & percentage of sample*	13	46.4	15	53.6
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Survey Part I (immigration) score	2.5	.47	2.4	.57
Survey Part II (L2 learners) score	2.7	.36	2.7	.27
Completion time (in minutes)	7.07	2.1	9.73	3.2

*Pilot *N*=36. Only 28 participants reported survey completion time; therefore, percentage calculation in this

table is out of 28, not 36.

Table 2

Main Study: Survey Order - Mean Scores and Completion Time

	Survey A		Survey B	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*
No. of participants & percentage of sample*	61	50	61	50
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Survey Part I (immigration) score	2.80	.56	2.81	.63
Survey Part II (L2 learners) score	2.76	.40	2.84	.38
Completion time (in minutes)	10.4	4.07	11.1	4.57

*Main study *N*=159. Only 122 participants had all the information required to complete this MANOVA; therefore, percentage calculation in this table is out of 122, not 159.

Table 3

Pilot: Correlation Levels of Each Part I Survey Item with Overall Part I Mean

Part I survey item	Correlation level	*M*	*SD*
1	.558**	2.02	.81
2	.679**	2.91	.90
3	.647**	2.57	1.00
4	.777**	2.44	.99
5	.645**	3.00	.75
6	.258	2.37	1.00
7	.804**	2.50	1.13
8	.845**	2.25	1.02
9	.366*	1.65	.80
10	.784**	2.63	.93
11	.529**	3.18	.90
12	-.338	2.11	.80
13	.193	2.37	.91
14	.050	2.33	.79
15	.809**	3.02	1.01
16	.573**	2.52	1.02
17	.465**	2.44	.84

Note 1. ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level

Note 2. Overall Part I mean score of all participants = 2.48, *SD* = .56

Table 4

Pilot: Correlation Levels of Each Part II Survey Item with Overall Part II Mean

Part II survey item	Correlation level	*M*	*SD*
1	.059	3.41	.73
2	.249	3.74	.50
3	.213	3.58	.50
4	.422[*]	1.75	.84
5	.420[*]	1.77	.76
6	.479[**]	2.05	.79
7	.383[*]	2.36	.93
8	.371[*]	3.52	.69
9	.636[**]	3.38	.90

Note 1.[**] Correlation is significant at the .01 level

[*] Correlation is significant at the .05 level

Note 2. Overall Part II mean score of all participants = 2.76, *SD* = .30

Table 5

Main Study: Correlation Levels of Each Part I Survey Item with Overall Part I Mean

Part I survey item	Correlation level	*M*	*SD*
1	.699[**]	2.70	1.03
2	.728[**]	2.99	0.97
3	.693[**]	2.95	1.00
4	.661[**]	3.47	0.74
5	.654[**]	3.13	0.84
6	.590[**]	2.49	1.10
7	.682[**]	2.90	1.02
8	.439[**]	1.83	0.91
9	.539[*]	2.40	1.15
10	.323[**]	2.56	1.07
11	.535[**]	2.34	0.90
12	.569[**]	2.14	0.91
13	.754[**]	3.04	0.89
14	.612[**]	2.95	1.05
15	.782[**]	2.60	1.03
16	.410[**]	3.55	0.72

Note 1. [**]Correlation is significant at the .01 level

   [*]Correlation is significant at the .05 level

Note 2. Overall Part I mean score of all participants = 2.76, *SD* = .577

Table 6

Main Study: Range of Correlation between Part I Survey Items and Overall Part I Mean

Range of correlation	*No.* of Part I survey items*	*%*
.600 or above	9	56
.400 to .599	6	38
.300 to .399	1	6

* Total number of survey items in Part I was 16.

Table 7

Main Study: Correlation Levels of Each Part II Survey Item with Overall Part II Mean

Part II survey item	Correlation level	*M*	*SD*
1	.531**	3.16	0.88
2	.229**	1.66	0.74
3	.540**	2.68	1.03
4	.447**	3.41	0.65
5	-.117	1.99	0.91
6	.540**	2.68	0.96
7	.708**	2.70	0.92
8	.337**	2.18	1.01
9	.482**	2.44	1.06
10	.221**	3.20	0.92
11	.425**	2.90	1.05
12	.625**	3.07	0.90
13	.685**	3.02	0.89
14	.420**	3.39	0.87
15	.731**	3.23	0.86

Note 1. ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level

Note 2. Overall Part II mean score of all participants = 2.78, *SD* = .411

Table 8

Main Study: Range of Correlation between Part II Survey Items and Overall Part II

Mean Score

Range of correlation	*No.* of Part II survey items*	*%*
.600 or above	4	26.7
.400 to .599	7	46.7
.200 to .399	3	20.0
Negative correlation	1	6.6

* Total number of survey items in Part II was 15.

