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Abstract

This literature review on teachers’ beliefs about English Language Learners (ELLs) in mainstream classrooms is organized into three sections: (1) inservice teachers’ existing beliefs, (2) predictors of inservice teachers’ beliefs, and (3) the connection between inservice teachers’ beliefs and practice. This body of literature points to a clear need for increased professional development for mainstream teachers because currently, teacher education possesses a “poverty of language learning.” According to the research included in this review, a relationship exists between beliefs and practice in relation to teaching ELLs in mainstream classrooms. Certain factors, such as training in teaching ELLs, years teaching experience, and exposure to language diversity, have been identified as predictors of mainstream teachers’ beliefs about English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) students. It is important for teachers who hold deficit beliefs toward ELLs to adopt a new set of beliefs for successful inclusion of ELLs.
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Teachers’ beliefs about English Language Learners in the mainstream classroom:

A review of the literature

This literature review begins with the current situation of English Language Learners (ELLs) in schools and the influence teachers’ beliefs have on these students. A clarification of key terms in the literature is included. The findings are then organized into three sections: (1) inservice teachers’ existing beliefs, (2) predictors of inservice teachers’ beliefs, and (3) inservice teachers’ beliefs and practice. According to the research included in this review, a relationship exists between beliefs and practice in relation to teaching ELLs in mainstream classrooms, but the findings are inconsistent. Certain factors are identified as related to mainstream teachers’ beliefs about ELLs. Furthermore, I believe the literature shows that although beliefs are highly resistant to change, depending on how beliefs are defined, it is possible to change them through effective professional development or coursework so that ELLs will have greater success in mainstream classrooms. The review concludes with a discussion of the need for increased professional development in order for teachers to adopt a new set of beliefs for the successful inclusion of ELLs. For example, teachers should at times encourage students to speak their native language(s) at home and in the classroom. Teachers need to be aware of the length of time it takes ELLs to become proficient in the academic language of English. Mainstream teachers also need to take responsibility for the education of the ELLs in their classrooms, rather than expecting the ESOL teacher alone to have this role.

There are over five million English Language Learners in schools in the United States, and in the last ten years this population has grown 65% (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition [NCELA], 2004). ELLs are estimated to be increasing at two and a half times the rate of the general student population (Marx, 2000; NCELA, 2006). The experiences
ELLs will have in school are partly dependent upon the beliefs of the teachers they encounter. In order for ELLs to become academically successful, teachers must hold positive beliefs and high expectations for them. As McSwain (2001) notes, “teachers’ self-perceptions of cultural and linguistic competency as they relate to helping children achieve academic and social potential play a powerful and intricate role in the type of educational services provided to culturally and linguistically diverse children” (p. 54). The beliefs and attitudes of teachers, perhaps as much as qualifications, can affect what children learn in their classroom. Unfortunately, many mainstream teachers hold deficit beliefs toward the ELLs in their classrooms. Teacher beliefs and attitudes, which are formed by the values they hold, play an important role in student performance (Freeman & Freeman, 1994; Moore, 1999). Thompson (1992) emphasizes that “to understand teaching from teachers’ perspectives we have to understand the beliefs with which they define their work” (p. 129). According to Peregoy and Boyle (1997), if teachers have unexamined negative beliefs toward ELLs, even well meaning teachers might discriminate without realizing it. On the other hand, teachers who hold high expectations for ELLs are able to make a positive impact on the school experiences of these students, a persistently vulnerable population.

Not only do teachers’ beliefs affect the expectations they hold of students, but their actions in the classroom also reflect their beliefs. Richardson (1996) states that the study of beliefs is a crucial element in teacher education because beliefs “drive classroom actions and influence the teacher change process” (p. 102). Additionally, Macnab and Payne (2003) point out that “the beliefs and attitudes of teachers—cultural, ideological and personal—are significant determinants of the way they view their role as educators” (p. 55). Not only do beliefs affect what teachers see as their purpose in teaching, but also teachers’ beliefs influence the ways teachers think about their subject matter and the choices they make in their teaching (Richardson,
Teachers will emphasize different aspects of the curriculum based on their stance on education. Teachers make choices throughout a lesson, a unit, or a course, each of which is influenced by their beliefs.

Teachers’ beliefs hold powerful implications for the ELLs in their classrooms. For example, Rueda and Garcia (1996) found that teachers’ beliefs about second language learning and teaching shape their perceptions and judgments which, in turn, affect students’ behavior in the classroom. Similarly, teachers’ attitudes toward ELLs affect the classroom interaction between these students and the teacher, which ultimately affects achievement (Mantero & McVicker, 2006). In particular, teachers’ beliefs about their ability to meet the needs of ELLs account for high student motivation and performance (Karabenick & Noda, 2004).

It is important to note that teachers’ beliefs are influenced by societal attitudes, which vary in different contexts. Beliefs teachers hold about ELLs often exist and change based on local and national policies. According to Walker, Shafer, and Liams (2004), “Local community contexts are large determinants in the extent and nature of societal attitudes” and “when teachers internalize dominant societal messages, they bring them directly into their schools and classrooms” (p. 131).

Similar to Ladson Billings’s (2004) discussion of the problem of “the poverty of culture” in teacher education, based on the literature reviewed, I believe there is a “poverty of language learning” in U. S. teacher education. By this, I mean many teachers who have completed their degrees have an overwhelming lack knowledge of second language acquisition (SLA), multicultural education, and English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) pedagogy. In addition, many inservice teachers have not learned a second language, and therefore cannot appreciate how difficult the experience can be.
This review begins with a clarification of terms used in the literature on teachers’ beliefs about ELLs followed by a discussion of the current situation that exists with the ELL population and the preparation of teachers. I will then synthesize the current literature on the topic before discussing the implications of the literature. According to the research included in this review, a relationship does exist between the beliefs teachers hold toward ELLs and their classroom practice. The beliefs of mainstream teachers about ELLs can be predicted based on certain factors and can be changed under the right circumstances. Mainstream teachers who are found to be products of the “poverty of language learning” in teacher education need to adopt a new set of beliefs for successful inclusion of ELLs that will be outlined in this paper.

Clarification of Terms

Making Sense of the Teacher Belief Construct

“There is no shared understanding of the use of the term teacher belief” (Kagan, 1992). At times, belief is defined as a very broad concept. For example, Sahin, Bullock, and Stables (2002) suggest the idea of belief may refer to “perceptions, assumptions, implicit and explicit theories, judgments, opinions, and more” (p. 373). Some researchers even equate attitudes with beliefs; according to Pajares (1992), concepts such as attitudes and preconceptions are really beliefs in disguise. However, in the last three decades the separation is usually made between attitudes (affective) and beliefs (cognitive) (Richardson, 1996). In this case, attitudes refer to “learned predispositions to respond to an object in a favorable or unfavorable way,” while beliefs involve what should be done concerning the object and beliefs about the object (Richardson, p. 103).

