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Students who speak languages other than English comprise a growing population in U.S. schools. As a result, many general education teachers find English language learners (ELLs) in their mainstream classrooms. However, they are often inadequately prepared to work with culturally and linguistically diverse students, resulting in a need for better ELL preparation of mainstream teachers.

Teacher self-efficacy beliefs (TSEB), or teacher perceptions of their confidence and preparedness, can provide important insights relevant to teacher professional development and preparation in teacher education programs. TSEB is defined as a self-assessment of the competence to perform a specific task within a certain context, or a judgement of the ability to perform a desired activity.

Recognizing the importance of investigating TSEB, this dissertation examines elementary preservice teachers and their preparation to work with ELLs through microteaching activities. Two research questions guided this study: 1) What are the self-efficacy beliefs of preservice teachers about teaching ELLs before and after microteaching experiences, and 2) how do four preservice teachers construct their self-efficacy beliefs regarding teaching ELLs through microteaching experiences?
The data—consisting of surveys (n=55), individual interviews with preservice teachers (n=4), classroom observations and lesson plans—were analyzed with the use of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Findings indicated that the self-efficacy beliefs of preservice teachers were enhanced after having participated in ESL microteaching experiences. However, the data also revealed that the preservice teachers still felt some anxiety and emotional concerns about teaching ELLs. Moreover, their self-efficacy beliefs varied by ELL characteristics (situational factors) and setting (contextual factors). Results further revealed that three factors shaped the construction of TSEB, namely ELL-related knowledge from course work, field experiences working with ELLs, personal and professional exposure to linguistic and cultural diversity, including their own language learning experiences.

Inquiries about the influence of purposeful field placements and ESL microteaching experiences for teacher candidates in settings with culturally and linguistically diverse students can yield valuable insights. Future studies of teacher preparation coursework for preservice teachers that embed linguistically responsive theories and practices can inform teacher candidates as they strive to enhance their preparation and self-efficacy beliefs for ELLs.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

If I were an English language learner, I’d want to be in a class where the
teacher put herself in my shoes, imagined the challenges I faced, and did
something concrete to help me find my way.

—Carol Ann Tomlinson

Background to the Problem: Mainstream Teacher Preparation Gap

Over the past few decades, schools in the United States have become more
culturally and linguistically diverse. According to the National Center for Education
Statistics, about 4.6 million English Language Learners (ELLs) are currently enrolled in
public K-12 schools (Kena, Hussar, McFarland, de Brey, Musu-Gillette, Wang, &
estimated that by 2030, ELLs will make up 40 percent of the entire K-12 population.
About 80 percent of ELLs are placed in K-5 levels (Samson, & Collins, 2012).

Unfortunately, many culturally and linguistically diverse students—ELLs in
particular—perform at a lower level than that their non-ELL peers (Ballantyne,
Sanderman, & Levy, 2008; Kena et al., 2016). The most recent results from the National
Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) show that in 2017, the achievement gap
between non-ELL and ELL students was 37 points at the fourth grade level and 43
points at the 8th-grade level (NAEP, 2017). Based on statistics from five states with
large population of ELLs (California, Florida, Massachusetts, New York, and Texas),
only a very small proportion of ELLs are able to achieve at or above level in reading in
the fourth grade (Samson, & Collins, 2012).

Because the ELL population and ELL enrollment in K-12 schools outpace total
numbers of bilingual and ESL programs nationwide, many districts and schools
currently place ELLs in mainstream classrooms (Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, & Driscoll, 2005). As a result, mainstream teachers are expected to make appropriate accommodations for their ELLs often without the support of a specialist ESL or bilingual teacher (Gándara & Santibañez, 2016).

Although a large population of teachers already have students of diverse backgrounds in their own mainstream classrooms, only a few teachers have received proper ESL teacher education and training in terms of how to best guide ELLs towards academic achievement (Gándara & Santibañez, 2016; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008). Previous research has shown that mainstream teachers are not well prepared to teach and work with ELLs (Durgunoğlu & Hughes, 2010; Walker, Shafer, & Iiams, 2004). According to NCELA (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition), it is reported that 1) only 29% of teachers of ELLs have the training to teach ELLs effectively, 2) only 20 states in U.S. require that all teachers have training in working with ELLs, 3) less than one out of six colleges offer preservice teacher preparation, including training on teaching ELLs and working with ELLs, and 4) only 26% of teachers have had training related to ELLs in their professional development (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008, p. 9).

Since many teachers in the U.S. are inadequately prepared to work with culturally and linguistically diverse students, there is a need for better preparation of mainstream teachers. As such, teacher education programs need to find ways to better address ELL-specific knowledge and skills so that teacher candidates have appropriate tools and knowledge to effectively teach ELLs in their future mainstream classrooms.
Teacher Self-Efficacy in Teacher Preparation

This study implements teacher self-efficacy beliefs (TSEB) as a theoretical lens to understand teacher preparation for ELLs. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007) defined TSEB as “a self-assessment of the competence to perform a specific task within a certain context, or a judgement of the ability to perform a desired activity” (p. 9). In other words, when teachers are familiar with certain teaching tasks, their TSEB tends to be higher and stronger as it closely corresponds to the required teaching task and performance (Dellinger et al., 2008). When certain teaching tasks are unfamiliar, teachers recall prior experiences that are similar to the required task to measure their TSEB in relation to the new teaching requirements (Dellinger et al., 2008).

Research suggests that if a teacher possesses a strong sense of self-efficacy, he or she will put greater effort into their teaching performance and will ultimately attain better teaching practices (Zee & Koomen, 2016). In contrast, if a teacher possesses a weak sense of self-efficacy, his or her performance can lead to less effort put forward in teaching and, ultimately, reduced teacher competency (Zee & Koomen, 2016). TSEB has been associated with improved teacher psychological well-being in terms of higher levels of job satisfaction and lower levels of stress (Collie, Klassen & Chiu, 2011). TSEB has also been associated with higher quality of classroom practices, such as planning and organization, teachers' efforts, aspirations, and investment in teaching (Collie et al., 2011).

In a synthesis of research findings, Protheroe (2008) concludes that efficacious teachers who have high levels of TSEB are “1) more open to new ideas and are more willing to experiment with new methods to better meet the needs of their students; 2) more persistent and resilient when things do not go smoothly; 3) less critical of students
when they make errors; and 4) less inclined to refer a difficult student to special education” (p. 43).

**Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs Based on Constructivism**

While much work on TSE has taken a social cognitive perspective, and has been investigated using quantitative research methodologies, more recent work in this area has considered TSEB through the lens of constructivism. In a constructivist framework, teachers are active learners while they evaluate the complexity of the teaching task and analyze what skills and knowledge are required to succeed in specific teaching tasks (Wyatt, 2013; 2015). This framework indicates that constructing TSEB is viewed as a complex process since teachers not only analyze required tasks in a specific teaching context, but teachers also consider factors such as the availability of teaching resources and the characteristics of their students (Dellinger, Bobbett, Oliver, & Ellett, 2008).

In line with this perspective, this study defines TSEB as situational, context-dependent and varying across subject matter and teaching tasks (Faez & Valeo, 2012; Siwatu, 2007). Preservice teachers construct their TSEB based on a particular group of students as well as specific teaching tasks (Wheatley, 2002; 2005). For instance, Faez and Valeo (2012) examined teacher education with novice teachers of ESOL (English to Speakers of Other Languages) through survey and follow-up interviews. Overall, study findings showed their sense of self-efficacy within certain teaching expectations was task-specific and highly situated. For example, preservice teachers showed strong confidence about teaching in a suburban school context compared to an urban school context. The results also highlight that teacher-perceived self-efficacy cannot be easily generalized when it comes to teaching culturally and diverse students, such as ELLs. Thus, these findings suggest that TSE beliefs are not static and may fluctuate across
Factors that shape teacher self-efficacy. Previous studies have explored factors that can contribute to teacher self-efficacy based on Bandura’s four sources of self-efficacy expectations (Lamorey & Wilcox, 2005). The four sources proposed are 1) enactive mastery, 2) vicarious modeling, 3) social (verbal) persuasion, and 4) emotional arousal. When applying these sources to teacher self-efficacy, it can be interpreted as TSE can be shaped by (a) individual teacher’s past positive teaching experiences in mastering a specific teaching task; (b) observation of co-teachers’ successful teaching experiences through modeling; (c) others’ positive encouragement and reinforcement through social and verbal discussions; and (d) individual mental states, such as teaching anxiety, can contribute to individual teacher’s TSE beliefs (Lamorey & Wilcox, 2005).

Among the four sources, Bandura (1997) stated that PSTs’ mastery experience is the most important because teachers who have previous successful teaching experiences can be more efficacious in completing similar teaching tasks than those who have not had success in previous teaching experiences. Another source that contributes to TSE is learning from peers’ modeled behavior. When teachers observe co-teachers successfully completing a teaching task, they feel more confident in completing a similar task.

The third source that affects TSE is social and verbal interactions with others. Teachers can be persuaded to believe that they can develop necessary skills to
successfully complete a teaching task through others’ positive feedback and reinforcement. The fourth source that affects TSE is teachers’ emotional and physiological status. To be specific, a teacher who expects to fail at a certain teaching task or finds the task too demanding is likely to experience emotional anxiety. If he or she constantly experiences teaching anxiety with a particular group of students, it can affect and likely weaken their teacher self-efficacy. To conclude, these four sources are all interconnected and can contribute to teachers’ perceived ability to perform specific teaching tasks. It is therefore important to encourage teachers when seeking to promote individual teaching performance with TSE.

**Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Preservice Teacher Preparation for ELLs**

When considering teacher self-efficacy in working with ELLs, Gandara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll (2005) argue that “good ELL teachers . . . have a sense of self-confidence regarding their ability to teach ELL students, a finding that echoes a broader body of research on teacher efficacy in general and its effect on student achievement” (p. 3). Research suggests that teacher self-efficacy in relation to teaching ELLs is promoted through teacher preparation coursework and professional development (Gandara et al., 2005; Paneque & Barbetta, 2006; Siwatu, 2011).

Despite the importance and impact of TSEB, only a handful of studies have considered ELL preservice teacher preparation (Butler, 2016; Durgunoğlu & Hughes, 2010). These studies highlight that preparing preservice teachers with an understanding of ELLs’ linguistic and cultural differences, as well as actual tools and strategies, can contribute to their TSE(B) for ELLs (Durgunoğlu & Hughes, 2010; Paneque & Barbetta, 2006). The purpose of this study is to address this gap.
Regarding the relationship between teacher content knowledge and TSEB, teacher educators have highlighted the importance of promoting PSTs’ knowledge of ELLs’ second language acquisition and literacy (de Jong, Harper, & Coady, 2013; Lucas et al., 2008; Sugimoto, Carter, & Stoehr, 2017). Previous scholars have also argued the importance of preparing preservice teachers with necessary pedagogical skills and accommodations for ELLs (Lucas et al., 2008; Sugimoto et al., 2007).

**Microteaching in Teacher Education Programs**

Microteaching activities exemplify one way that teacher education programs have responded to the need for facilitating preservice teachers’ effective teaching skills and their capability to translate those skills to their teaching (Amobi & Irwin, 2012). Microteaching experiences provide preservice teachers with a clear connection between theory and practice and help them improve their pedagogical skills regarding lesson planning, implementation, and evaluation (Saban, & Çoklar, 2013). As such, microteaching activities in teacher education can provide an opportunity for preservice teachers to not only critically reflect on what they learn from campus coursework, such as teacher education courses, but also create a venue to apply their knowledge and pedagogical skills through microteaching practices (Ismail, 2011; Payant, 2014).

For instance, Ismail (2011) showed that the implementation of microteaching was a positive influence on preservice English teachers’ self-efficacy in the forms of increasing their awareness and exposing views of their own teaching competencies. Payant (2014) also showed that the microteaching experience was an effective tool for helping PSTs to promote their mastery experience, which was one of the key factors of self-efficacy expectations.
Study Epistemology

This study is guided by constructivism, which views knowledge as a human construction (Creswell, 2012). Constructivists seek to obtain knowledge based on an individual’s experiences, their understanding, as well as their own meaning-making process (Ashworth, 2000). As such, one person’s experiences, background knowledge, and understanding of certain issues could be different from that of another person’s (Ashworth, 2000).

This dissertation uses constructivism to examine how four preservice teachers construct self-efficacy beliefs to teach and work with ELLs. From a constructivist perspective, individual preservice teachers construct their own TSEB as they interact with the people, objects, and events of their world. The study aims to examine the complexity of individual preservice teachers’ sense-making regarding teacher self-efficacy beliefs with a particular focus on their response to microteaching activities.

Although many studies have been conducted to understand the role of TSEB in preparing future teachers of science and math, less attention has been paid to how mainstream teachers’ TSEB in relation to ELLs can contribute to their preparation for teaching ELLs in teacher education programs. In addition, we do not know much about how mainstream teachers construct their TSEB and which factors contribute to shaping their TSEB in working with ELLs in teacher education programs. To better prepare preservice teachers for ELLs, this paper examines preservice TSEB related to their participation in ESL microteaching activities by answering two questions.

Q1: What are the self-efficacy beliefs of preservice teachers about teaching ELLs before and after microteaching experiences?
Q2: How do four preservice teachers construct their self-efficacy beliefs regarding teaching ELLs through microteaching experiences?

**Research Design**

This research implemented a multiple case study design. A case in this study was defined as an individual preservice teacher who was enrolled in a preparation course for ELLs in the teacher education program. Four individual preservice teachers, and so four cases, were focal study participants. Data collection consisted of: (1) two surveys: a pre-survey (n=30) and a post-survey (n=25) before and after microteaching experiences and (2) four foci-participants’ in-depth interviews (two interviews each, n=4). Thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) was used for data analysis.

**Value of the Study**

The findings from this research will increase teacher educators understanding of mainstream preservice teachers. It is important to understand preservice teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs with the increasing number of culturally and linguistically diverse students, and the urgent need for teacher preparation to meet the diverse needs of ELLs. This study will help researchers understand how elementary preservice teachers reflect upon their knowledge and practice related to teaching ELLs, and the role that microteaching experiences play in enhancing their teaching self-efficacy beliefs. This study will contribute to teacher preparation programs in effectively preparing preservice teachers for their future mainstream classrooms. As a result, this study can contribute to teacher preparation programs for teaching the growing numbers of culturally and linguistically diverse students.
Limitations of the Study

Although findings from this dissertation contribute to the field of knowledge and practice related to preservice teacher preparation and self-efficacy beliefs in serving ELLs, there are limitations to this study that should be addressed. First, participants from this study were preservice teachers at one public university in Florida. Since ESOL endorsement requirements in teacher education programs vary from university to university and state to state, findings related to teachers’ preparatory coursework for ELLs and ESOL field experiences at the current university may differ from findings in other programs. Larger scale studies may provide additional data and insights related to this field.

Another possible limitation of this dissertation may relate to the fact that all preservice teachers spoke Spanish as a second language and only one focal teacher expressed her ability to fully demonstrate her Spanish skill. Findings related to teachers’ use of their students’ home languages and cultures within their classroom practices may have differed if a wider range of language backgrounds had been represented among the ELL students enrolled in these teachers’ classrooms.

It should also be noted that the survey used for this dissertation was modified by the researcher. While the surveys administered to participants included questions about components of their teacher self-efficacy beliefs in teaching ELLs through microteaching experiences, questions about preparatory teacher education programs and reflections about their learning, questions related to participants’ level of achievement and personal effort during their preparation coursework were not asked. It is possible that questions that were left out may have yielded additional findings and suggestions related to
teachers’ sense of preparedness and self-confidence in teaching and working with ELLs.

Lastly, one limitation from survey results was the amount of attribution from the pre-survey to the post-survey. In total, five participants failed to complete the post-survey. The attrition issue in this research could have been mitigated by the use of student codes or names, but the blind design of the survey experiment provided students anonymity to answer honestly without being judged.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the literature related to
1) research on definitions and the theoretical understanding of teacher self-efficacy
(beliefs), 2) research on the impact of TSE(B) on teaching and learning 3) research on
factors that shape and enhance TSE(B), and 4) research on TSE(B) in relation to ELLs.
Based on this review, a theoretical model is proposed to enhance mainstream
preservice teachers’ self-efficacy for teaching and working with English language
learners.

Context of the Study

Over the past few decades, schools in the United States have become more
culturally and linguistically diverse. However, many culturally and linguistically diverse
students–ELLs in particular–obtain lower levels of achievement compared to their non-
ELL peers (Ballantyne et al., 2008; Gándara & Santibañez, 2016; Kena et al., 2016;
Samson & Collins, 2012). The most recent results from the National Assessment of
Educational Progress show that in all previous assessment years since 1998, reading
scale scores for non-ELL fourth and eighth graders were higher than their ELL peers’
scores. In 2017, the achievement gap between non-ELL and ELL students was 37
points at the fourth-grade level and 43 points at the eighth-grade level (NAEP, 2017).
These continued patterns of underachievement have led to an urgent call to better
prepare elementary preservice teachers to work with ELLs (Ballantyne et al., 2008;
López, Scanlan, and Gundrum (2013) examined the degree to which the requirements in each state’s teacher education programs reflect current theory and practice for teachers of ELLs in their coursework, and how these requirements in turn are related to the 4th grade Hispanic ELL’s reading outcomes on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). They found that required coursework on English language development and assessment were positively related to Hispanic ELLs' reading outcomes. Moreover, states that require both specialist certification, and all teachers to have some level of training to meet the needs of ELLs, also tend to have higher levels of achievement than states that do not have these requirements. The authors concluded that there is evidence that teachers’ grades in preservice teacher preparation programs are more strongly related to their students’ success levels than the teacher certification exams that were designed to hold teacher preparation programs accountable.

While some states require specific coursework (i.e., Arizona, California, Florida, Pennsylvania, and New York) and others make a general reference to the special needs of ELLs (17 states), several states (15) have no requirement whatsoever (Samson & Collins, 2012). Previous studies have shown that few teachers receive proper ESL teacher education and training in terms of how to best help and support ELLs to achieve academic success (Gándara & Santibañez, 2016). O’Neal, Ringler, and Rodriguez (2008) suggest that a majority of mainstream teachers do not feel prepared to teach ELLs, indicating that only 14% of teachers had taken a course in language acquisition, and only half of the teachers had received their teaching certification.
A lack of professional development and teacher preparatory coursework, including strategies for teaching ELLs, negatively impacts and results in a lack of preparedness for teaching ELLs. Some surveys on mainstream teachers’ perceptions of preparedness also indicate that these teachers are not adequately prepared to teach and work with ELLs. For example, according to the NCES (National Center for Education Statistics) survey, only 27% of teachers responded that they were “very well prepared” to meet the needs of ELLs, while 12% reported that they were “not at all prepared” (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). Reeves (2006) conducted a survey with 279 teachers and she found that 81.7% of teachers believed that they did not have adequate training to work effectively with ELLs, and 53% wanted more preparation.

Since many teachers in the U.S. are inadequately prepared to work with ELLs, there is a need for better ELL preparation of mainstream teachers. As such, teacher education programs need to find ways to better address ELL-specific knowledge and skills so that preservice teachers have appropriate tools and knowledge to effectively teach ELLs in their future mainstream classrooms.

**Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs**

To respond to the challenge of general teacher education preparation for ELLs, this dissertation explores how preservice teachers (PSTs) construct their self-efficacy beliefs (TSEB) through microteaching experiences. This section first presents a historical review on the conceptualization of TSEB, including chronological history, development, and common critiques of traditional definitions, followed by current views of TSEB.
**Defining self-efficacy: Historical perspectives**

Self-efficacy theory comes from the field of psychology and is based on social cognitive theory. Early scholars have explained that one’s self-efficacy operates as a key factor in a generative system of human competence (Bandura, 1997). Previous research supports the claim that self-efficacy is an important influence on human achievement in a variety of settings (Bandura, 1997). In earlier research on self-efficacy theory, the concept has been defined as static and fixed, which means that if one has higher self-efficacy, he or she can be successful in required tasks.

In the context of education, the concept of self-efficacy has been implemented differently and more developed. Teacher self-efficacy has been applied to teaching and teachers because it can be an influential factor on their educational practices and outcomes (Hoy & Spero, 2005). Although previously, scholars who studied TSEB research supported the idea of the fixed nature of TSEB, this concept has gradually changed. More recently, researchers have defined the nature of TSEB as situational and context-dependent based on Constructivism. These scholars have noted the dynamic nature of the TSEB, which indicates that teachers evaluate their own TSEB while considering several factors and variables, including different teaching tasks, school contexts, and types of students.

Rotter’s (1966) concept of "locus of control" has been suggested as one of the earliest attempts to understand one’s self-efficacy. Rotter defined locus of control as “an individual's perception about the underlying main causes of events in his/her life” (Neill, 2005, pp. 1-2). He used this concept to explain that individuals come to hold beliefs about what influences their actions. In his research, he developed a scale to examine peoples’ tendencies toward internal control (a situation or event within their control)
versus external control (a situation or event that people had no control over what would happen). In line with this concept, the author noted that one’s self-efficacy is the fundamental factor in decision making whether he or she progresses, or does not progress at all (Neill, 2005).

Since Rotter’s (1966) research was published, studies have expanded the literature on the area of self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Albert Bandura, a leading scholar in the field, broadened the scope of self-efficacy research and established a theory that is applicable to teachers and teaching. He argued that self-efficacy is a system that controls most personal activity, including appropriate use of professional knowledge and skills.

According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy refers to “individuals’ beliefs about their capabilities to successfully carry out a particular course of action” (p.3). In other words, self-efficacy is a person’s belief in his or her ability to succeed in a particular situation. He argued that when people perceive themselves as efficacious at certain tasks, they are generally able to handle tasks with a positive attitude. On the other hand, when people perceive themselves as less efficacious in certain tasks, they are fearful and try to avoid dealing with certain tasks or situations (Bandura, 1986). Thus, he suggested that people who have a high level of self-efficacy can develop a resiliency where they learn to persevere and give a sustained effort with difficult tasks (Bandura, 1997).

In order to understand what factors contribute to one’s self-efficacy, Bandura (1997) proposed four sources of self-efficacy expectations. These are 1) enactive mastery, 2) vicarious modeling, 3) social (verbal) persuasion, and 4) emotional arousal.
These sources are interpreted as self-efficacy that can be shaped by (a) a person’s own past positive or negative experience in mastering a specific task; (b) observation of others’ success or failure through modeling; (c) others’ feedback, such as encouragement through social (verbal) interactions; and (d) individuals’ mental states, such as fear or anxiety level, in judging their self-efficacy (Lamorey & Wilcox, 2005).

When applying these sources to understanding teacher self-efficacy, a teacher’s mastery experience is considered the most powerful influence as it provides authentic evidence of teacher’s teaching performance in a specific situation (Mulholland & Wallace, 2001). In other words, successful teaching performance by a teacher leads to an increase in his or her own TSE, while a failure creates a decrease in TSE. As teachers accumulate mastery experiences that lead to increasing TSE, they can apply their memories and interpretations to similar teaching situations (Lamorey & Wilcox, 2005).

Observing other teachers’ successful teaching performance is another factor that influences TSE. According to Bandura (1997), "Seeing people similar to oneself succeed by sustained effort raises observers' beliefs that they too possess the capabilities to master comparable activities to succeed" (pp. 3-4). As such, teachers can be persuaded to believe that they have the skills and capabilities to succeed due to social and verbal encouragement from others. Thus, this positive feedback and reinforcement helps teachers focus on giving their best effort to the task at hand. Teachers’ emotional status to certain teaching tasks also plays a role that contribute to TSE. This is because emotional states and stress levels can influence how a teacher feels about their personal teaching abilities in a particular situation. For instance, if a
teacher becomes extremely nervous before teaching certain groups of students, then he or she may develop a weak sense of TSE in teaching and working with those students.

**Critiques of TSE(B) conceptualization**

Despite the importance of the concept of Bandura's efficacious teachers (Chesnut & Burley, 2015), some scholars have critiqued traditional conceptualizations and simplistic relationships that assume that teachers with high self-efficacy are effective teachers in the field (Labone, 2004). The most salient critiques of TSEB were: 1) the lack of consideration about the specific teaching tasks as well as contexts and 2) the lack of consideration on teachers’ processes in shaping and constructing TSEB development (Labone, 2004).

The first critique was that researchers have rarely focused on understanding TSE(B) in specific contexts. Although TSEB is task-specific and context-dependent, some studies are continuously quantified to measure global or general TSEB to demonstrate its effectiveness across the field (Siwatu, 2007). This phenomenon unfortunately prevented researchers and teacher educators from understanding and examining which specific TSEB items needed adjustments or improvement and which problems needed to be addressed (Wheatley, 2005).

In their study published in 1998, Tschannen-Moran et al. expand on Bandura’s argument and note the cyclical nature of teacher efficacy. They defined TSE (Teacher Self-Efficacy) as a teacher’s “judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated” (p. 203). The underpinning of TSE is conceptualized as an individual teacher's belief in his or her ability to organize and execute a series of actions.
that are required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2004).

Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) explained that the major influences of TSE are assumed to be the teacher's analysis and interpretation of the four sources of information about self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986; 1997). The authors further explained that teachers may not feel equally efficacious in all teaching contexts and situations, which implies that teachers can feel more or less efficacious in teaching particular subjects to certain students in specific settings. This argument indicates that teachers can be expected to feel more or less efficacious under different circumstances and contexts. Therefore, in an effort for teachers to consider their TSEB judgment, it is necessary to measure one’s strength and weakness in relation to the requirements of the task at hand.
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Figure 2-1. The Cyclical Nature of Teacher Efficacy. Adapted from Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy (1998).
In an effort to allow teachers to measure their own TSE, this conceptual model was divided into two critical dimensions. Firstly, while analyzing a teaching task and its context, teachers will consider sources available that facilitate learning. Secondly, to assess self-perceptions of teaching competence, teachers evaluate personal capabilities, such as teaching skills, knowledge, strategies, or personally traits in the particular teaching context. Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) explained that the interaction between these two components leads to building teacher’s own self-efficacy beliefs, which eventually impacts the consequences of teacher efficacy. The consequences include: setting learning goals, high expectations for students, and putting more effort and resilience toward their teaching. Through this process, the authors argued that TSEB can ultimately result in teachers’ performance outcomes, which includes teacher commitment, implementation of new strategies, willing to take risks, and students’ academic achievement.

After proposing this conceptual model, Tschannen-Moran and colleagues (2001) modified pre-existing TSE measurements and then created a new scale called TSES (Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale). They noted that one must understand individual teacher’s personal teaching efficacy, which is a reflection of the teacher’s “confidence to develop strategies for overcoming obstacles to student learning” (p. 223). They also noted that a teacher’s perceived ability is the combination of the individual’s analysis of the teaching task and his/her own assessment of perceived competence. Since the initial TSES was published, many researchers have implemented and modified this scale to fit in their own research contexts (Collie et al., 2011).
The second critique about traditional conceptualizations of TSE(B) was that teachers’ complex processes and construction of TSEB, as well as which factors contribute to shaping TSEB, were not fully examined or explained. (Wheatley, 2002; 2005). For instance, a causal link between positive TSEB and teacher effectiveness may not fully capture and explain how teachers shape and enhance their TSEB in an effort to overcome their low self-efficacy to become effective teachers (Henson, 2002).

Studies have shown that several factors lead to constructing teacher’s own self-efficacy beliefs, which eventually impact the consequences of TSEB (Faez & Valeo, 2012; Siwatu, 2011). Such factors include setting learning goals, high expectations for students, and putting more effort and resilience toward teaching (Tschannen-Moran et al., 2007). This is because teachers will assess self-perceptions of teaching competence and personal capabilities, such as teaching skills, knowledge, strategies, or personally traits in the particular teaching context.

Drawing on data from observations and interviews, Wyatt (2013) presented a case study of one teacher’s efforts to overcome low self-efficacy beliefs in teaching English to young learners in a Middle Eastern context. This study revealed the importance of examining processes of TSEB, highlighting how the teacher drew reflectively upon her experiences to develop deeper practical knowledge and stronger self-efficacy beliefs with regard to the particular task. The author argued that it is necessary to understand the task-specific nature of TSEB and the teacher's potential for transformation through self-doubt and reflection.

Wheatley (2002) pointed out that doubting one’s self-efficacy beliefs can be highly beneficial as these doubts are central to teacher reflection, learning, and growth.
As a result, as Henson (2002) argued, “To fully understand the relationships between the sources of efficacy information, the meaning teachers attach to this information, and any ultimate change in their efficacy beliefs, in-depth study of teachers is necessary” (p. 147).

Current views on TSEB

Although TSE and TSEB are often used interchangeably in the pre-existing literature, researchers recently have especially focused their interests in teacher self-efficacy “beliefs” because they perceive that understanding teacher beliefs allows for better examination of an individual teacher’s current teaching situation in relation to a specific school, classroom, and students (Caprara et al., 2003; Neill, 2005). Although previous research had not made a clear distinction or consensus regarding the two terminologies, recent scholars have noted that the conventional TSE research tended to focus on teachers’ general teacher efficacy without considering several contextual factors in the education field. However, TSEB research specifically focused on an individual teacher’s belief in regards to specific teaching context and situation as well as considering school contexts, including classroom environments and various types of students in the education field (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

More recently, scholars have moved away from static definitions of TSEB and put more attention to the role of specific teaching contexts, teaching tasks, and the complex processes of TSE(B) development (Wyatt 2013; 2015). For instance, Wyatt (2015) argued that in an effort to understand the complex process of TSEB construction, teachers’ critical reflection is an important factor that shapes and enhances TSEB in teacher education programs. For the purpose of this study, TSEB is conceptualized as dynamic and varied based on situational variables and contextual variables. In an effort
to better understand the dynamic nature of TSEB, it is defined as a self-assessment of the competence to perform a specific task within a certain context, or a judgement of the ability to perform a desired activity (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

**Research on the Impact of TSEB**

This section provides an overview of the literature related to how enhanced TSEB results in positive outcomes for teachers and students. Zee and Koomen (2016) synthesized research on the impact of TSEB. Their review shows positive links between TSEB and 1) teachers’ implementation of new teaching strategies, 2) teachers’ psychological well-being, and 3) students’ academic achievement and adjustment in classrooms.

**TSEB and implementation of new instructional strategies**

TSEB is said to play a role in teachers’ implementation of new teaching strategies presented through professional development (Dunn, Airola, Lo, & Garrison, 2013). Researchers examining TSEB toward the implementation of new instructional practices have frequently found teachers’ self-efficacy was the powerful influence (Cantrell & Hughes, 2008; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009).

For instance, Cantrell and Hughes (2008) explored the relationship between TSEB and implementation of a content literacy approach. Among sixth and ninth-grade teachers, this study investigated the effects of year-long professional development with coaching on TSE for teaching literacy. A teacher survey was used to measure TSE before and after participation during professional development. In addition, classroom observations were used to explore teachers’ implementation of content literacy practices. Survey results indicated significant improvements in teachers’ personal and general efficacy for literacy teaching. Teachers who demonstrated higher TSEB were
more likely to implement the recommended content literacy practices. Teacher interviews indicated that providing professional development, including providing specific content materials, was an important factor in the development of TSEB in terms of implementation of innovative content literacy strategies.

Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) implemented the quasi-experimental study to examine teacher self-efficacy beliefs. Study participants were primary teachers (N=93) in nine schools who completed surveys of their TSEB as well as level of implementation of a new teaching strategy for beginning readers. The survey compared before and after participating in professional development. Survey results indicated that the professional development that supported teachers’ mastery experiences through follow-up coaching had the strongest effect on TSEB for reading instruction as well as for implementation of the new strategy. On the contrary, teachers who received no professional development, such as no follow-up coaching, reported low self-efficacy for reading instruction in terms of implementing new teaching strategies.

Research has found that TSEB can positively affect teacher practice and ability to improve their instruction through professional development (Dunn et al., 2013). As such, in order for teachers to promote their TSEB regarding willingness to improve their instruction, it is imperative that professional development focus particularly on instructional strategies so that teachers are supported throughout the process to increase their TSEB (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Previous studies have concluded that providing professional development with content materials positively influenced TSEB. In turn, this helped PSTs to implement new instructional strategies.
TSEB and teachers’ well-being and burnout

Previous research has found that TSEB is related to teacher job satisfaction with their choice of profession and their competence (Zee & Koomen, 2016). Efficacious teachers have been found to be more satisfied with their job and relationships than their less efficacious counterparts (Collie et al., 2012).