Table 9

Pilot Study: Percentage of Participants in Four Attitude Ranges

Attitude range (survey mean score level)	Part I (immigration)		Part II (L2 learners)	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*
Positive (3.00-4.00)	7	19.5	13	36.1
Somewhat positive (2.50-2.99)	12	33.3	18	50.0
Somewhat negative (2.01-2.49)	9	25.0	4	11.1
Negative (1.00-2.00)	8	22.2	1	2.8

Table 10

Demographic Information: Pilot Participants

Demographic variable (*no*. of participants who responded)* (*n*)	*No.* of participants in this demographic *n*	Percentage of participants in this demographic *%*
Gender (n = 36)		
Female	32	88.9
Male	4	11.1
U.S. born (*n* = 36)		
Yes	36	100
No	0	0
Region (*n* = 36)		
U.S. Northeast	2	5.6
U.S. Midwest	4	11.1
U.S. South	4	11.1
U.S. West	26	72.2
Immigrant (*n* = 36)		
Yes	0	0
No	36	100
Languages spoken (*n* = 35)		
One	30	85.7
Two or more	5	14.3
Experience with immigrants (*n* = 34)		
Positive	27	79.4
Negative	7	20.6
Native language (*n* = 36)		
English	34	94.4
Other	2	5.6

Table 10 (continued). *Demographic Information: Pilot Participants*

Demographic variable (*no.* of participants who responded)* (*n*)	*No.* of participants in this demographic *n*	Percentage of participants in this demographic *%*
Ethnicity (*n* = 36)		
Asian or Pacific Islander	2	5.6
Black non Hispanic	1	2.8
White non Hispanic	29	80.5
Hispanic	4	11.1
Native American/Alaskan Native	0	0
Other	0	0
Do not wish to disclose	0	0
Ethnic group (*n* = 36)		
White	29	80.6
Minority	7	19.4
University coursework (*n* = 36)		
Undergraduate	30	83.3
Graduate	6	16.7

* Total Pilot *N* = 36.

Table 11

Pilot: Correlation Levels of Each Demographic Variable with Part I Mean Score (attitude toward immigration) and Part II Mean Score (attitude toward L2 learners)

Demographic variable	*M*	*SD*	Correlation with Part I	Correlation with Part II
Age	28	5.98	-.165	-.141
Gender	1.12	.33	.219	-.292[*]
How many languages participant spoke	1.09	.26	.180	.157
Experience with immigrants	1.21	.42	-.454[**]	-.252
Ethnicity	1.18	.39	-.005	-.103
Undergraduate/graduate	1.15	.36	.099	-.036

Note 1.[**]Correlation is significant at the .01 level

[*]Correlation is significant at the .05 level

Note 2. Part I mean score of all participants = 2.52, *SD* = .55 (survey item 12 was excluded

from the mean)

Part II mean score of all participants = 2.78, *SD* = .32

Table 12

Pilot: Backward Regression Analyses Showing the Effects of Three Demographic

Variables on Attitude toward Immigration and Attitude toward L2 Learners

	B	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*
Attitude toward immigration	2.199	.527		4.177	.000
Demographic variables					
Gender	.452	.257	.271	1.763	.089
How many languages participant spoke	.558	.324	.266	1.723	.095
Experience with immigrants	-.655	.204	-.491	-3.206	.003
Attitude toward L2 learners	3.089	.192		16.114	.000
Demographic variable					
Gender	-.279	.164	-.292	-1.700	.099

Table 13

Demographic Information: Main Study Participants

Demographic variable (*No.* of participants who responded)* (*n*)	*No.* of participants in this demographic *n*	Percentage of participants in this demographic *%*
Gender (*n* = 153)		
Female	115	75.2
Male	38	24.8
U.S. born (*n* = 153)		
Yes	141	92.2
No	12	7.8
Region (*n* = 149)		
U.S. Northeast	10	6.7
U.S. Midwest	12	8.1
U.S. South	8	5.4
U.S. West	110	73.8
Europe	3	2.0
Asia	3	2.0
South America	3	2.0
Immigrant (*n* = 153)		
Yes	8	5.2
No	145	94.8
Languages spoken (*n* = 153)		
One	115	75.2
Two or More	38	24.8

Table 13 (continued). *Demographic Information: Main Study Participants*

Demographic variable (*No.* of participants who responded)* (*n*)	*No.* of participants in this demographic *n*	Percentage of participants in this demographic *%*
Experience with immigrants (*n* = 137)		
Positive	115	83.9
Negative	22	16.1
Native language (*n* = 153)		
English	139	90.8
Other	14	9.2
Ethnicity (*n* = 152)		
Asian or Pacific Islander	12	7.9
Black non Hispanic	8	5.3
White non Hispanic	92	60.5
Hispanic	21	13.8
Native American/Alaskan Native	1	0.7
Other	11	7.2
Do not wish to disclose	7	4.6
Ethnic group (*n* = 145)		
White	92	63.4
Minority	53	36.6
University coursework (*n* = 153)		
Undergraduate	128	83.7
Graduate	25	16.3

Table 13 (continued): *Demographic Variables: Main Study Participants*

Demographic variable (*No.* of participants who responded)* (*n*)	*No.* of participants in this demographic *n*	Percentage of participants in this demographic *%*
Education program (*n* = 73)		
Elementary	25	34.2
Secondary	38	52.1
Elementary and Secondary	10	13.7
Minority status (*n* = 153)		
Minority	57	37.3
Non-minority	96	62.7

*Total Main Study *N* = 159.