Others narrow the definition of beliefs in a different way. For example, many scholars differentiate knowledge from belief (Calderhead, 1996; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992). For
instance, Nespor suggests beliefs have evaluative and affective components that are stronger than knowledge, which connotes a cognitive element. Nespor argues beliefs are more influential and stronger predictors of behavior than knowledge. Similarly, a classic definition is often cited from Green (1971): a proposition that is accepted as true by the individual holding the belief; a psychological concept that differs from knowledge, which implies epistemic warrant. Richardson (1996) agrees beliefs differ from knowledge, and defines belief as a psychologically held understanding, premise, or proposition about the world that is felt to be true. A critical difference for Richardson is that beliefs, unlike knowledge, “do not require a truth condition” (p. 104). In other words, you do not have to prove that a belief you hold is correct, but knowledge can be put to this test. The distinction between belief and knowledge common to most definitions is that belief is based on evaluation and judgment, while knowledge is based on objective fact (Pajares, 1992). For example, Rimm-Kaufman, Storm, Sawyer, Pianta, and La Paro (2006) state that teachers’ beliefs are “based on judgment, evaluation, and values and do not require evidence to back them up” (p.143).

On the other hand, some researchers do not make such a strong distinction between beliefs and knowledge. Kagan (1992) argues “most of a teacher’s professional knowledge can be regarded more accurately as belief” because the domain of teaching is characterized by an “almost total absence of truths” (p. 73). Others define beliefs as a part of knowledge; for example, Fang (1996) states that theories and beliefs make up an important part of teachers’ knowledge. In a review of conceptions of knowledge in research on teaching, Fenstermacher (1994) states, “objectively reasonable belief is an acceptable form of knowledge within the context of educational practice” (p. 24). However, he also writes that a claim to know something is different from having a belief in something. Fenstermacher believes you can use the terms
knowledge and beliefs interchangeably if you are using knowledge as a grouping term that includes all sorts of mental states.

For the purpose of this review, I have chosen to use belief in the broadest terms encompassing many mental constructs such as knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions. From the literature, I find this is the most useful definition to use in relation to beliefs about ELLs because the authors of the articles in this review use many of these constructs interchangeably and often do not cite what definition they are using. I did not eliminate any articles based on the term(s) authors chose to use to describe the “belief” construct. Therefore, I feel I should not eliminate any of these mental states from my definition of beliefs. As you will see through this review, teachers’ beliefs about ELLs as I am referring to them include knowledge about second language acquisition, attitudes toward having ELLs in mainstream classrooms, as well as beliefs concerning the role of the ESOL teacher. In addition, the use of this broad definition of beliefs is preferable when discussing the possibility of teacher change. I argue that beliefs can be changed through professional development and reflection, but the more narrow definitions of beliefs would make the argument that change can occur more difficult.

**Defining the Mainstream Teacher and the Mainstream Classroom**

Before proceeding, it is necessary to clarify one other difficult term in the literature on teachers’ beliefs about ESOL students: *mainstream*. Mainstream teachers can be defined as those whose primary training has been in one or more traditional subject areas, such as mathematics, science, English, or social studies. They are diverse regarding their background, credentials, teaching histories, and opportunities for professional development. The use of mainstream teacher is synonymous with regular, content area teacher. Both of these terms (mainstream and regular, content area) are problematic because they imply non-traditional subject area classrooms
are irregular, peripheral, or non-mainstream. However, for lack of a better term and because mainstream is most frequently used in the literature (Youngs, 1999), I will use this term throughout the review. Also, when using the term *mainstream* classroom, I am referring to an English-only classroom. The focus for this review is not on teachers in ESL or bilingual classrooms.

**ELLS, LEP, ESL and ESOL Students**

Multiple terms and acronyms exist in the literature discussing English language learners. It is necessary to clarify the differences among these definitions. According to the NCELA (2006), ELLs are students whose first language is not English and who are in the process of learning English. Throughout this literature review, I will use this term. Limited English proficient (LEP) is the term used by the federal government to describe students who speak a language other than English in their homes and do not have sufficient mastery of English to meet state standards or be successful in an English-only classroom (Fix & Capps, 2005). Because of its negative connotation, unless citing a specific statistic or quote, I will not use the term LEP in this review. Some authors refer to ELLs as ESOL students. ESOL is defined as an educational approach in which English language learners are instructed in the use of the English language (NCELA). In addition, the NCELA considers ESL (English as a second language) synonymous with ESOL. It is possible to be an ELL without being an ESOL/ESL student, but all ESOL/ESL students are ELLs. This is because the terms ELL and LEP are used to identify a type of student, while ESOL/ESL is a placement option for these students. In other words, ELLs could be placed in a variety of programs, but the terms ESOL or ESL students refer to ELLs who participate in ESOL/ESL programs. None of the aforementioned acronyms (ELL, LEP, ESOL, or ESL) refer to bilingual students. Bilingual students are fluent in their first language and a second language.
The students in the aforementioned categories, while similar in some respects, have diverse backgrounds--linguistically, politically, socioeconomically, as well as educationally.

Now that the vocabulary used in the research is clear, the next section describes the tremendous opportunity teachers have to make a difference for many students by meeting the needs of ELLs. It is no longer an option, but a necessity to prepare for this growing population.

**Mainstream Teachers and ELLs: An Opportunity**

All teachers must be prepared for children from non-English speaking home backgrounds. Mainstream teachers are certain to encounter increasing numbers of ELLs in their classrooms. ELLs made up 10.5% of total public school student enrollment in 2005 (NCELA, 2006). Also in 2005, one in five children in public schools had at least one parent born outside the United States (Fix & Capps, 2005). This ratio is even higher, one in three, for grades 6 through 12 (Fix & Capps). ELLs are the fastest growing student population in public schools (Jones, 2002) with the enrollment of ELLs increasing at nearly seven times the rate of total student enrollment (NCELA). The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE, 2006) reported that the diversity of these students “continues to challenge teachers and schools” (p. 1). Continued linguistic diversification is projected for the coming decades (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). With increasing numbers of ELLs in schools, student demographics are changing. Teachers need to be primed for this new challenge and have a unique opportunity to improve the education of a large group of students by preparing to teach ELLs.

Many teachers are not adequately prepared to work with a linguistically diverse student population (American Federation of Teachers, 2004; Gandara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly, & Callahan, 2003; Jones, 2002; Menken & Antunez, 2001; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2002b; Nieto, 2003; Wong-Fillmore & Meyer, 1992). Feeling prepared to meet
students’ needs is crucial for successful teaching; Garcia (1996) found good teachers of ELLs have a sense of self-confidence regarding their ability to teach this population. Without proper training, it is hard to blame teachers for feelings of inadequacy. With the passage of laws, such as Proposition 227, which states that all children in California public schools shall acquire English by being taught solely in English, more and more ELLs are put in English-only mainstream classrooms led by teachers who have not been trained or “orientated toward responsibility for English language learners” (Jones, 2002, p. 7). Only 12.5% of U.S. teachers have received eight or more hours of recent training on teaching students of limited English proficiency (NCES). Jones suggests the need to expand “training beyond bilingual and ESL (English as a second language) certification programs and educating all prospective teachers about the needs of second language learners” (p. 6). Mainstream teachers can expect to teach ELLs, and therefore need to be equipped with the skills to meet their needs.

The topic of ELLs in mainstream classrooms has grown in importance since the passage of The No Child Left Behind Act (2001). Teachers can no longer expect that because a student is an ELL, his or her test scores will not count in grading the school. Instead, schools will be graded on the percentage of ELLs that do meet the standards according to their proficiency level. The ESOL teacher alone cannot prepare all of these students in every subject area without the help of mainstream teachers, and the beliefs of these mainstream teachers will influence the students’ performances. Researchers and practitioners must understand the role that beliefs play in the quality of instruction teachers will give ELLs. Although training and professional development are critical, they need to be focused on belief change in order to be effective.