For example, Bogler (2001) examined the effects of teachers’ perceptions about their job satisfaction. A quantitative questionnaire using Likert-type scales was administered to 745 teachers in Israeli schools. Teachers who reported feeling highly or very satisfied in their job had high sense of TSEB and were more likely to be confident and had feeling of success. A similar finding was reported by Collie and colleagues (2012). They found that teachers’ sense of teaching efficacy was directly related to their sense of job satisfaction. In other words, teachers’ perceived stress related to workload and sense of teaching efficacy were directly related to sense of job satisfaction.

Aloe, Amo, and Shanahan (2014) examined classroom management self-efficacy (CMSE) in relation to teacher burnout and found that teachers with higher levels of CMSE were less likely to experience burnout. In other words, teachers with higher levels of burnout, as well as teachers with lower levels of self-efficacy, are more likely to leave the profession. These findings suggest that burnout is a pervasive problem throughout the profession.

These studies have suggested that TSEB affects and teachers’ commitment to school and their job satisfaction (Klassen & Chiu, 2011). Jepson and Forrest (2006) also showed that teachers with greater work-related stress had lower job satisfaction, less commitment to teaching, and a stronger desire to quit teaching. Teachers’ stress and burnout is a major contributor to teachers’ overall stress, but promoting self-efficacy has
been found to mediate the relationship between teachers’ stress and negative outcomes (Klassen & Chiu, 2011).

**TSEB and student academic achievement**

Some scholars state that teachers who have a high level of self-efficacy regarding their ability to teach promote student learning achievement (Bray-Clark & Bates, 2003). The research on this finding is mixed. In other words, unlike the impact of TSEB on teacher well-being and their practice in previous sections, TSEB impact on student academic achievement and outcome is inconclusive (Zee & Koomen, 2016). For instance, Guo and colleagues (2010) examined the relations among preschool teachers' self-efficacy ($n = 67$), classroom quality (instructional support), and children's vocabulary knowledge over an academic year in the US. A total of 328 children were randomly selected to participate in assessments of their language and literacy achievement. The data showed that for students of teachers with higher levels of self-efficacy may experience higher vocabulary gains than students of other teachers. However, there was no significant academic improvement for students found.

In the research of Moolenaar et al. (2012), they examined the relationship between teacher collective efficacy beliefs and student achievement. Data were collected from 53 Dutch elementary schools to analyze teacher efficacy survey and student achievement data. Study findings indicated that well-connected teacher networks were associated with strong teacher collective efficacy, which in turn supported student achievement. The authors suggested that in order to understand the impact on student’s learning outcome, it is important to examine teacher collective self-efficacy with shared experiences of collective efforts and schools' social networks. This
implies that teachers’ perceptions of their collective capacity to increase student learning can affect student achievement.

After conducting a meta-analysis by synthesizing the results of 16 studies to explore the relationship between teacher efficacy and students’ academic achievement, Kim and Seo (2018) concluded that the mean relationship between teacher efficacy and students’ academic achievement was significant, but the effect size was small. To be specific, they found that the mean correlation between teacher efficacy and students’ academic achievement was statistically significant when teacher efficacy was focused on instructional strategies, student engagement, or personal teaching efficacy, but not in relation to classroom management or general teaching efficacy. These results implied that it is necessary to further assess the components of teacher efficacy, including students’ education level, number of years of professional experience, and school location influenced the relationship.

Zee and Koomen (2016) also concluded that the consequences of TSE for students’ academic adjustment should be interpreted with caution. This argument indicates that there were not many studies that found a statistically significant influence between TSEB and student’s learning outcome. Overall, studies suggest that TSE(B) is modestly associated with students’ academic achievement and adjustment. Zee and Koomen (2016) assumed that students’ motivation may be partly considered a factor determining the quality of classroom processes, and therefore, more proximal to TSE than academic performance. Regarding students’ academic achievement, TSE(B) appears less important for middle and high schoolers’ achievement in various subjects than for the attainment of elementary school children.
Factors that Shape and Enhance TSEB

Two major factors shape and enhance teachers’ TSEB: PSTs’ content as well as pedagogical knowledge (Abbitt, 2011; Sharp, Brandt, Tuft, & Jay, 2016) and opportunities to practice their teaching skills based on knowledge they have acquired (Cone, 2009; Wagler, 2011; Darling-Hammond, Eiler, & Marcus, 2002). Considering the scope and purpose of this dissertation, this section specifically focuses on preservice teachers in the teacher education programs and how these factors enhance their TSEB.

PSTs’ content and pedagogical knowledge

Previous studies have found positive relationships between TSEB and preservice teachers’ content knowledge, including pedagogical content knowledge (Abbitt, 2011; Sharp et al., 2016). For instance, Sharp and colleagues (2016) investigated relationships between elementary preservice teachers’ self-efficacy and their pedagogical knowledge of literacy instruction. An instrument was used to examine preservice teachers’ self-ratings in relation to confidence levels in their knowledge of literacy instruction. The survey was conducted three times over the course of 16 months to 70 preservice teachers. The study results indicated that PSTs’ self-efficacy scores about pedagogical knowledge of literacy instruction significantly increased over time. The results of this study showed that increased PSTs’ pedagogical knowledge was positively associated with their TSE, in relation to things such as ability to teach literacy.

Abbitt (2011) investigated the relationship between measures of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) and preservice teachers’ TSEB in terms of their technology integration. Within a single-group, pre-test/posttest-design, this study found a significant and positive correlation with PSTs’ self-efficacy beliefs about technology integration. A multiple regression analysis of pre-test and post-test data
indicated a change over time in the relationship between the measures of knowledge in TPACK domains and self-efficacy beliefs. These findings suggest that specific knowledge supports PSTs’ higher self-efficacy beliefs about technology integration. Studies have shown the role of PSTs’ content-specific knowledge with a pedagogical emphasis played an important role in promoting PSTs’ TSEB (Abbitt, 2011; Sharp et al., 2016). These findings indicated that preservice teachers who equipped their teaching with sufficient content knowledge through coursework showed higher self-efficacy beliefs in content area instruction (Swackhamer, Koellner, Basile, & Kimbrough, 2009).

PSTs’ opportunities to practice

Previous studies have shown the importance of PSTs having opportunities to practice through field experiences as well as microteaching experiences. Studies have shown that clinical field experience on PSTs’ TSEB can provide PSTs opportunities to link theories to practice while engaging in various activities working with students who have diverse backgrounds (Cone, 2009; Wagler, 2011). In terms of the role of microteaching experiences on PSTs’ TSEB, studies have demonstrated that microteaching can provide PSTs with opportunities to practice and demonstrate their lessons about how to leverage students in a university course setting (Chesnut & Burley, 2015).

The role of PSTs’ clinical field experience

Regarding the research on how clinical field experience influences PSTs’ TSEB, previous studies findings confirm its promise in enhancing teacher self-efficacy. Several scholars argue that teachers’ mastery experiences through field experiences, such as community-based service learning, are important in understanding TSEB (Cone, 2009;
To be specific, the PSTs’ clinical field experience enhances academic learning by presenting them with opportunities to link academic theories to practice while engaging in activities that address community needs (Cone, 2009; Wagler, 2011). Additionally, PSTs participating in field experience report higher self-efficacy and are more likely to feel as though they can address the diversity in students’ background experiences that they bring with them to the classroom (Darling-Hammond, 1996; Wade, 1995).

For example, Cannon and Scharmann (1996) investigated the impact of field experience on preservice elementary teachers' science self-efficacy. The data sample consisted of 120 preservice teachers who enrolled in an elementary science methods course. Among three sections of science method courses, two courses were randomly selected and tested to examine the PSTs’ TSEB before and after the field experience. The STEBI (Science Teaching Efficacy Beliefs Inventory) was implemented to measure PSTs’ science teaching self-efficacy beliefs. In addition, a random sample of personal interviews were also given to a selected subsample of study participants at the end of the semester. The results of this study reported field experience had a positive influence on the PSTs’ science teaching self-efficacy. To be specific, the STEBI-B scores provided evidence to support the notion that early field experience had a positive effect on the subjects' science teaching self-efficacy ($F = 8.63, p < 0.01$).

Cone (2009) investigated the effect of community-based service learning on the self-efficacy beliefs of preservice elementary teachers in regards to equitable science teaching and learning. Using the Self-Efficacy Beliefs About Equitable Science Teaching (SEBEST) instrument (Ritter, Boone, & Rubba, 2001), pre- and posttest data
from 32 preservice elementary teachers who were enrolled in two different science methods courses were analyzed. The data showed that the participants evaluated mastery experiences as having the most positive influence (M = 4.63, SD = 1.47) on their TSEB in regard to teaching science to diverse student groups. Participants also rated vicarious experiences (M = 4.54, SD = 0.90) and social persuasion (M = 4.52, SD = 0.75) as having the most positive influence on their TSEB. Findings from this study suggest that community-based service learning significantly influenced preservice elementary teachers’ outcome expectancy toward equitable science teaching and learning.

Wagler (2011) investigated the impact of vicarious experiences and field experience on preservice science teaching efficacy. The participants were 46 preservice elementary teachers enrolled in a field experience based elementary science education course. A pretest was administered to the preservice elementary teachers early in the semester with the Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument B (STEBI-B). A posttest was administered to the preservice elementary teachers at the end of the semester and consisted of field experience questions and the STEBI-B. The data showed that field experience could encourage PSTs to better equip themselves with knowledge using the techniques needed to meet the diverse needs of their students. To be specific, the data showed that PSTs revealed positive enactive mastery experiences through field experience ($F^* = 8.681$, $p = 0.001$).

Previous research has demonstrated that field experiences, such as community-based service learning, are important in promoting and enhancing PSTs’ TSEB (Cone, 2009; Wagler, 2011). Study findings have reported that PSTs participating in the field
experience showed higher TSEB and are more likely to address the diversity in students’ background experiences that they bring with them to the classroom (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002).

**The role of PSTs’ microteaching experiences**

Previous studies have suggested that microteaching activities are an effective tool to promote PSTs’ opportunities to practice because microteaching experiences can enhance PSTs’ mastery experience, which contribute to TSEB regarding specific pedagogy and tasks (Arsal, 2015; Bilen, 2015; Cinici, 2016). For example, Arsal (2015) examined the effects of microteaching on preservice teachers’ sense of self-efficacy. The study participants consisted of 70 preservice teachers in a special education teacher preparation program. The author implemented a pre- and post-test quasi-experimental design. The preservice teachers in the experimental group were exposed to microteaching training for one semester. The Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale was administered to all preservice teachers as a pre-test at the beginning and as a post-test at the end of the semester.

The study results suggested that the preservice teachers in the experimental group (having microteaching experiences) showed statistically significant progress in teaching compared to the control group. The author concluded that the PSTs in the experimental group “participated in enactive mastery experiences via the microteaching practices, receiving feedback provided on their performance, collaborating with each other and the instructor, modelling themselves on the instructor and sharing their experiences with each other” (p. 453).

Bilen (2015) examined teacher candidates’ self-efficacy beliefs through microteaching. The study implemented the case study design, including pre-test and
post-test measurement informed by math teaching efficacy. The study participants were 40 primary school preservice teachers who enrolled in a Special Teaching Methods course. The study findings showed that teacher candidates liked microteaching experiences because they acquired new pedagogical skills. In the survey, their self-confidence levels slightly increased due to their experiences with microteaching. The author concluded that the microteaching activity was effective in regards to the PSTs’ preparation of lesson demonstrations and classroom management skills. The microteaching activity also encouraged PSTs to consider the necessity of implementing varied teaching methods.

Cinici (2016) explored changes in PSTs’ self-efficacy beliefs toward science teaching through a mixed-methods approach. Thirty-six participants enrolled in a science methods course that included collaborative peer microteaching (Cope-M). The PSTs’ science teaching self-efficacy beliefs were measured through paired t-test procedures before and after the course. Additionally, structured interviews were conducted with six focal study participants. Study findings suggested microteaching sessions provided a supportive and rich environment for developing cognitive and affective skills in terms of professional teacher behaviors. Moreover, the microteaching sessions provided a supportive medium for enhancing science teaching self-efficacy beliefs. The author concluded that the microteaching experience cultivated preservice teachers’ self-confidence and self-efficacy beliefs in science teaching.

Only a few studies have been conducted in an effort to understand how microteaching activities directly impact preservice teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs in teaching. Thus, it is necessary for teacher educators to consider how to improve
preservice teachers’ self-efficacy in teaching through microteaching. A small portion of empirical research suggests that microteaching activities positively influence PSTs’ self-efficacy beliefs (Arsal, 2015; Chesnut & Burley, 2015; Cinici, 2016).

**A Conceptual Model of General PSTs’ TSEB**

This study implements teacher self-efficacy beliefs as a theoretical framework for understanding how preservice teachers shape and construct their TSEB. Based on constructivism, this study conceptualizes that TSEB is constructed based on specific teaching tasks and contexts, which defines TSEB as task-specific and context-dependent.

Previous research has shown that two factors construct PSTs’ TSEB: 1) PSTs’ content as well as pedagogical knowledge and 2) PSTs’ opportunities to practice. Firstly, this model conceptualizes that PSTs’ content knowledge with a pedagogical emphasis is an important factor that enhances preservice teachers’ TSEB (Abbitt, 2011; Sharp et al., 2016). Secondly, regarding PSTs’ opportunities to practice, this study conceptualizes that PSTs’ field experiences and microteaching experiences in teacher education programs are also important in constructing preservice teachers’ TSEB. This is because field experiences can promote PSTs’ practices by providing them a clear connection between theory and practice while working with students (Cone, 2009; Wagler, 2011). In addition, microteaching experience can impact PSTs’ mastery experiences through providing and receiving feedback on teaching performances as well as collaborating with peers and the instructors (Arsal, 2015; Bilen, 2015; Cinici, 2016).

This conceptual map shows that four mediating factors complement each other in influencing TSEB. Previous studies have shown that these factors are critical in
enhancing and constructing PSTs’ TSEB. It is posited that promoting PSTs’ TSEB can lead to enhancing teachers’ instructional practices in teaching and working with students. In other words, enhanced TSEB can lead to molding PSTs into quality future teachers who possess specific instructional strategies. When these quality teachers work in the field, it is expected that they can positively impact students’ learning outcomes and help promote academic achievement.

Figure 2-2. A Conceptual Model of General PSTs’ TSEB

**TSE(B) Research and Teachers of ELLs**

Despite the importance of TSE(B), only a handful of studies have considered this notion in the context of preservice ELL teacher preparation (Butler, 2016; Coady, de Jong, & Harper, 2011; Daniel, 2014; Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010; 2012; Olson & Jimenez-Silva, 2008; Torres & Tackett, 2016). Following the review above, and the factors identified as important for TSEB, this section reviews empirical studies
specifically related to teachers of ELLs. The section consists of: 1) how general teacher education programs prepare PSTs to promote their TSEB in relation to teaching ELLs and 2) two factors that shape and construct PSTs’ TSEB, including PSTs’ content knowledge as well as practice from teacher education programs and PSTs’ practice such as ELL-specific field experiences as well as microteaching experiences.

**PSTs’ TSEB in general teacher education programs**

Some studies have shown that preservice general education teachers who received ELL-specific professional development, such as in teacher preparation courses, revealed better preparedness and self-efficacy in teaching ELLs compared to PSTs who receive no ELL-specific preparation (Athanases, Wahleithner, & Bennett, 2013; Daniel, 2014; Jimenez-Silva et al., 2012; Olson & Jimenez-Silva, 2008).

For example, Butler (2016) examined 179 middle school mainstream teachers’ self-efficacy for ELLs. This study used a mixed method design and the survey instrument adopted from Tschannen-Moran and Hoy – TSES (2001). The qualitative data consisted of several interviews with focal participants. The survey results showed that about 70% of the teachers responded that they had less than five hours of ESL professional development. Over 65% of participants had no ESL coursework previously. Interview data revealed limited teacher preparation, such as lack of ESL professional development which may cause teachers’ unpreparedness in teaching ELLs and, in turn, lower their TSEB. The author suggested that it is necessary for teacher educators to provide ESL tools and strategies to make preservice teachers become more confident in their ability to teach ELLs.

Durgunoglu and Hughes (2010) examined preservice teachers’ self-efficacy, attitudes, and perceived preparedness of ELLs in high school classrooms. In their first
study, 62 preservice teachers performing student teaching (internship) completed a
survey. In their second study, four female preservice teachers from the first study were
observed to explore how preservice teachers interacted with ELLs. The survey results
showed that preservice teachers did not feel prepared to educate ELLs in mainstream
classrooms, revealing their low sense of TSEB. The classroom observations revealed
that these teachers may neglect isolated ELLs who need help and support in content
learning. Among five different classrooms, the authors observed very limited interaction
between teachers and ELLs. The authors concluded that most teachers in the study
were not effectively prepared to teach and work with ELLs; thus, their unpreparedness
in teaching ELLs indicated their low level of TSE.

Importantly, previous studies argue that preparing teachers with adequate
teacher education can positively contribute to TSE. For instance, Jimenez-Silva and
colleagues (2012) examined how ESL endorsement curricula in teacher education
programs can influence TSE for teaching ELLs. Participants were 197 preservice
teachers enrolled in an undergraduate Structured English Immersion course in the
Elementary or Secondary Education certification program. To explore TSE, the authors
used their own survey created to assess teachers’ beliefs and attitudes toward working
with ELLs (Olson & Jimenez-Silva, 2008). In the survey, most preservice teachers
reported that the methods of ESL instruction were helpful in their preparation for
working with ELLs. Also, the majority of preservice teachers responded that they were
generally confident in working with ELLs after having ESL teacher education courses.
These findings indicate that preparing preservice teachers with ELL-specific courses
that promote understanding of ELLs’ linguistic and cultural differences, as well as actual tools and strategies, can positively contribute to their TSE for ELLs.

Factors that contributes to PSTs’ TSEB in teaching ELLs

Various scholars have explained that general teacher education programs should encourage future teachers of ELLs to learn content knowledge from university coursework, but also to receive opportunities to practice through field experience in an effort to enhance their confidence to facilitate learning for ELLs (Athanases et al., 2013; Daniel, 2014; Salerno & Kibler, 2013; Uzum, Petron & Berg, 2014). Considering which factors appear to enhance preservice teachers’ TSEB in relation to teaching and working with ELLs, previous studies have specifically focused on two main areas: 1) PSTs’ content as well as pedagogical knowledge based on linguistically responsive teaching and 2) PSTs’ opportunities to practice, including ELL-specific field experience and microteaching experiences.

PSTs’ content and pedagogical knowledge

Previous studies have documented positive relationships between TSEB and preservice teachers’ content knowledge, including pedagogical content knowledge. When it comes to general education teacher preparation for mainstream teachers of ELLs, Linguistically Responsive Teaching (LRT) is suggested as a method to prepare preservice teachers’ knowledge of second language acquisition and ELLs’ cultures. Although there is a limited empirical research to specifically understand how the LRT is applied to examine PSTs’ TSEB, previous studies have generally found that culturally and linguistically responsive teaching as a whole is critical for preservice teachers to learn content knowledge about the role of second language and culture so that it can
contribute to enhancing their TSEB in the general teacher preparation programs (Evans, 2017).

**Linguistically responsive teaching: PSTs’ knowledge of SLA/culture**

Lucas and Villegas (2011; 2013) provided a comprehensive understanding of how to educate and prepare preservice teachers to become quality future teachers of ELLs. The LRT framework specifically addresses how to prepare all teachers in regards to second language acquisition theory related to the educational experiences of ELLs, as well as the pedagogical knowledge for teaching ELLs. In general terms, being a linguistically responsive teacher involves having increased awareness and knowledge of languages, knowing the language needs of ELLs, and being able to appropriately scaffold their needs to help them develop academic proficiency in English (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; 2013).

Lucas and Villegas (2011) defined teacher knowledge and skills as “the complex and interconnected disciplinary knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, knowledge of learners, and pedagogical skills needed by successful teachers” (p. 56). They identified four necessary proficiency areas for teachers that should be addressed during teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms. These were (a) learning about ELL students’ language backgrounds, experiences, and proficiencies, (b) identifying the language demands of the classroom, (c) knowing and applying principles of second language acquisition theory, and (d) scaffolding instruction for ELLs (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; 2013).

Firstly, linguistically responsive teachers should spend time interacting with each ELL student to establish a relationship so that they can understand ELLs’ prior knowledge and identify linguistic resources for students’ future learning. To be specific,
by anticipating learning aspects that can be challenging for ELLs, teachers can learn about ELLs’ oral English proficiency by interacting with them in a one-on-one setting while assessing spoken proficiency through SOLOM (Student Oral Language Observation Matrix). Teachers are also able to closely observe ELLs’ interaction with peers to understand their four language skills through the WIDA Can-Do Descriptors.

Secondly, linguistically responsive teachers should have the ability to identify language demands of the classroom. This involves “identifying key vocabulary, understanding the semantic and syntactic complexity of language in written materials, and knowing specific ways students are expected to use language to complete each learning task” (Lucas & Villegas, 2011, p. 62). To encourage ELLs’ active participation in content-based learning, teachers of ELLs must be able to analyze linguistic features of the discourse in their disciplines and modify classroom activities that are appropriate for ELLs.

Thirdly, linguistically responsive teachers need to understand the principles of second language learning and apply those principles in mainstream classrooms. For example, teachers should understand mastering levels of academic language proficiency is much more difficult than learning a social language skill (Cummins, 2008). Many studies have shown that mastering academic language performance takes more time (approximately five to seven years) even though bilingual children seem to have a good command of communication skills (Cummins, 2008). This implies that mainstream teachers should not jump to the conclusion that ELLs develop academic language proficiency in a short period time and are thus prepared to learn content materials for standardized exams.
Finally, linguistically responsive teachers need to scaffold instruction appropriately by applying strategies to make curriculum content accessible to ELLs, such as using extra-linguistic supports, supplementing and modifying texts and oral language, and giving clear instructions (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Teachers of ELLs are responsible for providing comprehensible input so ELLs will be challenged by classroom materials that are slightly beyond their proficiency levels (Krashen, 2003). This suggests that teachers of ELLs should comprehend not only students’ levels of proficiency, but also their individual learning styles and characteristics. Krashen (2003) further hypothesizes an affective filter that can influence students’ language output. This indicates that students’ anxiety or fears of making mistakes inhibits language learners from producing and practicing L2. In this regard, teachers should recognize that it is crucial for ELLs to create a safe and comfortable classroom environment.

**PSTs’ opportunities to practice**

When it comes to teacher preparation for ELLs, previous studies have shown that PSTs’ opportunities to practice, including ELL-specific field experience working with ELLs and microteaching experiences in teaching ELLs, can positively influence their TSEB in relation to ELLs. Studies have demonstrated that field experiences made PSTs feel more prepared because they were encouraged to apply theory to the field while directly working with ELLs (Salerno & Kibler, 2013; Uzum et al., 2014). Microteaching experiences have also been proven to promote PSTs’ TSEB as they allow PSTs various opportunities to develop their practices, including lesson planning/demonstration and peer teaching that typically occur in the university setting (Li, Hinojosa, Wexler, Bian, & Matinez, 2017).
**PSTs’ clinical field experience while working with ELLs**

A few studies specifically examined the impact of ELL-specific field experiences on enhancing preservice teachers’ TSEB in relation to ELLs (Mora & Grisham, 2001, Xu, 2000). Mora and Grisham (2001) described the restructuring of a field-based reading and language arts methods course to include more explicit emphasis on teaching ELLs. The authors found that the revised course included “explicit content and field-based learning activities with second language learners” (p. 63) served to increase teachers' knowledge and problem-solving abilities. Moreover, the participants expressed greater confidence in their ability to teach ELLs. This study concluded that preparing PSTs with clinical field experience promoted them to make informed instructional decisions, and in turn, contributed to their TSEB when working with ELLs.

Xu (2000) explored the impact of a field-based literacy methods course. She investigated how teacher candidates explored issues of diversity while working with students from diverse backgrounds. Specifically, she required the participants to complete an autobiography, a student biography, lesson plans, case-study reports, and a series of reflections. The author found that through interactions with diverse students in field experiences and class discussions, PSTs gained an increased awareness of effective strategies in literacy instruction, which made them feel more prepared to teach and work with ELLs.

To provide high-quality instruction for all students, preservice teachers must have opportunities to practice their teaching in settings that encourage them to connect with experiences of culturally and linguistically diverse students (McDonald et al., 2011). These opportunities are critical for teacher-candidates seeking ESL certification or
endorsements to teach ELLs (Ariza, 2003; Walker & Stone, 2011). Therefore, a central component of teacher education program should be clinical experiences to appreciate students’ diversity and to value students’ unique backgrounds and funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992). As such, clinical field experiences have the potential to provide preservice teachers with authentic opportunities to develop practice, beyond activities such as lesson planning and peer teaching that typically occur in the university setting (Salerno & Kibler, 2013; Uzum et al., 2014). Previous studies have concluded that ELL-specific field experiences generated a positive influence on promoting preservice teachers’ TSEB in regards to ELLs.

**PSTs’ microteaching experience in teaching ELLs**

Although microteaching experiences have proven to be effective in enhancing PSTs’ TSEB, there is no specific study that has focused on how microteaching experiences can benefit PSTs’ TSEB in general teacher education programs. A few studies consider microteaching in the context of English as a foreign language teaching are relevant for this study. These studies showed the microteaching experience was a beneficial tool to promote PSTs’ TSEB through professional development in teacher education programs (He & Yan, 2011; Ogeyik, 2009; Savas, 2012). Studies have also suggested that microteaching activities positively influence PSTs’ self-efficacy beliefs regarding teaching ELLs because the microteaching experience helped PSTs to receive opportunities to practice and demonstrate what they had learned from methodology courses (Li et al., 2017).

For instance, Ogeyik (2009) examined English preservice teachers’ opinions about the microteaching method in teaching practice classes. The study used a quantitative research design; the data included a Likert-type scale developed by the
author. Study participants were 57 fourth-year students in the ELT Department in Turkey. The study result indicated that the PSTs developed positive attitudes towards microteaching applications regarding “its effectiveness for professional development, self-assessment, self-confidence, material production, and teaching experiences in various courses in which students are of different ages and linguistic levels” (p. 205). The author concluded that microteaching activities provided preservice teachers opportunities to develop not only teaching abilities but also reflective practices. In addition, the microteaching activity was a beneficial tool to motivate student-teachers for their present courses and future professional development.

Savas (2012) investigated the opinions of 40 prospective English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers about the effectiveness of microteaching in two English language teaching methodology courses. The study was conducted at a state university in Turkey and the data collection was mainly done via a questionnaire. The results of the data analysis showed that the PSTs believed in the effectiveness of the microteaching videos on improving both English proficiency and teaching English skills. In addition, recorded videos were found effective, especially in overcoming problematic areas in teaching English. This was because 95% of the participants either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they could overcome these problematic areas after watching their own microteaching videos.

He and Yan (2011) examined the perceptions of 60 Chinese EFL preservice teachers in regards to microteaching experience. Reflective papers were implemented to explore the PSTs’ perceptions of a microteaching experience. The study findings showed that the student-teachers felt they had an opportunity to apply what they had
learned from the teaching methodology course through microteaching. However, the findings also revealed some limitations; the author claimed that the most commonly perceived deficiency was artificiality, which appeared to have, to some extent, limited the student-teachers’ development of real-life classroom teaching competence. As such, the authors suggested that it is necessary to redesign the preservice teacher education curriculum and pedagogy related courses because the integration of both practical and theoretical input is the key.

Only a few studies have been conducted in an effort to understand how microteaching activities directly impact preservice teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs in teaching and working with ELLs. A small portion of empirical research suggests that microteaching activities positively influence PSTs’ self-efficacy beliefs regarding teaching ELLs (He & Yan, 2011; Ogeyik, 2009; Savas, 2012). To be specific, the microteaching experience helped PSTs to receive opportunities to practice and demonstrate what they had learned from methodology courses (Li et al., 2017).

The microteaching experience also helped PSTs to practice their English language teaching. However, microteaching may have some limitations due to the artificial learning environment because PSTs did not receive chances to teach real students. This artificial environment could have limited the chances of implementing microteaching in the university coursework. After reviewing these studies, it appears future researchers need to consider how to improve mainstream preservice teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs in teaching ELLs through microteaching activities in an effort to prepare effective future teachers of ELLs in the teacher education coursework (Li et al., 2017).
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Research Epistemology: Constructivism

Constructivism is the belief that learning occurs as learners are actively involved in meaning-making and knowledge construction (Riegler, 2012). According to a constructivist perspective, a single or objective reality does not exist; rather, reality is constructed by individuals while they participate in making sense of the world around them (Kaufman, 2004).

Constructivists seek to obtain knowledge based upon an individual’s experiences, their understanding, as well as their own meaning-making process (Riegler, 2012). Thus, one person’s experiences, background knowledge, and understanding of certain issues could be completely different from that of another person’s (Kaufman, 2004). Previous research suggests teachers’ understanding and knowledge of what is important about teaching and learning influences their instructional practices (Brownlee, Purdie, & Boulton-Lewis, 2003).

Regarding the research epistemology, Creswell (2012) asserted that the researcher constructs meaning from the phenomena under study through his own experiences and that of the participants in the study. The researcher evaluates what is said to ascertain real facts. Based on this perspective, this dissertation is guided by a constructivist perspective in that it examines how individual preservice teachers construct their self-efficacy belief to teach and work with ELLs. This study aims to seek complexity of individual preservice teachers’ meaning and sense-making regarding TSEB through microteaching experiences. This study approached preservice teachers’ TSEB based on two assumptions:
1. Each individual preservice teacher’s experiences are unique, dynamic, and complex.
2. Individual teachers construct their TSEB within specific social and cultural context(s).

**Rationale for a Qualitative Case Study**

Yin (2011; 2013) developed several criteria to conduct a case study. These criteria were: (a) the case study can answer research questions as they relate to "how" and "why," (b) it can be used in cases where neither the participants nor the context can be manipulated, and (c) that the researcher thinks and believes that recognition of the role of the context is important for answering research questions. The case study approach was implemented because the research questions for this dissertation were closely related to "how" questions, and prior experiences that participants bring cannot be manipulated. In terms of the contextual aspect, the details of preservice teachers’ microteaching experiences in a general teacher education program were important to consider when answering two research questions:

Q1: What are the self-efficacy beliefs of preservice teachers about teaching ELLs before and after microteaching experiences?

Q2: How do four preservice teachers construct their self-efficacy beliefs regarding teaching ELLs through microteaching experiences?

**Defining a case.** This study implemented a multiple cases design. A case in this study was defined as an individual preservice teacher who was enrolled in an ELL teacher preparation course in the teacher education program. Because the goal was to gain an in-depth understanding of preservice teachers’ TSE construction, a case study design was most appropriate. This study did not invite more individuals to participate in this study as Creswell (2012) suggested that a small number of case studies, ideally fewer than four or five, provides “ample opportunity to identify themes of the cases as
well as conduct cross-case theme analysis” (p. 157). By using a multiple cases design, this study aimed to examine four preservice teacher self-efficacy beliefs (TSEB) related to their participation in microteaching activities.

This chapter described methodological decisions related to the following: (1) Research Context, (2) Study Participant Selection Process, (3) Data Collection Procedures, (4) Research Instruments, (5) Data Analysis, (6) Role of the Researcher, and (7) Building Trustworthiness. The overview of the research taxonomy in this study is outlined in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1. Research Taxonomy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistemology</th>
<th>Constructivism:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This assumes that learning occurs as learners are actively involved in meaning-making. According to this framework, people construct knowledge in their interaction with the people, objects, and events in their environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Framework</th>
<th>Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs (TSEB):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TSEB refers to a teacher’s belief in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action to successfully accomplish specific instructional tasks, or, more simply, his or her capacity to affect student performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Qualitative Case Study:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigation of a contextualized phenomenon in the specific given context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. It can answer research questions that relate to &quot;how&quot; and &quot;why.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. When the participants and the context cannot be manipulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. When the researcher thinks that the details of the context are important in answering the research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Yin, 2011; 2013).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of participants: Data Collection</th>
<th>Two surveys: pre-survey (n=30), post-survey (n=25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two in-depth interviews, 4 foci-participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Primary data source: Two surveys and two interviews with four preservice teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual data source: Researcher’s journals and collected lesson plans for microteaching activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Context: ESL-Infused Model in Teacher Education Program

The current study was conducted in a large, public university located in the southeast region of the U.S. Because Florida has one of the largest ELL populations in the U.S., the consent decree was negotiated requiring all teachers of ELLs to complete professional development in terms of second language teaching and learning. Specifically, the consent decree requires all teachers to receive a set of ESL teacher performance standards that are organized in regards to five curricular areas: applied linguistics, cross-cultural communication, ESL methods, ESL curriculum and materials development, and ESL assessment (Coady et al., 2016). As such, elementary teachers are required to complete a minimum of 300 hours of professional development in ESL. Secondary content teachers must complete 60 hours of ESL professional development under the state requirements (Coady et al., 2016).