Table 14

Main Study: Percentage of Participants in Four Attitude Ranges

Attitude range (survey mean score level)	Part I (immigration)		Part II (L2 learners)	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*
Positive (3.00-4.00)	62	39.2	51	32.3
Somewhat positive (2.50-2.99)	45	28.5	75	47.5
Somewhat negative (2.01-2.49)	35	22.2	25	15.8
Negative (1.00-2.00)	16	10.1	7	4.4

Table 15

Main Study: Correlation Levels of Each Demographic Variable with Part I Mean Score

(attitude toward immigration) and Part II Mean Score (attitude toward L2 learners)

Demographic variable	*M*	*SD*	Correlation with Part I	Correlation with Part II
Age	27	7.07	.020	.020
Gender	1.27	.44	-.098	-.342**
How many languages participant spoke	1.31	.58	.238**	.155*
Experience with immigrants	1.16	.36	-.437**	-.151*
Undergraduate/graduate	1.53	1.15	.191**	.036
Minority status	1.61	.49	-.167*	-.124

Note 1: **Correlation is significant at the .01 level

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level

Note 2: Overall Part I mean score of all participants = 2.82, *SD* = .57

Overall Part II mean score of all participants = 2.80, *SD* = .39

Note 3: *N* = 135

Table 16

Main Study: Backward Regression Analyses Showing the Effects of Three Demographic Variables on Attitude toward Immigration and Attitude toward L2 Learners

	B	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*	sr	sr2
Attitude toward immigration	3.314	.177		18.747	.000		
Demographic variables							
How many languages participant spoke	.210	.074	.216	2.840	.005	.216	.046
Experience with immigrants	-.663	.118	-.426	-5.600	.000	-.426	.1814
Attitude toward L2 learners	3.255	.159		20.432	.000		
Demographic variables							
Gender	-.308	.071	-.346	-4.336	.000	-.346	.1197
How many languages participant spoke	.099	.054	.147	1.835	.069	.147	.0216
Experience with immigrants	-.166	.087	-.153	-1.916	.058	-.153	.0234

Table 17

Main Study: Descriptive Statistics for 2x2 Factorial MANOVA

Gender	Minority Status	*n*	*M*	*SD*
		Attitudes toward immigration		
Female	Minority	46	2.90	.55
	Non-minority	69	2.72	.64
	Total	115	2.79	.61
Male	Minority	11	3.02	.45
	Non-minority	27	2.62	.40
	Total	38	2.73	.45
Total	Minority	57	2.92	.53
	Non-minority	96	2.69	.58
	Total	153	2.78	.57
		Attitudes toward L2 learners		
Female	Minority	46	2.89	.34
	Non-minority	69	2.82	.38
	Total	115	2.85	.37
Male	Minority	11	2.68	.39
	Non-minority	27	2.50	.44
	Total	38	2.56	.43
Total	Minority	57	2.85	.36
	Non-minority	96	2.73	.42
	Total	153	2.78	.40

Table 18

Main Study: 2x2 Factorial MANOVA Statistics for Comparison of Gender and Minority Status Effects on the Linear Combination of Mean Part I and Part II Scores

Demographic variable	$F(2, 148)$	p	η^2	Observed power
Gender	8.22	.000	.100	.958
Minority status	3.24	.042	.042	.610

Table 19

Main Study: Test of Between Subject Effects Statistics for Difference between Males and Females on Mean Part II Score and between Minorities and Non-minorities on Mean Part I Score

Mean difference	SS	$F(1, 149)$	p	η^2	Observed power
Difference between males and females on mean Part II (L2 learners) score					
.29	1.708	11.56	.001	.072	.922
Difference between minorities and non-minorities on mean Part I (immigration) score					
.23	2.079	6.48	.012	.042	.715

Table 20

Main Study: Descriptive Statistics for GLM MANOVA

How many languages one spoke	n	M	SD
Attitudes toward immigration			
1	115	2.71	.56
2 or more	38	2.97	.59
Total	153	2.78	.57
Attitudes toward L2 learners			
1	115	2.74	.41
2 or more	38	2.90	.36
Total	153	2.78	.40

Table 21

Main Study: GLM MANOVA Statistics for Comparison of Mean Part I and Part II Scores of Participants who Spoke one Language and Those who Spoke Multiple Languages

$F_{(2,150)}$	p	η^2	Observed Power
3.34	.038	.043	.625

Table 22

Main Study: Test of Between Subject Effects Statistics for Difference between

Participants who Spoke One Language and Those who Spoke Multiple Languages on

Mean Part I and Part II Scores

Survey Part	Mean difference	SS	$F(1, 151)$	p	η^2	Observed Power
Part I (immigration)	.25	1.803	5.63	.019	.036	.655
Part II (L2 Learners)	.16	.716	4.48	.036	.029	.557

APPENDIX 1

SURVEY VERSION A

Due to differing margin sizes on the original survey, the survey that appears in

this appendix has slightly modified formatting. The content, however, is complete.

Survey Of Teacher Candidates' Attitudes

Start time: _____ (please write what time it is right now, as you begin the survey)

Instructions

This survey has three parts. When you complete Part I, please <u>detach it</u> from your packet and submit it to me. Then, continue with parts II and III. You will notice a space designated for "Comments" next to each survey item in Part I. In this space, you can expand your response if you wish, or you can write feedback about the individual survey item itself (for example, you can let me know if the question is unclear).

I would like to thank you for taking the time to complete this survey! Your honest opinion is valuable and greatly appreciated!

Important Definitions

"Immigration" refers to the process whereby foreigners enter <u>legally</u> into the U.S. to settle permanently.
"Immigrants" in this survey, refer to the people who enter <u>legally</u> into the U.S. to settle permanently.