The purpose of this literature review is to convey what knowledge and ideas have been established on teachers’ beliefs about ELLs. In addition, this review will familiarize the reader
with any contrasting perspectives and viewpoints on this topic and will point to the need for more research in this area. I believe it will be evident through this review that there is a “poverty of language learning” in teacher education that translates into detrimental effects of ELLs in mainstream classrooms. These mainstream teachers of ELLs need professional development in order to adopt a new set of beliefs for the successful inclusion of ELLs. The research questions guiding this review are as follows:

- What is known about teachers’ beliefs about ELLs in mainstream classrooms?
- Are there any gaps in the knowledge of the subject?
- Is there consensus about teachers’ beliefs about ELLs in mainstream classrooms?
- What new set of beliefs should mainstream teachers possess to overcome the “poverty of language learning” in teacher education?

**Methods**

The articles in this review were retrieved primarily through Internet search engines, such as ERIC, Google Scholar, and EBSCO. I used key word searches including “teacher belief ESOL,” “teacher attitude ELL”, “teacher attitude ESOL”, and “belief English language learner.” I also searched for belief and attitude with ESL and English learner, as well as “teacher belief middle school.” In addition to Internet search engines, I searched through recent issues of journals publishing on this topic, including *TESOL Quarterly* and *Bilingual Research Journal*. With the exception of classic articles on teacher beliefs in general, I focused this review on the last 20 years, encompassing the years 1987-2007. The year 1987 was significant because in that year Penfield published a seminal article on the perspectives of regular classroom teachers toward ELLs.
So as not to confound the data, in searching for articles, I only included those which discussed the beliefs teachers held about students actually in some type of ESOL program, not just immigrant students or students whose first language was not English. This is because some students who are immigrants or at one time were learning English as an additional language may now read, write, and speak English with almost native-like fluency. Even if a student was once in the ESOL program, he or she could have exited the program after meeting certain criteria. Undoubtedly, teachers’ beliefs about these students would be different than their beliefs about those still needing ESOL services. In addition, my focus here is mainstream teachers’ beliefs, not ESOL teachers’ beliefs. It is worth noting the paucity of literature discussing inclusion with ELLs. I would have included any articles on this topic in which a mainstream teacher and ESOL teacher were in collaboration in a classroom, but few were found. Therefore, the articles in this review focus almost exclusively on mainstream teachers who are alone in the classroom with ELLs. I include all levels of teachers from upper elementary to high school and in every subject area. The upper elementary (3rd-5th) grades are a significant starting point because according to the Georgia Promotion, Placement, and Retention law (O.C.G.A. §§ 20-2-282 through 20-2-285) and State Board of Education Rule (160-4-2-.11), the policies on standardized testing often begin to affect grade promotion or retention. These policies could have an effect on the beliefs of teachers and the students they have in their classrooms. Other than these criteria, no other reduction strategies were employed and no particular research articles were excluded as long as they focused on mainstream teacher beliefs. In order to provide a thorough review of the literature, I did not eliminate articles that used the terms attitudes and perceptions (rather than beliefs) if they were relevant to mainstream teachers and ELLs. I included 23 articles with
different theoretical frameworks and represented various research designs, methods, and analytic techniques.

This review differs from Richardson’s (1996) review of the role of attitudes and beliefs in that it focuses in particular on teachers’ beliefs about ELLs. Additionally, I reviewed articles on inservice teachers only, while Richardson discussed preservice teachers as well. Richardson also focused most of her discussion on change, while the majority of the studies reviewed here dealt with teachers existing beliefs.

I analyzed the articles in the review qualitatively by initially using Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) open coding system to write down any of my thoughts as I read the articles. From there, codes were applied that resulted in the three main categories. I used a combination of content and thematic analysis (Ezzy, 2002) because at times the categories were predetermined, yet another category emerged from the data. For example, I knew I wanted to focus on teachers’ existing beliefs and the association between beliefs and practice because of what I had read about in previous reviews, such as Richardson (1996), on teachers’ beliefs. The predictors of teachers’ beliefs category was added after finding several articles on this topic. Each of the articles I found fit well into one of these three categories, so I was satisfied that they were sufficient.

Findings: What Research Says about Teachers’ Beliefs about Mainstreamed ELLs

In the following sections, I synthesize the literature related to teachers’ beliefs about ELLs. Taken as a whole, this research points to the need for professional development for inservice teachers in order to rectify the unwarranted beliefs many hold particularly related to current research on SLA. Additionally, factors that influence teachers’ beliefs toward ELLs will be identified. Teachers’ beliefs also affect teaching practice, so in order to meet the needs of ELLs, teachers must hold positive beliefs about these students.
What Research Says about Inservice Teachers’ Existing Beliefs about Mainstreamed ELLs

This category was created to explore the articles in which researchers focused on the beliefs teachers currently hold, but that did not focus on the predictors of these beliefs or how the beliefs are related to practice. The authors found that teachers hold many misconceptions about second language learning, bilingualism, and the role of the ESOL teacher. Table 1 shows the misconceptions uncovered in the articles reviewed along with what research says concerning these teacher beliefs. Many teachers from the studies were also found to hold low expectations toward ELLs. The desire of teachers for professional development related to ELLs was inconsistent across studies.

A number of articles in this section show the varying attitudes teachers have about ELLs in general. This body of literature shows that many teachers are frustrated with ELLs, or even blame ELLs, while others hold more positive perceptions of this student population. For example, Nixon (1991) found teachers do not believe ELLs have enough language skills to be in the mainstream classroom; they believed there should be transitional classes before students are put in mainstream classes. In a way, this is blaming the students for a lack of academic achievement rather than the teachers making the necessary accommodations to ensure success for the ELLs. Similarly, Penfield (1987) found many teachers attributed the academic difficulties of ELLs to “laziness or lack of effort” (p. 31). On the other hand, Gandara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll (2005) administered a questionnaire to 5,300 educators of ELLs in California to find out about the challenges, experiences, and professional development needs of these teachers. They found that for the most part, teachers did not blame the students or their families for low achievement, but instead focused on what they could do to improve student learning. The two greatest challenges confronting the teachers were communication with students and their families
and having enough time to teach all of the required subject matter in addition to developing the students’ English. Similarly, teachers in a study by Youngs (1999) noted time as a constraint in meeting the needs of their ELLs. Gandara et al. (2005) found teachers were frustrated with the range of abilities in their classrooms with respect to academics as well as English proficiency and were also challenged by lack of resources for teaching and assessing these students.

The context and ELL populations of the schools could explain teachers’ varying attitudes toward these students. Gandara et al. (2005) studied teachers in California where the highest concentration of ELLs exist. Therefore, the teachers most likely had exposure to language diversity and have had some time to prepare for the changing population. Gandara et al. (2005) even mention that the rural districts felt the most challenged, perhaps because they lacked resources to meet the needs of ELLs. On the other hand, Penfield (1987) researched teachers who had very few ELLs in their classrooms. These teachers seemed to have the most negative attitudes toward ELLs out of the articles reviewed. The teachers in Nixon’s (1991) study fell somewhere in the middle; they had attitudes that suggested that they blamed ELLs, but not in such explicit terms as Penfield’s participants. Perhaps this is because Nixon’s participants were from large urban cities with mixed nationalities whose ELL populations were evenly split (small, medium, and large).