The teacher education program in the current study is a five-year program that culminates in a year-long internship and a master's degree. The program is guided by the beliefs that teachers are responsible for the learning of students who have a broad range of needs and assets. The faculty advocates responsive education in which teachers design environments and use a variety of strategies that include and affirm all students in the community of learners, thereby increasing the likelihood of positive learning outcomes. The teacher education program prepares preservice teachers through “infused” ESL endorsement. The ESL-infused model requires: 1) a minimum of two ESL stand-alone courses, 2) that ESL performance standards are addressed and assessed in the program, 3) that 45 hours of professional development are required for instructors teaching ESL stand-alone courses, and 4) ELL-specific field experience (Coady et al., 2016).
In terms of the two ESL stand-alone courses, the first is an introductory course that is intended to explore various issues of second language and culture that are relevant for elementary school ELLs. The course also introduces principles and processes of first and second language development for ELLs. The second course is intended to reinforce PSTs’ knowledge about second language acquisition and provides pedagogical skills in content area learning. Simply put, the first course is more of a theory-driven course so that PSTs learn basic concepts of ELLs’ second language and their cultures. On the other hand, the second course is a more practice-based course, which provides opportunities for PSTs to apply theory into practice through various hands-on activities, such as lesson planning for ELLs and microteaching activities.

In addition, preservice teachers’ field experiences played a critical role in providing teacher-candidates with meaningful engagement with ELLs. The teacher education program implemented two ESL practica in order for preservice teachers to receive their ESL endorsement. The first practicum required preservice teachers to observe mainstream math and reading classrooms one full day per week in a rural district. The assignment consisted of an ELL case study, ELL field report, and a presentation. The second practicum required students to work with ELLs through individual tutoring and small group discussions for a minimum of 10 hours during the 16-week semester. Assignments consisted of online discussions about field experiences based on targeted questions and a final essay regarding reflection on experience teaching ELLs.

Table 3-2. Two ESL Stand-alone Courses in the Teacher Education Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First ESL stand-alone course</th>
<th>Second ESL stand-alone course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>Course Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This course will examine issues of language and culture that are relevant for elementary school learners of English as a second language (ESL). The course has three main sections: (1) the role and nature of culture and its influence on learning for diverse English learners (ELs); (2) an introduction to the structure of language and to principles first and second language development in young learners; and (3) beginning teacher strategies, including home-school partnerships, for teachers of EL students. This course builds on students’ knowledge and skills developed in preceding courses in the teacher education program. It will extend their understanding of ways that language and culture affect second language learners’ participation and learning in the elementary classroom. Students will learn to connect instructional objectives for language development with appropriate and challenging curriculum content, materials, and assessments to create meaningful and equitable learning environments for bilingual children.

### Field Experience Expectations

- One full day per week
- Rural County Public Schools: Rural district, 40,000 people, 8% self-identified as Hispanic or Latino, approximately 6% speak a language other than English in the home, and approximately 3.2% foreign-born
- Observe Math and Reading mainstream classes and take notes
- Focus: “Getting to know your ELL” Assignment: ELL field report, presentation, and class discussion

### Description of Preservice Teachers’ Microteaching Experience

The practice of microteaching was first developed by Dr. Dwight Allen of Stanford University in the mid-1960s. Microteaching has been defined as a system of controlled practice that makes it possible to concentrate on specified teaching behavior and to practice teaching (Remesh, 2013). Microteaching is a teacher education technique which allows teachers to apply defined teaching skills to carefully prepare lessons in a planned series of encounters lasting 10 to 20 minutes with a small group of students, often with an opportunity to observe the result on videotape (Bell, 2007; Remesh, 2013).
Six stages of a microteaching activity have been proposed. Figure 3-1 shows the processes of the microteaching cycle (Ogeyik, 2009; Saban & Coklar, 2013).

In the planning cycle, preservice teachers (PSTs) prepare the lesson plan for the specific subject, which is pre-determined. In the teaching cycle, they demonstrate microteaching lessons during class time. During lessons, their microteaching can be videotaped. Then, in the critique stage, preservice teachers are required to watch their own teaching videos and reflect on their sessions. In this stage, instructors provide scoring rubrics for PSTs so that they can analyze and evaluate all together. According to instructor’s suggestions, PSTs prepare the lesson plan again (re-planning stage) and re-teach microteaching lessons (re-teaching stage). For the second teaching session, their microteaching will also be video-recorded. Through to the end of the cycle (re-
criticizing stage), the microteaching activity gives PSTs opportunities to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses and try to improve their teaching for future purposes.

Throughout the six stages of the microteaching cycle, preservice teachers can revisit the sequences of their teaching for making thoughtful reflections, including judgements and decisions about how to improve their teaching in the future (Ogeyik, 2009). As such, the microteaching experience encourages preservice teachers to promote reflective thinking and the writing process, and it helps them shape their professional development and growth (Saban & Coklar, 2013). As such, microteaching is considered a positive teaching and learning experience to develop critical awareness in the beginning stages of professional development. This reflective practice in teacher education programs is a critical component in developing teacher-candidates’ self-confidence in teaching (Farrell, 2008; Payant, 2014).

In the second ESL stand-alone course, the instructor has designed the class with a faculty supervisor for preservice teachers to receive an opportunity to reflect on what they have learned from course readings through a collaborative and student-centered learning environment. Microteaching served as one of the hands-on activities in class. The microteaching activity itself took place over two cycles that were four weeks. Out of the four weeks in each cycle, one week was dedicated to microteaching preparation and the other week was reserved for the actual microteaching demonstrations.

In terms of microteaching preparation classes prior to actual microteaching weeks, the instructor gave a mini-lecture accompanied by Power Point files to promote PSTs’ background knowledge at the beginning of the class. After the lecture, he created
collaborative activities to increase students’ critical thinking and higher-order thinking skills. For instance, preservice teachers were provided teaching reading and writing scenarios for ELLs, including imaginary EL profiles that provided ELLs’ home languages and English proficiency levels based on WIDA descriptors. Based on these scenarios, PSTs created 10 minutes worth of microteaching lesson plans that focused on incorporating ELLs’ reading and writing skills in content area materials. While PSTs were completing activities, the instructor walked around the classroom to provide feedback to PSTs.

After preparation classes, all PSTs in the course were divided into two groups for each week – a reading week with eight teams and a writing week with eight teams. Every team contained two co-teachers who were assigned to teach at least one time throughout the semester. In actual microteaching weeks, students co-taught their lessons in pairs. Simply put, they had an opportunity to implement their lesson plans through microteaching demonstrations. The duration of microteaching spanned from a minimum of 8 minutes to a maximum of 12 minutes. During microteaching, the instructor evaluated each team with a rubric that had six criteria. Each criterion was worth 5 points for a total 30 points that were assigned to their final grade. During microteaching, their peers who did not demonstrate their lesson plans played the roles of ELLs as well as native speaker students. There was a total of six PSTs who acted as students and one of them was designated to act as ELL students. Remaining PSTs who did not participate in the microteaching (observers) provided peer evaluation for teaching-teams.
After the actual microteaching weeks, the instructor encouraged participating co-teachers to reflect on what they did in their microteaching sessions. By using the online discussion forum in Canvas, co-teachers wrote about three to four paragraphs for their reflections after microteaching. The guiding questions for reflections included identifying what the main goal was and how teachers prepared together with their co-teachers. Prompt questions also asked what they did well in using ESL accommodations and what needed to be improved. Then, remaining students who did not participate in that microteaching session responded to their peers via online posts in the learning management system, Canvas. In this way, they could communicate with each other to exchange ideas and opinions. After each microteaching activity, the instructor provided feedback using a rubric for participating co-teachers. Based on their reflections after microteaching and received feedback from the instructor, PSTs were required to submit their revised lesson plans (second lesson plans) through Canvas.

Since little research has been conducted to understand mainstream teachers’ ESL microteaching experience, the instructor and faculty supervisor created a microteaching rubric that was fit for this study. It was created based on the lesson plan checklist from the book "Enhancing English language learning in elementary classrooms: Study guide" (Grognet et al., 2000) in an effort to examine the six areas of mainstream teachers’ ELL accommodations, including ELLs’ comprehensibility, peer interaction, higher-order thinking questions, and funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992), and so on. To summarize, based on six cycles of microteaching in Chapter 2, this class completed four cycles: planning, teaching, feedback, and re-planning. Unfortunately, due to time limitations in the semester, re-teaching and re-feedback were omitted.
Based on the description of implementing microteaching activities, Figure 3-2 shows various data sources were collected in this dissertation in an effort to better understand the PSTs’ TSEB through microteaching experiences in the second ESL stand-alone course.

Figure 3-2. Research Model on PSTs’ TSEB through Microteaching Experiences

In the teacher education program, the PSTs already received prior knowledge, experience, and practice for teaching ELLs in the teacher education program. Hence instructors of the second course assumed that the PSTs entering the second ESL stand-alone course possessed basic knowledge and principles about teaching ELLs from first ESL stand-alone course.

Before having microteaching experiences in the second stand-alone course, the pre-survey was conducted to understand all of the preservice teachers’ TSEB (n=30) related to instructional practices and strategies in teaching ELLs. After conducting the
pre-survey, interviews were conducted with four volunteer participants’ (foci-participants) to further understand their personal background, professional exposure to teaching and working with ELLs, and their confidence in teaching ELLs before microteaching.

While conducting microteaching activities, contextual data were also collected, including PSTs’ two lesson plans from planning sessions and researcher’s notes while observing microteaching demonstrations. These contextual data were utilized as an additional data source to conduct data triangulation.

After conducting microteaching demonstrations, the post-survey was conducted to understand all of the preservice teachers’ TSEB to see if any change occurred. The items in the pre- and post-survey were identical to conduct pre-test and post-test. After taking the post-survey, the same foci-participants (n=4) participated in the second interviews. The second interviews asked about how microteaching experiences reinforced PSTs’ knowledge, experience, and practices regarding their TSEB.

**Study Participants**

The participants in this study were recruited through “a stratified purposeful sampling” (Hatch 2002, p.98) which aims to invite participants who represent a particular subgroup of interest. Four study participants were recruited for the study. The reason for selecting foci participants was to delve into the participants’ own personal histories and narratives, eliciting information from their experiences in detail (Gibson & Brown, 2009).

The participants of this study were recruited according to the following criteria:

1. Elementary preservice teachers who were enrolled in the second ESL stand-alone course in the teacher education program.
2. Preservice teachers who voluntarily participated in two interviews and agreed to submit their lesson plans and to be observed by the researcher during microteaching lesson planning sessions and demonstrations.

3. Preservice teachers who taught writing microteaching activities were recruited because these PSTs were familiar with the microteaching context after watching their peers’ previous reading microteaching sessions. In addition, the researcher was able to observe writing teams’ entire lesson planning sessions and microteaching demonstrations.

Data Collection Procedure

In fall of 2016, a pilot study was conducted to explore how microteaching experiences help prepare preservice teachers to teach and work with ELLs. The data sources collected were PSTs’ focus-group interviews, microteaching videos, and PSTs’ reflections after teaching. I learned several lessons through the pilot-study experience in terms of data collection tools and initial findings (Appendix A).

The data collection period for this study spanned from October 24, 2017 to December 22, 2017. During this period, participants were recruited and the data were collected. The data collection methods included a pre-survey and post-survey and four participants’ individual interviews. The data collection schedule relied on the syllabus and agenda from the second ESL stand-alone course.

Before week 10, I contacted the course instructor to visit the course to recruit study participants. In week 10, during the class, I provided a brief overview of my study and explained the purpose of the study. After the class, the pre-survey was distributed through Qualtrics to explore the PSTs’ self-efficacy beliefs in teaching ELLs before participating in the microteaching sessions. During this week, I also explained IRB
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Research Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Week 10 | Recruit research participants  
|         | Administer pre-survey  
|         | Share informed consent letters with selected foci participants                |
| Week 11 | Classroom observation I: To record researcher journal during lesson plan  
|         | preparation for writing microteaching                                          |
| Week 12 | Conduct first interviews (After writing microteaching preparation weeks)      |
| Week 13 | Classroom observation II: To record researcher journal during actual writing  
|         | microteaching demonstration                                                    |
| Week 14 | Administer post-survey                                                        |
| Week 15 | Conduct second interviews (After writing microteaching weeks)                  |
| Week 16 | Transcribe interview data and import all data sources to Dropbox and Nvivo    
|         | software for data analysis                                                     |

documents for my foci study participants and shared IRB consent letters with them. The IRB consent letter is located in Appendix B.

During week 11, a non-participatory classroom observation took place using the researcher’s journal. Meanwhile, lesson plans for writing microteaching were collected to understand foci participants' preparation for their microteaching sessions. These data sources were used as contextual considerations in an effort to triangulate all data sources.

During week 12, I conducted a first interview with each participant. The purpose of the first interview was to understand PSTs’ prior learning experiences and their educational background. The interview also asked about PSTs' lesson plan preparation process for their microteaching assignments. In week 13, a non-participatory classroom observation also took place. I observed four selected foci-participants’ actual microteaching demonstrations as well as recorded observations using the researcher’s journal.
In week 14, I distributed a post-survey to understand PSTs’ self-efficacy beliefs after having participated in microteaching sessions. During week 15, I conducted a second interview. The purpose of the second interview was to understand PSTs’ post experiences after having participated in the microteaching activities as well as to understand their TSEB as future teachers of ELLs. After all interviews were finished, I transferred all data sources to Dropbox to store data and also transferred the data to Nvivo software for analyzing all data sources.

**Research Instruments**

**Survey development process**

The original teacher self-efficacy instrument was created by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) and measured Efficacy in Student Engagement, Efficacy in Instructional Practices, and Efficacy in Classroom Management. Based on the original survey items, *Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)*, Butler (2016) focused on measuring the self-efficacy of middle school subject area teachers who were teaching ELLs. All of the questions were changed to reflect English language learners instead of Primary English Language Speaking (PELS) students by adding the acronym “ELL” to each question.

For the purposes of Butler’s study, the focus was only on the subscales of Efficacy in Student Engagement and Efficacy in Instructional Practices. Efficacy in Classroom Management was eliminated as a factor because it did not fit the parameters of the research. Thus, Butler’s study concentrated on the self-efficacy of teachers who teach ELL middle school students with regards to student engagement and instructional practices for ELLs, not classroom management. The survey included a Likert response scale of 1 (Nothing) to 9 (A Great Deal).
Based on Butler’s survey, this study only focused on the subscale of Efficacy in Instructional Practices. Efficacy in Classroom Management and Student Engagement were eliminated because these did not fit the parameters of the study as the goal was to explore self-efficacy of teachers who will teach ELL elementary school students with regards to instructional practices for ELLs, not classroom management or student engagement. Since the study participants were preservice teachers, their TSEB about ELL student engagement could not efficiently be measured because they were not currently teaching ELLs in real classrooms in school.

Butler’s survey items were further modified to create a pilot survey that was more comprehensible for two preservice teachers in the first ESL teacher preparation course. For example, the question, “How much can you assist families of ELLs in helping their children to do well in school?” was eliminated because PSTs were not interacting with real students in their microteaching activities. Another question that was eliminated was, “How well are you able to help ELLs to adapt to American culture?” because it does not align with the purpose of the ESL teacher preparation course for the purposes of this dissertation. Instead, questions were added, such as “How well are you able to integrate the linguistic backgrounds of ELLs (ELLs’ home languages) into your classroom?” as these types of questions allowed for the PSTs to express their LOTE (Languages Other than English) experiences.

WIDA standards were also incorporated in the survey questions, as in “How well are you able to accommodate ELLs who are in beginner levels based on WIDA?” because Florida state is one of the states that currently implements the WIDA. Importantly, the microteaching activities require PSTs to measure ELLs’ proficiency
levels based on WIDA descriptors, so I found it appropriate to add WIDA components to the administered surveys. The surveys included a Likert response scale of 1 (Not at all confident) to 5 (A great deal of confidence).

**Pre-survey and Post-survey**

The pre- and post-survey were used to explore preservice teachers perceived self-efficacy beliefs before and after having participated in microteaching sessions. The survey questions are attached in Appendix C. The purpose of pre-survey was to understand preservice teachers' perceived self-efficacy beliefs before microteaching experience. Open-ended questions in the pre-survey served to understand PSTs' prior knowledge regarding their preparedness in teaching and working with ELLs based on their previous experience in the teacher education program.

The purpose of the post-survey was to explore PSTs' TSEB after having participated in the microteaching experience. With the same survey rating-scale questions, the purpose of post-survey was to understand preservice teachers' perceived self-efficacy beliefs after having participated in the microteaching activity. Open-ended questions in the post-survey served to understand PSTs' TEEB about their knowledge and preparedness in teaching ELLs through microteaching activities.

**Interviews with four preservice teachers**

The in-depth interview is a technique to elicit a vivid picture of the participant's perspective on the research topic (Mack, Woodsong, MacQueen, Guest, & Namey, 2005). In-depth interviews are useful for learning about the perspectives of individuals as opposed to focus-group interviews, which are better suited for learning group norms of a community (Mack et al., 2005).
In-depth interviews can encourage preservice teachers to think about their previous experiences while expanding their ability to question, think and generate answers (Seidman, 2013). In addition, this provides individuals with sufficient opportunities to voice their opinions (Seidman, 2013). Since the purpose of this study was to examine individual preservice teachers’ TSEB in detail through microteaching experiences, the two in-depth interviews were implemented.

The interview lasted from 40 to 60 minutes, with each participant. The format of the interview was a semi-structured format, which conformed to the guiding questions but also allowed for the introduction of prompting questions to make it more open-ended in nature and responsive to a participant’s comments. Although the participants were asked particular questions, the interview was conducted in a conversational manner rather than as an interrogation. I asked open-ended questions so that each participant could elaborate on their responses to interview questions at length. I ensured that the atmosphere of the interview sessions was comfortable by providing them light Korean snacks and drinks.

The in-depth interview followed two-step interviews (Seidman, 2013). The purpose of the interview in this dissertation was to examine how four foci-participants (PSTs) interpret their TSEB using a microteaching experience as a mediating tool. To be specific, the first interview focused on exploring the participant’s life history and educational background. Each participant’s prior experiences and backgrounds were queried. The first interview also asked about their TSEB in terms of lesson planning and accommodation for ELLs before having these microteaching experiences.
The second interview involved their actual microteaching demonstration experiences. It specifically asked participants to describe why they made certain instructional choices during the microteaching demonstrations. The second interview also pertained to their overall reflections about their TSEB and preparedness to teach ELLs after having participated in microteaching experiences. The interview protocol is attached in Appendix D.

**Contextual Considerations**

**Researcher journal.** The observation fosters an in-depth and rich understanding of a phenomenon, situation and/or setting and the behavior of the participants in the classroom (Creswell, 2012). As such, classroom observation is an essential part of gaining an understanding of naturalistic settings and members' ways of seeing (Creswell, 2012). Non-participatory observation is a research technique whereby the researcher observes study participants without taking an active part in the situation (Merriam, 1998).

Two informal classroom observations were conducted during writing microteaching weeks (one observation during the microteaching preparation class and one observation for the actual microteaching demonstration class). The purpose of the observation was to capture detailed information and description of how the course instructor implemented microteaching activities, as well as how preservice teachers responded to activities through preparation and demonstration for microteaching activities. The observation also helped me collect course artifacts, such as lesson plans that served as prompts to understand PSTs’ TSEB during interviews.

To be specific, through the first observation (microteaching preparation class), I was able to understand information about microteaching expectations, guidelines, and
criteria for rubric. In addition, this observation helped me understand the process of how PSTs prepare their lessons for microteaching activities. During the second observation, I was able to understand how PSTs received opportunities to actually apply their lesson into practice. The collected initial lesson plans were used to understand four PSTs’ TSEB regarding how confident they were in accommodating their lessons for ELLs through their microteaching experiences. The lesson plans were also used as prompts in the second interview to understand four PSTs’ TSEB about their LOTE experiences, including their usage of ELLs' home languages during the microteaching activities.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis is a systematic process for seeking meaning (Merriam, 1998). In other words, data analysis is a journey to find meaning from the data set while seeking and answering the research questions. In this study, thematic analysis by Braun and Clarke (2006) was used.

**Thematic analysis.** Thematic analysis is the most widely used qualitative approach to analyze data sources. Braun and Clarke (2006) explain that thematic analysis is a method used for “identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within the data” (p. 79). This method was chosen because it is a rigorous thematic approach that can produce insightful analyses in an effort to answer research questions. To be specific, the six phrases are 1) familiarization with the data, 2) coding, 3) searching for themes, 4) reviewing themes, 5) defining and naming themes, and 6) writing up.

First, all data sources were transcribed, including interview data. Audio recordings were listened to several times for accurate transcription. All data sources were saved to a Dropbox folder and imported into the Nvivo software. As a second step,
codes and sub-codes were developed while working through the data. The third stage was theme development. At this stage, many nodes in Nvivo were read and reread to identify significant broader patterns of meaning, or potential themes. Fourth, these themes were aggregated into small numbers and further reduced to the most frequently referred to categories. As a fifth step, themes were defined and renamed for abstraction and data reduction. In this step, themes were re-categorized to determine how the initial analysis falls under Bandura's four sources of self-efficacy expectations through microteaching. In the last step, all data analysis was triangulated to create a final report.

The analysis of each data set was triangulated. First, open-ended questions were analyzed from surveys and comparing and contrasting themes and codes with PSTs’ two in-depth interviews. Based on two primary data sources and analyses, contextual data sources were further analyzed in an effort to triangulate all data sources. During this triangulation process, I tried to come up with commonalities and differences among all data sources and analysis. As a final step, I laid out all data analysis from the data set in an effort to write up a final report.

In an effort to create a case for each participant, all data sources, including survey responses, interviews, and contextual data, were triangulated. In terms of initial data analysis, the analysis consisted of 1) personal and background information of each individual case (i.e., where they were born and which community they grew up), 2) personal experience in working with ELLs (i.e., volunteering and teaching aboard experience), 3) a PST’s own field experience (i.e., through ESOL and/or mainstream classrooms), 4) analysis of lesson plans (i.e., reading and writing for the ELL, specifically focusing on usage of ELL accommodations), 5) researcher’s classroom
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Familiarizing yourself with your data</td>
<td>Transcribing data, reading and re-reading the data, writing down initial ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generating initial codes</td>
<td>Coding interesting features of the data in a systemic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Searching for themes</td>
<td>Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reviewing potential themes</td>
<td>Checking how the themes work in relation to the entire data set, generating a thematic analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defining and naming themes</td>
<td>Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells generating clear definitions and names for each theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Producing the report</td>
<td>The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

observation data (i.e., observations from lesson plan sessions and microteaching demonstrations), and 6) PSTs’ responses from two surveys (i.e., open-ended questions). Among various data sources, I specifically focused my data analysis in relation to PSTs’ teacher self-efficacy beliefs according to the purpose of this dissertation.

To build a specific case regarding each PST’s TSEB, I created a table that included emerging themes, descriptions of the themes, codes, and sub-codes. The table for each participant consisted of six major themes: 1) descriptions of the PST’s TSEB, 2) the PST’s TSEB analyzed by the Bandura’s four sources of self-efficacy expectations, 3) several factors that impacted the PST’s TSEB, 4) the PST’s TSEB through microteaching experience, 5) the PST’s challenges when teaching and working with ELLs, and 6) the PST’s description as a future teacher of ELL.
After building the individual case, I created another table that included similarities and differences among the cases of the four participants. Another table was created to build a cross-case analysis among the four participants in a collective manner. To be specific, themes emerging about similarities among four participants included: 1) PSTs’ situational and circumstantial TSEB in teaching and working with ELLs, 2) impacts of PSTs’ content and pedagogical knowledge on TSEB, 3) impacts of PSTs’ ESL microteaching experiences on TSEB. Themes regarding differences among four participants included: 1) distinctive features of the PST, including her own exposure to diversity, and 2) PST’s LOTE ability. Each data analysis step using the thematic analysis is attached in the Appendix E.

**Researcher’s Positionality**

I am a Korean-English bilingual who has experience as a teacher of English as a foreign language. My past teaching experience in South Korea encouraged me to consider how to best support English learners in Korea and guided me to expand my knowledge, pedagogical skills, and dispositions about effective instruction. After being admitted as a PhD student at the University of Florida, I had an opportunity to work as a research assistant to explore preservice teachers’ ESL field experience. This experience enlightened me to the urgent need for preservice teacher ELL preparation in general teacher education programs.

In addition, while working with preservice teachers as a field adviser, I realized the importance of a practice-based teacher education program that close the gap between theory from campus coursework to practice through field experience. Furthermore, my experience teaching the second ESL stand-alone course has provided
an opportunity to understand the research context and settings. It has also inspired me to conduct microteaching research to contribute to preservice teacher ELL preparation.

Since I had explored this research context through a pilot study, it was important for me to recognize my researcher bias. In order to ensure my reflexivity (Malterud, 2001) as a researcher, I created a reflexive journal in which I made regular entries during the research process. In these entries, I recorded methodological decisions and the reasons for them as well as reflection upon what was happening in terms of my own values and interests. I always recorded my perspectives and analyses on the issues that came from the process of the study to avoid projecting my researcher bias so it was not perpetuated through the data presented in the study. Most importantly, as a researcher, I tried my best to let the data speak for itself rather than to try to speak for them myself. In order to do this, I made a record of every analysis so that I could explain clearly reasons why I interpreted the data in certain ways.

Most importantly, based on previous research experience, I realized that being bilingual teachers could lead to differences as compared to monolingual teachers when accommodating ELLs in their own mainstream classrooms. As such, I was very careful not to project my own personal beliefs or research agenda while interacting with study participants during interviews and observations. During the dissertation process, I did not teach or work as a graduate assistant, which meant that I did not have an opportunity to work with the group of preservice teachers in the second ESL stand-alone course. I believe these controls prevented me from having a strong bias or influence in my working experience with them.
Establishing Trustworthiness

Instead of using terms from quantitative research methodologies, such as validity and reliability, I use the term “trustworthiness” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). In order to ensure trustworthiness of this research, I followed established criteria that should be met: 1) credibility, 2) dependability, and 3) confirmability (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

Credibility is the criterion that examines whether the study findings are credible or believable from the study participants’ perspectives. In order to ensure credibility, member checking methods were implemented. After finishing each case analysis, I sent my interpretation of the analysis to my foci participants and used it as the process for member checking. By doing this, participants were able to check whether the analysis and interpretation were accurate and whether they agreed with how the findings were described.

In order to ensure dependability for this research, I was transparent in my research as it pertained to data collection and analysis in order to provide opportunities for readers to examine the structure and relationship to the research questions. I tried my best to provide rich enough detail of the context so that a reader was able to recognize similarities and differences in my study participants and microteaching context in teacher education program. Furthermore, whenever any changes occurred, I had a regular meeting with my dissertation chair and provided updated information for my committee members.

In order to ensure confirmability, I kept recordings from my initial analysis to final analysis in terms of how initial codes and themes informed by TSEB were developed and interpreted as a final product. In addition, I collected multiple data sources and types of data. The goal of using multiple data sources was to develop a rich set of data
in consideration of triangulating themes and patterns within the data. The triangulation of data helped me ensure confirmability for my study and support trustworthiness.

Table 3-5. Research Matrix Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 1</th>
<th>What are preservice teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs about teaching ELLs before and after the microteaching experience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Methods</td>
<td>Purpose(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Surveys:</td>
<td>Pre-survey: To explore PSTs’ perceived TSEB before ESL microteaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-survey and Post-survey</td>
<td>Post-survey: To explore PSTs’ perceived TSEB after ESL microteaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-survey (n=25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 2</th>
<th>How do four preservice teachers construct self-efficacy beliefs regarding teaching ELLs through microteaching experiences?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Methods</td>
<td>Purpose(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTs’ Two Interviews</td>
<td>First Interview: To understand four PSTs’ TSEB prior to microteaching When: After pre-survey / prior to actual microteaching demonstration for writing class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First interview and Second interview</td>
<td>Second Interview: To understand four PSTs’ TSEB after microteaching When: After post survey / Following microteaching demonstrations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results

The purpose of this survey was to explore PSTs’ perceived teacher self-efficacy beliefs before and after having the ESL microteaching experiences. This chapter will present the quantitative results from two surveys. The quantitative phase of this study was analyzed first using the statistical results of preservice teachers’ responses to the modified online version of Butler’s (2016) Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale.

Table 3-6. Descriptive Statistics from Teacher Self-Efficacy about Teaching ELLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pre-survey M</th>
<th>Pre-survey SD</th>
<th>Post-survey M</th>
<th>Post-survey SD</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How confident are you in your ability to accommodate ELLs who are in beginner levels based on WIDA?</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How confident are you in your ability to motivate ELLs who show low interest in schoolwork?</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How confident are you in your ability to help ELLs value learning?</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How confident are you in your ability to gauge ELLs’ comprehension of what you have taught?</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>*0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How confident are you in your ability to craft higher-order thinking questions for ELLs?</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How confident are you in your ability to adjust your lessons to the proper level for each individual ELL student?</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>*0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How confident are you in your ability to implement a variety of assessment strategies for ELLs?</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>*0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How confident are you in your ability to accommodate ELLs who are in advanced levels based on WIDA?</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>*0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Pre-Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>P value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How confident are you in your ability to provide an alternative</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>*0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explanation or an example when ELLs are confused?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How confident are you in your ability to implement alternative</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>*0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies with ELLs in your classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How confident are you in your ability to provide appropriate</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges for very capable ELL students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How confident are you in your ability to integrate the cultural</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>*0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backgrounds of ELLs into your classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How confident are you in your ability to integrate the linguistic</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>*0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backgrounds of ELLs (home languages) into your classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How confident are you in your ability to adjust your lesson to</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>*0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper ELL proficiency levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How confident are you in your ability to support ELLs' second</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>*0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language development in content area teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How well do you feel you are prepared to teach ELLs in order to</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>*0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet academic needs of ELLs in mainstream classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * denotes significant difference

Descriptive analysis of individual questions found that preservice teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs significantly improved from pre-survey to post-survey after
microteaching experiences. In terms of individual question responses, preservice teachers felt that they can better accommodate advanced ELLs ($p = 0.010$) [8], adjust lessons to ELL individual needs ($p = 0.045$) [6], adjust lessons to match ELL’s proficiency levels ($p = 0.032$) [14], integrate ELL’s cultural background into the classroom ($p = 0.028$) [12], integrate ELL’s linguistic backgrounds into the classroom ($p = 0.001$) [13], provide alternative explanations or examples to ELLs ($p = 0.029$) [9], implement alternative strategies for ELLs ($p = 0.025$) [10], measure ELLs’ comprehension levels ($p = 0.024$) [4], implement a variety of assessment strategies for ELLs ($p = 0.005$) [7], and support ELLs’ second language development while teaching content area knowledge ($p = 0.028$) [15].

An interesting finding was the difference in teacher self-efficacy when accommodating ELLs’ proficiency levels. Preservice teachers’ TSEB when accommodating advanced ELLs was significantly higher than when accommodating beginner level ELLs. This indicates that preservice teachers are more confident instructing advanced ELLs after the microteaching experiences.

This analysis also showed that preservice teachers’ TSEB regarding adjusting lessons for ELLs improved significantly. Specifically, the difference in their confidence regarding adjusting their lessons to the individual ELL as well as the ELL’s proficiency level was both significant after receiving microteaching experiences.
CHAPTER 4
ARIEL’S STORY

Background

Ariel grew up in a white, upper middle-class family in the suburbs. She noted that she had not seen many culturally diverse people in the community she grew up in. Referring back to her own K-12 school experiences, she described her schools as A+ schools that had ample resources for learning. According to her descriptions, her schools received enough funding so that students used various types of educational technology, including devices such as the iPad. When asked why she chose to become a teacher, she credited one memorable teacher who was very caring and had a warm demeanor. Ariel stated that her teacher was a role model for her in deciding to choose a career in education and that she is still contact with that teacher.