Part I. Attitudes toward Immigration

1. There is too much immigration to the U.S.   Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Immigrants take jobs away from Americans.   Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

3. Our national security has been jeopardized by immigration.   Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

4. Policy should grant immigrants access only to jobs Americans do <u>not</u> need.   Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

5. Overall, immigration has a positive influence on American life.   Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

6. Money should <u>not</u> be spent on ballots and other government documents appearing in multiple languages.   Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

7. Immigrants cost taxpayers too much by using government services, such as public education and medical services.   Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

8. Immigrants should be given U.S. government assistance to preserve their customs and traditions.   Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

9. Many in the Senate and the House of Representatives favor "strengthening security at the borders, including building a 370-mile fence along the border with Mexico". Do you agree with building this fence?   Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

10. Immigrants should be given U.S. government assistance to learn English so that they can be competitive in the job market.   Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

11. Thinking about the community where you live, recent immigrants have improved the community.   Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

12. In order for immigrants to be successful in the U.S., they must Americanize, in other words, they must assimilate to the customs and institutions of the U.S.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

13. Immigration hurts the U.S. more than it helps it.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

14. Americans should have more privileges than immigrants.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

15. During elections for political office, I support candidates who are in favor of tougher restrictions on immigration into this country.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

16. When an American and an immigrant apply for a job in the U.S., the American should be hired, even if the immigrant is more qualified.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Part I. Feedback

(a) Did you feel comfortable being completely honest about your responses? Yes__ No__

(b) Were the survey items easy to read? (please check yes or no)   Yes __   No __
Basically, if you found that you had to read the survey item two times or more just to understand exactly what it is asking of you, then the item is NOT easy to read, and you would answer "No". Please list the number of the survey item(s) which was/were not easy to read:
_____

(c) Please write below any comments you would like to share about the survey layout, the survey content, or your feelings about this survey. Your feedback is valuable to me. Many thanks!
_____
_____
_____
_____

END OF PART I
Please DETACH Part I from the rest of the survey and submit it to me.
Thank you!!

160

Survey of Teacher Candidates' Attitudes

Instructions

At this time, please continue responding to Parts II and III of the survey. You will notice a space designated for "Comments" next to each survey item in Part II. In this space, you can expand your response if you wish, or you can write feedback about the individual survey item itself (for example, you can let me know if the question is unclear).

Many thanks for taking the time to complete this survey! Your honest opinion is greatly appreciated!

Important Definitions

"L2 Learners" refers to Learners of English as a Second Language throughout this survey.

"Native language" is the first language you learn. Sometimes, native language is referred to as mother tongue.

"Mainstream classroom" is to be distinguished from a language classroom, where language instruction occurs. In the mainstream classroom, both native speakers of English, and L2 learners are enrolled. Most U.S. classrooms are mainstream classrooms because L2 learners are enrolled in them.

Part II. Teacher Preparedness to Work with L2 Learners

1. If offered, I would commit to additional preparation for teaching L2 learners.
Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

2. I hope my L2 learners will learn <u>not</u> only English in my classroom, but also American customs and values so that they can blend in more easily into American society.
Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

3. In today's economy, we cannot afford additional programs to help L2 learners.
Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

4. In my university program, too much attention is given to preparing teachers to work with L2 learners.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

5. Since many L2 learners come from education systems that are <u>not</u> as advanced as the American education system, it is important for teachers to help L2 learners catch up.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

6. Preparation to teach L2 learners in the mainstream classroom is less important than learning to teach content matter, such as math or history.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

7. Preparing all teachers to teach L2 learners in the mainstream classroom is too costly.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

8. I would support a government-funded program that teaches L2 learners their native language.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

9. It is important for L2 learners to use <u>only</u> English in the classroom.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

10. I do <u>not</u> wish to place my L2 learners at a disadvantage because I am <u>not</u> prepared to address their needs.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

11. It is the teacher's responsibility to make sure that L2 learners' native cultural identity is <u>not</u> lost as a result of classroom activity.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

12. It is better to spend money on programs for gifted learners than to spend money on supporting L2 learners.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

13. L2 student performance is <u>not</u> the responsibility of the mainstream classroom teacher.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

14. Teaching about foreign cultures may benefit L2 learners, but <u>not</u> all students in the mainstream class.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

15. If teachers are successful in teaching the majority of students, they should <u>not</u> be expected to learn additional methods to accommodate L2 learners.

Comments:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Part II. Feedback

(a) Did you feel comfortable being completely honest about your responses?Yes __ No__

(b) Were the survey items easy to read? (please check yes or no)   Yes ___ No ___
Basically, if you found that you had to read the survey item two times or more just to understand exactly what it is asking of you, then the item is NOT easy to read, and you would answer "No". Please list the number of the survey item(s) which was/were not easy to read:
_____

(c) Please write below any comments you would like to share about the survey layout, the survey content, or your feelings about this survey. Your feedback is valuable to me. Many thanks!

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

END OF PART II

Please proceed directly to Part III. Thank You!