The next set of articles in this section point to teachers’ lack of knowledge about SLA. Two misconceptions teachers hold relate to the use of students’ native languages and the time it takes to learn a second language. For example, Reeves (2006) surveyed 279 subject-area high school teachers and discovered teachers hold misconceptions about how second languages are learned and lack the attitudes necessary to facilitate student achievement. Reeves found the teachers in her study held misconceptions that ELLs should be able to acquire English within
two years and should not use their native language as they are learning English. Clair (1995) conducted case studies of three mainstream classroom teachers with varying percentages of ELLs in their classrooms and also found teachers lacked an understanding of SLA. For example, the teachers said that “good teaching is good teaching” which does not account for individual differences or the importance of specialized knowledge in ESL pedagogy. According to Walker et al. (2004), teachers expected fluency after only one year, and fifteen percent felt that ELLs learn better if they are prohibited from using their native language in school. In reality, research has shown it can take 5 to 7 years for students to learn the academic language of English (Cummins, 1981), and proficiency in a native language can facilitate the acquisition of a second language (Cummins, 2000; Faltis & Hudelson, 1994; Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2005; Garcia-Vazquez, Vazquez, Lopez, & Ward, 1997; Lee, 2002).

A third misconception related to SLA is that students should be speaking English at home. For example, Reeves (2004) found teachers held the belief that native language use in school and at home would slow English acquisition. Similarly, Karabenick and Noda (2004) surveyed 729 teachers about their beliefs toward ELLs and found that teachers had gaps in their knowledge of SLA. For example, more than half believed the use of a first language at home interferes with learning a second language, and 23% were unsure how they felt about this statement. Likewise, Clair (1995) found a commonly held belief that a lack of English in the home negatively affected English language development. Although many teachers advise parents to speak only English at home because they believe bilingualism produces delays and confusion when learning English (McLaughlin, 1992; Wong-Fillmore, 1991), in actuality, proficiency in a native language leads to higher academic achievement (Cummins, 1992; Garcia-Vazquez et al., 1997; Lee, 2002). Conversely, the loss of proficiency in the native language breaks down
communication with family members and lowers self esteem (Lee & Oxelson, 2006; Tannenbaum & Howie, 2002).

Other misconceptions held by many mainstream teachers are related to the role of the ESL teacher and the ESL classroom. For example, Clair (1995) found mainstream teachers did not know what went on in the ESL classroom and that greater collaboration was needed between mainstream teachers and ESL teachers. Similarly, teachers in a study by Youngs (1999) wanted more collaboration with the ESL teacher, mentors of ELLs, and clarifications on what they should expect from these students. Penfield (1987) also revealed how little mainstream teachers knew about the job of the ESL teacher. The teacher participants repeatedly expressed the belief that ESL teachers spoke the native language of each student and actually taught in that language (Penfield, 1987). The teachers also expressed the feeling that it was the sole job of the ESL teacher to teach ELLs English. Likewise, numerous teacher comments in a study by Walker et al. (2004) showed the extent to which mainstream teachers felt their teaching responsibilities did not include ELLs. According to Harklau (2000), high school ESOL students “seemed to be viewed primarily as affiliated with and the responsibility of the ESL program and teacher” (p. 45). This is both impractical and incorrect. As Yoon (2008) states, “Teaching ELLS is not a responsibility of only ESL teachers but also of classroom teachers” (p. 516). Furthermore, “when the task of educating ELL pupils is left to specialist ESL teachers and no modifications are made in mainstream educational structures to accommodate diversity, the interactions that pupils experience in mainstream classrooms are unlikely to promote either academic growth or affirmation of pupil identity” (Cummins, 1997, p. 111). Mainstream classroom teachers need to accept ELLs as students in their classroom, and therefore their responsibility in order for these students to be successful.
A final misconception found in the literature that teachers may hold is that ELLs cannot master the required curriculum. For example, Sharkey and Layzer (2000) conducted interviews and classroom observations to investigate the beliefs of mainstream teachers toward ELLs and found the “benevolent conspiracy” of well-meaning teachers often produces low expectations for ELLs (p. 3). The teachers revealed their theories through the things they said, such as, students are able to pass if they “just hang in there and do their work” (Sharkey & Layzer, p. 4). One teacher in the study revealed it is possible to take a proactive stance towards this kind of disservice to students by making sure ELLs knew the material through “seating assignments, seatwork pairing, and explicit instruction” (Sharkey & Layzer, p. 5). According to Ortiz-Franco (2005), many teachers’ low expectations of ELLs can produce obstacles to these students’ mathematics achievement. Similarly, Harklau (1999) found that teachers did not call on ELLs for fear of embarrassing them. Katz (1999) states, “Caring about students does not mean being easy on them nor giving them artificially inflated grades” (p. 812). ELLs need to be provided with the support they need in order for them to have equal access to the curriculum.

These widespread misconceptions suggest the need for professional development. For example, Youngs (1999) used a questionnaire and interviews to investigate teachers’ perceptions of ELLs and found they needed more training in ESL pedagogy. Although the literature overwhelmingly points to a lack of training in the area of ELLs, teachers in the studies are divided on their willingness to receive this training. Many of the teacher participants would like to receive more training. For example, the teachers of all levels in the district in Karabenick and Noda’s (2004) study were open to and thought they needed professional development and had a relatively positive interest in serving ELLs in their mainstream classrooms. A study utilizing interviews and observations by Reeves (2004) yielded similar results, more than half the teachers
were interested in receiving more training in working with ELLs. Likewise, in a phenomenological study conducted by Penfield (1987), 162 New Jersey mainstream classroom teachers were surveyed about their perceptions of ELLs and ESL teachers and were found to be open to professional development. For example, when asked how they could deal more effectively with ELLs, the most frequent response was the need for more training on how to teach content to them.

Unfortunately, other teachers are not so open to professional development even when it is needed. For example, over the last 5 years, many of the teachers surveyed by Gandara et al. (2005) had received little or no professional development in teaching ELLs. When choices were presented of additional assistance these teachers desired, they most often chose more time to teach and collaborate with peers and better materials. Similarly, Walker et al. (2004) found that 51% of teachers surveyed were not interested in professional development in working with ELLs. Clair (1995) also found teachers felt inadequate in their ability to teach ELLs, but were not open to professional development. Likewise, Reeves (2006) found teachers were ambivalent toward professional development on working with ELLs.

It does not appear that ELL population plays a defining role in the desire for professional development. Karabenick and Noda’s (2004) participants taught in classrooms with one third ELLs who had been there a long time. Reeves (2004) surveyed teachers who had an ELL population of ten percent and was growing, while Penfield’s (1987) participants had very few ELLs. However, in general, the teachers in all these studies were open to professional development. On the other hand, the teachers who were more opposed to professional development taught in districts with varying percentages of ELLs (Gandara et al., 2005; Reeves, 2006; Walker et al., 2004). One possible explanation of the different results toward professional
development could be a difference in years of teaching experience because Walker et al. (2004) found that teachers with four years of teaching experience or less were more likely to want professional development than more experienced teachers. Further research would be needed to support this claim.

The final two articles reviewed looked at teachers’ attitudes toward bilingual students and bilingual education. Harklau (2000) used an ethnographic perspective to conduct three year-long case studies of ESOL students in the transition from high school to community college. Harklau used interviews, observations, and school documents to analyze the data inductively and found teachers’ attitudes towards these students were inconsistent and even when they appeared positive at the surface held the potential to stereotype the immigrants. The beliefs of the high school teachers in this study “cast students’ bilingualism only as a deficit in English” (Harklau, p. 51). Similarly, Shin and Krashen (1996) administered a questionnaire to 794 elementary and secondary teachers focusing on attitudes toward bilingual education. The ELL population in the study was 35 percent. As a group, participants showed agreement with the underlying principles of bilingual education; however, “support for actual participation in bilingual education was less positive” (p. 52). For example, if children were already bilingual, 40% of respondents were opposed to continuing first language development for these students.