Regarding her experience interacting with diverse people from outside the US, she traveled abroad to France with her family when she was younger. In France, her mother served as a translator for the whole family since she was able to speak French. Ariel mentioned that her family visited major cities, such as Paris, so she was not hyper aware of a language barrier as most people in the shops spoke basic English. Ariel also went on a mission trip to Costa Rica for a week, and she described the trip as an intensive Spanish immersion experience. This experience made her understand how being a newcomer ELL in a mainstream classroom could be really challenging. She explained that she felt sympathy towards ELLs because she could emphasize with ELLs who do not speak any English at all and just sit in mainstream classrooms without any specific ESOL support.

Ariel: I’ve seen just personally that when I was fully immersed for a week, very short amount of time, I learned a lot, but it was also very overwhelming, so
I can see that coming into a classroom where they speak nothing, would be frustrating and boring, and all of those things combined ... It's helped me to be a little bit sympathetic, and just understanding that you can't all of a sudden learn a language. It is a process, and at the same time, they deserve to have some of their background brought into it.

**Previous Experience Working with ELLs**

As far as her previous experience working with ELLs, Ariel detailed her field experience in the mainstream classroom and the ESOL classroom. While observing mainstream classrooms, she observed a lack of mentor teacher ELL accommodations and supports for ELLs. She described that one ELL in the classroom was motivated and worked hard, but that same ELL failed to pass the standardized testing. This incident was a surprising experience for Ariel because she believed that the ELL was high-functioning in the classroom. Thus, the field experience made Ariel aware of the importance of testing accommodations for ELLs.

While observing the ELL in the mainstream classroom, Ariel noted that her bilingualism appeared to be subtractive since the ELL did not want to speak their home language in class and did not want to share experiences from her home environment.

Ariel: They say that her first language is Bengalee, but when you ask her, she says she speaks English. She says she does not speak a different language at home. It doesn't sound like it. I had no clue until our teacher told us that she was classified as English Language Learner. She failed the test, because she's very defiant, so she refused to answer the counselor’s questions. She's testing her on her letters and everything. She's one of our brightest kids, but she just didn't feel like answering the questions, so she failed the test, and now is considered an ELL.

While observing ELLs in ESOL classrooms, she was able to observe some ELL accommodations, such as the incorporation of an English-Spanish dictionary. Specifically, Ariel noted that ESOL teacher tried to tap into the ELL’s funds of knowledge by integrating their cultural background in classroom lessons. She found that
observing the ESOL classroom was eye-opening for her and granted her opportunities
to witness ESOL accommodations that she learned from ESOL stand-alone courses.

Ariel: She would then use a lot of dictionaries, which I'm assuming she kind of
taught them how to use a dictionary.

Lee: Spanish dictionary?

Ariel: Yeah. Spanish to English. They were all three Spanish speakers, and they
did a lot of-- she used a lot of their funds of knowledge. So, they were
learning dances that they were performing a couple months later after we
left towards the end of the year so—

Lee: It's more cultural perspective.

Ariel: Yes. Definitely cultural, and a lot of them are families that are migrant farm
workers, so a lot of them were from the same background and so I think
that's how they were able to kind of all go together and-

Lee: Integrated.

Ariel: Yes, yes. That's the word.

Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs

Based on Ariel's survey responses and two interviews, she felt nervous about
actually teaching ELLs due to her lack of practice directly teaching and working with
ELLs. During interviews, she mentioned several times that having more practice could
perfect her ability to teach ELLs. In this regard, she wanted to receive more hands-on
experiences working with ELLs, and she tried to practice what she had learned from
coursework as well as from her ESOL field experience.

Although she was not very confident about actually teaching ELLs, she felt pretty
confident about accommodating and leveraging lessons for ELLs. After having
participated in the microteaching assignments, Ariel felt that her TSEB about lesson
planning for ELLs improved. During interviews, she emphasized that she felt more
confident about lesson planning compared to actually teaching real ELL students.
Ariel: I mean, we weren’t teaching a real ELL so there’s only so much confidence you can gain, but with the planning side, having to specifically think through how to incorporate funds of knowledge and strategies and things and even just being able to work one on one with students, I think that feeling confident about my planning— I definitely think that got better.

When prompted, Ariel showed some teaching anxiety and concerns about asking higher-order thinking questions for ELLs. She also responded that she still struggled with constructing proper higher-order thinking questions for native English-speaking students as well. Although she received a guest speaker who explained how to create and ask questions based on ELLs’ proficiency levels from a second ESL stand-alone course, she told me that she did not recall much about what she had learned from that talk.

Ariel: Honestly, the thing that I think I’m weakest at in my practice is higher-order thinking questions. So, I’m frustrated now that I can’t even completely recall but we talked about the different kinds of questioning, so connecting it back to self but I don’t remember. It wasn’t super impactful. I don’t know. I mean, everything she was teaching us, I think we’ve heard so it was like a refresher, which was really good to hear with questioning, but I honestly don’t remember that much from her.

**Situational and Contextual TSEB Concerning Teaching ELLs**

While analyzing interviews and classroom observations to prepare for microteaching assignments, Ariel explained that her TSEB when teaching ELLs was dependent on the type of ELLs she was expected to teach. For example, she was more confident about teaching Spanish ELLs because she had benefitted from using Spanish in her instruction. However, when she encountered non-Spanish ELLs, such as ELLs from Bangladeshi, she expressed she had did not feel confident working this group of students because she was not familiar with the ELLs’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In addition, her TSEB appeared to be affected by WIDA proficiency levels.
of ELL students in that she did not feel as confident teaching low-proficiency students as she did about teaching high-proficiency students.

Ariel: I also feel pretty good about being able to pull in funds of knowledge and learning about them and showing that I care to get to know them even if there's a language barrier. And especially if they're Spanish, I feel pretty good about being able to find resources that translate well. Now, I mean they could speak any language so ... you never know what you're going to get, Bengali, for example, in my classroom. I don't know what we would have done ... And also, depends on the kid, depends on what level they're at and if I-- if it's Spanish, if I can help them a little bit with that language or if it's just something completely different.

Another example of her TSEB being affected by the characteristics of the students she would be teaching was gleaned from survey questions that she answered. Regarding accommodating ELLs' funds of knowledge in manners such as integrating ELLs' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, she responded that she was more confident in integrating cultural backgrounds as opposed to linguistic backgrounds because her previous courses in the teacher education program helped her prepare to tap into students' diversity and cultures.

For example, she learned some tips how to create a safe and comfortable classroom environment by using family pictures and multiple countries flags from previous teacher preparation coursework. However, she was not sure about how to integrate the linguistic backgrounds of many types of ELLs although she had practiced using ELLs' home languages (Spanish) through microteaching demonstrations. While she would be able to research more about ELLs' linguistic background in her future classroom, she told me that it was much easier to consider how to integrate cultural backgrounds as opposed to linguistic backgrounds for ELLs.

Ariel: I think culturally we've talked a lot about how to incorporate all students' cultures into your classroom. We talked a lot about that first semester, for whatever reason.
Lee: In the program?

Ariel: Yes. Just getting to know them and having pictures of their families around and even if you have students from multiple countries hanging flags in your room, just little things like that. Linguistically, it seems more intimidating to me because I feel like you have to do more research and learn a little bit more about the language, especially if it was Bengali. I’d probably be doing research for days to just even figure out basic words and how to say them versus just finding images or pictures or flags that you could hang. It seems easier to incorporate cultural backgrounds versus linguistic.

Several times throughout the data collection period, Ariel expressed her emotional teaching anxiety in actually teaching ELLs. Although she gained some confidence in teaching ELLs through the microteaching experience, she still felt nervous about teaching real ELLs in her future classroom. For instance, if she has to teach ELLs by herself without any ESOL support in her future school, she would be nervous in working with ELLs. Although the microteaching experience made her believe that she gained some confidence, she still thought that a lack of experience in directly working with ELLs in a real-world context was the challenge that she faced.

During the interview, she revealed that she was not confident at all about teaching English grammar or syntax to ELLs. Referring to the first ESOL stand-alone course, she expressed hesitation about teaching English syntax and grammar for ELLs in content-area instruction. She told me that she was frustrated about learning technical terminology from English grammar and syntax and those technical concepts made her feel overwhelmed. She also stated that what she had learned about how to understand ELLs’ second language acquisition process from linguistic perspectives, which was a challenging content knowledge.

Ariel: His class was good. I think I didn’t really know what to expect, and I was frustrated sometimes with learning the technicalness, with learning the
language, especially when talking about grammar and syntax and morphing— I mean, that's his thing— what's that called? When it's—

Lee: Linguistics?

Ariel: Linguistics. I hate linguistics … So that was frustrating to me because I just kind of tuned out and I was like, "I don't care. I'm annoyed. This is too much." So, linguistics was a pain, but that was only one class and then it got better. And there wasn't as much practical— we weren't teaching in front of the class, but then going to that class while also being with some ELLs … that was really interesting. And I think it laid a good foundation. Yeah, I just hate linguistics, but he loves linguistics.

**Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**

In attending two ESOL stand-alone courses, Ariel learned that providing visuals to support ELLs’ comprehension levels was the most critical for ensuring their success in second language learning. She also stated that she wanted to incorporate ELLs’ funds of knowledge when utilizing visuals by including their native languages in content-based instruction. She further explained that incorporating language objectives in the lesson plan was critical content knowledge as it helped her become more conscious about focusing on vocabulary instruction at the beginning of her instruction. She told me that vocabulary instruction was really important to promote ELLs’ academic language development.

When prompted about her revised lesson plan for teaching writing, Ariel said that using simpler language for low-proficiency ELLs was important as content materials in math and science usually contain difficult words and technical terms that ELLs are expected to decode and comprehend. Although Ariel told me that she needed more practice to make content materials more accessible for ELLs, she learned that making texts much easier and comprehensible for ELLs was some key content knowledge she took away from the ESOL stand-alone courses.
Lee: Regarding your revised lesson plan writing, here it said using simpler language for Spanish, and there's another one, funds of knowledge. Could you tell me a little about that, this one here?

Ariel: I think I just started thinking that our anchor chart had a lot of academic vocab, which is fine. They're in fourth grade, so they're going to hear it, but I think we could have taken the time to simplify it a little bit for the ELL. We didn't necessarily do that, and, yeah, the visuals. It's so hard, visuals and writing […] It's one thing in science and social studies and even math, but in writing, it's a little trickier, but I think just thinking through how to use simpler language that-- because there's a lot of that academic language that they might not have even heard, like conjunctions and compound sentences. It's kind of tricky.

In terms of Ariel’s pedagogical knowledge through microteaching experiences, she learned various ELL accommodation strategies. While preparing for lesson plans and the microteaching demonstration, she received opportunities to practice and actually demonstrate some of the ELL accommodations. When prompted, Ariel could easily refer to her pedagogical knowledge about teaching ELLs and demonstrated some ELL accommodations through the microteaching activities.

To be specific, based on her reading lesson plan for ELLs, several ELL accommodations were noted. These were: providing visuals for comprehensible input of materials, creating a collaborative activity to provide peer help for ELLs, providing individual support, such as tutoring for ELLs, focusing on key vocabulary for ELLs’ reading development, focusing on listening skill while using L1 audio resources, and creating sentence frames for ELLs’ academic language development.

Regarding writing lesson plans, it was clearly noted that her instructional decision-making process was based on the ELL’s WIDA level in the microteaching scenario. From classroom observation data about her lesson planning, Ariel and her co-teacher carefully analyzed the ELL’s writing sample. After analyzing the sample, they decided to teach conjunctions in compound sentences because the ELL had some issues
overusing run-on sentences. Similar to the reading lesson plan, Ariel incorporated several visual aids to support the ELL’s comprehension and scaffolding and also integrated supplemental resources from Pinterest.com. In terms of boosting the ELL’s academic language development, Ariel provided sentence frames so that the lesson could accommodate the ELL’s writing ability.

Ariel: We found it. We found it on Pinterest. And I loved it because a lot of them that I found online were very wordy, and in my opinion, an anchor chart should just be something that you can look at quickly and kind of see what you need to know without having to read multiple sentences. So, I loved how it listed all the conjunctions and shades on either side.

During interviews, she also explained that conducting a mini lesson about conjunctions by using the acronym FANBOYS helped students to remember what they had learned in previous lessons. In an effort to activate ELLs’ prior and background knowledge, she decided to conduct a quick review lesson. She told me that focusing on conjunctions could be beneficial for all of her students because some native-English students may struggle with combining and connecting sentences using proper conjunctions.

Ariel: Compound sentences focusing on conjunctions, so joining the two sentences together. We thought of it because the sentences were almost run-ons and there weren’t any conjunctions, and so just kind of showing students they could do that. And we went on the notion that the other students also were struggling with conjunctions, and so it was kind of a refresher for the whole class.

Lee: Can you tell me more about activating prior knowledge here?

Ariel: Yeah, we wanted to, at the beginning, just see what students know, so asking them, and we’re assuming that they’ve already had lessons on compound sentences, but it’s a little mini lesson to remind them. So, asking them, again, what’s a compound sentence and trying to have them recall the conjunctions that you use. Some people use the acronym FANBOYS, for, and, but, and it lists all them. Yeah, just kind of asking them questions to see where they’re at and, also, having them start to think about compound sentences and conjunctions before we start.
Based on the microteaching rubric, she also spent some time in working with the ELL alone, which was an individual ELL support through the microteaching demonstration. By using tutoring as a strategy, Ariel and her co-teacher divided their roles and took turns to support all six students. For instance, one teacher worked with ELLs individually. Meanwhile, another teacher walked around to check comprehension for native-English speaking students.

Ariel learned three years of Spanish in her high school. When promoted, she self-evaluated herself as a monolingual speaker and she was not very confident about speaking Spanish. To be specific, she worried about her Spanish pronunciation in front of Spanish ELLs because she wanted to save face. However, through classroom observations by the researcher, it was noted that she incorporated Spanish resources for the ELL because she realized that using the ELL’s home language could help the her second language development. In addition, the microteaching rubric prompted her to include and utilize the ELL’s home language.

For example, in the reading lesson plan for ELLs, she incorporated the words gato (‘cat’) and pescado (‘fish’) in Spanish within the microteaching scenario. In terms of the writing lesson plan and microteaching demonstration, she incorporated the Spanish terms for conjunctions and sentences in Spanish to tap into ELLs’ funds of knowledge according to microteaching rubric.

Lee: So how are you going to incorporate ELL’s native language?

Ariel: That's what we added. So in that section, we were saying how we're going to talk about-- well, we just used two words. So conjunción, if that's how you say it, is conjunction in Spanish. And then frase is sentence. So just, like, using those words kind of interchangeably with sentence and conjunction.

Lee: Would they be like a cognate?
Ariel: *Conjunciòn* and conjunction, yeah, it would be. But *frase* sounds like phrase. So that works for a sentence.

**TSEB Through Microteaching Experience**

Ariel’s responses from surveys and interviews revealed she felt she had gained some confidence in teaching ELLs through microteaching practice. In the first interview, she mentioned that microteaching experience was helpful for her to practice ELL accommodations while focusing on the low-proficiency ELL. This was because the ELL’s WIDA levels in the microteaching prompt and scenario were beginner level, reading 2 and writing 2. After having participated in microteaching experiences, Ariel explained how she revised her lesson plans to better accommodate the ELL in this scenario. She reflected that sample sentences in lesson plans should be more culturally and linguistically relevant for ELLs. She observed one group who incorporated Mexican culture during their microteaching sessions, and she mentioned that she should have done it as well.

In addition, she reflected that she could have incorporated simplified texts so that she could modify language that was less complex for ELLs. In other words, simplified texts should be required when considering the ELL’s WIDA levels, which was level 2 in reading. She mentioned that she missed a huge opportunity to create sample sentences that were culturally and linguistically relevant for a Spanish ELL so that the ELL felt that the content materials include his or her home culture and language. While revising the lesson and writing a reflection after microteaching, she realized an important lesson about tapping into ELLs’ funds of knowledge.

Ariel: We just missed a huge opportunity to use our sentences as something that they knew. I mean, we didn’t even think about that, and it’s just kind of funny but we just did things that we knew … It was things about Mexico or something and I was like, "Wow, that’s so cool." So, we could have done it
about Mexico, or about-- even just Florida, we could have taken it and done about Florida or a city in general. Maybe like a theme out of the-- just from the activity. So, but I mean, I didn't see that until after we taught the lesson, and we talked to the instructor, and we talked to each other and we wrote our reflection, then, I realized it. So, it's kind of scary because it's like, even when you're doing an activity, purposely about-- you're really focused on ELLs, there's still things you can improve.

Reflecting on her own microteaching experience, Ariel's biggest takeaway was that she realized the importance of being critical in lesson planning for ELLs. She explained that when planning lessons for ELLs, she should be really intentional and critical. She mentioned that having interviews with the researcher made her reflect about what she had done and consider how she will accommodate ELLs in her own future classroom. This reflection experience made her believe that she has room for improvement.

Ariel: I think my biggest takeaway was just the personal reflection that I guess you just have to be really on top of yourself with how you're planning. Just the whole thing of that we didn't even include the cultural background or use cultural funds of knowledge. Because I can see myself getting into my internship and even just teaching in general and it's kind of just bursting out lesson plans and teaching just to get it done and do what you need to do […] But I think it's helpful to take a step back and reflect and see where you can improve. So, I think that that was my biggest takeaway that if I'm not reflecting personally as a professional then I'm not doing a big service to my kids.

**Developing a Beginning Repertoire**

During interviews, Ariel credited her positive working experience with ELLs and she also showed willingness to learn ELLs' funds of knowledge, including linguistic backgrounds if she was not familiar with certain group of ELLs. During the interview, she also showed willingness to incorporate ELLs' funds of knowledge in content instruction. She also wanted to better research ELLs' cultural and linguistic backgrounds. In addition, she wanted to get to know ELLs more.

Ariel: I love to talk to kids and hear more about the language so if they're at the proficiency level where they can teach you words, I think that's really fun
and they enjoy that but that's not always the case and they're not always at that level. But I think that's a really good way to show that you care and incorporate those words once you've learned them.

When Ariel was asked to explain how she felt about becoming a teacher of ELLs, she noted she would have a responsibility to accommodate ELLs in her future classroom. In addition, she explained how she will accommodate ELLs in her own future classrooms. She mentioned several ELL strategies, such as providing peer help, providing one-on-one tutoring, and creating a welcoming environment for ELLs. Her performance in lesson planning processes and microteaching demonstrations indicated that she was willing to try out new strategies and to learn more about ELL accommodations. Furthermore, she mentioned an online tutoring program that she could use to gain more experience directly working with ELLs. She mentioned that if she wanted to have more hands-on experience directly working with ELLs, she would like to explore an online tutoring program that helped EFL (English as a foreign language) students to learn English taught by a Native English-speaking teacher.

Ariel: So in some ways, I just wish I could have more experience. Even just tutoring ELLs which, also, side tangent, my mom's friend does this online tutoring thing called--have you heard of VIPKID?

Lee: Yeah.

Ariel: It's Chinese students. So they're in Beijing and it's online and you teach English to them... and I don't know if it's legit. Her friend only taught math for one year.

Lee: It's like private tutoring.

Ariel: Yes, it is. You're teaching them English and it's a curriculum that the company has written, which could be good or bad, but I'm thinking about doing that maybe in the summer which could give me experience working with students who I know nothing about their language. I mean, that's obviously a totally different realm, but that might give me experience. I'm really crossing my fingers that my class starting in January will have at least one or two ELLs.
At the end of interview, she explained that she was collecting accommodations that she learned from the teacher education course for her future career. To be specific, she learned so much content knowledge and pedagogical strategies from several courses, she realized that it was necessary for her to put everything in one box. She stated she was considering writing her reflections in her teaching journals on her own, and she tried to create a toolkit book based on what she learned from coursework as well as her field experience. This was because she may not remember key content knowledge and practices she had learned from the teacher education programs.

Ariel: So that's funny because I started getting very overwhelmed with--I just was convinced that I was going to forget everything we've learned in the program just in general. I was like, "I'm never going to remember any of this." Like, "I'm going to forget it all." So recently, I started a box, and I've been writing things on notecards, so some strategies, just ideas I've seen from teachers. And I also have a little-- I know Taylor has one too. It's a little mini just like journal thing that--I'd started doing that last semester. So in my practicum—

Lee: Like teaching journals?

Ariel: Yeah. I would just write down things she did like strategies or—

Lee: Reflections.

Ariel: Yeah. Just little things that I wanted to remember, to potentially do in my classroom. And so I've been putting them all in one box. And when I said that I write down strategies for ELL, honestly, I might just do that on a notecard and put it in my box because I genuinely don't know when I'll be teaching any. But we're not forced to do that, but just for organizing my brain, I wanted to. But I mean, I think it would be a great idea if they made us, but it's almost just like on you to do it. But we do get a lot of information between our practicums, and our classes, and ideas and things that people throw out that it'd be hard to go back and find it. It's almost like you just need it all in one place to look through and remind yourself of things.
Summary of Ariel’s Story

After having participated in microteaching experiences, Ariel expressed that her TSEB was enhanced in terms of lesson planning and accommodations for ELLs. However, she had some teaching anxiety in regards to creating higher-order thinking questions for ELLs. After conducting in-depth interviews, it was apparent her TSEB was situational and contextual in teaching ELLs because her confidence in working with high-proficiency ELLs was higher than that of working with low proficiency ELLs. Also, her TSEB was stronger in working with Spanish ELLs as opposed to non-Spanish ELLs.

Regarding her content and pedagogical knowledge from ESOL stand-alone courses, Ariel explained that familiarizing herself with ELL proficiency levels in the WIDA, using visual aids and supports for ELLs, and focusing on key vocabulary in content area instruction were crucial to enhance her TSEB in teaching ELLs. During her ESOL field experience, she also observed the importance of using appropriate educational technology and realized the pros and cons of incorporating technology for ELLs’ learning. As a future teacher of ELLs, she was willing to incorporate ELLs’ home languages and cultures in her future instruction and she believed that teaching ELLs was her responsibility in the mainstream classroom. She showed empathy towards ELLs after observing how subtractive bilingualism could negatively impact ELLs’ learning processes in the mainstream classroom.
CHAPTER 5
TAYLOR’S STORY

Background

Taylor grew up in a culturally and linguistically diverse community near the Orlando, Florida area. In terms of her K-12 experience, she noted that she had been exposed to a few ELLs in her school days. While interacting with them, she noticed that ELLs were some of the higher-functioning students in class. This was because the ELLs she studied with were already fluent in English. Taylor explained that these ELLs were born in the US, so she did not perceive these ELLs struggling with learning English.

Regarding her motivation to become a teacher, Taylor liked teaching as she grew up; for instance, she taught family members and relatives in her household. When prompted about a memorable teacher in her K-12 experience, she mentioned her kindergarten teacher and the she always paid close attention to students while taking care of students’ feelings and emotions in class. Taylor admired her and tried to become like that teacher, looking up to her as a role model.

Regarding her experience interacting with diverse people outside the US, she had had a study abroad experience where she traveled to Ireland. The trip was guided by one of the ESOL faculty members in the teacher education program. When Taylor was in Ireland, she witnessed a dual language program in action at a school, in which two languages were both used interchangeably. To be specific, she described her Ireland experience as a language study where she observed a flip-flop dual language immersion classroom, which meant that the students were fully immersed in Gaelic one day and in English the next.

Lee: Could you tell me a little bit about your experience in Ireland?
Taylor: It was really cool. We went to two different places. One was an English school, but they had an hour of Gaelic a day, and then the other one was fully Gaelic. And then after kindergarten, you had an hour of English a day. They would flip-flop. It was interesting, because they still teach religion in schools, and then we also noticed that they teach a lot more history.

Lee: It’s more like a dual language program.

Taylor: Yeah. Not fully, where they’re learning both as much, but they flip-flop throughout the day and have a specific hour designated for the other language.

**Previous Experience Working with ELLs**

Regarding her previous experience working with ELLs, she noted that she had two ELLs in her practicum classroom. The setting was a mainstream classroom using a full inclusion model. She mentioned that teaching and working with ELLs was exciting and that this experience really helped her better understand concepts that she learned from ESOL stand-alone courses. In the practicum, Taylor and her co-teacher incorporated individual ELL accommodations, such as tutoring. In other words, when Taylor’s mentor teacher led the classroom instruction, Taylor and her co-teacher incorporated some translation methods, such as using key Spanish vocabulary for ELLs in content-based instruction.

In terms of her field experience, she observed some ELL accommodations in the ESOL classroom. She explained that the ESOL teacher focused on promoting ELLs’ academic language support. Through observation, Taylor was able to observe the differences about how to accommodate ELLs based on WIDA proficiency levels. In the ESOL classroom, the teacher allowed ELLs to use their home languages during small group activities. According to her descriptions, the teacher incorporated translilingual practice for ELLs.
Taylor: And then the afternoon group were the lower-proficiency kids. So those were the kids who were--we have a kid who moved here three weeks ago and stuff like that. And they were working on a lot of vocab. So, they had to go through and look at feelings words and translate from their language into English and draw a picture. And so then, when I was there they were creating a PowerPoint of the word and a picture to represent it.

While observing the mainstream classroom through field experience, she noticed the usage of educational technology for ELLs. Based on her observations, Taylor listed pros and cons of incorporating educational technology and how it impacted ELLs’ second language development. For example, in terms of practicing speaking through the Rosetta Stone program, Taylor observed that ELLs were easily frustrated when the program did not recognize ELLs’ English pronunciation. However, in order to promote low proficiency ELLs’ vocabulary development, Rosetta Stone could be effective because it was designed to target key vocabulary based on the Tier words list.

Another educational technology she observed was the Reading Assistant program. Taylor explained that it could be a beneficial tool for ELLs to practice reading aloud. However, it was necessary for mentor teachers to provide guided support. Through her observation based on her own field experience, she concluded that simply setting up ELLs to work with the technology might not guarantee success and actually impact ELLs’ second language development.

Taylor: Reading Assistant was, I think, good and bad because the kids would get really frustrated because it kept saying that they pronounced the word wrong. But technology isn’t always reliable. So sometimes they just couldn’t hear them or stuff like that. So, I think it was easy for them to get frustrated. But, I mean, it’s good that they were practicing reading aloud, I guess, so.

Lee: What about your impression of Rosetta Stone?

Taylor: Well, I think that you only did Rosetta Stone if you were low-proficiency. And so I’m pretty sure the kids that I was with only did Reading Assistant when they were on the computer. But there was one kid in there that was doing Rosetta Stone. And I mean, I think that it probably has its benefits
because at least if you don't know the language, they can get some support of vocab and stuff. But I don't think it can be the only thing we use. Maybe every so often to kind of build some of that vocabulary, but not just like, "Oh. You don't speak English. I'm going to put you on Rosetta Stone. Learn it." And I feel like that's what happens a lot, so.

**Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs**

Based on Taylor’s two interviews, she felt that her TSEB improved. For instance, she was not confident in teaching and working with ELLs last semester due to a lack of experience teaching ELLs directly. However, thanks to her own practicum experience in teaching ELLs on a regular basis, her TSEB improved compared to the last semester. Specifically, she had two ELLs who had just come from Puerto Rico, so she received enough opportunities to directly accommodate them. She expressed her excitement in working with ELLs because she noted that ELLs were developing their own English-speaking skills. In other words, her practicum experience aided in promoting Taylor's TSEB in regard to teaching ELLs.

Taylor: Before this semester, I was not confident at all. Last semester I had three ELLs. The same three as Ariel (Case 1). We weren't in the same classrooms but [...] they did reading with her and do science with me. So, they were very proficient. So I was excited to get back to them to work with them but they were so proficient already that it was very different than this semester where I have two kids who just came from Puerto Rico and speak-- they say, "Thank you" and that's about it in English [...] So it's been really cool because I feel I get this point of semester I'm much more confident than I was two or three months ago, which is exciting.

Although she had two ELLs in her practicum, she was not sure which ELL accommodations could actually be effective and beneficial for each specific ELL. For instance, although she had learned various ways of accommodating lower-level ELLs through her practicum and microteaching experience, she showed teaching anxiety about creating higher-order thinking questions for ELLs. Since she had not practiced teaching high-functioning ELLs previously, she was not sure how to create and ask
proper questions for high-proficiency ELLs. She described that her weakest part of working with ELLs was creating HOTs for ELLs based on their proficiency levels in WIDA.

Taylor: That's probably one of our weaker parts, just because we don't really have that much experience in teaching writing. This is a really good activity, because it forced us to create a lesson plan for writing. We've only had one writing course, so creating higher-order thinking questions in a writing lesson, basically, in a grammar lesson, was new for both of us. I don't know how great our higher-order thinking stuff is. That's definitely something that we could look at tonight and tweak a little.

Situational and Contextual TSEB Concerning Teaching ELLs

During interviews, she showed concerns about teaching non-Spanish ELLs, whose linguistic and cultural backgrounds she was not familiar with. She showed some confidence in teaching Spanish ELLs because she learned Spanish in her high school, so she was able to incorporate Spanish in her instruction. However, if she encountered non-Spanish ELLs who she had not taught previously, she felt anxious about accommodating many linguistically diverse ELLs in her future classroom.

It was also noted that her TSEB changed based on which subject she would have to teach. For instance, she felt confident in accommodating reading lesson for ELLs, but she was not confident in writing lessons for ELLs. She stated that she had learned an ample amount of pedagogical knowledge in targeting reading for students, but there was not a specific course that focused on how to accommodate students' writing skills in the teacher education program. Thus, although she had practiced writing accommodations for ELLs through microteaching assignments, she felt that she needed more practice in teaching writing for ELLs.

Taylor: I have never really planned a writing lesson [...] specially focusing on ELLs and so I think that was a big learning experience, and it kind of helped me gain confidence in kind of trying to find ways that you can
challenge both ELLs and your other students but also meet the needs of them because they can be at such different levels. And really the importance of keeping the learning goal the same and just having it look different for each student.

Taylor received three years of Spanish language instruction in high school. When prompted, she self-identified herself as a monolingual as she did not feel confident speaking Spanish. She told me that her father strongly encouraged her to learn Spanish because knowing Spanish could help her to work with ELLs since many ELLs are Spanish speakers in Florida. It was noted based on classroom observations that she was capable of using Spanish in her instruction through microteaching demonstrations. However, she revealed some concerns about her Spanish pronunciation in front of Spanish ELLs because she wanted to save face. She felt she mispronounced some Spanish words in front of ELLs and ELLs noticed that her pronunciation was not proper. This experience made her feel hesitant in using her LOTE ability although she had the capacity to speak a few key Spanish words. So, she preferred to let ELLs speak Spanish for her instead of her incorporating ELLs’ native language (Spanish) during her instruction.

Lee: So how confident do feel about incorporating ELLs’ L1 during the lesson?

Taylor: It was funny because we were very scared about it because you don't want to say it wrong, which I do that all the time right now. I'll tell my kid something in Spanish because I feel most confident obviously in Spanish because I did take that for three years, and they'll kind of chuckle, and I'm like, "Oh, I said it wrong." And then I'll go home and listen to it like five times on random things or I'll ask them to say it for me and kind of try and repeat it back to the [...] And so I don't think I'm necessarily super confident and especially if it's not Spanish but I think it's important to show the kids that it's okay not to be confident and to put yourself out there and to say something even if it doesn't sound right or it sounds funny.
Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Regarding Taylor’s content knowledge that she had learned from the ESOL stand-alone courses, she explained that focusing on the language objective in lesson planning and accommodating her lessons based on ELLs’ proficiency levels were the two most important concepts. To be specific, she mentioned that she had not received opportunities to specifically include language objectives in her lesson plans previously because the lesson template in the teacher education program only included content objectives and not highlighting ELLs’ linguistic needs in content-based instruction. She also mentioned that understanding how to measure and gauge ELLs’ proficiency levels using WIDA was a critical content knowledge she had learned.

Taylor: They [lesson plan templates] don’t have a language objective but they do have a part where it says, like, “How will you accommodate ELLs?” And so, you have to think about general accommodations, but it isn’t as specific as the course where we had to actually do the language objective and then answer all the different questions for the ELLs. It’s kind of just all in one box and you kind of do it brief. That’s what I would do.