Part III. Demographic Information

1. **How old are you?** _____

2. **What is your gender?**

☐ female   ☐ male

3. **Were you born in the U.S.?**

☐ yes   ☐ no

4. **Where are you from? (city/state/country)** _____
    (if you lived in more than one city, list the one where you have lived the longest)

5. **Do you consider yourself an immigrant to this country?**

☐ yes   ☐ no

6. **How many languages do you speak?** _____

7. **How would you describe your experience with immigrants to the U.S.?**

☐ positive   ☐ negative

8. **Is English your native language? (native language = mother-tongue, or first language)**

☐ yes   ☐ no

9. **What is your ethnicity?**

☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
☐ Black non Hispanic
☐ White non Hispanic
☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American or Alaskan Native
☐ Other
☐ Do not wish to disclose

10. **How much university coursework have you completed?**

☐ some university courses
☐ bachelor's degree completed
☐ some masters courses (emphasis area: _____)
☐ masters degree completed (emphasis area: _____)

11. **Are you enrolled in the elementary or secondary education stream?**

☐ elementary
☐ secondary

<div align="center">

END OF PART III
You have completed the survey! THANK YOU!
Please submit part II and III together to me. I sincerely appreciate your participation!!!

</div>

<div align="center">

Completion time: _____(what time is it now?)

</div>

APPENDIX 2

PILOT SURVEY VERSION A

Due to differing margin sizes on the original pilot survey, the survey that appears

in this appendix has slightly modified formatting. The content, however, is complete.

Survey of Teacher Candidates' Attitudes

Start time: _____ *(please write what time it is right now, as you begin the survey)*
*As you complete this survey, please keep in mind the following questions, which you will answer at the **end** of Part I:*
(a)Is the layout of the survey confusing?
(b)As you are answering the questions, are you feeling confident that your answers are completely anonymous?
(c)As you are answering the questions, are you feeling comfortable being completely honest about your responses?
You will notice that next to each survey question below, there is a box asking you "was this question easy to read?" Basically, if you find that you have to read the question two times or more just to understand exactly what it is asking of you, then the question is NOT easy to read, and you would answer "no" by placing a check mark next to "no". Also in this box, you see the statement "comments about this question". Here, you can write any feedback you would like to share about an individual question on this survey.
Thank you!

Instructions: This survey has three parts. When you complete the first part, please detach it from your packet and submit it to me. Then, continue with parts II and III. Many thanks for taking the time to complete this survey! Your honest opinion is valuable and appreciated!

Part I. Attitudes toward Immigration

***** IN THIS SURVEY, IMMIGRATION REFERS TO PEOPLE ENTERING <u>LEGALLY</u> INTO THE U.S. TO SETTLE PERMNANENTLY.**

1. Immigration to the U.S. should be increased.

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No __
Comments about this question:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Immigrants take jobs away from Americans.

Was this question easy to read? Yes ___No __
Comments about this question:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

3. Our national security has been jeopardized by immigration.

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No __
Comments about this question:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

4. When it comes to the immigration bill, many in the Senate and the House of Representatives favor "strengthening security at the borders, including building a 370-mile fence along the border with Mexico". Do you agree with this proposition?

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No __ Comments about this question:

5. Overall, immigration has a positive influence on American life.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No ___ Comments about this question:

6. I would favor a program that allows immigrants to work in the U.S. only on a temporary basis and then return to their home country.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes ___No __ Comments about this question:

7. Money should <u>not</u> be spent on ballots and other government documents appearing in multiple languages.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No __ Comments about this question:

8. In the next election, I would support a candidate who is in favor of tougher restrictions on immigration into this country.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No __ Comments about this question:

9. Immigrants should be given U.S. government assistance to preserve their customs and traditions.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No ___ Comments about this question:

10. Immigrants cost taxpayers too much by using government services like public education and medical services.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes ___No __ Comments about this question:

11. Immigration policy should grant access only to jobs Americans do <u>not</u> need.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No ___ Comments about this question:

12. Immigrants strengthen the U.S. economy because they provide low-cost labor and they spend money.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No __ Comments about this question:

13. Immigrants should be given U.S. government assistance to learn English so that they can be competitive in the job market.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No __ Comments about this question:

14. It is better if immigrants adapt and blend into our society.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No ___ Comments about this question:

15. Immigration hurts the U.S. more than it helps it.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes ___No __ Comments about this question:

16. Native-born Americans should have the benefit of more privileges than immigrants.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes ___No __ Comments about this question:

17. Thinking about the community where you live, recent immigrants have improved the community.

Was this question easy to read? Yes ___No __
Comments about this question:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Part I. Feedback on the Survey questions

(a) Was the layout of the survey confusing? (please check yes or no)   Yes ___ No ___

(b) Did you feel confident that your answers are completely anonymous?   Yes ___ No ___

(c) Did you feel comfortable being completely honest about your responses?   Yes ___ No ___

(d) Please write below any comments you would like to share about the survey layout, the survey content, or your feelings about this survey. Your feedback will help me improve the survey. Many thanks!

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

END OF PART I

Please detach Part I from the rest of the survey and submit it to me.

Thank you!!

Survey of Teacher Candidates' Attitudes

*As you complete this survey, please keep in mind the following questions, which you will answer at the **end** of Part II:*
(a)Is the layout of the survey confusing?
(b)As you are answering the questions, are you feeling confident that your answers are completely anonymous?
(c)As you are answering the questions, are you feeling comfortable being completely honest about your responses?
You will notice that next to each survey question below, there is a box asking you "was this question easy to read?" Basically, if you find that you have to read the question two times or more just to understand exactly what it is asking of you, then the question is NOT easy to read, and you would answer "no" by placing a check mark next to "no". Also in this box, you see the statement "comments about this question". Here, you can write any feedback you would like to share about an individual question on this survey.
Thank you!