These articles discussing inservice teachers’ beliefs about ELLs show that many teachers hold numerous misconceptions about the best ways to learn a second language and have low expectations of ELLs. These mainstream teachers must adopt a new set of beliefs in order to be effective with the ELLs in their classrooms. These beliefs for the successful inclusion of ELLs include the following: (1) high expectations for ELLs, (2) accepting responsibility for ELLs, (3) encouraging native language use both at home and in the classroom, (4) an awareness of the time
it takes ELLs to learn academic English, and (5) a desire for professional development in relation to ELLs when needed.

Various terms similar to beliefs were referenced in these studies. However, from my reading, the authors of these articles did not cite what they said they were measuring. In other words, they did not define the mental constructs they were researching. Youngs (1999) used the term perceptions, Reeves (2006) used the terms attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs, Karabenick and Noda (2004) researched beliefs and attitudes, and Gandara et al. (2005) seemed to use the terms beliefs and attitudes interchangeably. However, I was unable to find definitions in these studies. Perhaps this is why some researchers state that change can occur, while others disagree. It is difficult to judge true change in beliefs when beliefs are not defined. Table 2 provides an overview of the articles reviewed in this section.

This section of the review on existing beliefs is the least clear in that it includes very different types of teacher beliefs ranging from teachers’ beliefs about the need for professional development and ELLs to teachers’ beliefs about bilingual education. Bilingual education in itself is implemented in extremely diverse ways across contexts. I included this wide range in order to give a thorough review of the literature that exists related to this topic. Bilingual students could be just as proficient in English as another language, so any negative perceptions teachers hold toward these students are even more troubling than those toward ELLs. If teachers are not open to bilingual students, one could assume that they would be even more resistant to ELLs.

What Research Says about Predictors of Teachers’ Beliefs about ELLs in Mainstream Classrooms
Several studies focus on the factors influencing teachers’ beliefs about ELLs in their mainstream classrooms. Predominantly using survey research, many predictors of mainstream teachers’ beliefs toward ELLs were identified. Teachers who had more training in teaching ELLs, had greater exposure to language diversity, or who spoke another language held more positive beliefs toward ELLs. Teaching experience, gender, and the number of ELLs teachers had experiences working with were also found to be factors that influence teachers’ beliefs.

Predictors found to influence teacher beliefs include exposure to language diversity or ELLs. Most studies found that the more exposure to different languages and those that spoke them led to more positive attitudes. For example, Byrnes, Kiger, and Manning (1997) found that 191 mainstream teachers who had greater exposure to language diversity had more positive attitudes about diversity. These authors also found that the native language(s) of the students does not affect the results. Similarly, Gandara et al. (2005) observed that teachers who had more ELLs in their classrooms felt more competent to teach these students. Shin and Krashen (1996) also found that teachers who had more ELLs in their classrooms held more positive attitudes toward these students and bilingual education. On the other hand, Lee and Oxelson (2006) found the percentage of ELLs taught was not a significant predictor of teacher beliefs.

Additionally, Byrnes, et al. (1997) found the region of the country a teacher is living or working in could have an impact on their beliefs about linguistically diverse students. These two factors, i.e., exposure to ELLs and region of the country, could be related, but more research is needed. In the study by Byrnes, et al., the teachers with more experience working with ELLs had more positive attitudes toward these students and were located in similar geographical regions. However, Walker et al. (2004) studied schools across a Great Plains state and found that schools with few ELLs held positive, but perhaps naïve attitudes about ELLs, teachers in schools with a
rapid-influx of ELLs held neutral attitudes, and migrant-serving schools’ teachers held the most negative attitudes toward ELLs. It is evident that place and geography are important factors in how teachers view students. Sixteen states have “English-only” laws which may cause teachers to see ELLs as a burden because of the social and political context in which they live. The studies in this section were overwhelmingly conducted in “English-only” states, including California, Arizona, and Virginia.

Another factor found to impact teachers’ beliefs is years teaching experience. For example, Gandara et al. (2005) found through a questionnaire that the more years teachers worked with ELLs, the more highly they rated their ability to teach these students. However, the questionnaire results of Garcia-Nevarez, Stafford, and Arias (2005) showed “the more years a teacher taught, the more his or her attitude became negative toward his or her students’ native language” (p. 295). Similarly, Mantero and McVicker (2006) found that teachers with between six and ten years of teaching experience had the most positive perceptions of ELLs. On the other hand, the findings of Shin and Krashen (1996) and Lee and Oxelson (2006) did not show years experience to be a significant factor in teacher beliefs.

The reason for the inconsistent results of years teaching experience as a factor needs to be explored further. All the studies reviewed here relating to years teaching experience were conducted in “English-only” states with relatively large ELL populations. On one hand, as teachers have exposure to ELLs, they may gain confidence and learn strategies that are successful with these students if they have the support they need. On the other hand, if teachers have few resources and do not receive professional development, I can see teachers becoming increasingly frustrated with a new population of students.
The most consistent factor found to influence teacher beliefs was teacher training. Building on the explanatory work of Byrnes et al. (1997), Youngs and Youngs (2001) surveyed 143 middle school mainstream teachers to explore the predictors of their attitudes toward ELLs. Teachers who had taken foreign language courses, had some type of ESL training, or had taken a course in multicultural education were significantly more positive about teaching ELLs than those teachers who had not had these experiences. Similarly, Shin and Krashen (1996) found teachers with more training in ESL were more supportive of bilingual education. Gandara et al. (2005) also found “greater preparation for teaching English learners equaled greater teacher confidence in their skills for working with these students successfully” (p. 12). Additionally, Garcia-Nevarez et al. (2005) found evidence in a questionnaire given to 152 Arizona elementary teachers that those certified in bilingual education were more supportive of their students using their native language in the classroom than teachers without this certification. Likewise, Mantero and McVicker (2006) reported the more staff development hours taken and “the more graduate credit hours taken in courses dealing with language minority students, the more positive the perception of ELL students” (p. 11). Lee and Oxelson (2006) provide further support that teachers with more training in teaching ELLs will have more positive attitudes toward ELLs and hold beliefs more in line with current research concerning these learners. Lee and Oxelson (2006) surveyed 69 teachers and then interviewed ten of them about their attitudes toward students’ maintenance of their first language. The teachers with ESOL training “agreed with the idea that the maintenance and proficiency in the heritage language positively affect linguistic minority students’ academic endeavors” which corresponds with the research (Lee & Oxelson, p. 461). On the other hand, the teachers without ESOL training believed their foremost priority is to
teach English. For these teachers, language learning was an either/or choice; bilingualism was not considered.

Another factor found to influence teachers’ beliefs was whether they spoke a language other than English. For example, Lee and Oxelson (2006) found that if teachers were fluent in another language, they were “significantly more likely to implement practices that encouraged and affirmed students’ home language and cultures in the classrooms” (p. 464). Similarly, Shin and Krashen found if teachers were fluent in another language, they tended to demonstrate a stronger support for bilingual education. Additionally, Youngs and Youngs (2001) found mainstream teachers who had lived outside the United States were significantly more positive about teaching ELLs. Although age did not make a significant difference, females had more positive attitudes toward ELLs than males.