In addition, the course instructor from the ESL stand-alone sources recounted a language immersion experience at the beginning of the semester, which helped Taylor recognize the importance of getting to know ELLs. Through language immersion experiences, she felt that she should do more research on ELLs’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Specifically, Taylor said that from the course instructor’s teaching aboard experience in China, she had gleaned that in Asian culture, giving peer feedback in class might not be considered a legitimate evaluation and assessment. She learned that East Asian ELLs prefer to receive feedback and evaluation from the class instructor or advisor who was considered an authority figure. Thus, providing the peer feedback in US schooling might not be a familiar concept for certain types of ELLs. In
this regard, when she works with diverse ELLs, she has to be very attentive to the diverse cultural backgrounds that ELLs bring into classrooms.

Taylor: The instructor definitely used it a lot when he was talking about how important it is to know the cultural background of your ELLs so that you don't--you understand if students are looking in your eyes are a bit confused, why they're not sitting in line or if you want them to work with your peers or give peer feedback how it sometimes that can be like they don't think that it's appropriate to give each other feedback and it should come from the teacher. And so, I think that my biggest takeaway from all of this is talk about China was just how important it is to do research about your kid's cultural background so that you can better understand them and better support them.

While preparing for lesson plans and the microteaching demonstration, she received opportunities to practice and to actually demonstrate some ELL accommodations. To be specific, based on her reading lesson plan for an ELL, several ELL strategies were noted. These were: focusing on vocabulary in reading instruction to support ELL's academic language development, instructional decision-making based on ELL's WIDA proficiency level, targeting summarizing skills based on standards, and providing visual storyboard for ELL’s comprehension and scaffolding.

Lee: Could you tell me a little bit about here and the graphic organizer?

Taylor: So what we wanted to do is, obviously, when we're reading as a whole class the English version of the text, it might be hard. He is already reading level one. So, we figured if we created a visual storyboard as we're reading through it, he could also have that to refer to, to kind of see what's going on and follow along. And then maybe even catch some vocab words based on words that he knows and the pictures that he sees. And then for the graphic organizer, we're talking about doing key details and then with the arrows leading to a little summary.

In her writing lesson plan for ELLs, Taylor focused on teaching conjunctions to make compound sentences. Taylor wanted ELLs to transition from simple sentences to compound sentences by using several conjunctions. For her writing lesson plan, several ELL accommodations were also noted. These were: activating ELLs’ prior
knowledge by reviewing concepts that ELLs had learned previously, providing sentence frames to support ELLs’ academic development, providing sample sentences through teacher modeling and demonstration, and using an anchor chart to make the content materials accessible for ELLs.

She mentioned that she especially did not want to make her materials too complex for the ELL by, for example, using too much technical vocabulary in the content-based instruction. Through classroom observations throughout her microteaching planning and demonstration, Taylor used several paper clips in an effort to demonstrate how to combine two simple sentences by using conjunctions. She explained that this teacher modeling helped the ELL understand the concept better. She also pointed out that since the ELL placed in the lower level in the WIDA writing, she did not ask the ELL to write a full paragraph. She said that using two simple sentences in order to make compound sentences was her main focus while considering ELLs’ proficiency levels. This was because she did not want to create a lesson that could easily overwhelm ELLs.

Taylor: So, we didn't want to make them too complex where if there was going to be a lot of vocab that the kids might not know. And so we want to keep them pretty simple but we're going to show that all of these different words can be used to bridge them together to make more complex sentences. So, it's not always about using high vocab and making this, like, super wordy sentences. You can have two simple sentences and make them a better sentence by combining them using the word. So, I think using the little paper clips in the sentence parts will help them kind of see that it's not that hard to make a compound sentence. You can use your two simple ideas. And, like, if they do, if they can only write a few words in a sentence, they're not necessarily at the level yet where they can write an essay or a full paragraph, and showing that, yes, you can write these short sentences, and then you can use just one word to kind of connect them.
In the microteaching demonstration, Taylor spent some time working with the ELL alone, which was an individual ELL support based on the microteaching rubric. By using individual tutoring as a strategy, Taylor and her co-teacher divided their roles and took turns to support all six students. For instance, one teacher worked with ELLs individually. Meanwhile, another teacher walked around to check comprehension for native-English speaking students.

**TSEB Through Microteaching Experience**

Through the ESL microteaching experience, Taylor gained some confidence in teaching ELLs as the experience provided her opportunities to practice and reflect on what she had learned. For instance, a one-on-one conversation after the microteaching demonstration with the course instructor helped her restructure her lesson plans for the ELL. However, she also mentioned about some limitations of her microteaching experience. She said that watching her own teaching demonstration made her feel awkward. She also mentioned she felt intimidated during the microteaching demonstration because she had to teach in front of her peers who were pretending to be ELL students.

When asked about the revised lesson plan for teaching writing, Taylor reflected that she might have missed opportunities to effectively accommodate the ELL. For example, she explained that she should have included vocabulary pre-teaching so that ELLs may not have much difficulty in understanding texts and sample sentences that she created. In addition, she could have done a better job in incorporating the ELL’s home language, Spanish. If she had an opportunity to teach this lesson again, she would use bilingual audio files to promote four language skills simultaneously. Specifically, watching her peers teach provided her some insights on how she could
improve her own teaching. In other words, the microteaching experiences helped her consider many different ideas and ways to accommodate ELLs.

Taylor: So, I think that overall the process taught me a lot more that I was expecting it to. Seeing everyone else’s lesson helped me to think of all of the different ways you can teach something like conjunctions or all of the different activities you can do and all the different accommodations […] That could be super great, but I would've never thought to have that for them for their writing, so it gives you a fresh perspective of things that you never even thought about, and it helps you to reflect back on it and kind of see what you could’ve done better and differently.

Taylor’s biggest takeaway was that when planning lessons for ELLs, she should possess a critical eye and reflection. During interviews, Taylor mentioned having a critical eye and reflection several times while planning lessons for ELLs.

Lee: So, as you look back at microteaching, what do you think you would take away from it?

Taylor: I think the biggest thing that I probably took away from it is just the importance of looking through everything with a very critical eye. I think if you really take the time in your planning to think critically about the different things and how it’s going to come across to your students and how you can get them more engaged. […] So, I think it really just emphasized the importance of being critical of your own teaching, of your own thinking and putting your kids’ point of views into perspective and kind of trying to think about it from their point of view before teaching it instead of just after.

**Developing a Beginning Repertoire**

Several times throughout the data collection period, Taylor expressed positive attitudes and perceptions towards ELLs. Through her own pre-internship experience teaching ELLs, she noted that ELLs were smart, and they already possessed home language literacy. She also stated that ELLs were really motivated to learn not only English but also content materials. During interviews, she was willing to learn more about ELLs’ funds of knowledge and she also wanted to try out new ESOL strategies. In other words, in order to better support ELLs in her future classroom, she explained that
she had to get to know more about ELLs while researching their linguistic and cultural background knowledge.

In terms of teaching English syntax and grammar, Taylor showed willingness to research ELLs’ linguistic backgrounds. This was because knowledge that she learned from linguistics could help her better understand ELLs’ second language development as well as how to research ELLs’ native languages in her future classroom.

Lee: How do you feel about incorporating linguistics, like grammar and syntax, in your lesson?

Taylor: I'm not going to say I love it, but I think that I know it's important and especially if I'm in a higher grade where the student does have that knowledge in their home language or in their native language, I think that it's worth it to do the research and figure out some of the linguistics behind it in order to best benefit them [...] I definitely think that it's something that is worth looking more into and kind of researching.

When prompted, she emphasized how she will accommodate ELLs in her future classrooms. Four major ELL accommodations emerged. First, she will provide comprehensible input for ELLs so that she can make content materials more accessible for ELLs. Second, she will create various small group activities by pairing ELLs with native English-speaking students as helpers. Third, she will provide individual support through tutoring. In the one-on-one environment, she will incorporate her LOTE ability, Spanish, for ELLs. Fourth, she will create a welcoming environment for newcomer ELLs to relieve their tension and anxiety in the mainstream classroom. To sum up, she believed that she was in the process of developing herself as a future teacher of ELLs.

Taylor: I think being critical of myself and my planning and my classroom and kind of how you create a safe learning environment and how you incorporate those accommodations. So, I think if you're critical of yourself and how you're planning the lessons then you'll be much more beneficial to your ELLs then if you are just kind of like, oh, I'll put some pictures on a page, and sweet, that'll check off that box. So, I think if you're really critical and
you really are thoughtful when you're planning and practice with that and practice with the ELLs will help me become a stronger teacher.

**Summary of Taylor’s Story**

After having participated in microteaching experiences, Taylor expressed that her TSEB was enhanced in terms of lesson planning and accommodations for ELLs. However, she had some teaching anxiety in regards to creating higher-order thinking questions for ELLs. Her biggest takeaway from the MT experiences was her own critical reflection about her instructional decision-making process because she realized that she should be very careful about her instructional choices and reflected on how to incorporate effective ELL accommodations for her future classrooms.

Regarding her content and pedagogical knowledge that she learned, she explained that incorporating language objectives in her lesson plans that were closely connected with ELLs’ WIDA levels was key knowledge to promoting her TSEB in teaching ELLs. Regarding her opportunity for practice, she received various opportunities to work with ELLs regularly in her pre-internship and practicum, which made her feel more confident in teaching ELLs in the mainstream classroom. As a future teacher of ELLs, she was willing to incorporate ELLs’ home languages and cultures in her future instruction. Specifically, in an effort to accommodate newcomer ELLs, she realized that creating an inclusive learning environment was critical because it impacted ELLs’ learning process in the mainstream classroom.
CHAPTER 6
SARAH’S STORY

Background

Sarah grew up in a very small town in West Palm Beach, Florida. She described her hometown a small horse town with a very monolingual and monocultural community. In terms of her K-12 experience, she was not exposed to many culturally and linguistically diverse students in her school days. Regarding her family background, her mother originally came from Colombia and immigrated to Florida when she was young. After switching her careers a few times, her mother ended up working as an ESOL teacher for high school students in the West Palm beach area. From her mother’s ESOL teacher experience and perspective, Sarah noticed that maintaining high expectations for ESOL students was the key to ELLs’ academic success in K-12.

In addition, although her mother is a fluent bilingual teacher in both Spanish and English, it was difficult for her to tap into the many diverse ELLs who have different linguistic backgrounds. For instance, when she encountered non-Spanish ELLs, such as students whose native language is French, it was challenging to leverage specific ELLs’ funds of knowledge.

Sarah: So, my mom is from Colombia, so she’s a native Spanish speaker, and so then when she decided to switch careers, and she became a teacher, that was kind of a sub-specialty she took on, where for over a decade, she was teaching ESOL students, and she was obviously already fluent in Spanish, but she also picked up some Haitian. She had a lot of students come from Haiti […] So, it's kind of scary not knowing the language of your ESOL student, where my mom did, and so she would tell me about how hard it was to work with her students who spoke French or Haitian because she wasn't able to get on that same level as she was with the Spanish students.

In terms of Sarah’s experience interacting with diverse people outside the US, she went on a mission trip to Peru for about a week. During the trip, she learned that
learning a second language was a gradual process and she felt empathy towards ELLs because these students might have a difficult time adjusting in mainstream classrooms. While interacting with people in Peru, she could easily imagine ELLs’ challenges and struggles adapting in US schools while learning English as well as content materials. For example, newcomer ELLs in the mainstream classroom need to go through a multi-step process in an effort to ask a simple request or permission from the teacher to complete certain tasks, such as going to the restroom.

Sarah: I think it'll definitely make me empathetic to where they're coming from because I think, like, spending ... I was in Peru for one week, so just having that, where I could understand them but, for the life of me, I couldn't tell them what I was thinking or what I needed. It gave me a much broader appreciation for the struggle that these students go through and how, like, they can't just simply ask to go to the bathroom [...] It's a multi-step process, where they have to translate each word, get the attention, do it, get a response, translate the response, and it just adds so much energy consumption and so much extra stress to their day, where you can't just raise your hand and say, "Can I go to the bathroom?" It becomes a stressful event.

**Previous Experience Working with ELLs**

Regarding her previous experience working with ELLs, Sarah described her field experience in ESOL classrooms as well as in mainstream classrooms. To be specific, in the ESOL classroom, she received opportunities to tutor two to three Spanish ELLs. While tutoring them, lots of ELLs asked her questions in Spanish after they realized that Sarah knew basic Spanish. Sarah explained that she understood what ELLs asked for, but she could not respond in Spanish due to her limited Spanish-speaking ability. Thus, she responded in English when students asked several questions about class activities in Spanish. While observing the ESOL teacher’s instruction, Sarah noted that although the teacher could not speak Spanish, she allowed ELLs to use translation during class
activities. She also observed that two ESOL paraprofessional helped the ESOL teacher in the classroom to support ELLs.

Sarah: I've worked with, like, two or three students one-on-one, but a lot of it has just been, like, making sure they're on track, doing what they're supposed to do, and that's where I felt a lot of issues where the students will ask me a question, but I can't respond to them in Spanish because they'll ask me the question in Spanish. I know what they're asking me, but I can't respond because I can't translate my response into Spanish, and so then [...] I'll respond in English.

Lee: The teacher actually speaks Spanish for instruction or --
Sarah: No. No. She doesn't speak any Spanish.
Lee: Well, so she lets Spanish students to speak Spanish or --
Sarah: Yeah. She has, I think around ... She has two paraprofessionals.

While observing the mainstream classroom through field experience, Sarah noted the usage of educational technology for ELLs. During interviews, she explained how an English-learning program impacted ELLs' second language acquisition and she also listed some pros and cons surrounding using the technology in mainstream classrooms. For example, Sarah explained that the Rosetta Stone program was a helpful tool for ELLs to practice speaking and listening, but it might not be effective for reading and writing development. Sarah believed that it would be better if the program was designed to promote productive skills while learning content materials simultaneously.

Sarah: My impression is that I think it's helping them with learning how to pronounce words, not so much for learning to read or write, but I think it's teaching them, like, different spelling combinations.

Lee: So, listening/speaking perspective.

Sarah: Yeah. There's a lot of speaking that it's helping them with, where I think for that, it's phenomenal because it has them say it, and it records it, and then it says it back them, and it has, like, how it should be said and all that kind of stuff, and it does a lot of phoneme manipulation, where it'll have, like, a picture of a chart. They have to make the word "chart," but then they have to make it "part," and then they have to do it like that [...] So, I think it
definitely has pros and cons, where it's not going to teach them any content skill at all, not so much for writing. It'll teach them how to spell better, but I think it's really good for the speaking and listening.

**Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs**

Based on Sarah’s survey responses and two interviews, she felt pretty confident about accommodating lessons for ELLs based on proficiency levels (WIDA levels). She also revealed some confidence in creating and asking higher-order thinking questions for high-functioning ELLs. During the interviews, she mentioned that the mini-lecture by the ESOL faculty member in the second ESOL stand-alone course was beneficial for her in practicing what questions were appropriate to ask for ELLs based on Bloom’s taxonomy. She also told me that she reflected on how to create and ask the right questions in her pre-internship while she was teaching.

Sarah: So, I've been working a lot on higher-order questioning, so that's something I feel pretty confident about right now because I've been putting a lot more effort in the pre-internship into just putting more thought of, okay, how am I asking this question? Am I asking it the correct way to elicit the responses that I really want? Where am I making them think? Are they having to think enough? So that's something I feel comfortable with.

**Situational and Contextual TSEB Concerning Teaching ELLs**

Throughout the data collection period, Sarah expressed several times that her TSEB about teaching ELLs was situational. For example, she responded that she was not confident in teaching ELLs who are in low-proficiency level based on the WIDA. She explained that it was difficult for her to show her confidence until she actually has ELLs in her own future. In addition, she was not confident in teaching ELLs whose native languages she was not familiar with. In terms of which ELLs she will teach, she was quite confident in teaching and working with Spanish ELLs compared to non-Spanish ELLs.
She also stated that her TSEB varied based on students’ grade levels. She was pretty confident in teaching K-1 classes. She felt some confidence with younger students as opposed to high grade level ELLs in middle or high schools. Regarding how many ELLs she will have in her own future classroom, she told me that she preferred to work with a small number of ELLs (low-incident ELLs) when comparing many ELLs with many different languages.

Sarah: I feel like my confidence changes drastically based on the situation, where if I’m in a kindergarten or first-grade class and it's a Spanish speaker coming in with low to moderate or whatever proficiency, I would feel okay, but if it was a student who spoke a different language that had a different alphabet and then any level of proficiency, and then especially in higher grade levels, that's where them speaking a language I'm not familiar with really, I guess, I feel a lack of confidence there.

During the interviews, Sarah also mentioned that her TSEB might also affected by which subjects she will teach. To be specific, she felt confident in teaching literacy skills, such as teaching reading and writing skills for ELLs. However, she showed some concerns about teaching ELLs in content subject areas, such as math and science. She explained that she learned an ample amount of knowledge regarding how to teach ELLs’ four language skills from ESOL stand-alone courses, but she did not learn much about how to leverage and accommodate ELLs effectively in content area instruction.

Sarah: I feel most confident with reading and writing, not so much with teaching math, science, or social studies, where I feel like I could get them working with reading passages, answering questions, writing sentences, but I feel like there’s such a disconnect from those skills with science and math and social studies [...] 

Lee: Subject areas.

Sarah: Yeah, and I also just ... I don’t think we’ve ever really learned about teaching content areas in another language, like, to ELL students, so that just isn’t something that I necessarily feel comfortable with yet [...]
While working on the microteaching lesson planning, she chose to teach Spanish ELLs although there were two different ELL profiles in the microteaching scenario. She explained that she decided to teach the Spanish ELL because she was familiar with the Spanish ELL’s linguistic and cultural backgrounds. During the interviews, she mentioned that she tended to stay in her comfort zone where she felt comfortable in planning and demonstrating lessons for Spanish ELLs.

Lee: So, could you tell me how you decided on that or why you chose, like, a Spanish ELL?

Sarah: We chose Spanish because my partner had previously done an activity with the Spanish version of Cinderella. So, she had already read it, so we did that because she's already familiar […] So I would feel relatively comfortable with adding in more Spanish words or reading a book in Spanish. So that's not too out of my comfort zone.

Regarding her survey responses, she also showed teaching anxiety about working with low-proficiency ELLs who do not speak any English at all. She explained that she would be frustrated if she experienced a severe language barrier while working with ELLs. She also noted that she would feel intimidated if she could not communicate with ELLs effectively. In this case, she also told me that she was not sure about how to motivate ELLs. She responded that motivating ELLs in mainstream classrooms was not her strong suit and strength.

Sarah: I just feel like there's already students in English, where if they're not motivated at all, I have ... Like, I'm fine at motivating them, but I see them as a huge language barrier […] Well, I guess when I answered one, not confident at all on that one, I was expecting it, in my mind, it was just "student doesn't speak English," so they were, like, level one all across. That's where they were in my mind when I was saying "not confident at all" just because, like, that stinks, and I understand why they're not motivated […]
Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Regarding Sarah’s content knowledge from ESOL stand-alone courses in the teacher education program, she was exposed to Chinese immersion experience by the instructor at the beginning of the semester. Through this immersion experience, Sarah learned that teachers of ELLs should respect ELLs’ second language acquisition process and creating a welcoming environment for ELLs. For example, while watching a demonstration by the instructor about how to manipulate and construct Chinese letters and characters, she realized how different ELLs’ native languages may be to English. This experience was eye-opening for her to realize the linguistic diversity that ELL bring to mainstream classrooms.

Sarah: There was one lesson that really stuck out to me where he (the instructor) showed us how to manipulate a character, where it would start out with ... I think it was the character for bug, and then to change what kind of bug, you'd add on something else to the character, and so that kind of taught me about how really you need to understand the basics of the language to understand where they're coming from, where, like, I mean, Chinese to English is already a whole other alphabet, but, whew, but it just kind of showed me where you need to understand how they're going to manipulate words and sentences, where that, you know, just changing lines on the character, that's now how we change words in English, but in Mandarin, that's how you do it.

Sarah also learned various pedagogical knowledge throughout the microteaching experience. While preparing for lesson plans and the microteaching demonstration, she received opportunities to practice and to actually demonstrate some ELL accommodations. To be specific, based on her reading lesson plan for an ELL, several ELL strategies were noted. These were: targeting tier two words for the ELL’s vocabulary learning, incorporating an English-Spanish dictionary to tap into the ELL’s funds of knowledge, using a visual support (power point slides) for the ELL’s comprehension and scaffolding, clearing up the ELL’s misconceptions and
misunderstandings about content materials, and using a class dojo in order to provide compliments.

Specifically, she mentioned that targeting tier two vocabulary words would be beneficial not only for ELLs but also for native English-speaking students because some students may struggle with acquiring fundamental vocabulary for content-based instruction.

Lee: Could you tell me a little bit about why you decided on teaching tier two words?

Sarah: Yeah. So, we decided on tier two words just because they’re the words that you’re likely to see in common day life, so we figured since we are kind of targeting this lesson at an ELL student, then this would be the best for them to know more tier two words so they can build their vocabulary and, like, gain speaking and listening skills by knowing those words […] And, like, going over tier two words will never hurt with ELL students.

Regarding Sarah’s writing lesson plan for ELLs, several pedagogical knowledge about ELL accommodations were also noted. During lesson planning sessions, it was observed that Sarah and her co-teacher made instructional decisions based on the ELL’s WIDA level and writing samples that were provided from the microteaching prompt. While analyzing the ELL’s writing sample, Sarah noticed that the ELL had some issues on using proper capitalization. Thus, they decided to introduce proper nouns and focus on teaching capitalization for the ELL.

Sarah: We thought this would also be a good way to teach more about proper nouns since that would be a good fourth grade lesson, going over what is, what isn’t, kind of expanding beyond just basic, “You capitalize the first word of every sentence, but you also capitalize proper nouns,” and kind of explaining that, and then having them write sentences.

In addition, she noted that it would be beneficial to teach proper nouns with example sentences so that the ELL could build on some background knowledge about content materials. She also explained what she had practiced with her co-teacher in her
own pre-internship. For instance, by using lots of non-examples at the beginning of the classroom instruction, she intended to teach grammatical rules more effectively as this approach helped students to clear up their misconceptions through teachers’ clarifications and demonstrations.

Sarah: So our class, because co-teacher and I are in the same practicum class, and we’ve been seeing how our teacher uses a lot of non-examples, and it seems to clear up a lot of misconceptions, where it’s seeming to be much more helpful then I ever expected, where I knew it had a time and a place, but it’s been very helpful with clarifying, I guess, the boundaries of these really difficult grammar rules, but it’s helpful, so that’s why we wanted to include it.

She was observed spending some time working with the ELL alone, providing individual ELL support as noted in the microteaching rubric. By using individual tutoring as a strategy, Sarah and her co-teacher divided their roles and took turns to support all six students. For instance, one teacher worked with ELLs individually. Meanwhile, another teacher walked around to check comprehension for native-English speaking students.

In terms of Sarah’s ability of the LOTE, she took three years of Spanish classes in high school. When prompted, she self-evaluated herself as a monolingual speaker and she was not very confident about speaking and pronouncing Spanish words. In terms of her Spanish skills, she told me that her listening was fine, but she was not confident in speaking Spanish fluently. She also described that she was not typically good at learning languages, so she could not perceive herself to be a bilingual person. However, during the microteaching demonstration, it was observed that she incorporated some Spanish vocabulary for the ELL.

During interviews, she explained that it would be tricky to incorporate ELLs’ native languages frequently in the mainstream classroom because not all schools may
foster a bilingual environment for ELLs as opposed to the bilingual program. However, she mentioned that she was able to translate English words to Spanish back and forth when those words are cognates.

Lee: Okay. Fish and cat in Spanish.

Sarah: Yeah. So those are kind of things that we thought would allow ELLs to have more of a tie and a connection. Give them a question they definitely know the answer to while giving everyone else a little more background knowledge [...] Yeah, we could. That's never really something I've thought of since I was always raised in such monolingual schools where I'm still kind of having a difficult time seeing how you should make a classroom bilingual if it's not a bilingual program. But yeah, there's definitely words that I think could translate easily, like cognates.

**TSEB Through Microteaching Experience**

Sarah stated that the microteaching experience helped her better understand how to assess ELLs based on WIDA levels. After working on the microteaching assignments, Sarah felt more confident to teach ELLs compared to before having the microteaching experience. In addition, watching her own demonstration video made her aware of her body language during instruction in terms of her tone of voice, teacher language, facial expressions, hand motions, and gestures. Furthermore, watching her peers teach provided her new ideas and insights so that she received opportunities to reflect on what she had done and how she could have done things differently.

Lee: What was it like for you to observe your peers' teaching? Did you get anything out of it?

Sarah: I definitely liked being able to watch my peers, where-- I did get more ideas on accommodations and just get a lesson in general, so it's always fun, and just hearing different ways that they would phrase things to an ELL. I enjoyed that, or I feel like I got something out of it.

After having participated in the microteaching experience, her biggest takeaway was that in lesson planning, she should leverage lessons and content materials based
on ELLs’ proficiency levels. In other words, the content materials in her lessons should be closely tied to ELLs’ proficiency levels.

Lee: So as you look back on microteaching, what do you think you will take away from it? What kind of lesson did you learn from the microteaching?

Sarah: Definitely the practice of going through a lesson plan and creating a lesson with the thought of, "Okay. I need to tie in this student and make sure this works for them." [...] So, I think that's really what I got out of it, just that practice of going through and thinking like, "Okay. How will I do this so it works with this level of proficiency, and how will I assess so it meets with the student's proficiency?"

When asked about the revised lesson plan for teaching writing, Sarah reflected that she might have missed opportunities to effectively accommodate the ELL. For example, she should have included the ELL’s cultural resources so that she could make content materials more relevant for the ELL. She further mentioned that although her mother is an ESOL teacher, she had not discussed the microteaching experience with her mom in terms of how to effectively accommodate and leverage the ELL. She felt that she had missed an opportunity to discuss ESOL strategies and accommodations with her mom.

Sarah: I guess something I realize with that, our lesson didn't really incorporate any funds of knowledge at all. There's this one point where we talked about what some of the words were in Spanish but that's it. So, some of the ELLs individualized the combinations we talked about, which was the most helpful thing that I got out of microteaching, was just kind of the specifics. [...] I could just ask my mom. But I missed that chance.

**Developing a Beginning Repertoire**

When prompted, Sarah emphasized how she plans to accommodate ELLs in her future classrooms. During interviews, several ELL accommodations emerged. First, she will provide comprehensible input for ELLs so that she can make content materials more accessible for ELLs. Second, she will create various small group activities by pairing
ELLs with native English-speaking students as helpers. Third, she will provide individual support through tutoring. In the one-on-one environment, she will incorporate her LOTE ability, Spanish, for ELLs. Fourth, she will create a welcoming environment for ELLs to relieve their tension and anxiety in the mainstream classroom.

Reflecting back on her own field experience in mainstream classroom, Sarah explained how she would do things differently as a future teacher of ELLs. To be specific, she mentioned the importance of testing accommodation and considering ELLs’ L1 literacy skills. She further explained how she could have done differently if she were the teacher in that classroom. She particularly did not agree with the mentor teacher’s ELL accommodations, so she provided some suggestions based on what she learned from the ESOL stand-alone courses and her previous experiences working with ELLs.

Sarah: They needed the test in Spanish to test, like, if they actually comprehended, but I suppose that goes to whatever standard they were teaching. If they had the standard for reading a passage in English, then, yes, that's what was necessary, but if the standard was comprehension, then they didn't need it at all [...] I just felt there were a lot of things that could have been differently, and so since I was there, and that was last semester, and I kind of saw what could have been done differently, I had a decent amount of confidence with that kind of setting, where it's like there's a couple of ELL students within the class […]

When prompted about what makes her a strong teacher of ELLs, Sarah responded that having more practice makes her a better teacher of ELLs. She told me that through several trials and errors, she could develop her self-confidence in teaching ELLs, although she may have some teaching anxiety of working with diverse ELLs who have different linguistic backgrounds. In other words, she concluded that with more practice of actually teaching and working with ELLs, she will develop herself as a future teacher of ELLs.
In addition, she expected that she will work with ELLs when she comes back to her hometown in West Palm Beach. Thus, through more practice, she will figure out hands-on activities and resources that are effectively accommodate ELLs. She also told me that she would like to communicate with the teacher community there to seek more hands-on examples and practical strategies for ELLs in that specific context.

Sarah: Practice. Actually, having to do it. Definitely something that, as much as I would like to put off and avoid, it's going to happen eventually, and so, hopefully, I don't mess up on the first one [...] I guess something I would that I think would help me is having more examples of strategies, and that's just kind of the teacher community where hearing other's ideas is very helpful, and I think just talking to someone who has experience with ELLs, especially within that community or of that language, where, for example, I'm sure when I'm back home in West Palm, I will most likely have at least ELL students available and teachers who have taught ELL students that I could ask questions of. I think just, I guess, hearing more practical examples would help me, of knowing [...]”

**Summary of Sarah’s Story**

After having participated in microteaching experiences, Sarah expressed that her TSEB was situational and contextual based on ELLs' proficiency levels, grade levels, and which subjects she teaches. Although she expressed that her TSEB in teaching ELLs was enhanced in certain areas after MT experiences, she also pointed out limitations of MT experiences. She expressed that MT experiences might not significantly help her reduce her teaching anxiety although she gained some confidence in teaching ELLs. Her biggest takeaway from MT experiences was making her lessons closely tied with the proficiency levels of ELLs so that she was able to provide comprehensible input for students.

Regarding her content and pedagogical knowledge from teacher preparation coursework, she explained that focusing vocabulary based on tier words as well as providing one-on-one tutoring was key knowledge that enhanced her TSEB in teaching
ELLs. In addition, she mentioned that incorporating ELLs’ funds of knowledge during instruction was another piece of key knowledge that she learned from her own ESOL field experience. As a future teacher of ELLs, she emphasized that providing appropriate accommodations in standardized testing was critical because testing accommodations could leverage ELLs to be successful for their academic achievement. In addition, she emphasized a teacher learning community in an effort to seek additional resources to better leverage her future ELLs in the mainstream classroom.
CHAPTER 7
LAURA’S STORY

Background

Laura’s father was a former US military personnel. Her family lived in the UK when she was young and moved frequently around the world. Laura described that the community in the UK was quite diverse as she noticed a large Indian and Pakistani population. After kindergarten, she moved to the US. In Florida, she grew up in a community surrounded by many Spanish speakers. In general, she noted that she grew up in a culturally and linguistically diverse community throughout her life.

Laura: I would say the most diverse community I lived in was probably England, actually. There was a large, like, expat community, and so there was different kind of subcultures within the community, so there was a lot of kind of Indian transplants in England. [...] We went back to visit over the summer. Now there’s a very large Pakistani community in the village where we lived, so I think just the nature of that. I mean, I wasn’t even British. I was kind of an expat in the sense we were there, so being there I think was the most diverse and the least, like, racially charged environment I’ve been in [...] 

Regarding her previous experience interacting with diverse people outside the US, Laura had had a volunteer experience during Spring break affiliated with the teacher education program. She described that her experience in Guatemala was an eye-opening experience because she noted a lack of educational equity among students. To be specific, she observed severe tensions between people based on different socioeconomic status. This tension impacted students’ education as she observed that some students were segregated without receiving proper educational supports and access to resources. Through this experience, she realized the importance of educational equity for all students and to be aware of the social justice issues in K-12 education. She noted
the opportunity gap between students because she observed how access to educational resources influenced on students’ academic success in schools.

Laura: There’s a lot of disparity there between the access to opportunities and the access to education for the native population and then for the, like, majority population in that area, and there’s a really big stigma. There’s been a lot of tension and war between the two populations, and because of the cost of getting to the schools and everything, for the most part, many of the native children go uneducated and illiterate because they don’t have the access […]

**Previous Experience Working with ELLs**

Regarding her experience in working with ELLs, Laura taught abroad in Sevilla, Spain. She stayed there about three months and taught various teaching subjects, such as science and social studies. She described it as an English immersion classroom through content-based instruction. Since it was an EFL context (English as a Foreign Language), she was required to use English only by the administrators. Laura also emphasized that teaching there was an authentic environment for her to learn Spanish since she received many opportunities to practice her Spanish speaking skills.