Instructions: This survey has three parts. You have already completed Part I, and submitted it to me. At this time, please continue responding to parts II and III. Many thanks for taking the time to complete this survey! Your honest opinion and feedback are greatly appreciated!

Part II. Teacher Preparedness to work with L2 learners

***** L2 LEARNERS REFERS TO LEARNERS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE.

1. In my teacher education program, coursework related to teaching L2 learners was <u>in</u>sufficient to prepare me to teach these students in a mainstream classroom.

Was this question easy to read? Yes ___No __ Comments about this question:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

2. If offered, I would commit to additional preparation for teaching L2 learners.

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No __ Comments about this question:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

3. In my program, too much attention is given to preparing teachers to work with L2 learners.

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No Comments about this question:

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

4. I hope my L2 learners will learn <u>not</u> only English in my classroom, but also American customs and values so that they can blend in more easily into American society.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No ___
Comments about this question:

5. Since many L2 learners come from education systems that are <u>not</u> as advanced as the American education system, it is important for teachers to help L2 learners catch up.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No ___
Comments about this question:

6. The faster L2 learners Americanize, the easier it will be for them to assimilate.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes ___No __
Comments about this question:

7. I would support a government-funded program that teaches L2 learners their native language.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No ___
Comments about this question:

8. One of many responsibilities teachers have is to make sure that the L2 learners' native cultural identity is <u>not</u> lost as a result of classroom activity.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes ___No __
Comments about this question:

9. Teaching about foreign cultures may benefit L2 learners, but <u>not</u> all students in the mainstream class.

agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	disagree
☐	☐	☐	☐

Was this question easy to read? Yes __No __
Comments about this question:

Part II. Feedback on the Survey questions

(a) Was the layout of the survey confusing? (please check yes or no)   Yes ____No _____
(b) Did you feel confident that your answers are completely anonymous?   Yes ____No _____
(c) Did you feel comfortable being completely honest about your responses?   Yes ____No _____
(d) Please write below any comments you would like to share about the survey layout, the survey content, or your feelings about this survey. Your feedback will help me improve the survey. Many thanks!

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

END OF PART II

Please proceed directly to Part III. Many Thanks!

Part III. Demographic Information

1. **How old are you?** _____

2. **What is your gender?**

☐ female ☐ male

3. **Were you born in the U.S.?**

☐ yes ☐ no

4. **Where are you from? (city/state/country)** _____
(if you lived in more than one city, list the one where you have lived the longest)

5. **Do you consider yourself an immigrant to this country?**

☐ yes ☐ no

6. **How many languages do you speak?** _____

7. **How would you describe your experience with immigrants to the U.S.?**

☐ positive ☐ negative

8. **Is English your native language? (native language = mother-tongue, or first language)**

☐ yes ☐ no

9. **What is your ethnicity?**

☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
☐ Black non Hispanic
☐ White non Hispanic
☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American or Alaskan Native
☐ Other
☐ Do not wish to disclose

10. **How much university coursework have you completed?**

☐ some university courses
☐ bachelor's degree
☐ some masters courses
☐ masters degree
☐ some doctoral courses
☐ doctoral degree

<div align="center">

END OF PART III

You have completed the survey. What time is it now? _____

Please submit part II and III together to me. I sincerely appreciate your participation!!!

</div>

REFERENCES

Achinstein, B., & Barrett, A. (2003). *(Re)framing classroom contexts: How new teachers and mentors view diverse learners and challenges of practice*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (1999). Minority teacher recruitment and retention: A national imperative. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (2002). Educators' preparation for cultural and linguistic diversity: A call to action. Washington, DC: Author.

Apple, M.W., Gandin, L.A., & Hypolito, A.M. (2003). Paulo Freire. In J. A. Palmer, L. Bresler, & D.E. Cooper (Eds)., *Fifty modern thinkers on education: From Piaget to the present* (pp. 128-133). London and New York: Routledge.

Beaton, A.M., Tougas, F., Clayton, S., & Perrino, A. (2003). L'impact de valeurs conservatrices et de prejuges racistes sur l'ouverture a l'immigration. *Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement*, *35*(3), 229-237.

Bernat, E., & Gvozdenko, I. (2005). Beliefs about language learning: current knowledge, pedagogical implications, and new research directions. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, *9*(1), 1-21.

Bourdieu, P. (1999). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Britzman, D.P. (1986). Cultural myths in the making of a teacher: Biography and social structure in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(4), 442-456.

Byrnes, D. A., Kiger, G., & Manning, M.L. (1997). Teachers' attitudes about language diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *13*(6), 637-644.

Canagarajah, S. (2004). Subversive identities, pedagogical safe houses, and critical learning. In B. Norton and K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Carter, K. (1996). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 291-310). New York: Macmillan.

Carter, K., & Doyle, W. (1996). Personal narrative and life history in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T.Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 120-142). New York: Macmillan.

Cooney, T.J., Shealy, B.E., & Arvold, B. (1998). Conceptualizing belief structures of preservice secondary mathematics teachers. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 29(3), 306-333.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education Inc.