The major factor found to affect teachers’ beliefs is training in working with ELLs. This is encouraging because it is something that can be changed. If teachers have more courses and professional development on SLA, their misconceptions can be rectified. School districts could also make an effort to hire teachers who have experience working with ELLs, who have lived in another country, and/or who speak another language. The authors of articles in this section also failed to elaborate on how they define the terms they used, such as attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs. Additionally, no attention was given to theoretical frameworks. Table 3 summarizes the articles reviewed on the factors influencing teachers’ beliefs.

What Research Says about Inservice Teachers’ Beliefs about Mainstreamed ELLs in Relation to Practice

Teachers’ beliefs influence their classroom behavior (Pajares, 1992; Rueda & Garcia, 1996). The choices teachers make in the classroom have profound effects on their students. In a
review of research on teacher beliefs and practices, Fang (1996) states that a substantial number of studies support the notion that teachers possess beliefs that tend to shape their instructional practices. This is true for teachers of ELLs as well. According to Harklau (2000), the actions of teachers of ELLs “not only serve to teach language but also serve to shape students’ attitudes toward schooling and their very sense of self” (p. 64). The following articles point to a link between beliefs and practice for teachers of ELLs. Researchers in the articles reviewed found that training affects teachers’ practice in working with ELLs.

Yoon’s (2008) study demonstrates a clear link between belief and practice; “the teachers with a narrow notion of their roles limited their teaching approaches for their ELLs” (p. 516). The three teacher participants positioned themselves in different ways (a teacher of all children, a teacher for regular education students, or a teacher for a single subject) that caused them to assume varying levels of responsibility for the ELLs in their classrooms. For example, the teacher who believed all children were her responsibility actively involved the ELLs in her classroom, while those who believed their job was to teach regular education students or a certain subject, did not invite the participation of ELLs in activities.

The type of scaffolding teachers provide ELLs could be a result of training received by the teachers. Rueda and Garcia (1996) used interviews, a questionnaire, classroom observations, and artifacts to explore the differences in belief and relationships to practice among three groups of teachers. The 54 teachers were either teachers trained in bilingual education, “waivered” teachers who were not trained in bilingual education, or special education teachers of “learning handicapped” language minority students (p. 316). As expected, the trained bilingual teachers had more positive attitudes toward their students than the “waivered” or special education teachers. Differences in practice were found among the three groups. The bilingual credentialed
teachers used more of a student-centered approach, while the other two groups used a traditional, skill driven approach. Overall, the observations were consistent with the interview and questionnaire data; this points to a connection between beliefs and practice. For example, the teachers who believed students should be taught using constructivist strategies allowed their students more control in the classroom. These authors define teacher perspectives as including beliefs and as an “interpretation of experience that serves as a basis for subsequent action” (p. 312). The authors write from a constructivist perspective in which teachers’ knowledge and meaning influence their actions. Unfortunately, many of the beliefs and practices documented were “at odds with current views of literacy instruction and assessment” (Rueda & Garcia, 1996, p. 328). Prior training appears to be a factor that influences teachers’ practices, but it cannot be determined that the training affected the teachers’ beliefs. It is possible that the teachers may have chosen the training programs based on the beliefs they already held or their exposure to ELLs was a factor.

At times the tension between espoused beliefs and actual practice affects schools on a district, as well as a school-wide, level. Gitlin, Buendia, Crosland, and Doumbia (2003) investigated a middle school in the western United States using critical and poststructural theories. They saw how immigrants were “caught in institutional practices that simultaneously welcomed and unwelcomed them” (p. 91). Although on the surface, the schools professed to include the new students in the culture of the school, in actuality, the students were participating on the margins. For example, they sat on the fringe tables in the lunchroom and were not highlighted in the school assemblies. Similarly, on a larger scale, in an attempt to meet the needs of a new student population, one Georgia school district formed a Latino educational policy which included a bilingual education and a binational K-12/University partnership (Hamann,
However, the “interface between culture, policy and power” forced only portions of the policy to be put into place (p. 67). In particular, the bilingual education component was not realized in the way it was originally intended. The beliefs of the school district employees influenced the enactment of the policy in a negative way.

Although the number of articles found was not substantial, the articles reviewed show that teachers’ beliefs do influence their practice with ELLs. As Fang (1996) writes, research “indicates that teachers teach in accordance with their theoretical beliefs” (p. 53). The studies reviewed here varied methodologically, but the findings remained consistent. The training teachers have received, as well as how they view their roles as educators may influence teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding ELLs. Many authors cited in this section did discuss theoretical perspectives, perhaps because of the qualitative observations that are necessary to research teachers in practice. These perspectives included critical and poststructuralist perspectives (Gitlin et al., 2003; Harklau, 2000), as well as positioning theory (Yoon, 2008). These authors had many similarities in respect to theoretical perspectives; Harklau and Gitlin et al. (2003) both discussed issues of representation, and Harklau (2000) and Yoon (2008) wrote about theories of identity. I believe the critical perspective is important for focusing on structural influences, but the poststructuralist perspective adds the ability to analyze those issues such as identity, representations, and positions that greatly benefit this literature. Articles reviewed on teachers’ beliefs about ELLs in relation to practice are summarized in Table 4.

Discussion

It is evident that mainstream teachers of ELLs have many misconceptions concerning second language learning that need to be rectified. These misconceptions, along with a lack of knowledge about and training in ESOL pedagogy and multicultural education, combine to point
to a “poverty of language learning” in mainstream teacher education. Through research, factors have been identified to influence teachers’ beliefs toward ELLs. The most prevalent predictor found, and perhaps the easiest to change, is the amount of second language learning training received by teachers. It is important to uncover and attempt to change unwarranted beliefs and misconceptions held by teachers because they affect classroom practice. The five components of the beliefs for successful inclusion of ELLs provide a framework for teaching this new set of beliefs. The following paragraphs comment on the possibilities for belief change to occur. Next, implications for professional development and research methodology are discussed.

The articles reviewed have shown the importance of teachers’ beliefs toward ELLs. We must ask ourselves, what can be done about the beliefs that require change? Unfortunately, some research has shown that beliefs can be highly resistant to change (Pajares, 1992). According to Pajares, “the earlier a belief is incorporated into the belief structure, the more difficult it is to alter” (p. 317). Beliefs about teaching are developed during what Lortie (1975) called the apprenticeship of observation which occurs during the many years spent as students in school. Similarly, Horwitz (1985) suggested teachers’ beliefs about language learning come from their second language experiences in secondary school. However, this is not to say beliefs cannot change under the right circumstances, especially when using beliefs as a broad term. Beliefs may be replaced when they are proved unsatisfactory, but they are “unlikely to prove unsatisfactory unless they are challenged and one is unable to assimilate them into existing conceptions” (Pajares, 1992, p. 321). Beliefs can change as a result of experience (Brown, 2004). Accordingly, Kagan (1992) argues a program can promote growth among teachers, but “it must require them to make their preexisting personal beliefs explicit; it must challenge the adequacy of those beliefs; and it must give novices extended opportunities to examine, elaborate, and integrate new
information into their existing belief systems” (p. 77). Similarly, teachers should be provided with opportunities and resources for reflection in order for change to occur (Rueda & Garcia, 1996). Kennedy and Kennedy (1996) concluded that it was possible to change teachers’ beliefs by raising awareness. According to Kennedy and Kennedy, the context also needs to be taken into account, particularly through classroom observations. In addition, for belief change by teachers to succeed in practice, it will take top-down support from administration.