Laura: My official role was as an English auxiliary teacher. I would lead lessons that I designed in English, and we did different topics. So, some of them were science lessons. We talked about living and nonliving organisms and different things like that, but they were taught in English, and then the general education teacher was there as well […] They [teachers] really wanted only English to be spoken in the classroom, which is a lot, not a totally effective way to learn, which we know that because of the class that we’re in, but I would do my best to explain […]

Regarding Laura’s ESOL field experience, she noted that directly working with ELLs was a valuable experience because she understood the necessity of ELL accommodations in mainstream classrooms. While tutoring ELLs, she observed ELLs’ various cultural and linguistic backgrounds, which she felt passionate about learning. In addition, while tutoring one specific Spanish ELL, she observed the ELL’s second
language acquisition process in content area teaching and learning. Through this field experience, she learned that teachers of ELLs should be sensitive and attentive to many cultural differences and diversity. Laura also realized that ELLs must learn content and language simultaneously; thus, she mentioned that the language in texts in content materials should not be too complex so that it is comprehensible for ELLs. After working with ELLs, Laura told me the importance of making content instruction accessible for ELLs in mainstream classrooms.

Laura: So, mostly it was just working with Carlos to help him understand, and I had a very close relationship with the mentor teacher in that placement, but it was a different setting because I was in the math and science classroom, which is, I felt, a bit easier because we're not teaching, like, the nuances of English, and there's not so much text. Granted, science can be a bit text-heavy, but they're concepts that can be easily illustrated with whether it be with numbers or experiments, things like that.

Furthermore, Laura emphasized that it was necessary for ELLs to provide some testing accommodations because she had not seen many ELL accommodations while ELLs were taking standardized testing. Through her field experience, Laura observed how ELLs might have a difficult time in taking the test without any additional accommodations or supports. In addition, she observed that during testing period, the mentor teacher tended to narrow down and focus on testing preparation.

Laura: Fourth grade, I would say, there was a lot of hurdles for him as well because fourth grade is such a big assessment year.

Lee: FSA, right?

Laura: Yeah. So, the teacher's focus is so narrowed on that test and making the students pass the test that I feel like they don't, unfortunately, provide enough attention to other things, and the ESOL accommodations being one of them. I think coming in fourth grade had to be really hard for him [...]
After talking about her own experience working with ELLs, Laura stated that she was fully aware of how ELLs could become overwhelmed if the teacher’s instructional language was not one ELLs were familiar with. In addition, she was better able to understand ELLs’ struggles and challenges in mainstream classrooms. Laura told me that ELLs seemed to be really happy in ESOL classrooms as opposed to mainstream classrooms where there was no one who he or she could connect and communicate with in their own native language. In this regard, she noted that without proper ELL accommodations for ELLs, these students would be frustrated in mainstream classrooms. She also emphasized that this experience made her realize the struggles and difficulties that ELLs face in schools, building her empathy for ELLs.

Laura: We had one student who spoke Chinese and he was the only one and there was no one in the class that he could talk to and he’s already five. That’s kindergarten. It’s already a big adjustment to even get used to being in school, but to just have to go somewhere every day where you don’t have the ability to share your thoughts with anyone or you’re not really understanding what’s going on around you, it was just heartbreaking to see because he would not want to come in in the mornings. He’d be crying, and I think maybe that’s why I so deeply want to make every student feel valued in my classroom is because I just saw him struggle and saw him just be so overwhelmed with everything. And then he would leave with the ESL teacher and that was the best time of day for him, and I think probably most likely there were other students who shared the same native language so he was able to kind of communicate with someone, but that experience really kind of opened my eyes to, whoa.

**Teacher Self-Efficacy Beliefs**

When prompted, Laura felt pretty confident in accommodating lessons for ELLs. She told me that her TSEB about lesson planning was relatively good. In a rating scale from 1 (not confident) to 5 (very confident), she self-evaluated her TSEB as 4 out of 5. She was also confident in measuring ELLs’ proficiency levels so that she could
accommodate her lessons according to ELLs’ WIDA levels. In survey responses, she also showed some confidence in providing comprehensible input for ELLs.

However, she told me that she felt worried about actually implementing ELL accommodations with real ELLs because she thought that she needed more practice to accommodate specific ELLs. Regarding her survey responses, she was not confident in promoting ELLs’ second language development in content-area teaching. Although she showed some confidence in making content materials more accessible for ELLs, she told me that she often experiences some trials and errors while making materials. She emphasized that creating every single lesson to include scaffolding strategies in an effort to provide comprehensible input for ELLs could be challenging. Although she said that she felt good about accommodating one lesson for a specific purpose, considering ELL accommodations in everyday lessons requires more practice.

Laura: Now I’m going to have to be more intentional and through every single lesson make sure that there’s enough comprehensible input for my English language learners and I’ve made enough different access points in everything. So, I think that’s where I feel the least confident. It’s just like with one lesson, one time I did okay, I got the grade I needed and everything is fine but in reality, it’s a lot more than that. So that scares me a bit.

**Situational and Contextual TSEB Concerning Teaching ELLs**

Although Laura had some previous experience in working with ELLs, it was observed that she had some concerns about teaching diverse ELLs who have different linguistic backgrounds. For example, she was more confident about teaching Spanish ELLs as opposed to non-Spanish ELLs. She specifically explained that she was worried about pronouncing words in non-Spanish ELLs’ native languages (e.g., Portuguese). In terms of survey questions, she responded that her TSEB about tapping into ELLs’ cultural backgrounds was much stronger than incorporating ELLs’ linguistic resources.
In addition, she was also concerned about whether she could find and have access to appropriate materials, such as translated texts or bilingual books, if she was teaching non-Spanish ELLs.

Laura: So, I feel confident in the state of Florida in that the majority of our ESL students are Spanish-speakers. But then I was just thinking, in my placement for next semester, the first part of my Master’s internship, we have three ELLs in our classroom, two speak Spanish and one speaks Portuguese. And I’m thinking like, are we able to still better connect with the two Spanish-speaking students because I felt like I can bridge that gap easily. And then I don’t want the Portuguese-speaking student to feel that I’m not making the effort there just because I don’t speak Portuguese […] I feel like I’m not super confident there because the pronunciations are different, they are languages I have no experience in […]

Throughout the data collection period, Laura revealed her situational TSEB would be influenced by the classroom contexts she will be placed in and subjects she will teach. Although she was quite confident in accommodating ELLs in a single lesson per day, she stated that if she must accommodate lessons for ELLs every day in every subject, she would feel intimidated.

Laura: But those accommodations are going to have to carry throughout the entire school year, across all subject areas regardless of how easy or difficult you might think that is. So, I think what I’m least confident about would be accommodating not just one lesson plan, but every single lesson all day because I want the students to have access to anything that we’re doing, not just the one. […] It seems like such a big task to have to plan every lesson all day, every day, all year. Now I’m kind of in the same way intimidated by the fact that okay, now I have to go back whereas planning has become pretty effortless for me.

Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

When prompted, Laura told me that she learned various content knowledge from ESOL stand-alone courses. For example, in the first ESOL stand-alone course, she learned that many ELL instructional choices and accommodations were grounded in the Florida Consent Decree. Laura told me that before taking the ESOL teacher education
course, she was not fully aware of how and why the legislation required all teachers of
ELLs in Florida to be prepared to teach and work with ELLs.

Lee: So, could you tell me a little bit about your course experience last semester in first ESOL stand-alone course?

Laura: Sure. I think for us, that was the first time we realized going into education, how it's not just encouraged that you accommodate these students and make your instruction accessible for these students. We went through, like, the legislation and the history behind it. I think that and then being introduced to the WIDA levels and the actual structure of ESOL education, that was the first time that we had really talked about it. I mean, I've had experiences before that class with ESOL students, but I didn't know all of the things behind it. I didn't know about the legislation, what you are required and not required to do […]

In addition, she realized that getting to know ELLs and being able to recognize cultural and linguistic diversity were important pedagogical knowledge that she had learned. She mentioned that she realized ELLs bring their own funds of knowledge, including linguistic and cultural aspects from their own lives and experiences. As a teacher of ELLs, she felt responsibility in respecting their diversity and tried to highlight the diversity in her own future classroom. Although it was not possible to be familiar with all the native languages that ELLs bring to the classroom, she wanted to do more research and better understand how she could leverage ELLs’ linguistic resources in the classroom. She emphasized that creating an inclusive learning environment can make ELLs feel more comfortable in the mainstream classroom.

Laura: Just because I do feel like it might be a bit easier to research various cultures and, you know, spend a day or some hours just really diving into that and seeing different sources and kind of working hard to understand the community that the student is coming from and, you know, the customs that they're used to, the family structure they're used to, different, you know, religious populations where they're from, different holidays, things like that, I feel like are more readily available to be found out, but then linguistic backgrounds ... I think I also did very little confidence because this is right after I had worked with the student who spoke five different languages.
Laura’s lesson planning sessions for ELLs showcased her pedagogical knowledge regarding ELL accommodations. During interviews, she also listed several strategies she implemented to accommodate ELLs in the reading and writing lessons. To be specific, Laura’s description of ELL accommodations for reading development included providing visual aids to support the ELL’s comprehension, promoting the ELL’s academic language development in reading, linking content materials to the ELL’s background knowledge, implementing pre-teaching vocabulary strategies before diving into content, and using a translation method, such as incorporating Spanish cognates during the lesson.

Laura also mentioned that she could integrate her pedagogical knowledge from the reading class in the teacher education program in order to leverage ELLs’ reading development. She specifically mentioned the importance of teaching sequencing and how it influenced on students’ reading comprehension. She also told me that teaching transitional words helped students to develop academic language. She thought that teaching sequencing words was an essential skill for students’ reading comprehension and development.

Laura: So, we’ve learned sequencing in our reading classes through the teacher education program and the importance of being able to understand the order of the story in order to kind of comprehend, you know, the cause and effect relationships that are happening and really just that it's kind of a backbone, almost, to comprehension […]

Regarding her writing lesson planning for ELLs, it was observed that Laura made several instructional decisions based on the ELL’s writing samples and WIDA proficiency levels. While analyzing the ELL’s written sentences, she decided to teach capitalization because she noted that the ELL has some issues in understanding proper capitalization and proper nouns. To better support the ELL’s academic language
development, she also came up with sentence frames because the ELL was not able to write a long sentence without receiving prompts from the teacher. Considering the ELL’s reading and writing levels, she described that it was necessary for the ELL to receive some prompts to begin with.

Laura: And then the fact that capitalization would be already in there and maybe using now as my focus point, would address the mistakes that ELLs are making without the student feeling like, "Oh, this lesson is for me because I always mess up capitalization," if that makes sense. I don't want the student to feel singled out. So, we kind of didn't really think about how quickly they would be able to revise the letter. So, I thought just in reaching the letter with more errors and more different kinds of errors would make it, I guess, more like a fully-fledged lesson, not so quaint and easy and redundant […]

In terms of Laura's LOTE ability, she incorporated several Spanish words during the microteaching demonstration for the ELL. For example, she incorporated two Spanish words, mayuscula for capitalization and revisar for revise, during the microteaching demonstration. In the second interview, she mentioned that she had to be more intentional in an effort to incorporate these Spanish words because ELLs may be confused if she did not make her instruction clear so that the ELL could fully follow and understand her classroom instruction. She emphasized how she could leverage the ELL’s native language into lessons more strategically by understanding which Spanish cognates she could incorporate

Laura: I would have written both of the words on the board to help scaffold the connection for the student rather than just verbally saying them because, obviously, when I'm speaking in English and then I just slip in a Spanish word, it's going to be like, I'm sure the student is trying to sift through all of these words that I've said in English, and then all of a sudden, they hear mayuscula and then they're confused. Like, "Why did she just say a word in Spanish?" And then they've missed all these English words that’s I’ve kept right on saying. I don't think I spoke slow enough and but enough emphasis on the connection between the two. I would be more intentional in drawing that connection between mayuscula, capitalization, and then revisar, revise. Yeah. I think that would be more helpful.
Regarding Laura’s description of the microteaching experience, she mentioned that watching her own teaching video made her realize the importance of speaking slowly to accommodate ELLs. After watching her own teaching video, she reflected that she should modify her own speech so that the ELLs would understand her more easily. Also, having one-on-one feedback with the course instructor confirmed that she needed to reduce her speaking rate for the ELL in the microteaching demonstration.

Laura: When I was watching the video, I noticed a lot more about little things that I would want to do differently, which was the point of it. It was helpful, but one of the things that the instructor and I talked about was the speed. My rate of speech is really fast. For native speakers, especially college-level students, that's fine. It wasn't an issue, other than the fact that it made our lesson pretty short, but when I'm working with students, one, it needs to be slower, and then on top of that, when I'm working with students who are just learning the language, I need to slow down a lot more, just to really put emphasis and focus on my intonations, and gesturing, and everything. Overall, it went well, but that was the biggest thing when I was watching it. I was like, "Oh, my goodness, slow down."

After having participated in the microteaching activity, Laura told me that this experience helped her to practice in integrating ELLs’ native languages in lesson plans as well as in demonstrations. She also noted that the microteaching experience provided an avenue for her to focus on ELL-specific strategies and accommodations because she did not have much opportunities to design and implement the ELL-specific lesson plans in her teacher education program. After the microteaching experience, Laura felt more confident to teach ELLs as to before the microteaching experience.

Laura: We've learned how to bridge the gap and bring in some of their linguistic background, make it more culturally relevant. I feel like we've learned so many different strategies and ways you can come at it that I do feel I would be okay. So, I could do it, but I don't think it will be easy.
When prompted about her reflections and takeaways from the microteaching experience, she mentioned her revised lesson planning. While revising her original lesson plan, she noticed that making a clear agenda for the ELL at the beginning of the activity was necessary. Also, she wanted to provide more teacher-created modeling and samples, such as sample sentences for the ELL. She also stated that making a simplified language by using educational technology could be a good idea. She explained that she could incorporate what she had learned from the educational technology course in teacher education so that the complexity of texts in class content would be easier for the ELL when considering the ELL’s low proficiency level in reading.

Laura: We learned how to address needs that are content specific, I feel like. In technology we learned a bit about apps that you can use on the computer, like the read and write extension for Google Chrome that takes whole articles or a whole webpage and rewrites the text to different levels of English proficiency so it'll take the vocabulary words that are a little longer, it'll put their definition in their place, or it'll change the words and just make them more easily understood, and how that could be used to help provide access for ESOL students. You could read the same article and one student could read it on this level and another student could read it on this level but they're going to understand the same thing at the end of the article […]

**Developing a Beginning Repertoire**

Throughout the data collection period, Laura remarked on her positive attitudes and perceptions towards ELLs. Based on her previous teaching experiences, she stated that ELLs were very motivated to learn language as well as content. She also showed her willingness to learn and explore ELLs’ funds of knowledge, such as their diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. She explained that if she encounters ELLs whose background information she is not familiar with, she would research more about them. She emphasized that she was passionate about understanding and learning about ELLs.
In terms of pedagogical perspective, she showed her willingness to try out new strategies, such as using educational technology to make content materials more accessible for ELLs. As a future teacher of ELLs, she explained that she plans to accommodate ELLs in every lesson she makes every single day. In order to achieve this goal, she noted that she needs to have more experience and practice in terms of how her knowledge of ELL accommodations can be effectively transferred to real practice. Although she had some concerns about working with ELLs, she told me that she was in the process of developing herself as a future teacher of ELLs.

Laura: And I think the more that I do that, and if I'm intentional in every single lesson that I plan-- and by the end of I think week seven, you're supposed to plan half the day, so there will be a lot of lessons that I am planning. I think it will help me if I'm very intentional throughout the master's year in addressing the needs of the ELLs in my classroom, then it will become more effortless, and I will just be able to be confident about it in the future. I think just time because this is the first experience we've had really in thinking about accommodations and being so thorough and learning the theory behind everything and then practicing with the microteaching, so I think the only thing left to do really is just keep going and keep applying what I've learned and then I'll be more confident.

Summary of Laura’s Story

Laura was a bilingual PST who had received ample exposure to linguistic diversity, including a teaching abroad experience in Spain, volunteering experience in Guatemala, and several tutoring experiences in local community learning centers. She expressed that her personal and professional exposure to diversity made her feel more confident in teaching and working with ELLs.

After her microteaching experiences, Sarah expressed that her TSEB was enhanced in many areas although she showed some emotional concerns about working with non-Spanish ELLs, whose languages she was not familiar with. She showed great
confidence in working with ELLs. However, she showed some anxiety in working with several ELLs who would bring various cultural and linguistic resources.

Regarding her content and pedagogical knowledge from university teacher preparation coursework, she explained that incorporating ELLs’ home languages in her instruction was key knowledge in order to enhance and promote her TSEB in teaching ELLs. In addition, she received several opportunities to directly work with ELLs through ESOL field experience, which made her feel more prepared to work with ELLs in general. As a future teacher of ELLs, she was willing to research diverse ELLs’ linguistic background and to apply appropriate educational technology in her own content-based instruction. She also showed her dedication to leverage ELLs whenever she had opportunities so that she could apply the knowledge that she learned from teacher education programs into the real field with ELLs.
CHAPTER 8
A VIEW ACROSS

This chapter presents the findings and themes that emerged from the cases of the four participants. The narrative of each participant was analyzed with a review that determined where similar or different themes recur by using Braun & Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis. While the previous four chapters delineated the experiences of preservice teacher self-efficacy beliefs throughout the ESL microteaching experiences, this chapter will present the patterns and themes that emerged from four participants’ experiences through cross-case analysis. There were both themes that differed and aligned as well as particular patterns across the four participants’ narratives. The first section will discuss the similarities of preservice teacher self-efficacy beliefs and their microteaching experiences that each participant shares. The second section includes the core differences between three monolingual teachers and one bilingual teacher. The last section will present a summary of findings from four cross-cases.

Similarities Among Four Participants

Throughout the ESL microteaching experience, the most common theme that emerged was preservice teachers’ teacher self-efficacy beliefs in accommodating lessons for ELLs. The four PSTs felt pretty confident about creating a lesson that accommodates ELLs but not in real practice. In other words, PSTs’ TSEB concerning lesson accommodation is much stronger than their TSEB for actually teaching ELLs. Regarding their low sense of TSEB about teaching ELLs, most PSTs (three out of four PSTs) mentioned that they were not very confident in creating higher-order thinking questions and asking appropriate questions for ELLs according to ELLs’ proficiency levels. The PSTs said that they wanted to have more practice with various hands-on
examples and activities so that they felt more confident about teaching and working with low proficiency ELLs.

Laura: I feel confident when planning a lesson, planning the accommodations. I feel most confident about actually deciding what accommodations are going to be best, and making them.

Ariel: Honestly, the thing that I think I'm weakest at in my practice is higher-order thinking questions. So, I'm frustrated now that I can't even completely recall but we talked about the different kinds of questioning, so connecting it back to self but I don't remember-- it wasn't super impactful. I don't know. I mean, everything she was teaching us, I think we've heard so it was like a refresher, which was really good to hear with questioning but I honestly don't remember that much from her.

Situational and contextual TSEB

Concerning similarities among the four PSTs’ TSEB, the second theme that emerged was their situational TSEB regarding teaching ELLs. For example, the PSTs’ TSEB varied based on ELLs’ proficiency levels (teaching high-proficiency ELLs versus low-proficiency ELLs). Specifically, the four PSTs felt more confident teaching advanced ELLs and creating challenges for them. However, they did not feel as confident about teaching lower proficiency ELLs.

Another example of situational TSEB was to incorporate ELLs’ funds of knowledge into their lessons by incorporating particular aspects, such as ELLs’ home cultures and native languages. To be specific, all PSTs felt confident in incorporating ELLs’ cultural resources in their lessons and classrooms. This was because the coursework from the teacher education program made them feel confident in incorporating the diversity concept in their lessons. However, regarding integrating ELLs’ linguistic resources in their lessons, the four PSTs were not confident enough to do so. The PSTs told me that they did not feel confident in tapping into ELLs’ linguistic
backgrounds in their lessons as there were so many linguistically diverse ELLs who bring various linguistic resources into mainstream classrooms.

Laura: I was having a moment there where I was like, "I don't know actually how confident I feel," just because in that situation, there were five different linguistic backgrounds in one lesson, so it's easier in our microteaching, where we're only working, hypothetically, with one student in one native language, but then when you're in that scenario, you know, how do you integrate fluidly five different languages into your one ... and not get them mixed up in your head and not say the wrong thing or, you know? So, I think that is more intimidating to me because it is something that isn't as easy, in a sense.

Regarding what types of ELLs PSTs would need to teach and work with, all PSTs showed high confidence in working with Spanish ELLs. They also told me that incorporating Spanish ELLs' L1 resources for was an area that they felt confident about. However, when the PSTs need to work with non-Spanish ELLs, such as East Asian ELLs, the four PSTs said that they struggle to do so. In other words, among ELLs, the four PSTs felt more confident about teaching Spanish ELLs compared to non-Spanish ELLs. In addition, during their microteaching demonstrations, all PSTs chose to teach Spanish ELLs although there were three ELL profiles in the microteaching scenario and prompt, including a Persian ELL and Japanese ELL.

After having the ESL microteaching experiences, they told me that they tended to stay in their comfort zones because they were more confident and felt more comfortable in teaching and working with Spanish ELLs since they decided to teach students in Florida.

Ariel: And also, depends on the kid, depends on what level they're at and if I—if it's Spanish, if I can help them a little bit with that language or if it's just something completely different. So, I don't know, I think I don't know that I feel like crazy more confident this semester. I think my confidence just as a preservice teacher has increased just from my practicum. But I don't know that it's specifically gotten better with ELLs [...] I still think there
should be some kind of extra support, don’t know that I agree with the fact that they don't have an ESOL Program.

PSTs’ contextual TSEB emerged when considering how many ELLs PSTs would need to teach and work with in mainstream classrooms. All PSTs said that they felt more confident in teaching low-incident ELL classrooms, which involves having only one or two ELLs in the classroom. Thus, they did not feel confident in teaching a classroom environment that had five ELLs who all speak different languages. PSTs also expressed that their TSEB varied based on classroom contexts. For instance, they were pretty confident in working in mainstream classrooms, but not in ESL classrooms. In addition, their TSEB could be also influenced based on ELLs’ grade levels and proficiency levels because they were not sure about what and how they could accommodate different grade level ELLs in the real context.

Taylor: I feel least confident when it's just me in the classroom, being able to do it for more than one ELL. It's been really hard, now that there's two of them, because you have to basically do triple the work. You have to do it for all the students, and then students that are struggling, that speak English, and then for ELLs. And so, I'm most scared, almost, of being able to implement the best practices all the time, and not let it get overwhelming. If you imagine that you are the sole teacher and there is no help. There's several ELLs, and you feel scared.

Sarah: I feel like my confidence changes drastically based on the situation, where if I'm in a kindergarten or first-grade class and it's a Spanish speaker coming in with low to moderate or whatever proficiency, I would feel okay, but if it was a student who spoke a different language that had a different alphabet and then any level of proficiency, and then especially in higher grade levels, that's where them speaking a language I'm not familiar with really, I guess, I feel lack of confidence there.

**Influences of ESL microteaching experience on TSEB**

Considering the PSTs’ TSEB throughout the ESL microteaching experiences, several similar themes and patterns emerged. To be specific, all PSTs said that the microteaching activities helped them practice accommodating and leveraging their
lessons for ELLs in content-based instruction. They also explained that the microteaching activities helped them to be prepared to teach lower proficiency ELLs because the microteaching scenario asked them specifically focused on accommodating low-proficiency ELLs.

In addition, PSTs mentioned that planning lessons for ELLs and actually implementing lesson plans through the microteaching demonstration was a beneficial experience. All PSTs explained that the microteaching experience made them feel confident about teaching and working with ELLs through practice in making ELL accommodations in lesson planning.

Ariel: Yeah. It was good. I think after everything, I think it was helpful in even just planning a lesson having to specifically think about ELLs. I mean we do in every lesson but this one was that was kind of the focus of it and it was interesting to do both reading and writing to see the difference and the similarities between the lesson plans and how to accommodate an ELL in both.

Laura: We've been given enough resources, enough examples, different ways to accommodate students, be it vocabulary preview, or gesturing, or all these guided note-taking, graphic organizer [...] We've learned how to bridge the gap and bring in some of their linguistic background, make it more culturally relevant. I feel like we've learned so many different strategies and ways you can come at it that I do feel I would be okay.

The four PSTs further mentioned that watching their peers teach during microteaching demonstrations provided them more creative ideas about how they could also implement ELL accommodations that they had not considered previously. In addition, having individual meetings with the instructor and watching their own teaching demonstration videos helped them reflect better on what they should improve on for next time. In this regard, PSTs noted that receiving positive encouragement from others impacted their TSEB. Furthermore, revising their lesson plans for ELLs’ writing
development provided an additional opportunity to revisit and reflect on their original lesson plans to make them more effective for ELLs.

Ariel: And something that one of my classmates did in their microteaching was I noticed that their activity, if the student was from, I think, Mexico they had their story all about Mexico. And so, I really liked how they incorporated that. So that's something I would like to do.

Taylor: Seeing everyone else’s lesson helped me to think of all of the different ways you can teach something like conjunctions or all of the different activities you can do and all the different accommodations. You can have them have a key on the desk where it shows the picture and the vocab word in their language and in English. That could be super great but I would've never thought to have that for them for their writing. So, it gives you a fresh perspective of things that you never even thought about and it helps you to reflect back on it and kind of see what you could've done better and differently.

In terms of the PSTs’ reflections and takeaways throughout the microteaching experience, all PSTs revealed that they realized something that they should have done better to improve their instruction. Throughout the revised lesson planning and individual feedback meetings with the course instructor, they realized that they might have missed some opportunities to specifically tap into ELLs’ funds of knowledge. Furthermore, all PSTs mentioned that reflection after having the microteaching experience made them realize that they should be really intentional and purposeful about their instructional decision making. They also said that the lesson plans with ELL accommodations was not something that naturally occur. All PSTs explained that the reflection process encouraged them to be more prepared to work with ELLs.

Taylor: I think the biggest thing that I took away from this is that if you’re not thinking about doing it, it's not just going to happen. So, I'm not just going to, without knowing it, incorporate cultural and linguistic backgrounds of my students. And I saw that because in our lesson plan when we reflected on it, there were things we could have done even further […].

Taylor: And we were really thinking about how to plan this lesson for them and there was so much more that we could have done with it so. Those two
could go either way but I think it's just showing me that if I'm not aware of my own--what I'm teaching them and what I'm incorporating, it's got to be a purposeful like, "I want to include this in the classroom and in my teaching," or else it's just not going to happen.

However, there were some themes that emerged suggesting the microteaching might not be effective in contributing to their TSEB about teaching ELLs. The most common theme and pattern about limitations of microteaching was that the experience only provided an artificial teaching environment because all PSTs were teaching their peers who were pretending to be mainstream and ELL students.

For example, Sarah (case 3) described that the microteaching experience might not have affected her TSEB dramatically in terms of her confidence about teaching ELLs. She felt that the microteaching environment was not a realistic setting, so she felt a little weird about teaching in front of her peers who pretended to be elementary school students. Other PSTs also told me that they felt intimidated teaching in front of their peers who were acting as students. The PSTs mentioned that their peers already knew the content they taught, so it made them apprehensive about demonstrating their lessons.

Sarah: I guess I don't feel like I took too much out of it, just because I feel a low confidence with the lower proficiency ELLs, which this was, so since it didn't really play to my strong suits, I guess, and I don't feel like I learned too much about how to do it just because, I don't know, I just felt like, of course, our peers are going to go along with us and act like the perfect ELL student, but it didn't feel realistic to me because they knew what was going on.

Influences of content and pedagogical knowledge on TSEB about teaching ELLs

Regarding PSTs’ content knowledge, the most common theme that they learned was understanding the WIDA levels so that they could use them to evaluate and judge instructional decisions based on proficiency levels of ELLs. The WIDA also encouraged
PSTs to think about how they could leverage and modify their lessons according to ELLs’ proficiency levels. All PSTs told me that their content knowledge about the WIDA made them feel more confident in accommodating lessons for ELLs.

Ariel: I think that and then being introduced to the WIDA levels and the actual structure of ESOL education, that was the first time that we had really talked about it […] Like, we need to sort through all those things and know which is required and which is not, and obviously, we're learning how important it is to differentiate for ELLs, so that on top of the WIDA levels, and then just learning a bit more about the English language itself because the course instructor was very into, like, the linguistics of everything.

Laura: I had to think through the ELL's WIDA level and capabilities and plan a lesson that challenged the student. It forced me to think about what the student could do and scaffold the student's thinking. I learned a lot about placement and where students fall and then what to expect from them and how to accommodate those levels, and then I loved the lecture Dr. D came in and gave us about how to give higher-order questioning to a WIDA level one, you know, where she showed us different ways to ask a higher-order question.

Another noticeable theme about PSTs’ content knowledge was the necessity of providing testing accommodations for ELLs. Throughout their previous working experience with ELLs in the ESL field experiences, most PSTs observed and realized the importance of ELL testing accommodations in standardized testing. They realized that without appropriate guidance and support from the mentor teacher in mainstream classrooms, many ELLs might not be successful in standardized testing as ELLs had to learn language and content simultaneously. This content knowledge influenced their TSEB about teaching ELLs because it created an avenue for them to reconsider how they would do things differently in their own classrooms.

Sarah: They were more comfortable with Spanish, where sometimes they would have to think to translate a word, but with that, I would feel confident because I didn't really agree with W school's accommodations for students because a lot of their accommodation, like, for example, for a test, some of them were just given a Spanish-English dictionary, and that was it, and
then the test would have, like, ridiculous words that there isn't a natural equivalent or it's just too time consuming if they have to look up every single word in a 300-word passage. Like, I just thought it was not helpful.

Another common theme about PSTs' content knowledge was how the educational technology played a role in ELLs' second language development. Most PSTs noted that using educational technology had both pros and cons. To be specific, in order to promote ELLs' listening and speaking skills, the PSTs told me that technology was used properly. However, for promoting literacy skills, such as reading and writing development, they reported that technology such as Rosetta Stone had limited impacted on ELLs' second language learning process. This content knowledge also influenced their TSEB as they reconsider the usage of educational technology that was effective for ELLs. They all realized that simply providing technologies to ELLs did not guarantee they would help promote ELLs' literacy skills in content-based learning.

Taylor: Reading Assistant was, I think, good and bad because the kids would get really frustrated because it kept saying that they pronounced the word wrong. But technology isn't always reliable. So sometimes they just couldn't hear them or stuff like that. So, I think it was easy for them to get frustrated. But, I mean, it's good that they were practicing reading aloud, I guess [...]..

Taylor: Well, I think that you only did Rosetta Stone if you were low-proficiency. And so, I'm pretty sure the kids that I was with only did Reading Assistant when they were on the computer. But there was one kid in there that was doing Rosetta Stone. And I mean, I think that it probably has its benefits because at least if you don't know the language, they can get some support of vocab and stuff. But I don't think it can be the only thing we use. Maybe every so often to kind of build some of that vocabulary, but not just like, "Oh. You don't speak English. I'm going to put you on Rosetta Stone. Learn it." And I feel like that's what happens a lot, so.

The last theme that emerged from the data set was that all PSTs noted the importance of creating a safe and comfortable learning environment for ELLs. In order to do this, the four PSTs told me that they had to get to know more about the ELLs. The
PSTs mentioned that they were willing to explore ELLs’ funds of knowledge perspective, including diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds as well as resources. They expressed that if they know more about ELLs, they would feel more confident about accommodating that specific ELL effectively. They also pointed out that the teacher education program had emphasized how to be sensitive and respectful to classroom diversity so that PSTs could apply their knowledge into real practice while working with students who are culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Sarah: Yeah, where I feel like that’s more of a class-wide effort, that I would want every student to pull in their culture, so I feel like it’s easier and, like, not so much easier, just I’m more comfortable with the steps on how to do it, where I feel very comfortable with that, but then … I also feel comfortable with bringing language in to a certain extent because I would like to put Spanish words around the classroom for them, teach the other students how to give greetings in Spanish just to make it a little more bilingual, but that also just depends on the area where you are.

In terms of PSTs’ pedagogical knowledge about ELL accommodations, the most common theme that emerged was to provide comprehensible input with various scaffolding strategies. To be specific, providing visuals aids for ELLs, such as creating Power Point slides and using graphic organizers to support ELL’s comprehension was the most salient pedagogical knowledge that the PSTs mentioned. In addition, they also learned that creating a small group activity with the peer help could be effective for ELLs. The PSTs mentioned assigning native English-speaking students as helpers to support ELLs’ content learning process during several group activities. Lastly, all PSTs stated that providing individual support for ELLs through tutoring was the key ESL pedagogical knowledge. Whenever it is possible, they wanted to work with ELLs alone so that they could provide additional support for ELLs’ academic success in mainstream classrooms.
Ariel: Yeah. I think that just kind of goes back to what the lesson was, itself. And since we were given the picture of the little narrative, I feel like that's something that it would really easy to make that picture story something that the ELL is interested in and things that they actually have knowledge about.

Taylor: Going back and teaching a whole group lesson targeted at the ELL students' weakness just isn't so much of a good use of time, where it would be more targeted, like small-group, individual instruction that would help them [...] 

**Differences Among Four Participants**

**Exposure to diversity**

The core differences among participants were individual PSTs’ personal background information, knowledge, and previous teaching experience while working with ELLs. From the data set, it was observed that the individual PSTs’ TSEB can be influenced by their own teaching and working experiences with ELLs. For example, Taylor (Case 2) had two ELLs in her own pre-internship practicum; thus, she was able to work with ELLs in the mainstream classroom on a daily basis. She said that her TSEB in teaching ELLs improved while teaching and working with ELLs continuously throughout the semester.

To be specific, in the previous semester, she was not that confident in teaching ELLs as she did not have experience in directly working with ELLs. However, in this semester, she told me that having ELLs in her own practicum helped her apply what she had learned from ESL stand-alone courses to real practice. In this regard, she expressed that she felt much confident in teaching ELLs.

Taylor: I think that's because of this semester. A lot of the times I have to kind of check back in with my two students and kind of gage where they're at and if they understood it and I feel like I've developed a pretty good sense of when they have no idea what's going on [...] I like watching their body language and watching how they're participating and then other times they'll be super into it and stuff like that. So, I do feel like I've gained a lot
of experience in gaging comprehension like what they’re understanding [...] I think it was helpful because I had to come up with an accommodation for a lower proficiency level which before this semester all of the ELLs that I’ve had the experience to work with have been higher proficiency.

Regarding Laura’s experience (Case 4), it was noted that her TSEB could be influenced by her own personal experience volunteering. Before she took the ESOL stand-alone courses with field experience, she had an opportunity to tutor children in the community center. In the tutoring center, there were several ELLs who had diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. She mentioned that this experience made her realize she had lacked in interacting and responding to these students’ learning needs. She also noted that this experience encouraged her to teach as well as study abroad because she wanted to be prepared for these types of students. Thus, her motivation of ELL teaching came from her personal previous experience, and it made her decide to fill in the gap for her future career.

Laura’s TSEB can be also influenced by her own teaching abroad experience. In the open-ended questions from the survey, she responded that:

Laura: My experiences working in Spain & Guatemala teaching English to students ages 4-10 have made me more confident in teaching around a language barrier.

Laura had previous experience in teaching ELLs in Spain (about 5 to 6 weeks) and in Guatemala (one month). In Spain, she received many opportunities to teach English for EFL learners in content-based instruction. She described in the interview:

Laura: Some of them were English lessons, but a lot of it was science. I was in two different classrooms, so I was in a year two classroom and a year four classroom, and I kind of went back and forth. Sometimes we’d even do social studies lessons. I know because I was there in the fall, they were very interested in holidays around the world, especially Halloween. They wanted to know all about Halloween, and so I kind of took that as a chance to design a lesson. We did learn about Halloween. We also
learned about Dia de los Muertos and the Irish origin of Halloween and All Souls’ Day, and we kind of talked about different holidays and how different cultures celebrate it. That was really the only social studies one we did, but for the most part, I would say science and then some were English.

In Guatemala, she further experienced the diversity as well as the social justice issues in education. After observing students’ educational inequity there, she noted that there were serious issues regarding opportunity gaps and unfair access to educational resources. She also mentioned the segregation and educational stigma towards certain group of students she witnessed.

Laura: There’s been a lot of tension and war between the two populations, and because of the cost of getting to the schools and everything, for the most part, many of the native children go uneducated and illiterate because they don’t have the access. So, we volunteered in a school that was founded to address that issue, and it’s a nonprofit subsidized education K through 12. So, some of them come, like, an hour in to go to the school, but it was just a very refreshing opportunity to work in a school where they have been dying their whole lives to have that chance.

Overall, thanks to these experiences, Laura showed high confidence in teaching and working with ELLs compared to the other PSTs because she knew what she had to do to work with ELLs. Laura further told me that she had a better understanding about how ELLs would feel in US mainstream classrooms. She described that ELLs could experience a linguistically overwhelming situation and environment. These experiences made her feel empathy towards ELLs. In addition, these experiences made her realize the importance of ELL accommodations and why these matter to ELLs’ academic achievement and success in US schooling.

Laura: I think I have a better understanding now of what it feels like to be in an environment that is so linguistically overwhelming, just to be exposed to so much all day, every day and really struggling to understand, you know, the text that you’re surrounded by and the input that you’re hearing, and I think that we forget how many words we encounter each day, whether they’re spoken or written, and I think just that experience alone has helped me [...]
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Another critical difference among participants was their own LOTE ability. The three monolingual teachers interviewed were really worried about their own proficient in LOTE. For instance, the three monolingual teachers did not feel confident in speaking their L2 (Spanish) in front of students because they were concerned about using wrong Spanish pronunciation. Although they all learned Spanish in high school and did incorporate Spanish resources in their own lesson planning and microteaching demonstrations, they stated that they did not feel confident in doing so. They mentioned that their LOTE was limited and they identified themselves as monolingual speakers.

However, Laura (case 4) showed strong self-confidence in using her LOTE ability. While analyzing the data set, Laura identified herself as a bilingual, and she said that she had decent speaking and listening skills in Spanish. Thus, she was not worried about pronouncing Spanish words in front of Spanish ELLs. In addition, during the microteaching lesson planning sessions and demonstration, she easily code-switched between English and Spanish. She also reported that during the microteaching demonstration, she could easily incorporate and demonstrate her LOTE without noticing. Since she had had enough practice in real teaching settings throughout her previous teaching aboard experience, she was very confident in teaching and working with Spanish ELLs compared to the three monolingual teachers.

In her lesson planning, she incorporated differentiated instruction for ELLs and tried to tap into ELLs’ linguistic resources. Here are some examples from her lesson plans:

Laura: Introduce sequencing skill. Reveal 3 images to students on the projector, and explain that we are going to order them according to what happens “first”, “next”, and “last”. Say: “In Spanish, we would say: primero, 
siguiente, and último. Show letter from mystery author without capitalization (en mayúscula). Read the letter aloud to students while it is displayed on the board, and then discuss how good authors revise or double-check their work to make sure they haven’t made any mistakes. Write the word “revise” on the board with its Spanish translation: repasar. Ask students if they notice any mistakes. Once the capitalization mistake is pointed out by a student, remind students that we always start our sentences with a capital letter (una letra mayúscula).

During the interviews, she explained and described the language objectives with incorporating Spanish’s ELLs’ linguistic resources.

Laura: So, we decided to do that because we did choose the ELL in the classroom was Ricardo, and I thought after we’d already supported the concept behind the lesson with the cards and the ordering, this was just the language objective for the lesson, so we felt it kind of necessary to explicitly make the connection between first and primero and then next, siguiente and building those, like, word-to-word relationships so they understand.

To conclude, it was observed that this individual PST showed different levels of her own teacher self-efficacy beliefs regarding teaching ELLs. Specifically, the bilingual teacher (Laura) showed a higher TSEB in teaching ELLs compared to the three monolingual PSTs. This was because Laura is a bilingual and she had various previous teaching and working experience with ELLs. These experiences made her feel more confident in teaching ELLs and that she is ready to work with ELLs in the real field.

Summary

To sum up, the analysis of the data suggests the following: 1) PSTs felt pretty confident in accommodating and leveraging their lessons for ELLs; 2) Most PSTs did not feel confident in asking and creating higher-order thinking questions based on ELLs’ proficiency levels; 3) PSTs’ TSEB varied due to several factors, including ELLs’ proficiency levels, ELLs’ home languages and cultures, and the classroom contexts (e.g., grade level) PSTs need to teach; 4) PSTs’ content knowledge about
understanding and using the WIDA level was a key component to contribute to their TSEB; 5) PSTs’ pedagogical knowledge about comprehensible input and scaffolding strategy were important to contributing to their TSEB; and 5) PSTs’ own personal background and previous teaching experience influenced their TSEB about teaching ELLs.
CHAPTER 9
DISCUSSION

As educators, all decisions we make, no matter how neutral they may seem, have an impact on the lives and experiences of our students. (Nieto, 2002, p. 43)

Although ELLs currently constitute about 9.2% of the public-school student population (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2015), there exists a persistent achievement gap between ELLs and their native English-speaking peers (Ballantyne et al., 2008; Kena et al., 2016). One factor that contributes to the status quo of ELLs is that many mainstream teachers are not effectively prepared to teach and work with ELLs (de Jong, 2014; Samson & Collins, 2012). The majority of in-service teachers in the US have been reported to lack training for ELLs, and about 76% of teacher preparation programs in the US were identified as not having adequately prepared their teacher candidates for teaching ELLs (Gándara & Santibañez, 2016).

Recognizing the importance of mainstream preservice teachers’ preparation for ELLs, this dissertation examined preservice teacher self-efficacy beliefs (TSEB) related to their participation in ESL microteaching activities. Teacher self-efficacy beliefs, an area of research that investigates teacher perceptions of their confidence and preparedness, can provide important understandings relevant to mainstream teacher professional development and preparation for ELLs. Unfortunately, research on TSEB of PSTs related to ELLs is limited. Thus, it is essential for researchers to investigate PSTs’ TSEB and how individual TSEB is shaped in teaching and working with ELLs in teacher education programs.

Specifically, the study asked the following two questions:
Q1: What are preservice teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs about teaching ELLs before and after microteaching experiences?

Q2: How do four preservice teachers construct self-efficacy beliefs regarding teaching ELLs through microteaching experiences?

A multiple case study design was implemented in the context of a teacher education program to prepare preservice teachers through “infused” ESL endorsement. The ESL-infused model requires: 1) two stand-alone ESL courses and 2) ELL-specific field experience. A case in this study was defined as an individual preservice teacher who was enrolled in the second stand-alone ESL course in the teacher education program. Four individual preservice teachers voluntarily participated in the study and were used as focal study participants.

Data collection consisted of: (1) two surveys: a pre-survey (n=30) and a post-survey (n=25) before and after microteaching experiences, (2) four foci-participants’ in-depth interviews (two interviews, approximately 30 to 50 minutes, each, n=4), and 3) two classroom observations (contextual data). Descriptive statistics (survey) and thematic analysis (interview data) were used for data analysis.

Data analysis revealed that, after having participated in microteaching experiences, PSTs’ TSEB was enhanced. Furthermore, PSTs’ TSEB varied based on situational and contextual variables, and they constructed their perceived TSEB based on their content knowledge from ESL stand-alone courses, practice through field experience, and their exposure to diversity, including LOTE.

The Role of Microteaching Experience (MT) in Enhancing PSTs’ TSEB

To answer the first research questions, survey and interview data analysis illustrate that PSTs’ reported TSEB increased from the pre-test to the post-test. The
survey data also showed that not all items changed significantly. The interview data confirmed these findings and provided more insights as to how the microteaching experiences supported PSTs’ TSEB.

**Differentiated impact on MT**

As reported in Chapter 3-1, PSTs overall ratings (n=55) positively changed from the pre-test (taken at the beginning of the semester, prior to the microteaching experience) to post-test (administered immediately after the microteaching experience). PSTs rated themselves significantly higher in four areas: their ability to 1) adjust lessons to ELL individual learning; 2) adjust lessons to match ELLs’ proficiency levels; (3) measure ELLs’ comprehension levels; and 4) accommodate ELLs who are in advanced levels based on WIDA assessments. In contrast, PSTs did not rate their TSEB significantly higher in relation to their ability to 1) accommodate ELLs who are in beginner levels based on WIDA standards; (2) provide appropriate challenges for very capable ELL students, and 3) to craft higher-order thinking questions for ELLs.

This survey data indicated that MT had differentiated effects on PSTs’ TSEB. Specifically, PSTs felt confident in planning lessons while measuring ELLs’ proficiency levels because their perceived TSEB was enhanced in these areas. However, they did not feel confident in asking higher-order thinking skills for ELLs, which indicated their actual TSEB in teaching ELLs in the field had not increased.

Although there has been no specific research to investigate how MT experiences impacted PSTs’ TSEB in teaching ELLs, some studies have found that teachers felt certain areas were easier than others. For instance, using a modified version of Tschannen-Moran and Hoy’s *Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale* survey with middle school subject teachers, Butler (2016) found statistically significant results for
instructional practices on TSEB in teaching ELLs. However, teachers’ TSEB regarding student engagement was not found to be significant. Chacon (2005) found that EFL teachers’ efficacy for instructional strategies was higher than efficacy for management and engagement. These studies indicated that teachers felt their confidence in teaching ELLs was stronger in some areas, but this confidence may not be applicable across teaching contexts and types of students.

**Microteaching activity and TSEB**

Participation in the microteaching activity appeared pivotal in affecting preservice teachers’ TSEB. Interview data with four foci-participants indicated that the microteaching experience played an important role with increasing TSEB. The important role of microteaching in enhancing PSTs’ TSEB can be understood when considering the activity in light of Bandura’s framework and its proposed sources of self-efficacy, particularly enactive mastery, vicarious modeling, and verbal persuasion (Lamorey & Wilcox, 2005).

First, microteaching experiences provided opportunities for PSTs to master lesson planning for ELLs with a focus on comprehensible input and differentiation. As part of the MT activity, PSTs were required to specifically designed and implement their lessons in the second ESL stand-alone course. Second, MT teaching provided opportunities for vicarious modeling. PSTs emphasized that observing their peers’ microteaching demonstrations helped them conceptualize different strategies to implement ELL accommodations in future instruction. Third, MT teaching provided opportunities for verbal persuasion. PSTs confirmed that the feedback session with the course instructor after microteaching helped them better reflect on what opportunities
were missed during the MT demonstrations and how these opportunities could improve their own teaching.

These findings align with previous studies which stress that a microteaching experience can be an effective tool in promoting PSTs’ TSEB because it provides opportunities for PSTs to practice and master what they learn from teacher education programs (Arsal, 2015; Chesnut & Burley, 2015; Cinici, 2016). For example, Arsal (2014) found that PSTs’ mastery experience through microteaching could contribute to increasing their TSEB because PSTs have the opportunity to plan the lesson for teaching and learn time/classroom management.

Another component of MT was the inclusion of observing peer teaching and having individual feedback meetings with the instructor after the MT experiences. Wang and colleagues (2004) indicated that preservice teachers who were exposed to vicarious experiences showed significantly greater increases in judgments of self-efficacy for technology integration than those who were not exposed to these vicarious experiences. These results support benefits of vicarious learning on self-efficacy and highlight the potential benefit of providing preservice teachers with opportunities to observe teacher modeling.

Hoy and Spero (2005) argued that instructor’s feedback played an important role in promoting PSTs’ TSEB because this type of verbal persuasion encourages preservice teachers to reflect on their performance and offers an additional perspective that can impact their self-efficacy. Specific feedback on their teaching performance may enable preservice teachers to develop strategies in which they can teach more effectively (Mergler & Tangen, 2010).
In short, PSTs’ sense of self-efficacy was enhanced because they participated in an activity that provided mastery experiences, feedback on their performance, and opportunities for peer collaboration and modeling (Arsal, 2015; Chesnut & Burley, 2015; Cinici, 2016). Like other studies, the modeling and learning experiences that microteaching affords had a positive influence on PSTs’ TSEB (Cone, 2009; Wagler, 2011; Wang et al., 2004).

However, the data revealed that the MT experiences did not positively impact PSTs’ TSEB regarding Bandura’s framework of emotional arousal. Since the microteaching activities in this study were not structured to teach real ELLs and did not explicitly address anxiousness about teaching lower-level ELLs, the data highlighted the limitations of the MT experience. While some studies have found that MT experiences may relieve tension and anxiety regarding PSTs’ TSEB (Peker, 2009; Remesh, 2013), this dissertation showed that MT experiences did not resolve PSTs’ emotional anxiety in teaching beginner level ELLs.

**PST TSEB is Situational and Context-dependent**

It has been argued in the literature that TSEB is not a static concept. Findings from this dissertation confirm that TSEB needs to be dynamically conceptualized as it may vary based on situational and contextual variables (Faez & Valeo, 2012; Siwatu, 2011; Wyatt 2013; 2015). When focusing on ELLs, this study suggests ELLs’ proficiency levels and familiarity with ELLs’ home languages and cultures (situational variables) may mediate PSTs’ TSEB.

PSTs showed stronger TSEB in teaching high-level ELLs as opposed to low-level ELLs. They also felt more confident in working with Spanish-speaking ELLs as they had familiarity with the Spanish language and culture. Most PSTs reported that they felt
confident in incorporating ELLs’ cultural resources because they had learned to embrace cultural diversity and incorporate it into their lesson plan and instruction through the teacher education program. However, PSTs expressed lower confidence about working with various ELLs who bring different linguistic resources. These findings indicate that PSTs’ TSEB can be influenced by ELLs’ characteristics, such as proficiency levels, home languages, and cultures.

In addition to these situational variables, the study also identified two contextual variables that affected PSTs’ TSEB: the number of ELLs in their classrooms and PSTs’ perceived ability to teach specific subject areas. PSTs reported that they felt more confident in teaching ELLs in contexts where there would be only one or two ELLs in the mainstream classroom. In addition, PSTs’ TSEB varied based on which subjects, for instance, they felt more confident in teaching reading for ELLs. The latter finding was due to the fact that they were able to apply and transfer their prior knowledge from extensive reading coursework in the teacher education program. However, regarding teaching writing for ELLs, they expressed low confidence because microteaching was the first incident in which they were specifically guided to scaffold ELLs’ writing development. These findings indicated that PSTs’ TSEB can be influenced by classroom contexts and specific subject area.

Although some studies have demonstrated the dynamic nature of TSEB (Dellinger et al., 2008), these studies have mainly focused on other contextual variables, such as suburban versus urban school setting (Siwatu, 2011) or certification requirements, the organizational structure, school climate, and the developmental level.
of students within schools of varying academic levels (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2007).

These findings support the idea that it is critical to understand the context-specific nature of TSEB in diverse contexts and while considering different types of students (Faez & Valeo, 2012; Siwatu, 2011). However, previous studies have not specifically demonstrated how PSTs’ situational variables could influence their TSEB, considering ELLs’ proficiency levels and ELLs’ home languages and cultures. This study added an important finding and implication in order to fill the gap in the pre-existing literature.

**Constructing TSEB**

To respond to the second research question as to how PSTs construct their TSEB, this study identified three factors that appear to shape PSTs’ TSEB related to teaching ELLs: 1) ELL-specific content knowledge, 2) ELL-field experiences, and 3) PSTs’ experiences with diversity.

**The role of content and pedagogical knowledge**

PSTs’ content knowledge from ESL stand-alone courses made a difference about their confidence in teaching and working with ELLs. In particular, tools provided for assessment (i.e., WIDA), comprehensible input, and increasing peer interaction were perceived as valuable and helpful in feeling more efficacious in working with ELLs. During interviews, PSTs further explained it was important to identify demands of classroom language and scaffold lessons through explicit vocabulary teaching for reading and using sentence frames to support writing. PSTs reported that this content and pedagogical knowledge, in relation to learning about various ELL accommodations
with different strategies, appeared to construct the PSTs’ TSEB in teaching and working with ELLs.

Previous studies confirm the importance of content-specific knowledge with a pedagogical emphasis on enhancing TSEB (Abbitt, 2011; Sharp et al., 2016). Swackhamer et al. (2009) suggested that teachers who equipped their teaching with sufficient content knowledge through coursework showed higher self-efficacy beliefs in content area instruction. Sharp and colleagues (2016) showed that PSTs’ increased knowledge was positively associated with their TSEB in relation to the ability to teach literacy. These findings suggest preservice teachers enhanced their content and pedagogical knowledge through teacher preparation coursework, which resulted in an increase of their self-efficacy for teaching ELLs.

**The role of ELL-specific field experience**

ELL-specific field experiences played an important role with PSTs’ working with ELLs. Findings from this dissertation indicate what PSTs learned and observed through field experiences contributed to their TSEB. PSTs felt more confident working with ELLs because they received opportunities to observe how to create an inclusive learning environment so that ELLs actively participated in classroom lessons. In addition, PSTs felt more prepared to incorporate ELLs’ home languages and cultures because they observed ESL teachers’ specific instructional strategies working with ELLs. Furthermore, one-on-one tutoring helped PSTs learn more about second language acquisition and language principles which created opportunities for PSTs to apply theory-based methods and techniques to real practice during tutoring sessions.

Previous studies have demonstrated the importance of ELL-specific field placements to support mainstream teacher preparedness and self-efficacy in working
with ELLs (Mora & Grisham, 2001; Xu, 2000). These field placements, which include direct interactions with ELLs for PSTs to reflect on their experiences, can raise awareness of the roles of language and culture in the classroom (Ariza, 2003; Salerno & Kibler, 2013).

For instance, Mora and Grisham (2001) found that preparing PSTs with clinical field experience allowed them to receive various opportunities to directly work with ELLs, and in turn, this contributed to their TSEB when working with ELLs. Xu (2000) also found that, through interactions with diverse students in field experiences and class discussions, PSTs gained an increased awareness of effective strategies in literacy instruction, which made them feel more prepared to teach and work with ELLs. PSTs’ practice through ELL-specific field experience was a key factor in shaping PSTs’ TSEB in relation to ELLs. Field experiences gave PSTs opportunities to practice working with ELLs, which made PSTs feel more confident in working with ELLs.

**The role of exposure to diversity**

The last factor that contributed to PSTs’ TSEB was their exposure to diversity. This included PSTs' personal backgrounds, previous teaching and working experience with ELLs, and their own bilingual ability (i.e., LOTE). Cross-case analysis showed PSTs with linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds showed much stronger TSEB as opposed to other teachers who did not have similar exposure.

For example, Laura (Case 4) had had enough practice in real teaching settings throughout her previous teaching aboard experience; thus, she was very confident in teaching and working with Spanish ELLs compared to the other participants, who were monolingual teachers. In addition, her LOTE ability influenced her TSEB in terms of using her Spanish skills for Spanish ELLs in the mainstream classroom. During the
microteaching lesson planning sessions and demonstration, it was clearly observed that she could easily code switch between English and Spanish. She also reported that during the microteaching demonstration, she could easily incorporate and demonstrate her LOTE without noticing.

Previous studies have noted that learning another language, traveling abroad, and exposure to culturally diverse settings positively affects PSTs’ TSEB (Evans, Arnot-Hopffer, & Jurich, 2005; Torok & Aguilar, 2000). Research on studying abroad and other culturally diverse placements have demonstrated that these experiences influence teachers’ self-efficacy working in diverse contexts (Barkhuizen & Feryok, 2006). Barkhuizen and Feryok (2006) showed that international teaching experiences provide opportunities for teachers to improve their language proficiency in the language they will teach, to develop their pedagogical knowledge and to engage with an international sociocultural environment with which they are not familiar.

These findings are aligned with previous studies in which teachers who were exposed to linguistic diversity were able to develop the understanding and skills of implementing L1 instruction, which increased PSTs’ confidence with teaching ELLs. As such, teachers’ diverse experiences, including cultural and linguistic experience through PSTs’ personal backgrounds, previous teaching and working experience with ELLs, and their own bilingual ability (i.e., LOTE) contributed to shaping PSTs’ TSEB in teaching ELLs.

**Understanding Mainstream Teacher Preparation for ELLs**

Data analysis revealed that microteaching experiences helped influence PSTs’ TSEB. It also revealed that PSTs’ TSEB varied based on situational and contextual
variables, content knowledge from ESL stand-alone courses, practice through field experience, and their exposure to diversity, including LOTE.

Figure 9-1. Understanding Mainstream Teacher Preparation for ELLs
PSTs come with prior experience and background knowledge and learn more content in their teacher preparation program. Specifically related to ELLs, they learn about proficiency levels and providing comprehensible input for teaching ELLs and so forth. They also engage in field experiences that required them to observe in classrooms with ELLs or work directly with ELLs.

To better prepare mainstream teachers, this study suggests microteaching experiences can function as an important mediating tool to enhance PSTs’ TSEB. Based on Bandura’s four sources of self-efficacy, the ESL microteaching experience affords PST with 1) mastery experience (i.e., lesson planning for ELLs), 2) vicarious experiences through observation from peers conducting microteaching lessons, and 3) verbal persuasion as they receive feedback from the instructor.

In addition, the model posits that ELL-specific content, pedagogical knowledge, and PSTs’ personal or professional experiences with diversity play a role in enhancing TSEB. PSTs’ content knowledge of the second language acquisition process, ELLs’ home language, and understanding cultural diversity were critical factors for enhanced TSEB. ELL-specific field experience was also closely connected with the PSTs’ opportunities to practice as it provided a clear connection between theory and practice. PSTs’ exposure to diversity helps PSTs better understand ELLs’ unique learning needs, such as incorporating home languages during instruction. PST’s bilingualism enhanced TSEB in teaching ELLs because it made them feel confident in accommodating and leveraging ELLs by using their own LOTE ability.

Although building TSEB made PSTs feel better prepared to teach and work with ELLs, it is important to note PSTs’ TSEB is their perceptions of their capabilities and not
their actual level of teaching competence. This implies that perceived TSEB may not be directly transferred and linked to actual teaching performance and outcome expectancy.

**PSTs’ TSEB through Microteaching Experiences**

As evident in Figure 9-1, the PSTs had already received content/pedagogical knowledge as well as practice from the first ESL stand-alone course. By infusing microteaching activities as a mediating tool, this model showed that MT experiences reinforced PSTs’ content knowledge and practice, which, in turn, enhanced their TSEB.

This conceptual model also showed that several variables, including classroom settings and ELL characteristics, should be considered in an effort to explain why PSTs’ TSEB was contextual and situational. Although previous studies have demonstrated that contextual variables, such as different schools or classroom settings can impact the PSTs’ TSEB, the pre-existing literature has not shown how PSTs’ situational TSEB played a role in the PSTs’ TSEB in relation to teaching ELLs. Thus, this model added an important implication to the existing literature in terms of the necessity of examining the PSTs’ situational TSEB based on ELLs’ proficiency levels and home languages.

Another important contribution from this research through this model is how the PSTs’ LOTE ability is closely connected to their situational TSEB in teaching ELLs. When PSTs felt confident in tapping into ELLs’ home languages, such as Spanish, they showed enhanced TSEB about teaching and working with Spanish ELLs. For example, findings from this dissertation revealed that the bilingual teacher who had personal and professional exposure to cultural and linguistic diversity showed a stronger and higher TSEB as opposed to three monolingual teachers who did not have similar experiences. Monolingual teachers still did not feel confident about incorporating ELLs’ linguistic resources in their own instruction.
To conclude, this model suggests that PSTs’ perceived TSEB was enhanced thanks to microteaching experiences. Based on the model, it is expected that efficacious teachers of ELLs who have high self-efficacy beliefs about teaching and working with ELLs can promote ELLs’ academic outcome. These teachers can be considered effective future teachers of ELLs who received sufficient content knowledge from university ELL preparation courses and various opportunities to practice through microteaching experiences. On top of that, they had meaningful exposure to linguistic diversity based on their own personal experience. These experiences combined can hopefully be used in teacher education programs to educate teacher candidates to become quality future teachers of ELLs.

Figure 9-2. PSTs’ TSEB through Microteaching Experiences
A Theoretical Model of PSTs’ TSEB in Relation to ELLs

This study implements teacher self-efficacy beliefs as a theoretical framework for understanding how preservice teachers shape and construct TSEB in an effort to become future teachers of ELLs. Based on constructivism, this study conceptualizes that TSEB is constructed based on specific teaching tasks and contexts, which defines TSEB as task-specific and context-dependent.

Three mediating factors construct PSTs’ TSEB: 1) PSTs’ content and pedagogical knowledge, 2) PSTs’ opportunities to practice, and 3) PSTs’ exposure to diversity, including LOTE (Language Other than English). Firstly, this figure conceptualizes that PSTs’ content knowledge about linguistically responsive teaching is an important factor that enhances preservice teachers’ TSEB for teaching ELLs. This is because the LRT involves having increased awareness and knowledge of languages, knowing the language needs of ELLs, and being able to appropriately scaffold their needs to help them develop academic proficiency in English.

Secondly, regarding PSTs’ opportunities to practice, this study conceptualizes that ELL-specific field experiences and microteaching experiences in teacher education programs are also important in constructing preservice teachers’ TSEB. This is because field experiences can promote PSTs’ practices by providing them a clear connection between theory and practice while working with ELLs. In addition, microteaching experience can impact PSTs’ mastery experiences through providing and receiving feedback on teaching performances as well as collaborating with peers and the instructors.

It has been established in general teacher education that two mediating factors—PSTs’ content as well as pedagogical knowledge and their opportunities to
practice—can contribute to TSEB. Increasingly, teacher educators have pointed to another mediating factor: teachers’ exposure to diversity, including their own cultural and linguistic backgrounds. This is because teachers who were exposed to diversity, such as the ability to speak languages other than English (LOTE), are able to interpret, negotiate, and connect their personal experiences to fill the gap between ELLs’ diverse learning needs and the curricula’s learning requirements (Gomez et al., 2008; Souto-Manning, 2006). As such, a third mediating factor is PSTs’ exposure to diversity that contributed to shaping TSEB because the diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds of teachers can help them better understand ELLs’ unique learning needs. For mainstream teachers, LOTE abilities positively influence TSEB in teaching ELLs.

Teacher educators in mainstream teacher ELL preparation programs suggest teachers’ exposure to diversity is a critical component that influenced PSTs’ TSEB (Gomez et al., 2008; Souto-Manning, 2006). Some studies have shown that preservice teachers’ experience with LOTE and their own LOTE abilities can be beneficial in promoting their ELL-specific pedagogy, which can contribute to TSEB (Paneque & Barbetta, 2006). Teacher educators should consider promoting preservice teachers’ funds of knowledge, such as experience with LOTE and their LOTE abilities, in order to meet ELLs’ unique learning needs in mainstream classrooms (Karathanos, 2010). As such, teachers’ bilingual experiences can contribute to their practice in teaching ELLs so that they are better prepared to serve growing numbers of culturally and linguistically diverse students in K-12 (Torok & Aguilar, 2000).

To summarize, this conceptual map shows that three mediating factors are key to enhancing preservice teachers’ TSEB. Promoting PSTs’ TSEB is expected to
enhance teachers’ instructional practices in teaching and working with ELLs. In other words, enhanced TSEB can lead to helping PSTs become quality future teachers of ELLs who possess specific instructional strategies for teaching ELLs. When these quality teachers work with ELLs in the field, it is expected that they can positively impact ELLs’ learning outcomes and help promote academic achievement. As a result, effective teachers of ELLs can contribute to closing an academic gap between ELLs and native English-speaking students regarding standardized testing.

Figure 9-3. A Theoretical Model of PSTs’ TSEB in relation to ELLs

Summary

Findings of this dissertation indicated that the TSEB of mainstream preservice teachers was enhanced after having participated in ESL microteaching experiences. Enhancing TSEB made PSTs feel better prepared to teach and work with ELLs because MT influenced their content knowledge and practice, and, in turn, appeared to promote
their perceived TSEB. However, study findings also showed that PSTs’ TSEB varied based on situational and contextual variables. Thus, it is necessary to understand how PSTs constructed their TSEB and which factors that contributed to their TSEB. Results reveal that PSTs constructed TSEB through three main factors: content knowledge, field experience working with ELLs, and past experiences with diversity and LOTE that played an important role in effectively teaching and working ELLs. Although it was concluded that microteaching experiences enhanced their perceived TSEB, this study calls future research to understand and examine how their actual teaching ability and outcome expectancy are enhanced and what key role this plays in mainstream teacher preparation for ELLs.
CHAPTER 10
CONCLUSION

Inclusion is a mindset. It is a way of thinking. It is not a program that we run or a classroom in our school or a favor we do for someone. Inclusion is who we were. It is who we must strive to be. (Lisa Friedman: Removing the Stumbling Block)

This study explored pre-service teachers’ self-efficacy in teaching and working with ELLs. A particular emphasis was placed on their teacher self-efficacy beliefs guided by the epistemology of the constructivist paradigm, analyzed by the use of thematic analysis to provide a clear picture of the study’s findings (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The four focal teachers drew from their personal backgrounds, previous teaching and working experiences with ELLs, learned content and pedagogical knowledge from ESL stand-alone courses as well as field experiences and microteaching experiences, and their bilingualism and experiences learning a second language (Spanish).

In-depth interviews were introduced to understand their stories and narratives. I respected their narratives about their TSEB through microteaching activities as best as I could for the purposes of this study. Some may argue that when one listens to voices from a small sample group, the outcome of a qualitative study may be biased, and it could be difficult to generalize study findings to the whole population. However, as the existing literature and research studies in education lack in exploring the voices and the experiences of PSTs’ TSEB in relation to ESL microteaching, it was meaningful to listen to their experiences and how their TSEB was shaped through various mediating factors, such as content knowledge, practice, and exposure to diversity, including LOTE.

This research experience allowed me the opportunity to explore individual PSTs’ TSEB and notice emerging themes and patterns based on their responses. Their openness and willingness to contribute to the field of teacher education for those who
teach ELLs was critical in contributing to the success of this study. In conducting this dissertation with mainstream preservice teachers, this study ascertained a number of findings that were either significantly common or different among participants and their TSEB, including preparation and confidence about teaching and working with ELL students.

**Summary of Findings**

This study revealed the following findings:

1. After having participated in ESL microteaching experiences, PSTs felt pretty confident in accommodating their lessons for students. PSTs reported that leveraging lessons specifically for the ELL was a valuable experience that contributed to their TSEB in teaching ELLs. In addition, watching their own teaching videos and having individual meetings with the instructor as well as observing their peers conduct microteaching activities provided them many opportunities to reflect on what they had missed through microteaching demonstrations as well as how they could also implement effective ELL accommodations. These ESL microteaching experiences contributed to promoting their TSEB in regards to ELLs.

2. PSTs reported that their TSEB was situational and context-dependent. Individual PST’s TSEB varied due to several factors, including ELLs’ proficiency levels, ELLs’ home languages and cultures, and classroom contexts (e.g., the number of ELLs in the classroom). Among ELLs, PSTs felt more confident about teaching Spanish ELLs compared to non-Spanish ELLs due to their experience in learning Spanish as a second language. PSTs also reported that they felt more confident in teaching low-incident ELLs, which involves having only one or two ELLs in the classroom. In situations where
they would need to engage with many ELLs in their classrooms, PSTs did not feel confident in leveraging students’ various cultural and linguistic backgrounds,

3. PSTs considered content knowledge that they learned from ESL stand-alone courses contributed to enhancing their TSEB. For instance, understanding and using the WIDA level in lesson planning was critical knowledge to make them feel more prepared to work with ELLs. All PSTs reported that the WIDA helped them feel more confident in evaluating ELLs’ proficiency levels while preparing and demonstrating their lessons through ESL microteaching activities. Regarding ELL accommodations, including incorporating various ESL strategies, PSTs reported that learning how to provide comprehensible input and scaffolding for ELLs was important in enhancing their TSEB.

4. The data suggests PSTs’ TSEB was shaped by three key mediating factors, including 1) PSTs’ content knowledge from teacher education courses, such as ESL stand-alone courses, 2) PSTs’ practice through field experience as well as microteaching experiences, and 3) PSTs’ exposure to diversity, including LOTE ability. These three factors were complementary in shaping individual PST’s TSEB to become teachers of ELLs.

5. PSTs’ exposure to diversity influenced their TSEB regarding teaching ELLs. One PST noted that having ELLs in the internship setting provided her many opportunities to work with ELLs on a daily basis. This experience made her feel more prepared to teach ELLs. Another PST noted that her TSEB was influenced by her own personal backgrounds, previous teaching experience, and LOTE. The bilingual PST showed a higher level of TSEB in teaching ELLs compared to the three monolingual
PSTs due to her experiences working with ELLs. In addition, the bilingual PST felt more confident, as opposed to monolingual teachers, in incorporating ELLs’ home languages during her instruction. This indicated that the bilingual teacher’s LOTE influenced her TSEB regarding instructional choices in an effort to tap into ELLs’ linguistic backgrounds.

**Implications for Teacher Educators**

Findings from this study present important implications for teacher preparation and professional development. Based on this dissertation, teacher educators should evaluate program requirements, course offerings, and components of teacher education coursework to ensure that teacher candidates are provided with ample opportunities for developing their knowledge, practices, and skills to teach and work with ELLs.

First, an important contribution from this dissertation is that teacher educators should guide ELL-specific instructional strategies through microteaching activities in teacher preparation courses for ELLs so that PSTs are able to receive various opportunities to specifically design lessons through ESL MT demonstrations. ESL microteaching experiences also provided opportunities for PSTs to observe examples of peer teaching and application of techniques for ELLs. Previous research suggests that providing teacher candidates with various opportunities to practice with ELL accommodations and strategies through microteaching can contribute to enhancing PSTs’ TSEB in teacher education programs (Ogeyik, 2009; Savas, 2012).

Another contribution from this study finding is that when teacher educators implement microteaching activities in the teacher preparation course, they should carefully consider how microteaching prompts and guidelines specifically focus on ELLs’ features and characteristics. In an effort to respond to this limitation, teacher educators
are urged to design microteaching prompts that closely align with target students so that PSTs receive more opportunities to practice in order to leverage ELLs who are at low proficiency levels. In addition, microteaching guidelines should also be designed to develop PSTs’ questioning skills based on ELLs’ proficiency levels as well as asking higher-order thinking skills. This study showed that PSTs are still not confident in teaching these areas, and this lack of confidence was connected to their actual TSEB in the field.

Another implication from this dissertation is that teacher educators are urged to design microteaching experiences that relieve PSTs’ emotional teaching anxiety related to one of Bandura’s sources of self-efficacy, emotional arousal. The microteaching implementation of this study was not specifically structured to tap into relieving PSTs’ anxiety in teaching ELLs. Thus, the data did not clearly show a positive impact on how their teaching anxiety influenced their TSEB in teaching ELLs. To respond to the limitation of microteaching activities, teacher educators should consider how to properly structure MT activities that can relieve their emotional teaching anxiety to teach different ELLs who bring different linguistic and cultural resources.

As for implications from this dissertation regarding PSTs’ content knowledge, teacher educators should prepare future teachers of ELLs with sufficient knowledge and understanding of second language acquisition, including essential principles of second language learning (e.g., distinguishing between BICS and CALP; the importance of comprehensible input) that could enable preservice teachers to develop a perspective on teaching and learning that is informed by an understanding of second language development (Zainuddin & Moore, 2004). Findings from this dissertation showed that
PSTs’ content knowledge about the WIDA assessment tool, comprehensible input, and increasing peer interaction enhanced PSTs’ TSEB in teaching ELLs. In addition, PSTs’ knowledge about identifying demands of classroom language and scaffolding lessons in content instruction was the key knowledge that played a critical role in promoting PSTs’ TSEB in teaching and working with ELLs.

In terms of implications from this dissertation regarding PSTs’ field experience, teacher educators are urged to provide meaningful opportunities for preservice teachers so that PSTs receive direct teaching and working experience with ELLs. Participants in this dissertation indicated that their field experiences in mainstream as well as ESL classrooms settings fostered their preparation and confidence for serving ELLs. The preservice teacher who perceived that she felt confident in teaching ELLs attributed the development of her knowledge and practice of ELL strategies to her field practicum working with ELLs. A number of researchers contend that preservice teachers benefit from ELL-specific field experiences with culturally and linguistically diverse students (Ariza, 2003; Mora & Grisham, 2001; Xu, 2000).

In addition, teacher educators are encouraged to design teacher preparation courses that highlight PSTs’ personal and professional exposure to diversity, including LOTE ability. Considering the current English-only ideology in K-12 and many educators’ assimilationist perspectives in the US, teacher educators also need to consider how to promote PSTs’ primary language usage in their instruction (Karathanos, 2010). As such, it is important for teacher educators to challenge these ideologies by valuing the status of ELLs’ native languages and cultures in teacher education programs (Karathanos, 2010). One suggestion is to value bilingual PSTs’
LOTE because bilingual teachers are better able to effectively incorporate ELLs’ funds of knowledge in instruction by using their own native languages (Ellis, 2006; Paneque & Barbetta, 2006). By doing so, future teachers of ELLs could ensure ELLs’ educational equity and promote ELLs’ academic success (Coady et al., 2015; de Jong, 2014).

Results from this study showed that one PST’s diverse linguistic background played a critical role in promoting her TSEB in teaching ELLs. In an effort to respond to this need, teacher educators should incorporate the importance of multilingual practices in teacher preparation courses, for example, by use of cognates in vocabulary teaching and creating bilingual books. In addition, teacher educators should be able to assist PSTs in identifying bilingual resources for the classroom (e.g., bilingual dictionaries, bilingual children’s books, books in LOTE, students’ native language supplementary materials) that contribute to enhancing their TSEB in teaching ELLs. A number of researchers contend that preservice teachers benefit from exposure to diversity that enhance their TSEB in teaching ELLs (de Jong, 2014; Paneque & Barbetta, 2006).

Lastly, it is imperative for teacher education programs to emphasize incorporating a language teacher identity framework with ESL pedagogy throughout ESL field placement. If pre-service teachers do not position themselves as ELL teachers, and if they do not embrace the roles of language teachers, it is highly possible that future teachers of ELLs will not meet ELLs’ unique learning needs and interests in K-12 (Kayi-Aydar, 2015; Reeves, 2009). In other words, when pre-service teachers consider themselves as not only content teachers, but also as language teachers, they are more likely to implement culturally and linguistically responsive teaching strategies for ELLs (Lucas & Villegas, 2013). Therefore, teacher educators should continually implement
language teacher identity frameworks both on a theoretical and a practical level within their pedagogy so that pre-service teachers’ cognition, including perceptions, knowledge, and beliefs towards their language teacher identities will be more aligned with the mission of the teacher education program.

Preparing PSTs to work with diverse populations, particularly ELLs, relies on their development of an awareness of how their linguistic and cultural contexts shape not only their language teacher identities but also their ESL teaching practices. There is a need for mainstream pre-service teachers to be culturally and linguistically responsive in their classroom practices because such practices allow the PSTs an opportunity for discourse that trouble their perceptions and push them to engage in critical reflections (Athanases et al., 2012; Johnson, 2009). In this regard, teacher educators must embed activities that require pre-service teachers to reflect on their own backgrounds, languages, and cultures and those of the ELLs, thus enabling them to rethink their language teacher identities as future teachers of ELLs, including responsive language teachers (Daniel & Peercy, 2014).

**Suggestions for Future Research**

The findings from this dissertation present various suggestions for future research. Inquiries about the influence of purposeful ELL-specific field placements and ESL microteaching experiences for teacher candidates in settings with culturally and linguistically diverse students can yield valuable insights. Future studies of teacher preparation coursework for preservice teachers that embed linguistically responsive theories and practices can inform teacher candidates as they strive to enhance their preparation and self-efficacy beliefs for teaching ELLs. Still, further research is needed
to explore what knowledge, practice, and skills that shape preservice teachers’ TSEB to become effective teachers of ELLs.

First, findings from this dissertation suggest that we do not know much about how PSTs’ situational TSEB played a role in the PSTs’ TSEB. The data analysis showed that PSTs’ TSEB was situationally constructed based on ELLs’ proficiency levels and home languages. Since previous studies have not specifically explored how mainstream teachers’ TSEB is constructed according to different variables, including teaching tasks, contexts, and characteristics of ELLs, future studies are urged to explore this area. There should also be more research to investigate which of survey items that measure PSTs’ TSEB in relation to ELLs should be developed and refined. Since different studies measured different areas of PSTs’ TSEB in teaching ELLs, future studies should specifically focus on the variables that can properly measure PSTs’ content knowledge and practices through microteaching experiences.

Second, a longitudinal study is recommended in terms of how preservice teachers’ TSEB was sustained or developed after they exited teacher education programs. Some studies have found that preservice teachers may face struggles while teaching and working with ELLs although they have finished required ESL-infused credentials and endorsement. This indicated that follow-up research is necessary regarding preservice teachers’ TSEB after completion of teacher education programs. Future research on this area can give us additional insights to understand how TSEB changes and develops in an effort to understand TSEB while teaching ELLs in the field. These future studies will also help researchers to investigate how actual TSEB can impact ELLs’ academic outcome and performance, including academic achievement.
Thus, future research on this topic guides us on how to close an opportunity gap as well as achievement gap in standardized testing in US school environment (Villegas, SaizdeLaMora, Martin, & Mills, 2018).

Third, only a few research studies on bilingual mainstream teachers have been conducted, which has resulted in the absence of their voices and experiences in the field of mainstream teacher preparation for ELLs. If we can hear more from them in drawing from their bilingual experiences and more about their views on teaching ELLs, future research could contribute to the improvement of teacher education for the growing numbers of culturally and linguistically diverse students in the U.S. These asset-oriented perspectives will result in closing the gap in academic achievement between CLD students and English native-speaking students (Villegas et al., 2018).

Lastly, there is a call for future studies to explore how teacher preparation programs appropriately guide mainstream pre-service teachers to develop language teacher identities. Although previous studies have examined pre-service teachers' ESL knowledge and skill development, this study still found a gap in the literature in terms of developing elementary pre-service teachers' language teacher identities in ESL teacher education. Since language teacher identity heavily impacts teachers’ choices of ELL accommodations, future researchers must continue to examine how pre-service teachers are able to connect ESL theory to practice by demonstrating their advanced competence and performances in language teaching.
APPENDIX A
LEARNED LESSONS FROM THE PILOT STUDY

In the fall of 2016, a pilot study was performed to explore how microteaching experiences help prepare preservice teachers to teach and work with ELLs. After conducting the pilot study, I learned several lessons that helped me better organize this study. These were: 1) the importance of exploring teacher reflection after microteaching to understand teacher self-efficacy beliefs, 2) the importance of deciding appropriate data collection tools for this study, and 3) the importance of initial findings to recognize limitations and researcher personal reflection throughout the pilot study.

While reading relevant literature, I realized that it was important to examine PSTs’ reflections after microteaching because it can provide insight on what PSTs had learned through the microteaching experiences, and what they would do differently in the future (Fernández, 2005). Previous studies have also shown that PSTs’ reflections are effectively aligned with Bandura’s four sources of self-efficacy expectations for better capturing how preservice teacher construct and shape TSE while analyzing teacher reflection (Arsal, 2014; Newton, Leonard, Evans, & Eastburn, 2012). Using PSTs’ reflections from the pilot study, one PST reported:

Before ESL microteaching, we had obviously learned a lot through our readings and classroom lectures, but we never really had to apply this knowledge. We have also observed ELL classrooms or students, but never really had to plan for teaching any. I think this microteaching helped us to better understand what it really takes to implement a lesson that ELLs will understand and be able to apply to their own work.

This direct quotation made me recognize the importance of incorporating PSTs’ reflection after microteaching. I also realized that microteaching experience provided them opportunities to practice their ELL accommodations in class.
Another lesson I learned was the importance of choosing proper data collection methods. Based on previous studies, I concluded the interview method was needed to document preservice teachers’ experiences with microteaching in more detail (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008; Payant, 2014). Thus, I conducted PSTs’ focus-group interviews with twenty-eight preservice teachers. After conducting focus-group interviews, I realized that it might not be most appropriate method to explore individual preservice teacher’s TSE construction. This was because it was difficult for me to closely examine and analyze individual teacher sense-making as well as meaning-making on TSE construction. For these reasons, I decided not to use focus-group interviews. For this study, I will interview individual preservice teachers with three-step in-depth interviews utilizing a multiple cases design.

I also explored preservice teacher’s two surveys, pre- and post-surveys before and after microteaching implementation. Since many studies have implemented the TSES, I decided to modify the contents and use it for my pilot study (Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010; Fraser, 2014; Morgan, 2008). After conducting surveys, I realized that the data helped me navigate this group of PSTs’ perceived self-efficacy beliefs to teach and work with ELLs. The pre-survey provided baseline data about PSTs’ background knowledge before entering the second ESL stand-alone course. The post-survey provided an understanding of how TSE was shaped after having microteaching experiences. Open-ended questions in the survey were appropriate to triangulate data sources with PSTs’ reflections to match how PSTs responded consistently about their TSE with multiple data sources. For these reasons, I decided to use survey data continuously for this dissertation.
After exploring several data sources with a pilot study, my initial analysis showed that the ESL microteaching activity in general made PSTs feel more prepared to teach and work with ELLs. In addition, PSTs’ microteaching experience created a space to design and revise their lesson plans as in-class activities. For instance, one PST responded:

Microteaching activities have affected our knowledge on how to teach English language learners in that we have learned some essential strategies to best teach our students. The lesson plan activity especially helped us apply and utilize what we learned from pre-class session.

Although many PSTs responded that microteaching was beneficial, few PSTs revealed its limitations. For example, some responded that a 10 to 15-minute mini-lesson could limit their abilities to demonstrate their ELL accommodation skills. This implied that the microteaching activity should be extended to longer than 20 minutes so that PSTs received enough time to implement and demonstrate what they had planned. In addition, it seemed that many PSTs felt that the microteaching environment was not real because they taught in front of their peers. To respond to this issue, I realized that I need to have a meeting with the instructor and course supervisor. During the meeting, we discussed how we can overcome some challenges that emerged from the pilot study. In addition, we discussed what we can do differently to make the environment better for PSTs’ microteaching experiences.

Interestingly, this pilot study made me critically analyze the PSTs’ teaching anxiety level in teaching and working with ELLs. During the pilot study, I perceived their fear and high teaching anxiety to teach ELLs may contribute to their lack of preparedness and effectiveness based on social cognitive theory. This indicated that their low sense of TSEB may negatively influence their practice and knowledge. However, studies on TSE
based on constructivism criticizes this notion and recent scholars argue that teacher self-doubt with critical reflection can be the key to promote their efforts to overcome their low TSE. Thus, I should not jump into conclusion that low TSE is naturally related to less-efficacious teachers. Instead, I should closely examine how PST describes their fear and anxiety in teaching ELLs to determine whether he or she can overcome their low TSE and challenges with critical reflection to become quality future teachers of ELLs through microteaching experience.
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APPENDIX C
SURVEY QUESTIONS

Pre-Survey

A. Rating-scale questions

Directions: Rate yourself on a scale from 1-5 as to your understanding (knowledge) of your competency and confidence in your ability to demonstrate this competency in the classroom with English Language Learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not At All Confident</th>
<th>Very Little Confidence</th>
<th>Some Confidence</th>
<th>Quite A Bit of Confidence</th>
<th>A Great Deal of Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How confident are you in your ability to accommodate ELLs who are in beginner levels based on WIDA?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How confident are you in your ability to motivate ELLs who show low interest in schoolwork?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How confident are you in your ability to help ELLs value learning?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How confident are you in your ability to gauge ELLs' comprehension of what you have taught?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How confident are you in your ability to craft higher-order thinking questions for ELLs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How confident are you in your ability to adjust your lessons to the proper level for each individual ELL student?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How confident are you in your ability to implement a variety of assessment strategies for ELLs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How confident are you in your ability to accommodate ELLs who are in advanced levels based on WIDA?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Not At All Confident</td>
<td>Very Little Confidence</td>
<td>Some Confidence</td>
<td>Quite a Bit of Confidence</td>
<td>A Great Deal of Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How confident are you in your ability to provide an alternative explanation or an example when ELLs are confused?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How confident are you in your ability to implement alternative strategies with ELLs in your classroom?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How confident are you in your ability to provide appropriate challenges for very capable ELL students?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How confident are you in your ability to integrate the cultural backgrounds of ELLs into your classroom?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How confident are you in your ability to integrate the linguistic backgrounds of ELLs (home languages) into your classroom?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How confident are you in your ability to adjust your lesson to proper ELL proficiency levels?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How confident are you in your ability to support ELLs’ second language development in content area teaching?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How well do you feel you are prepared to teach ELLs in order to meet academic needs of ELLs in mainstream classroom?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Open-ended questions

How well do you feel you are prepared to teach ELLs?

How confident are you in your ability to teach ELLs?

What experiences and knowledge have contributed to your confidence in teaching ELLs?

What is your perception of your ability to teach ELLs in the mainstream classroom?

What do you think you still need to know in order to teach ELLs effectively?
Post-Survey

Open-ended questions

How did the ESL microteaching experience help you incorporate ELLs’ linguistic needs in your classroom?

How did the ESL microteaching experience help you incorporate ELLs’ cultural needs in your classroom?

How did the ESL microteaching experience help you accommodate your lessons for ELLs at different proficiency levels?

How did the ESL microteaching experience influence your ability to teach ELLs at different proficiency levels?

Now that you have completed the microteaching activities, how do you feel about your ability as a future teacher of ELLs?
APPENDIX D
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

First Interview

1. How confident do you feel at this time about teaching ELLs?
   a. What experiences in your life and in college contribute to your confidence in working with ELLs?
   b. What do you feel most confident about when teaching ELLs?
   c. What do you feel less confident about when teaching ELLs?

2. How confident do you feel in your ability to successfully complete the microteaching assignment?
   a. What worried you about the assignment?
   b. What did you feel most confident about?
   c. What did you feel least confident about?

3. Tell me how you approached the lesson plans you designed for the microteaching activities (use actual lesson plan as prompt).
   a. How did you choose your topic or focus?
   b. What resources did you use to plan the lesson?
   c. What were some aspects of teaching ELLs that you thought about as you planned the lesson?
   d. In what ways do you think the lesson met the criteria in the rubric?

4. Referring back to pre-survey results that student-teachers responded to,
   a. I noticed that they answered this question on the survey like this….
      Can you tell me more about how you rated that question as a (scale 1-5)?
   b. Tell me more about why you rated yourself this way.

5. Tell me about yourself.
   a. Where did you grow up? What was your community like?
   b. Tell me about the schools you attended.
   c. Why did you choose to become a teacher?
   d. What opportunities, if any, have you had to learn a language other than English? How do you think these experiences might influence your work with ELLs?
   e. Tell me about other experiences you may have had in your life that might influence the ways you will work with ELLs.

6. Is there anything that you would like to add? Do you have any questions or comments?
Second Interview

1. I'm going to ask you about some of responses to the second survey.
   a. I noticed that student-teachers answered this question on the survey like this…. Can you tell me more about how you rated that question as a (scale 1-5)?
   b. Tell me more about why you rated yourself this way.

2. How confident do you feel about accommodating your lessons for ELLs in your classroom?
   a. What did you feel most confident about when planning lessons for ELLs?
   b. What did you feel least confident about when planning lessons for ELLs?

3. Following microteaching, tell me about your microteaching experience.
   a. What was it like for you?
   b. Were there surprises? Tell me about them.
   c. As you look back on microteaching, what do you think you'll take away from it?

4. How confident do you feel in teaching ELLs as a result of the microteaching experiences?
   a. What aspects of microteaching you believe have strengthened your sense of confidence as teachers of ELLs?

5. One requirement of the microteaching was to use the students’ home languages. How confident did you feel about doing this?
   a. I noticed that you [give example of L1 use in microteaching]. Tell me more about why you chose that strategy.

6. How would you describe your sense of confidence as a future teacher of ELLs?
   a. How confident are you in teaching ELLs in your future classroom?
   b. What will it take for you to become a strong teacher of ELLs?
   c. How could microteaching be modified to help you to feel more confident about teaching ELLs?

7. Is there anything that you would like to add? Do you have any questions or comments?
### APPENDIX E

**THEMATIC ANALYSIS**

| Table E-1. An example of individual case building (Case 1: Ariel). |
|---|---|---|
| **Themes** | **Descriptions** | **Codes and sub-codes** |
| 1. Description of PST’s TSEB | PST described teacher self-efficacy belief about teaching ELLs through her own words. Codes included how she felt about teaching ELLs, what areas she felt the most as well as the least confident about teaching ELLs. The noticeable point of this theme is that PST’s TSEB vary based on ELLs’ proficiency levels and languages that they speak. | 1.1 Her definition of TSEB<br>- She felt prepared to teach ELLs 1.2. Highly confident about teaching ELLs<br>- In terms of lesson planning, she was quite confident 1.3. Not at all confident about teaching ELLs<br>- She worried about teaching ELLs who do not speak English at all (beginner level)<br>- She was not confident in asking and creating higher-order thinking questions to ELLs 1.4. Situational TSEB<br>- Her TSEB about lesson planning was good, but her TSEB about actually teaching ELLs was low<br>- TSEB fluctuated based on ELL students’ languages (Spanish VS. non-Spanish ELLs)<br>- PSTs were worried that she may use wrong pronunciation |
| 2. PST’s TSEB analyzed by the Bandura’s four sources of self-efficacy expectations | Individual TSEB is analyzed based on Bandura’s four sources of self-efficacy appraisal. These codes are aligned with the theoretical framework that was implemented for this research. This framework is also applied to understand PST’s microteaching | 2.1. Enactive mastery experience<br>- PST’s past teaching experiences in mastering a specific teaching task (teaching ELLs in this case) 2.2. Vicarious modeling<br>- Observation of peers’ successful microteaching demonstration<br>- Integrating ELLs’ culture in microteaching demonstration – e.g. Mexican culture 2.3. Social (verbal) persuasion |
### Table E-1. An example of individual case building (Case 1: Ariel).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Codes and sub-codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>experiences based on four</td>
<td>- Received positive encouragement from the course instructor through</td>
<td>2.4. Emotional arousal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources.</td>
<td>discussions and feedback based on the microteaching rubric</td>
<td>PST’s teaching anxiety impacts PST’s TSEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Factors that shape PST’s</td>
<td>This study proposes a new framework for three major factors that contribute to</td>
<td>3.1. PST’s content knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST’s TSEB</td>
<td>shaping and constructing individual PST’s TSEB. Codes included: PST’s content</td>
<td>- PST’s knowledge of tapping into ELLs’ funds of knowledge in the ESOL classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge, PST’s pedagogy, and PST’s LOTE - bilingual ability.</td>
<td>- PST’s knowledge of ELL assessment based on WIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How educational technology impacts ELLs’ learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. PST’s content knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2. PST’s pedagogical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of ELL accommodations</td>
<td>- Providing many ideas through visuals for ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Providing vocabulary instruction for reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Using Extra resources – found on Pinterest.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- PST’s decision-making based on WIDA and ELLs’ writing samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Using visual aid - Anchor chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Academic language development – provide sentence frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Providing sample sentences for conjunctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual tutoring – individual ELL accommodation strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. PST’s LOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. PST’s TSEB through MT experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PST’s own bilingualism - Spanish language skills</td>
<td>PST described her own TSEB through microteaching experiences. Codes included what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Incorporating ELL’s L1 (Spanish) through microteaching assignments</td>
<td>they learned, and how they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “Phrase” for sentence / “conjunclon-Spanish” for conjunction</td>
<td>4.1. As a result of microteaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Gained more confidence after having participated in microteaching experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2. High TSEB in terms of accommodating lessons for ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table E-1. An example of individual case building (Case 1: Ariel).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Codes and sub-codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3. Learned Lessons – PST’s Takeaways</td>
<td>4.3. Learned Lessons – PST’s Takeaways</td>
<td>- When planning lessons for ELLs, she should be intentional and should have a critical eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4. PST’s reflections regarding missed opportunities</td>
<td>4.4. PST’s reflections regarding missed opportunities</td>
<td>- ELL-specific pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5. PST’s TSEB changes through microteaching</td>
<td>4.5. PST’s TSEB changes through microteaching</td>
<td>- Simplifying language in text for ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PSTs’ challenges when teaching ELLs</td>
<td>PST described specific challenges about teaching and working with ELLs. Codes included a lack of experience in working with ELLs and possible challenges that she could encounter while working with future ELL students.</td>
<td>5.1. Lack of experience teaching ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- need more experience / practice makes perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2. Schools that have no ESOL support</td>
<td>5.2. Schools that have no ESOL support</td>
<td>- If she has to teach ELL(s) by herself without having any ESOL support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3. Accommodating standardized Testing, such as FSA, could be a challenge</td>
<td>5.3. Accommodating standardized Testing, such as FSA, could be a challenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4. Challenges of teaching English grammar and syntax for ELLs in content-based instruction</td>
<td>5.4. Challenges of teaching English grammar and syntax for ELLs in content-based instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Future ELL Teacher</td>
<td>PST described how she envisions their role as future ELL teacher and how she will accommodate ELLs in her future classroom.</td>
<td>6.1. As a future teacher of ELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Small group activities with native English speaker help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide 1:1 tutoring – one-on-one time with ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Creating a welcoming environment for newcomer ELL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E-1. An example of individual case building (Case 1: Ariel).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Codes and sub-codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Codes included evidence of becoming a linguistically responsive teacher. Also, researcher's notes are included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross-case analysis among four participants (four cases)

Table E-2. Themes regarding similarities among four participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes regarding similarities among four participants</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PSTs’ Situational and Contextual TSEB in teaching ELLs</td>
<td>PSTs expressed their situational and contextual TSEB in teaching and working with ELLs. The noticeable point of this theme was that PSTs’ TSEB varied based on ELLs’ proficiency levels, ELLs’ native languages, subjects they teach, and number of ELLs.</td>
<td>1.1. Situational TSEB based on ELLs’ proficiency levels (i.e. high-proficiency VS. low-proficiency ELLs) 1.2. Situational TSEB based on ELLs’ native languages (i.e. Spanish ELLs VS. non-Spanish ELLs) 1.3. Contextual TSEB based on subjects they teach (i.e. Literacy – reading and writing VS. Content-based instruction) 1.4. Contextual TSEB based on number of ELLs in the classroom (i.e. Small incident setting VS. five ELLs who have diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Impacts of PSTs’ content knowledge on TSEB</td>
<td>PSTs explained how their content knowledge from ESL stand-alone courses impacted their TSEB. The noticeable point of this theme was that understanding the WIDA and observing usage of educational technology during field experience contributed to their TSEB.</td>
<td>2.1. Understanding the WIDA to evaluate ELLs’ comprehension for ELL lesson planning 2.2. Observing how educational technology influenced ELLs’ second language acquisition process 2.3. Tapping into ELLs’ funds of knowledge (i.e. Integrating ELLs’ culture during instruction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-2. Themes regarding similarities among four participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes regarding similarities among four participants</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Impacts of PSTs’ pedagogical knowledge on TSEB</strong></td>
<td>PSTs explained how their pedagogical knowledge from ESL stand-alone courses impacted their TSEB.</td>
<td>3.1. Using visuals to support ELLs’ comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The noticeable point of this theme was that learning how to incorporate comprehensible input strategies contributed to their TSEB.</td>
<td>3.2. Using ELLs’ peers to create collaborative learning activities (i.e. increasing peer-interaction between ELLs and native-speaking students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3. Creating a safe and welcoming environment for ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4. Teaching vocabulary and using sentence frames to support ELLs’ academic language development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Impacts of PSTs’ ESL microteaching experiences on TSEB</strong></td>
<td>PSTs reflected on how ESL microteaching experiences impacted their TSEB.</td>
<td>4.1. “PST’s mastery experience” Felt pretty confident in accommodating their lessons for ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The noticeable point of this theme was that their TSEB could be analyzed by Bandura’s four sources of self-efficacy expectations.</td>
<td>4.2. “PST’s vicarious modeling” Observing their peers conduct microteaching activities (i.e. helped them create better ELL accommodations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3. “PSTs’ social (verbal) persuasion” Watching their own teaching videos and having individual meetings with the instructor (i.e. helped them reflect better on what they should improve on for next time)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-3. Themes regarding differences among four participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes regarding Differences among four participants</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interesting and distinctive feature of PST</td>
<td>Each PST had interesting background that should be recognized when building a case. These codes make PST different and distinctive from other cases.</td>
<td>1.1. PST’s travel experience – interacted with diverse people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission trip to Costa Rica – Spanish immersion experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traveled to France – her mom speaks a little bit about French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-&gt; This experience made her understand how ELLs would feel if they know nothing about English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PSTs’ exposure to diversity impacts on PSTs’ TSEB</td>
<td>PSTs’ exposure to the Diversity impacted their TSEB.</td>
<td>2.1. PSTs’ pre-internship (practicum) experience (i.e. working with ELLs in the mainstream classroom setting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The noticeable point of this theme was that PSTs’ personal background, teaching aboard and volunteering experience contributed to their TSEB. Also, PSTs’ LOTE impacted TSEB when demonstrating their lessons for ELLs during microteaching activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. PSTs’ volunteering and teaching aboard experience (i.e. Teaching EFL students in Spain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3. PSTs’ LOTE ability (i.e. PSTs’ L2 ability - Spanish)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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