Darder, A., Baltodano, M. & Torres, R. (2003). Critical pedagogy: An introduction. In A.
Darder, M. Baltodano, & R.D. Torres (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*.
London: RoutledgeFalmer.

deHaan, M., & Elbers, E. (2005). Reshaping diversity in a local classroom:
Communication and identity issues in multicultural schools in the Netherlands.
Language and Communication, 25, 315-333.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York:
The New Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of
education.* New York: Free Press.

Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (1995). Intercultural communication in English language teacher
education. *ELT Journal*, *59*(2), 99-107.

Echevarria, J.A., Vogt, M.J., & Short, D.J. (2008). *Making content comprehensible for
English learners: The SIOP model.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Feimen-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L.S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.)
Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman.

Feimen-Nemser, S., & Remillard, J. (1996). Perspectives on learning to teach. In F.B.
Murray (Ed.), *The teacher educator's handbook* (pp. 63-91). San Francisco:
Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fenstermacher, G. (1979). A philosophical consideration of recent research on teacher
effectiveness. In L.S. Shulman (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 6, pp.
157-185). Itasca, IL: Peacock.

Ferguson, J. (2002). Global disconnect: Abjection and the aftermath of modernism. In

    J.X. Inda, and R. Rosaldo (Eds.), *The anthropology of globalization: A reader*.

    Oxford: Blackwell.

Franson, C. (1999). Mainstreaming learners of English as an additional language: The

    class teacher's perspective. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *12*(1), 59-71.

Freire, P. (1982). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* Hardmondsworth: Penguin.

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Fowler, F.J. (2002*). Survey research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage

    Publications.

Garcia, E.E. (1996). Preparing instructional professionals for linguistically and culturally

    diverse students. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of*

    research on teacher education (pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan.

Giroux, H.A. (1981). *Ideology, culture, and the process of schooling*. Philadelphia:

    Temple University Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*.

    London: Harper and Row.

Gollnick, D.M., & Chinn, P.C. (2002). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society*

    (6th ed.). New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Groulx, J.G. (2001). Changing preservice teacher perceptions of minority schools. *Urban*

    Education, *36*(1), 60-92.

Hacking, I. (1990). Making up people. In E. Stein (Ed.) *Forms of desire*, New York:

    Garland Publishing.

Hall, S. (1996). The west and the rest: Discourse and power. In S. Hall, D. Held, D. Hubert, and K. Thompson (Eds.), *Modernity: An introduction to modern societies.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Hofer, B.K. (2002). Epistemological world views of teachers: From beliefs to practice. *Issues in Education*, *8*(2), 167-173.

Hollihan, K.A. (2000). Making us do the things we ought to do: Constructing teacher identity in Alberta Normal schools. *Journal of Historical Sociology, 13*(2), 172-189.

Iddings, C. (2001). *On breaking ground: Second-language literacy and language learning through sociocultural practices*. Published Dissertation. US: UNLV.

Iddings, C. (2005). Linguistic access and participation: English language learners in an English-dominant community of practice. *Bilingual Research Journal, 29*(1), 165-183.

Inda, J.X.., & Rosaldo, R. (2002). Introduction: A world in motion. In J.X. Inda, and R. Rosaldo (Eds.), *The anthropology of globalization: A reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Johnson, K.E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, *10*(4), 439-452.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, *62*(2), 129-169.

Kainan, A. (1995). Forms and functions of storytelling by teachers. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, *11*(2), 163-172.

Karabenick, S.A., & Noda, P.A.C. (2004). Professional development implications of

   teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward English language learners. *Bilingual*

   Research Journal, *28*(1), 55-75.

Keppel G. 1991. *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook* (3rd ed.). Englewood

   Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Kramsch, C. (2001). *Language and culture.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American*

   Educational Research Journal, *32*(3), 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G.J. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A

   critical race theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 211-247.

Larkin, R.W. (1975). Social exchange in the elementary school classroom: the problem of

   teacher legitimation of social power. *Sociology of Education, 48*, 400-410.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*.

   New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago

   Press.

Lucas, T., & Grinberg, J. (2008). Responding to the linguistic reality of mainstream

   classrooms: Preparing all teachers to teach English language learners. In M.

   Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D.J. McIntyre, & K.E. Demers (Eds.),

   Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing

   contexts (3rd ed., pp. 606-636).

Mantero, M., & McVicker, P. (2006). The impact of experience and coursework: Perceptions of second language learners in the mainstream classroom. *Radical Pedagogy*, *8*(1), ISSN: 1524-6345.

McCombs, B.L. (2002). Knowing what teachers know a response to Schraw and Olafson's teachers' epistemological world views and educational practices. *Issues in Education*, *8*(2), 181-186.

McLaren, P. (2003). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McLaren, P. (2007). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McMillan, J. & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Merriam, S. B. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (Rev. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Milner, H.R. (2005). Stability and change in US prospective teachers' beliefs and decisions about diversity and learning to teach. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*, 767-786.

Norton, B. (2001). Non-participation, imagined communities and the language classroom. In M. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research.* Singapore: Pearson Education.

Ogbu, J.U., & Simons, H.D. (1998). Voluntary and involuntary minorities: A cultural-ecological theory of school performance with some implications for education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *29*(2), 155-188.