**Implications for Inservice Professional Development**

If it is possible to change beliefs through effective professional development, then it is imperative that mainstream teachers of ELLs receive this beneficial training. Walker et al. (2004) found that “even a little appropriate training can go a long way in preventing and improving negative teacher attitudes” toward ELLs (p. 142). According to Clair and Temple (1999), professional development of teachers with respect to ELLs needs to be designed with teacher input using principles of adult learning. Possible structures include university-school partnerships, teacher networks, and teacher study groups. It is important for inservice teachers of ELLs to understand “basic constructs of bilingualism and second language development, the nature of language proficiency, and the role of the first language and culture in learning” (Clair & Temple, p. 3). These authors explain that in order for professional development to be successful, it needs to be supported by district and school policies and given adequate time and resources. One model school was described as using peer coaching, peer evaluation and teacher portfolio presentations among the teachers as a part of staff development. Another school reported using peer visitation and small group discussions of professional literature as an effective tool for professional learning.
Researchers have examined the necessity of good professional development and what it takes to make it effective. For example, Johnson and Johnson (1996) found teachers’ beliefs were related to thinking styles; they recommend professional development that encourages new information and ideas because abstract thinkers were shown to be more tolerant of ELLs. These changes may be introduced through administration. Principals can influence the beliefs of a faculty, help promote diversity, encourage teacher creativity, and be catalysts for change (Moore, 1999). In addition, the idea that culture is inseparable from language needs to be taught and put into practice (Ryan, 1995). Ryan emphasizes it is necessary to “encourage teachers to become sensitive to and skilled in the teaching of culture” (p. 19). Upon concluding ELLs’ needs were not being adequately met in mainstream classrooms, Harklau (1994) recommended inservice professional development with a focus on how input can be adjusted for nonnative speakers and “how appropriate, explicit, and consistent language instruction for ESL students might be incorporated into mainstream instruction” (p. 268). Collaboration must be practiced and discussed for mainstream teachers to be aware of the ESOL teacher’s responsibilities versus their responsibilities in the classroom (Moore, 1999). Similarly, Gilette (1996) points out that collaboration must take place between teacher educators, school districts, community agencies, and institutions to connect the work of the university to practice. Godley, Sweetland, Wheeler, Minnici, and Carpenter (2006) cautioned that teachers will disregard information that doesn’t seem to apply to them. Therefore, “only relevant information anchored in practice is likely to affect teacher practice significantly” (p. 33). Overall, “teachers must have opportunities to gain specialized skills to work effectively with ESL students; otherwise, mainstreaming is not a positive solution” (Young, 1996, p. 18).

Implications for Research Methodology
These implications begin with the call for more qualitative research, particularly longitudinal studies in the area of teachers’ beliefs toward ELLs. A brief critique of the experimental studies is included, along with a discussion of the impact context has on teachers’ beliefs. This section continues by addressing the specific areas that need future research, including the predictors of teachers’ beliefs. In conclusion, I argue for more attention to definitions in the literature.

In addition to quantitative research, various methods of analysis in qualitative research could strengthen this body of literature, just as Richardson (1996) pointed out in her review. Phenomenological studies could help to explain what it is like to be a mainstream teacher of an ESOL student. Discourse analysis could be used to look closely at the language mainstream teachers are using in conversation with their ELLs. Stories could be constructed to help readers gain insight into the day-to-day experiences of mainstream teachers of ELLs through narrative analysis.

The research on predictors of mainstream teachers’ beliefs about ELLs uses survey research almost exclusively. Questionnaires provide useful knowledge as a starting point to understanding beliefs, but are not adequate alone. Teachers may not be able to articulate certain beliefs or realize they even hold them. Perhaps longitudinal, observational studies could add to the knowledge in this area. The studies reviewed here indicated teachers can alter their beliefs. Nevertheless, as Middleton (1999) points out, “long term studies are needed to clarify just how these alterations occur” (p. 357). The need for longitudinal studies was a common theme among many of the articles. For example, Richardson (1996) notes, “an understanding of the relationship between beliefs and learning to teach, however, would be enhanced by longitudinal studies of teachers who move from preservice teacher education into teaching practice” (p. 110).
Camacho, Socas, and Hernandez (1998) also included a recommendation about the necessity of continuing analysis through longitudinal studies about the conceptions, attitudes, and beliefs of future teachers from their first year at university until they graduate.

Thompson’s (1992) reflections summarize future recommendations for research methods with respect to teachers’ beliefs about ELLs. She writes that as individuals, teachers may not be the best to clearly explain their own beliefs and perspectives. Teachers may not realize they hold, or may be unable to articulate certain beliefs. Therefore, Thompson concludes “investigations of teachers’ beliefs should examine teachers’ verbal data along with observational data of their instructional practice; it will not suffice to rely solely on verbal data” (p. 135). Another possibility is to use photo elicitation interviews to stimulate discussions by teachers or even use photo voice to allow the teachers to take pictures of what they see and feel which they may not be able to put into words. Perhaps some mixed methods research could be used to identify a widespread phenomenon, as well as understand it on a deep level.

With respect to the majority of the experimental studies, the authors did not admit the danger of novelty effects. Perhaps teachers in these studies appeared to change their beliefs because what was presented to them was new and exciting, but the changes may not have been long lasting. Additionally, many of the experimental studies would be difficult to replicate because of inadequate information about the participants. The authors should provide a description of the number, ethnicity, social class, age, and gender of those participating in the study in order to make appropriate conclusions.

Some studies reviewed reference the affect of geographic location on teachers’ beliefs about ELLs. This suggests that local and national contexts play a role in teachers’ beliefs, such as through the English-only laws mentioned previously. Lack of resources and teacher collaboration
are examples of how school structures could affect teachers’ beliefs. Researchers should attempt to situate teachers’ beliefs in broader contexts to show how beliefs can be influenced by societies and policies unique to an area.

The findings of this review suggest there is a need for further research related to the predictors of mainstream teachers’ beliefs toward working with ELLs. Youngs and Youngs (2001) reported that 71% of the variance in teachers’ beliefs was unexplained. Future research is needed to pursue additional predictors of teachers’ beliefs about ELLs in their classrooms. Youngs and Youngs found that a more diverse ESOL population yielded more positive attitudes of teachers toward the ELLs in their classrooms. Research should be done to investigate whether ELLs’ geographical origins impact teachers’ beliefs. This could help explain why Byrnes et al. (1997) found living in certain regions of the country affected teachers’ beliefs. The size of the ESOL population was also not considered as a factor in the majority of these studies. Research should also be conducted in settings with various numbers of ELLs, including those districts with small numbers to see if this affects teachers’ beliefs.