Oxford, R.L. (2001). 'The bleached bones of a story': Learners' constructions of
language teachers. In M. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language
learning: New directions in research.* Singapore: Pearson Education.

Pajares, M.F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy
construct. *Review of Educational Research*, *62*(3), 307-332.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction.* Mahwah, New
Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Pennycook, A. (2004). "Critical moments in a TESOL praxicum". In B. Norton and K.
Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning*. Cambridge, UK:
Cambridge University Press.

Pintrich, P.R. (1990). Implications of psychological research on student learning and
college teaching for teacher education. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of
research on teacher education* (pp. 826-857). New York: Macmillan.

Pohan, C. A. (1994). *The development and validation of "The Educators' Beliefs About
Diversity Scale."* Dissertation Abstracts International. Ann Arbor, MI: University
Microfilms, Inc.

Pohan, C.A., & Aguilar, T.E. (2001). Measuring educators' beliefs about diversity in
personal and professional contexts. *American Educational Research Journal*,
38(1), 159-182.

Reeves, J.R. (2006). Secondary teachers attitudes toward including English-language
learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research,*
99(3),131-142.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T.Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan.

Schraw, G., & Olafson, L. (2002). Teachers' epistemological world views and educational practices. *Issues in Education*, *8*(2), 99-148.

Spring, J. (1999). *Wheels in the head: Educational philosophies of authority, freedom, and culture from Socrates to human rights* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill College.

Spring, J. (2000). *The American school 1642-2000.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Spring, J.H., (2001). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Stuart, C., & Thurlow, D. (2000). Making it their own: Preservice teachers' experiences, beliefs, and classroom practices. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(2), 113-121.

Tsing, A. (2002). Conclusion: The global situation. In J.X. Inda, and R. Rosaldo (Eds.), *The anthropology of globalization: A reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tyack, D. (1995). Schooling and social diversity: Historical reflections. In W. D. Hawley & A. W. Jackson (Eds.), *Toward a common destiny* (pp. 3-38). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Walker, A., Shafer, J., Iiams, M. (2004). "Not in My Classroom": Teacher attitudes towards English language learners in the mainstream classroom. *Journal of Research and Practice*, *2*(1), 130-160.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *41*(2), 237-269.

Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of the research on

  learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry.

  Review of Educational Research, 68(2), 130-178.

Youngs, C. S., & Youngs, G. A. (2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes

  toward ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 97-120.

Zeichner, K.M., & Hoeft, K. (1996). Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In J.

  Sikula, T.Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher*

  education (pp. 525-547). New York: Macmillan.

VITA

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Midena Maria Sas

Home Address:
     7855 Mohican Canyon Street
     Las Vegas, Nevada 89113

Degrees:
     Bachelor of Education, 2000
     University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada

     Master of Science in Curriculum and Instruction, 2002
     University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Special Honors and Awards:
     Graduate Assistant Excellence in Teaching Award, 2006
     GREAT (Graduate Research Training) Assistantship, 2003

Publications:

Wang, J., Lin, E., Tanase, M. and Sas, M. (2008). Revisiting the Influence of Numerical Language Characteristics on Mathematics Achievement: Comparison among China, Romania, and U.S., *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 3(1). http://www.iejme.com

Presentations:

Tanase, M., Lin, E., Wang, J., & Sas, M. (April 2006). Comparing the influence of Chinese and American numerical language characteristics on math achievement. Presentation at AERA, San Francisco, California.

Tanase, M., Sas, M., Lin, E., & Wang, J. (March 2006). Comparing the influence of Chinese, Romanian and American numerical language characteristics on math achievement. Presentation at the Comparative and International Education Society, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Sas, M., & Tanase, M. (2005). "Numerical language characteristics and math achievement". Presentation at the Southern Nevada CATESOL Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Odell, S.J., Kyles, C., & Sas, M. (2004). "ATE standards for teacher educators: A guide for doctoral students using e-portfolios". Panel Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Teacher Educators, Dallas, Texas.

Gallavan, N., Brantley, D., Cimpoeru, C., Colbrook, T., Garcia, J., Kyles, C., Lin, E., Mull, K., Pollak, J., Richards, D., Sas, M., & VanderVeldt, M. (2004). "Becoming a teacher educator: Hearing voices of eight teacher educator interns and their mentors". Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Teacher Educators, Dallas, Texas.

Gallavan, N., Brantley, D., Cimpoeru, C., Colbrook, T., Garcia, J., Kyles, C., Mull, K., Richards, D., Sas, M., & VanderVeldt, M. (2003). "Hearing the voices of eight teacher educator interns". Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Teacher Educators, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Sas, M. (2003). "Teaching languages: Lessons from abroad". Presentation at the Southern Nevada CATESOL Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Sas, M. (2002). "Reading anxiety's effects on incidental vocabulary acquisition: Are culturally relevant texts exempt?". Presentation at the Southern Nevada CATESOL Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Dissertation Title: Teacher Candidates' Attitudes toward Immigration and Teaching Learners of English as a Second Language

Disseration Examination Committee:
    Chairperson, Dr. Sandra Odell, Ph.D.
    Chairperson, Dr. Steven McCafferty, Ph.D.
    Committee Member, Dr. John Butcher, Ph.D.
    Graduate Faculty Representative, Dr. Kathleen Krach, Ph.D.