Future research is needed in the area of teachers’ beliefs about ELLs, particularly in the areas of changing teachers’ beliefs and the association between beliefs and practice. Additionally, the current shift is for ESOL teachers and mainstream teachers to collaborate in inclusion classrooms, yet very little research in this area was found. The effect mainstreaming has on the role of ESOL teachers in schools should be considered. As Platt, Harper, and Mendoza (2003) found in their study in Florida, when ESOL teachers are “eliminated or forced to become jacks-of-all trades in a school their curricular and methodological expertise is either lost or diluted for distribution to the general faculty, who often lack fundamental knowledge of language and the L2 learning process and of how to implement this understanding” (p. 128).
ESOL teachers have valuable expertise to offer to schools, but for this knowledge to be utilized to its potential, the mainstream teachers they work with must have some training in ESOL pedagogy as well. Perhaps the idea of a separate ESOL teacher should be reconsidered. As opposed to collaborative classes with ESOL and mainstream teachers, another possibility is for all teachers to become credentialed to teach ELLs.

Finally, I believe more attention should be given to defining constructs cited in the literature. In order to effectively interpret data on teachers’ beliefs, it is necessary to understand how belief is defined. Various terms were used throughout the literature to describe the belief construct, sometimes interchangeably. However, a discussion of why a term was chosen or how it was being used was rarely provided.

Conclusion

Studying the beliefs teachers hold toward ELLs in their classrooms is important in order to raise awareness of the need for more formal training for inservice teachers. As the numbers of ELLs entering school systems throughout the United States grow, it will become increasingly vital for the academic, as well as affective, needs of these students to be met. According to the research included in this review, there is a consistency between beliefs and practice in relation to teaching ELLs in mainstream classrooms. By adopting the beliefs for successful conclusion of ELLs, mainstream teachers will be able to more effectively teach the ELLs in their classrooms. This new set of beliefs include: (1) high expectations for ELLs, (2) accepting responsibility for ELLs, (3) encouraging native language use both at home and in the classroom, (4) an awareness of the time it takes ELLs to learn academic English, and (5) a desire for professional development in relation to ELLs when needed. If teachers’ beliefs can be understood, the
predictors of certain beliefs toward ELLs identified, and unwarranted teachers’ beliefs rectified, the education of the fastest growing population in the United States today can begin to improve.
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Table 1

*Teachers’ Misconceptions and What Research Shows*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ Misconceptions</th>
<th>What Research Shows is True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students should be able to acquire English within 2 years of coming to the U.S. (Reeves, 2006); ELLs should be fluent after 1 year (Walker et al., 2004)</td>
<td>It can take 1-3 years to learn conversational English and 5-7 years for academic English (Cummins, 1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a first language at home interferes with learning a second language (Clair, 1995; Karabenick &amp; Noda, 2004; Reeves, 2004)</td>
<td>Literacy in one’s native language is the best basis for developing literacy in a second language (Olsen, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a native language in the classroom interferes with acquisition of English. (Reeves, 2004, 2006; Walker et al., 2004)</td>
<td>Proficiency in a native language facilitates English acquisition and leads to higher academic achievement (Cummins, 1992; Lee, 2002).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

*Inservice Teachers’ Existing Beliefs about Mainstreamed ELLs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clair (1995)</td>
<td>Explore the beliefs, practices, and professional development needs of teachers of ELLs</td>
<td>3 teachers</td>
<td>Interviews, observations, and teacher journals; case study</td>
<td>Teachers felt inadequate to teach ELLs; held misconceptions about SLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll (2005)</td>
<td>To find out about the challenges, experiences, and professional development needs of teachers of ELLs</td>
<td>5300 California teachers of ELLs</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Teachers had little training; were frustrated with lack of time and communication with students and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harklau (2000)</td>
<td>Examine the representation of ELLs from high school to community college</td>
<td>3 students</td>
<td>Interviews and observations</td>
<td>Students were seen as the job of the ESOL teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karabenick and Noda (2004)</td>
<td>Explore teachers’ beliefs of ELLs in mainstream classes</td>
<td>729 teachers</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Gaps in knowledge of SLA; open to professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon (1991)</td>
<td>Investigate teacher</td>
<td>80 high school teachers</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Teachers do not believe ESL students have necessary language skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penfield (1987)</td>
<td>Investigate teachers’ perceptions of ELLs and ESL teachers</td>
<td>162 mainstream teachers</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Teachers believed it was the ESOL teachers’ job to teach ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves (2004)</td>
<td>Examine 1 high school</td>
<td>4 teachers</td>
<td>Interviews, observations, field notes, and document collection</td>
<td>Teachers wanted more training and held misconceptions about SLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeves (2006)</td>
<td>Examine teachers’ beliefs of ELLs in mainstream classes</td>
<td>279 high school teachers</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Ambivalent about professional development; held misconceptions SLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharkey and</td>
<td>Investigate beliefs</td>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>Interviews and</td>
<td>Teachers often have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layzer (2000)</td>
<td>Teachers' observations of ELLs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers towards ELLs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Assess beliefs and attitudes of mainstream teachers and 6 ELL teachers</td>
<td>422 K-12</td>
<td>Teacher attitudes towards ELLs appeared neutral to strongly negative, but differences exist across contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngs (1999)</td>
<td>Explore mainstream teachers' perceptions and experiences working with ESL students</td>
<td>Middle/junior high school teachers and interviews</td>
<td>Teachers needed more training; felt time was a constraint; wanted collaboration with ESL teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Predictors of Teachers’ Beliefs about ELLs in Mainstream Classrooms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Purpose:</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Factors Found to Influence Teachers’ Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byrnes et al. (1997)</td>
<td>To examine factors hypothesized to affect beliefs</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Greater exposure to language diversity; number of ELLs taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia-Nevarez et al. (2005)</td>
<td>attitudes towards ELLs’ native languages and their use in instruction</td>
<td>152 elementary teachers</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Type of certification held; years teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee and Oxelson (2006)</td>
<td>teachers’ attitudes toward students’ heritage language maintenance</td>
<td>69 K-12 California public school teachers</td>
<td>Survey and interviews</td>
<td>Nature of teacher training; personal experience with languages other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantero and McVicker (2006)</td>
<td>differences between mainstream and ELL teachers’ beliefs</td>
<td>160 middle school</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Years teaching experience; staff development in working with ELLs; graduate courses in working with ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shin and Krashen</td>
<td>teachers’ attitudes toward bilingual education</td>
<td>794 elementary and secondary teachers</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>More ELLs in classroom; training in ESL; fluent in another language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngs and Youngs</td>
<td>predictors of mainstream teachers’ attitudes toward ESL students</td>
<td>143 junior high/middle school mainstream teachers</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Completion of foreign language, multicultural education, or ESL courses; experience abroad; lived outside the U.S.; work with diverse ESL students; gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Teachers’ Beliefs about Mainstreamed ELLs in Relation to Practice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gitlin et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Investigate how immigrants were treated in school</td>
<td>5 ESL teachers, 10 students, a program director, and a school administrator</td>
<td>Interviews, observations, and document analysis</td>
<td>Institutional racism; immigrants were at times welcomed and unwelcomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harklau (2000)</td>
<td>Explore how ELLs are represented across educational settings</td>
<td>3 language minority students</td>
<td>Ethnographic case study</td>
<td>Teachers’ representations of students affect students’ attitudes toward learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rueda and Garcia (1996)</td>
<td>Investigate beliefs and practices of 3 groups of teachers</td>
<td>54 teachers in 3 groups with different training</td>
<td>Interviews, questionnaires, observations, and classroom products</td>
<td>Differences in practice found among 3 groups; Training did affect practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoon (2008)</td>
<td>Examine teachers’ views of their roles with regard to language arts teachers</td>
<td>3 middle school</td>
<td>Collective case study</td>
<td>Teachers’ beliefs varied based on their positioning of themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELLs