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CHAPTER I

Introduction

General Description

The percentage of language and cultural minority students is steadily increasing (Okagaki, 2006; U.S. Department of Education, 2010). This reality emphasizes the need for elementary school general education teachers to become knowledgeable about students’ backgrounds so that they can mold instruction to meet all students’ needs (Bennett, 2007; Spring, 2007; Whitcomb, 2003). There is, however, little research about elementary school general education teachers’ views and accommodations about heritage language maintenance (a.k.a. multicultural and multilingual inclusion) (Goldstein, 2003). The purpose of this study was to examine how elementary school general education teachers view heritage language learning and accommodate students who have a heritage language background.

While most research on elementary school general education teachers focuses on how teachers teach the English language and how students acquire English (Harper & De Jong, 2004; Rossell, 2004), less research has addressed the beliefs and accommodations of elementary school general education teachers. This particular study sought to examine the beliefs and accommodations of a neglected sample, elementary school general
education teachers. The underlying premise was that elementary school general education teachers have beliefs about and accommodations for heritage language maintenance (HLM) that are shaped by their perceptions of HLM, their personal backgrounds, and their teacher education preparation, among other factors. Current research on elementary school general education teachers and their beliefs and accommodations has not illustrated how teachers accommodate students who have a heritage language background.

**Significance of the Research**

The significance of this study was that it examined elementary school general education teachers’ beliefs and accommodations related to HLM. This study provides teachers with an opportunity to reflect on their beliefs about HLM. In addition, teachers assessed and gained awareness of their language beliefs and actions by participating in surveys and observations. This study presented empirical evidence (quantitative and qualitative) of how elementary school general education teachers incorporate HLM in the classroom with students who have a heritage language background. There is a need to evaluate how all kinds of teachers accommodate students who have a heritage language background. Based on the increasing diversity of American elementary schools, general education teachers will inevitably encounter students who have a heritage language background (Brisk et al., 2002; Ball, 2000). With a focus on multicultural and multilingual inclusion, teachers can meet all students’ needs. In the end, the results from this study have important educational implications for how teachers’ classroom behaviors relate to perceptions.
Operational Descriptions

Given the complexity of terminology used in education research, definitions of terms used in this study are necessary. To clarify, heritage language learning and heritage language teaching are shorthand expressions to label belief categories. Heritage language learning focuses on students when teachers incorporate multicultural and multilingual inclusion (HLM) in a non-judgmental and open classroom, also known as heritage language teaching. In this study, positive beliefs were defined as a set of cognitive tenets in favor of heritage language learning and teaching that a teacher brought into a teaching situation. For example, positive beliefs about heritage language learning were correlated with statements such as *I believe it is valuable to be multilingual in our society* (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.1). Positive beliefs about heritage language teaching were correlated with statements such as *I have my students share their heritage language and culture every chance I get.*

Negative beliefs were defined as a set of cognitive tenets against heritage language learning and teaching that a teacher brings into a teaching situation (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.1). Negative beliefs about heritage language learning were correlated with statements such as *I believe maintaining a heritage language prevents students from fully assimilating into this society.* Negative beliefs about heritage language teaching were correlated with statements such as *I believe monolingual teachers cannot foster multiliteracy since they are not multiliterate.*

Background information (independent variables) about teachers’ history with language learning refers to gender, age, ethnicity, area of specialization, grade taught, past grades taught, school corporation, years of teaching experience, family history of
speaking a foreign language, interest in bilingualism, personal history of speaking a foreign language, fluency in speaking a foreign language, and teacher education programs (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.2). As open-ended items, other background information includes source of strategies, techniques, or materials for HLM, institutional support, multicultural experiences, feelings about multicultural experiences, and impact of multicultural experiences on teaching.

Accommodations refers to how teachers implement strategies that recognize and build upon resources and assets that students who have a heritage language background bring to the school (Brisk et al., 2002) (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.3). Accommodations in terms of heritage language include the following: encouraging students to actively engage in exploring and discovering the richness of their linguistic and cultural heritage and using language skills and cultural experiences that students bring with them as an integral part of instruction (Fortune, 2000; Scalera, 2000; Hinton, 2003).

General education teachers were described as mainstream, elementary, and non-foreign language teachers. The term “elementary teachers” is not used, because elementary teachers may have specialties (i.e., mathematics, science) that represent a specific body of content knowledge. The term “elementary school general education teachers” is used because this term emphasizes a general knowledge of all subject matters, such as language arts, social studies, mathematics, and science, taught in elementary school.

Heritage language students are often referred to as non-native English speakers and may have varying proficiency (moderate speaking ability, near-native comprehension
skill, etc.) in their heritage language and their second language (English) (Kondo-Brown, 2003). This definition includes students who have learned English as a native language in addition to their heritage language, because all students of all heritage language abilities have the right to embrace their heritage language with the assistance of heritage language accommodations.

Research Questions

The questions this study addresses include the following:

1. What do elementary school general education teachers believe about positive and negative beliefs about heritage language learning and heritage language teaching (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.1)?

2. What teacher background characteristics (gender, age, race/ethnicity, area of specialization, grade taught, past grades taught, years of teaching experience, school corporation, family history of speaking a foreign language, parents’ interest in bilingualism, personal history of speaking a foreign language, fluency in speaking a foreign language, teacher education program, and multicultural experience) (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.2) relate to the positive and negative beliefs about HLM?

3. What accommodations (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.3) do elementary school general education teachers typically use in the classroom to assist students who have a heritage language background?

4. Why do elementary school general education teachers choose to either utilize or not utilize certain accommodations?
5. What institutional support is provided for teachers who accommodate (i.e., time, materials, visiting native speakers, etc.)?

6. What is the relationship between positive and negative beliefs from the survey and accommodations in the classroom with relation to HLM?

Summary

While there is much research on how teachers teach the English language and how students acquire English, there is little research concerning elementary school general education teachers’ views of and accommodations for heritage language learning. Since language and cultural minority students are populating elementary school classrooms, there is a need for elementary school general education teachers to become knowledgeable about diverse students’ backgrounds. The purpose of this study was to examine how elementary school general education teachers view heritage language learning and accommodate students who have a heritage language background. The empirical evidence gathered from the survey and observation checklist yields a number of benefits. Not only do teachers assess and gain awareness about their language beliefs and actions; there are also important educational implications in how teachers’ classroom behaviors relate to perceptions. In the end, defining terms and laying out the research questions were necessary to establish the framework of the study.
CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

*General Framework*

The literature that supports the importance of heritage language maintenance (HLM) stems from heritage language research, language programs, and teacher education. The review of literature will provide the backdrop for the current project, beginning with heritage language research, and then moving toward a discussion of teachers’ beliefs and accommodations. To understand why a survey about beliefs and observations is needed, a review of how heritage languages evolve and how heritage language is defined is informative. After gaining familiarity with the benefits of heritage language development as well as negative mainstream views, a historical review of heritage language programs and teacher training will provide the necessary context for current practices and teacher limitations. It is important to understand the multifaceted role teachers’ beliefs play in their reluctance or refusal to work toward HLM. This review of teacher training and teachers’ beliefs will be followed by an overview of heritage language accommodations. Finally, reviewing how accommodations can be inaccessible will add to the complex debate about teachers’ beliefs and heritage language maintenance.
History of Heritage Language Research

The term “heritage language speakers” has a tumultuous history in the U.S. and has evolved into many other labels, such as circumstantial bilinguals, home background speakers, native speakers, and fluent speakers (Valdes, 2001; Valdes, 2005; Wiley, 2001). When a large number of non-English speakers enter a country, a change occurs within the foreign language landscape and the teaching profession. The first region to focus on the practice of heritage language instruction was Ontario, Canada. Ontario led the study, maintenance, and revitalization of heritage language with heritage language programs in 1977 (Feuerverger, 1997). In contrast, American scholars only began to study and associate heritage languages with language policy in the late 1990s (Cummins, 2005).

In the late 1800s and early 1900s, maintaining a heritage language in the U.S. depended on the demands and politics of society. In 1868, the Indian Peace Commission found that Native Americans were not following Manifest Destiny because of language difficulties. As a result, Native American children were placed in boarding schools and were forbidden to be instructed in Native American languages (Draper & Hicks, 2000). From the 1990s to 2006, the Native American Languages Act and Preservation Act allowed Native American children to engage in indigenous heritage language beyond the classroom as a result of new legal status and immanent language loss (Haynes, 2010). There is greater language consciousness and intergenerational cultural transmission among Native Americans to rectify governmental intrusion and past injustices against Native Americans (Fishman, 2006).

In contrast to the Amerindian (indigenous people of North and South Americas) situation, intergenerational vernaculars (i.e., Dutch, Swedish, Finnish, Welsh) were not
valued except for French in New England and Louisiana, Spanish in the Southwest, and German in Pennsylvania. German in the U.S. can be considered a colonial and immigrant heritage language, because this language was already spoken before the U.S. was established as a country, and immigrant reinforcement supports the colonial origins of German usage. Overall, the first and largest immigrant language spoken in the U.S. was German in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The second largest immigrant language spoken was Spanish in the 1980s, making this language a de facto majority second language (Lynch, 2003; Pratt, 2003). Even though immigrant languages fade, as do indigenous languages and colonial languages, some immigrant languages are maintained because of increasing populations of speakers and their importance in the world at large (i.e., science, commerce, and diplomacy) (Fishman, 2006). Past and present efforts from communities have led to a reflection in research of the timeliness of language preservation.

An important challenge to teaching heritage language speakers is defining them along a continuum of bilingualism. Bilingualism can be defined as the ability to use two languages with advanced and equal skills in both languages or as the ability to use two languages with varying levels of competence in one of the two languages. Without understanding bilingualism and the necessary match between students’ requirements and teachers’ expectations, placement of foreign language classes or the incorporation of appropriate methods may not suffice the needs of non-native speakers of English (Cummins, 2005). The continuum of bilingualism includes various levels of competence in speech or comprehension in the second language. For example, a native English speaker may be literate in English but read French. A non-native speaker of English can
understand English but speak and write in their heritage language. Both are bilinguals more so than an individual who reads or understands just one language. Other factors like age, birth of new siblings, length of stay in the new country, level of assimilation within a heritage language community, a community that is socially or linguistically isolated (Tosi, 1985), parents’ usage and attitudes (Tse, 2001a), professional class versus middle class, first generation versus second generation, stigmatized versus socially accepted language (Valdes, 2001) and/or language versus ethnic group identity (Schreffler, 2007; Tse, 2001a) can impact how “bilingual” one becomes in a new country.

Many researchers have noted that bilingualism is related to academic achievement and self perception of competency. Heritage language maintenance shares that relationship to achievement and self perception, along with better English development. The more proficient students are in their first language, the more efficiently they learn their second language due to prior experience (i.e., schema) and background knowledge (Cummins, 2005; Biaslystok, 2001; Tse, 2001b; Lenski et al., 2006; Padilla & Gonzalez, 2001). The key to gaining the full positive effects of fluent bilingualism is simultaneous mastery of two languages and cultural repertoires (Portes & Hao, 2002). Besides efficiency, children whose first language is maintained along with their second language gain higher intelligence measures (i.e., control of attention, concept formation, analytical reasoning, and problem solving), higher performance in creativity tests (i.e., cognitive complexity), increased metalinguistic awareness (i.e., noticing errors in grammar and meaning), and overall academic development in English (Biaslystok, 2001; Diaz & Kingler, 1991; Garcia, 1991; Moran & Hakuta, 1995; Cummins, 2005; Greene, 1998; Krashen, 1996; Thomas & Collier, 2002; Fay & Whaley, 2004; Lessow-Hurley, 2003).
Shibata (2004) assessed second generation Japanese college students who have attended Japanese schools in the past and spoken Japanese at home in maintaining English proficiency, Japanese proficiency and academic achievement. Through surveys, Japanese college students revealed their knowledge of Japanese did not infringe upon their knowledge of English (Suarez, 2007). When foundational skills are presented in their heritage language, non-U.S. born Mexican students obtain higher GPAs than their U.S.-born counterparts of Mexican descent (Padilla & Gonzalez, 2001). The differential performance between Mexican-born and Mexican-American students may be due to many factors, such as familial and cultural values on education in Mexico, strong environmental influence from peers and society in the U.S., age at the time of immigration, and length of residency in the U.S. (Aonghas, 2002; Padilla & Gonzalez, 2001). Notably, Mexican-born students who maintain fluency in Spanish and English were more likely to aspire to and expect higher educational opportunities for themselves. Altogether, heritage languages as a resource can potentially benefit national security (i.e., Defense Language Institute) and community development (i.e., teachers of less commonly taught languages) (Cummins, 2005; Tse, 2001b).

There are many benefits that accrue from heritage language development. Correspondingly, there are many reasons why heritage languages are associated with language shift and language loss. The major reasons are related to status of minority/majority languages, misconceptions, and power. The status of minority and majority languages stems from the powerful pull of English. Often, students who have a heritage language background may adopt negative mainstream views (from adults and even their peers who belong to the same cultural group) that their heritage language is
stigmatized, useless, and even subversive. Such negative mainstream views stem from volatile debates on bilingual education and how English proficiency is not achieved at the expense of teaching the other language (Tse, 2001b; Cummins, 2005). This debate and view of English is reflected in the infrastructure of education. High English language skills are promoted while oral skills in Spanish are devalued, with little academic knowledge or literacy promoted in that language. Even when children have parents and friends who are bilingual and attend a bilingual school, they may develop conversational Spanish while shifting to English as the dominant and preferred language (Tse, 2001b).

Misconceptions among parents, school officials, and peers are quite rampant. To prevent their children from being ridiculed and ignored for speaking a native language, parents encourage the use of English (McBrien, 2005). Additionally, parents may also be encouraged by school officials and teachers who believe learning another language at home would hamper their children’s ability to speak English. Limited access to communities like churches and temples may reduce the number of opportunities for hearing spoken heritage language in an authentic and practical setting (Tse, 2001b). It appears that societal groups of differential power impose implicit and explicit language policies, resulting in current de facto national and state language policies (Tse, 2001a; Cummins, 2005). Despite how embedded the causes of language loss and language shift are, there are measures undertaken by independent groups to explore heritage languages more deeply.

Beyond this “xenophobic” discourse about language diversity, academic initiatives like conferences and organizations provide venues for heritage language support based on its merits and not situated in political debates about bilingual education
and immigration (Cummins, 2005). Professional associations like the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, the National Foreign Language Center and the Center for the Applied Linguistics have produced many useful handbooks for teachers, language-based resources, and searchable databases for teaching materials (Valdes, 2005). Discussions on heritage language were held during the first Heritage Languages in American conference in 1999 and the Bi-national Meeting on Heritage Language Research Priorities in 2001 (Valdes, 2005; Cummins, 2005). The discussion from such academic initiatives has led to the development of HL programs, which may ultimately combat language loss, language shift, and negative mainstream views.

**Heritage Language Programs**

A heritage language program teaches the heritage language of the child. To understand the unique role of heritage language education, each of the related language programs should be defined. A second/foreign language program teaches a second language to a student, in addition to whatever language the child already knows. Traditionally in the United States, English has simply been taught as a second language to non-English speaking students, and the heritage language was usually not taught in schools. It might even be discouraged in accordance with an English-only policy. The ultimate incongruity occurs when students are unable to study or are discouraged from studying their heritage language and then are encouraged later in their education to take a foreign language class (Tse, 2001b). Despite an influx of students speaking their heritage language at home, these very students became confused on vocabulary and grammatical aspects when taking language classes in college. The reason for this is that there is a
difference between their home language, which might be a stigmatized variety of their language, and the standard academic version of that language (Valdes, 2005).

Aside from foreign language and English as a second language, there are also immersion programs and bilingual programs. An immersion program differs from a second language because the student’s partial or entire school curriculum (full immersion) is taught in the second/foreign language. Students benefit from learning high levels of proficiency in a foreign language (Cunningham & Graham, 2000). Immersion programs are far more effective at teaching a second language than an isolated second language class. Immersion programs were first viewed with skepticism about their possible effects on the students’ performance. Notably, research confirmed that students in an immersion program perform as well in the subjects as students learning those same subjects in monolingual programs (Day & Shapson, 1996; Genesee, 1987; Swain, 1985). Aside from immersion programs, bilingual education sometimes uses the heritage language in its instruction to teach students English (Valdes, Fishman & Perez, 2006). Currently, bilingual education is mainly a transitional tool to move minority students into English-only education (McBrien, 2005). In both immersion and bilingual programs, students can use the knowledge of their first (heritage) language (L1) (if available in such programs) to make sense of input received in the second language (L2), and thus strong L1/L2 relationships are observed for literacy-related aspects of language (Cummins, 2005).

Heritage language programs can be held in community centers, churches, temples, public or private schools, and colleges (Compton, 2001). They differ from bilingual education, as bilingual education teaches only the academic form of the second language, whereas heritage language programs teach the heritage language through a variety of
courses such as language skills, culture, civic involvement, and even traditional cooking. Furthermore, unlike a bilingual program, the heritage language class may focus entirely on the heritage language and not necessarily two languages.

The term heritage language itself varies internationally. The Australian and British contexts have instead used the term community language to refer to the same range of language resources (Cummins, 2005). Canada has adopted several different terms. Ontario replaced the term heritage language with international language, because the term heritage connoted past traditions rather than language skills. Canadian First Nations communities preferred the terms indigenous or aboriginal languages. In South Africa, the term referred only to languages spoken by South Africans of Indian descent and not to the indigenous African languages (Brutt-Griffler & Makoni, 2005). In this use, the heritage language term is clearly racialized.

Despite the success of heritage language programs in teaching both the heritage language and English, there are few heritage language programs to meet the needs of students who have a heritage language background (Wang et al., 2010). Success has not been sufficient to survive political hostility (Wright, 2007). In California, one middle school incorporated a Khmer-for-Khmer-speakers course as an elective after the dissolution of the bilingual program that instructed children in their heritage language of Khmer (Cambodian). Comparable to bilingual programs, most students were reading Khmer at grade level and English at or greater than grade level by the end of third grade. However, the ultimate success was immaterial, given the Pressure of Proposition 227 to teach English only, and the English-only test SAT-9 being administered to second graders, a grade before students were fully transitioned to English. The pressure to
immediately raise test scores of second graders became a barrier to a program that promoted the learning of English and Khmer at grade levels.

A similar law and a similar story can be found in Arizona, where Proposition 203 accelerated the pressure to immediately increase academic achievement under No Child Left Behind (Wright, 2007). Prior to Proposition 203, bilingual education was common and acceptable for both Spanish and Native American students. Even though there were many charter schools in Arizona, which were not subject to the requirements of Proposition 203, active hostility of state education leaders was detrimental to bilingual education. The superintendent of public instruction declared he would cut funding to charter schools that did not follow the English-only law, Proposition 203. Proposition 203 did not apply to Native American tribes, as there were federal protections for Native American languages. Nevertheless, hostile administrators still attempted to cut funding unless tribes reduced the instruction given in tribal language in favor of English only. To deal with the anti-heritage language movement within education, teachers must first understand their role in teaching and in teacher education programs to build the foundation of heritage language knowledge and to devise effective instructional practices.

*The Training of General Education Teachers in a Diverse World*

General education teachers typically attend teacher education programs at universities or teacher training colleges for three to four years or otherwise attend an intensive four week course such as the Certificate in English Language Teaching to Adults (CELTA) (Borg, 2006). Although specific subject area programs differ, teacher education programs in the U.S. consist of portfolio requirements (Anderson & DeMeule, 1998; Zeichner & Wray, 2001), practicum field experiences (Gomez et al., 2009) and
general education courses in pedagogy and various subject areas. Gomez et al. (2009) found that 335 participants, including those who speak English and Spanish and those who speak only English, enjoyed working with English learners in field experiences. However, teacher candidates who spoke only English needed support, skills, and training to facilitate success among students who were learning English as a second language (ESL).

Despite the ethnically, racially, linguistically, and economically diverse student population, teacher preparation programs at the university level do not include heritage language courses for teaching at the elementary level, with two notable exceptions. Hunter College requires a heritage language methods course for all foreign language teachers and Chicago’s heritage language program is geared toward preparing teachers for students who speak Spanish as a heritage language (Potowski, 2003; Scalera, 2000). On the other hand, there are limited pre-service public school certification programs for teachers of Chinese as a foreign or second language, much less heritage language (McGinnis, 2008). Unfortunately, there are few teachers prepared to provide instruction that meets the linguistic, cognitive, academic, and emotional needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students (Brisk et al., 2002; Gomez et al., 2009).

In 2008, 1,558 colleges and universities reported on average that there was a considerable shortage of teachers in the bilingual education field, German, and Japanese, while there was some shortage of teachers in the English as a second language field (AAEE, 2008). According to Tse, there is a shortage of foreign language teachers in less common languages like Farsi, Chinese and Russian (2001a). Often foreign language teachers also act as heritage language teachers, even when qualifications are not met
(Scalera, 2000; Schulz, 2000). Across all levels (i.e., elementary, secondary) and all languages (i.e., Spanish, Chinese, Russian), there is an obvious shortage of teachers adequately prepared to teach language, much less general education teachers schooled in accommodating students who have a heritage language background at the elementary level.

The increasing diversity of the classroom has become a reality for all teachers. In 2008, public schools included on average the following percentages of ethnic minority students: 21.2% Hispanic American, 17.0% African-American, 4.8% Asian American/Pacific Islander, and 1.2% American Indian/Alaskan Native (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Approximately 21% of students in the U.S. spoke a language other than English at home (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010; U.S. Department of Education, 2010). In 2008, 5.1% of school-aged children reported speaking English with difficulty. Although U.S. schools are becoming more diverse, the percentage of ethnic minority teachers is decreasing (Okagaki, 2006; U.S. Department of Education, 2010). This discrepancy in numbers expresses the need for teachers to become cognizant of students’ backgrounds so they can plan instruction tailored to the needs of students (Bennett, 2007; Spring, 2007; Whitcomb, 2003; Gomez et al., 2009).

A discrepancy in views among different groups of teachers may be crucial to understanding why general education teachers are not working toward heritage language maintenance. Lee and Oxelson (2006) surveyed and interviewed sixty-nine teachers from the U.S. who revealed that teacher training shapes attitudes. Results showed some differences among those who speak English only and those who had Bilingual Cross Cultural language and Academic Development credentials. Teacher preparation
programs had a significant impact on shaping teachers’ attitudes. Across the board, most of the forty-four respondents who had obtained a special teaching concentration/credential in English as a second language or in bilingual cross-cultural language had more favorable attitudes, incorporated more practices in favor of the home language, and embraced the whole child who speaks a heritage language. Overall, since these teachers tend to be fluent in a language in addition English, they were more likely to be sensitive toward supporting heritage language maintenance.

Although the twenty-two participants who were non-language credential teachers did not engage in the previously stated practices, both groups believed that language maintenance will incur positive results like a strong ethnic identity and strong family values (Lee & Oxelson, 2006). However, these non-language credential teachers tend not to value the usefulness of additive bilingualism because language teaching may hinder students’ assimilation into society. Six of the non-language credential teachers (n = 10) believed the school, parents, and community must value English as a high priority. The crux of the problem is the nature of preparation for teachers, which appeared to be related significantly to teacher understanding and attitudes toward students’ heritage language maintenance. More awareness is needed to address the critical role of heritage languages and cultures among the increasingly diverse student population for all teachers across all subject areas.

Karathanos (2009) also recorded mainstream teachers’ perceptions on first language instruction. Among 327 participants who were pre-service and in-service teachers taking English as a second language courses, there were 100 pre-service participants, 117 untrained in-service teachers with no bilingual experience, and 110
trained in-service teachers with bilingual experience. Similar to Lee and Oxelson’s findings (2006), there was strong support for heritage language instruction over the application in school setting (Karathanos, 2009). In contrast to the notion that English hinders acculturation, there is some moderate disagreement that heritage language use in the classroom should stop once the student who speaks the heritage language has learned English.

Adding to the reforming of teacher education preparation, there is strong evidence that mainstream teachers demand more theory in HLM based on their educational background. An increase in theory knowledge will bolster the support for practical applications of heritage maintenance (Brisk et al., 2002). Practical field experiences in cultural and linguistic settings or participation in service learning communities outside university lectures can expose teachers to multilingual diversity, thus leading to positive attitudes when working with ESL students (Gomez et al., 2009; Ryan, Carrington, Selva, & Healy, 2009). Based on 143 junior high/middle school teachers, teachers’ exposure to cultural diversity encouraged positive attitudes toward ESL students (Youngs & Youngs, 2001). Teacher candidates need more diverse field experiences to obtain the support, skills and training needed to facilitate success among diverse students (Gomez et al., 2009). Overall, cultural awareness or cultural training is needed for mainstream or general education teachers (Skinner, 2010).

The Nature of Teachers’ Beliefs

To delve into why teachers’ perceptions are so critical in terms of heritage language maintenance, one must understand that beliefs strongly influence behavior (Pajares, 1992). Teachers without English language learner (ELL) preparation would
least likely advocate bilingualism or more likely embody negative stereotypes regarding heritage language (Samway & McKeon, 2007). Disentangling the belief system may be the key to uncovering the tasks and cognitive tools that allow all teachers to interpret, plan, and make decisions (Dufva, 2003). Beliefs may determine why and how teachers utilize new teaching methods (Golombek, 1998). Although it is interesting to see pre-service teachers evolve in their cognition because of their “sense making” during clinical field teaching, there is a distinction between cognitive change and behavioral change among in-service teachers (Borg, 2006). On one hand, cognitive change may translate to behavioral change, but on the other hand, actual performance does not always reflect cognitive change (Gusky, 2002). Argyris and Schön’s theory of action reflects an extension of the latter dichotomy where humans first act, then learn, and then change if necessary (Kane et al., 2002). Theory of action consists of five parts, in which thoughts are based on actions (Dick & Dalmau, 2000). Action strategies, consequences for self, consequences for others, governing values, and action strategy effectiveness can be applied to two kinds of theory of action: espoused theories and theories-in-use. Espoused theories are personal theories applied to ourselves. Theories-in-use are the implicit theories based on past behavior. Argyris and Schön explain how espoused theories sometimes do not match theories-in-use. This argument relates to the current study by presenting an alternative interpretation to how cognitive change translates to behavioral change. Overall, the distinction between cognitive change and behavioral change suggests that it is beneficial to address teachers’ beliefs and actual classroom practices to explore the complexity between teachers’ views and teaching (Levin & Wadmany, 2006).
There are many ways to approach beliefs and performance conceptually. Belief systems and actual performance are dynamic and continually fluctuating and not uni-directional or bi-directional. Beliefs are unique based on their “intensity” and “importance” and vary along a “central peripheral dimension” (Rokreach, 1968, pp. 3-4). Depending on where beliefs lie along a continuum, teachers can change their beliefs with ease or difficulty. While teachers’ beliefs are associated with past experiences, positive and negative (based on emotion) (Dewey, 1938), individual beliefs based on negative experiences or contrary to instructional reform are difficult to change (Richardson, 1996).

While having isolated beliefs might be the case, another approach to beliefs is accepting multiple conceptions of beliefs and actual practice within a symbiotic relationship (Gunstone, 1994; Foss & Kleinsasser, 1996). Teachers can obtain and maintain multiple contrasting beliefs about HLM based on an individual position (dimensions along a continuum) or a social position (based on others’ influence), even when there are seemingly discrepant views (Caravita & Hallden, 1994; Rokreach, 1968). This means teachers can adapt their instruction to diverse students while maintaining old conceptual ideas and acquiring new ideas. Depending on the choices they make and the circumstances they are in, teachers exhibit differences in a range of beliefs, contrasting or congruent (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Young & Kram, 1996).

An example of the complexity between teachers’ views and teaching in research is whether teachers were more likely to embrace language maintenance in one form of research (i.e., surveys) but present a contradictory opinion in the actual practice of teaching. Many researchers utilized surveys to study teachers’ perceptions (Shafer & Liams, 2004; Mantero & McVicker, 2006). To increase internal validity, different forms
of data such as questionnaire responses and observations can capture teachers’
pedagogical knowledge and perceptions. Additionally, assessing an equal number of
participants through surveys and observations may increase validity in terms of
triangulating the information from one medium (i.e., surveys) to another medium (i.e.,
observations). Lee and Oxelson (2006) had sixty-nine teachers (mixed sample of trained
elementary teachers and trained ESL/bilingual teachers), but ten teachers were
interviewed. This begs the question of whether the fifty-nine teachers who did not
interview may have specific teacher characteristics that define this group differently from
the ten who were interviewed.

More studies need to explore mainstream teachers specifically in elementary
education and not necessarily language teachers (who are typically in secondary
education); this research will broaden the sample and methodological diversity beyond
language teachers. Furthermore, exploring the complex relationship between teachers’
beliefs and actual practices can highlight teachers’ educational processes and goals and
more fully address issues associated with HLM. Teachers can move away from the belief
that language teaching is useless by infusing heritage language accommodations into
their curriculum without restructuring the whole curriculum.

*Heritage Language Accommodations*

There are several strategies of accommodation that will aid students who have a
heritage language background. Consideration must be given to the multiple factors that
influence decisions in using accommodations at the personal (i.e., time usage, efficacy),
educational (i.e., heritage language spoken in the classroom, demand for test preparation),
and societal levels (i.e., availability of resources, social value of language). Many
teachers have cited hindrances to accommodating students who have a heritage language background, as well as sources of information from which accommodations came (Karathanos, 2010). Based on 227 Midwestern teachers and their input on surveys and course documents, Karathanos (2010) highlighted culturally responsive strategies and hindrances in carrying out those strategies. Most notably, teachers with more ELL preparation indicated more strategies that addressed the native language in instruction.

One simple yet ideal technique is for teachers to provide interesting reading materials in the heritage language to the student (McQuillan, 1996). Materials like comic books, magazines, stories and novels that have been found to be enjoyable and comprehensible (i.e., dual language in English and in the heritage language) should be utilized among students who have a heritage language background. If materials like dual-language books are not available, teachers should consult students and parents who speak a heritage language in creating books (Peterson & Heywood, 2007).

Students can create dual language books by using translation from their heritage language into the new language (i.e., English) (Cummins, 2005). If teachers do not speak the heritage language, there are a number of ways parents and teachers can work together to create books by translating books written by students, publishing books, or at the very least creating a page of text in the heritage language and in English (Peterson & Heywood, 2007). Another venue for access to print is religious worship settings like Catholic Churches and Buddhist temples where the HL was used. Such reading materials like the Bible, missals, hymnals, books of teachings and chants, and prayer cards account for one of the greatest means of access to HL print beyond the home (Tse, 2001a). If given unlimited resources, teachers should also consider the four predictors of heritage
language competence: parents’ use of the heritage language, reading, watching TV in the heritage language, and visiting the country of the heritage language (Cho, Shin, & Krashen, 2004). While some resources (i.e., Bible, missals, etc.) are not allowed in schools and most of these activities are outside the school’s reach (i.e., travel abroad), teachers can still suggest and recommend such activities and resources to parents. One cautionary consideration is the time investment, based on the complexity of the heritage language and coordinating work with parents and students outside the classroom. Although tracking down diverse reading materials or creating reading materials could be time-consuming, this accommodation has limitless benefits for students to create literature or art to explore issues relevant to them, their culture, or their communities (Cummins, 2005).

Besides content material, accommodations in terms of groupings and class structure can reduce one of the stressors of language usage among students who have a heritage language background. Teachers who read books with students and discuss the readings with the parents can provide a source of security for immigrant and refugee students by demonstrating that teachers are willing to attend to their needs (McBrien, 2005). In preventing one stressful environment due to language fear, among other factors, classrooms should not combine low proficiency and high level speakers together because of their diverse needs. More insight must be gained from all levels of speakers before putting them together in cooperative groups. A class structure of slowly adding heritage language accommodations may prove better in language arts classroom (Webb, 2000). This structure should take into account the fact that students do not learn best in one universal fashion like the sink-or-swim immersion of English instruction but would
respond better to individual instruction in which teachers personalize accommodations to students with specific heritage language needs. Without the focus of teaching heritage language literacy, teachers can present a topic of relevance to the class for the first ten minutes. Then for the majority of the class time, teachers can assign independent leveled reading. During that time, the teacher confers with individual students to identify specific needs the students have. The class then ends with a whole group discussion of the students’ reading experiences and goals (Webb, 2000). This feasible scenario can make it possible for teachers to assess, using checklists or mind maps for students who have a heritage language background while promoting a non-threatening environment (Lenski et al., 2006).

There are two caveats with groupings and class structure in particular. The first caveat is that general education teachers cannot teach literacy, even though the class structure is built on individualizing students’ accommodations. Although most general education teachers are limited in their skills to teach or assess heritage language, multicultural reforms were accommodated more easily to the cultural than the linguistic diversity of students, based on a four year study of literacy (Lenski et al., 2006; Datnow et al., 2003). Independent reading and additional reading activities can be replaced with student-parent-created materials or lessons with bilingual parents to provide linguistic assistance. The second caveat is that No Child Left Behind does not allow teachers the freedom to deeply explore students’ speaking skills for specific groupings, much less provide individualized instruction. Standardized testing under No Child Left Behind requires whole class instruction to increase test scores among all students. The demand for test preparation may have more importance over the social value of the heritage
language. In the long run, tapping into students’ preexisting knowledge, like their heritage language, through individualized instruction and careful groupings should improve the language skills of students who have a heritage language background more readily than strategies that ignore the heritage language of the student (Datnow et al., 2003; Cummins, 2005).

To tap into the development of a heritage language as well as teachers’ knowledge of English, one must also look to the strategies used in a bilingual classroom. One strategy is paying attention to the cognate relationships (“items of vocabulary in two languages which have the same roots and can be recognized as such,” Holmes & Ramos, 1993, p.88) across languages (i.e., English and other Romance languages like Spanish or French) (Holmes & Ramos). Students may think of what words mean in their first language (i.e., compensación) and successfully guess the meaning of the equivalent word in the second language (i.e., compensation) (Lenski et al., 2006). Among seventy-four Spanish and English literate upper elementary students who were tested for vocabulary knowledge in Spanish and English, students were aware of cognates and made some use of Spanish knowledge in reading English. Nagy (1992) suggested that students would benefit from explicit instruction on languages’ cognate relationship to increase English expository comprehension. However, there are some difficulties in using cognition relationships, especially with Mandarin, Korean, Arabic, etc.

The implication is teachers have to know both languages in order to teach cognates. However, Cummins (2005) pointed out that a teacher in a regular classroom does not have to know Spanish, because most of the English words come from Latin and Greek. Cognate relationships can be easily found among Romance languages, while
finding similarities among other languages, such as Mandarin, may be difficult without extensive research. An extension of finding cognate relationships is finding similar meanings (Cummingham & Graham, 2000; Rodriguez, 2007). Cross language transfer can take place between the heritage language and English, particularly with individual words (“transform”; “transformar”) and suffix morphology (“city”; “cuidad”) (Hancin-Bhatt & Nagy, 1993). Consideration must also be given to teachers on a personal level. If a teacher does not know how to find cognate relationships in the heritage language and English or define the uses of cognate/loan word usage (Mugford, 2008), the teacher will have a difficult time implementing this strategy. If the teacher is having difficulties with producing cognate relationships, the teacher can seek help to create or assess from parents who are fluent in the heritage language or bilingual paraprofessionals from their local or state resource centers (Lenski et al., 2006). Although there are conflicting ways of defining cognates, in addition to the difficulty in accessing resources, the benefits of cognate relationships are wide-ranging, including increasing students’ confidence on how much they already know, embracing the notion that English is not strange, and improving vocabulary and production strategies.

In conclusion, many of these accommodations have advantages for students but disadvantages in implementation. The justification to apply practical heritage language solutions in the mainstream classroom is still mired in a politically driven educational landscape. Due to the historical prejudice against languages other than English (Cho, Shin, & Krashen, 2004), teachers may reflect negative mainstream views influenced by their teacher education program, which lacks diverse field experiences. To understand the impact of teachers’ views, research is needed to explore the interaction of teachers’
beliefs and classroom practices. The complex nature of beliefs and issues associated with accommodations can reveal a telling story about the extent of general education teachers’ practice of accommodating students who have a heritage language background.

Summary

The literature review began with how heritage languages in the US have evolved and led to the status debate between minority and majority languages. Despite the xenophobic discourse about language diversity, academic conferences and language programs (i.e., second/foreign language programs, bilingual education) have addressed language loss, language shift, and negative mainstream views. However, due to the current high stakes testing and ‘English only’ propositions, language programs were cut, leaving general education teachers to teach an increasing population of students who have a heritage language background. Teachers are left to their own devices based on the limited pedagogical resources from inadequate teacher education programs. Teachers who were trained in ESL or bilingual education or tutored ELL students were more likely to support heritage language instruction. The underlying factors supporting teachers’ educational processes and goals in terms of HLM may include the relationship between cognitive change (i.e., beliefs) and behavioral change (i.e., accommodations), as this relationship relates to background information. Disentangling the belief system may be the key to uncovering the tasks and cognitive tools that allow all teachers to interpret, plan, and make decisions. To increase internal validity, different forms of data (i.e., surveys and observation checklists) were used to capture teachers’ language perceptions and pedagogy. Pedagogy or accommodations, as they relate to general education teachers, can take the form of heritage language reading materials, student-teacher-parent
produced text, classroom groupings, individualized instruction, and cognate relationships. Consequently, many of these accommodations are plagued by accessibility issues, time investment, diverse needs, lack of skills teaching literacy, and degree of difference between English and the heritage language. In the end, these accommodations are beneficial for students to increase their linguistic and cognitive development and ultimately become bilingual citizens of the U.S.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

Overview

The purpose of this study is to examine how elementary school general education teachers view heritage language learning and teaching, and accommodate students who have a heritage language background. The survey (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.1) used for this study was adapted from Benefits of Heritage Language for Schooling Scale, Personal Benefits of Heritage Language Scale, Attitudes of Bilingualism Scale, Importance of English-only Scale (Lee & Oxelson, 2006), and the Language Attitudes of Teachers Scale (Boyd, 2000). The observation checklist (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.3) used for this study was based on the following sources: an available elementary/middle school Scale of Foreign Language Teacher’s Perspective (Fortune, 2000), A Statement of Shared Goals and Fundamental Beliefs to Promote Heritage Languages (Scalera, 2000), and Classroom Techniques when a Teacher is not Fluent (Hinton, 2003). Surveys and ninety observations were completed by thirty elementary teachers who taught during the 2010-2011 school year. The reliability and validity of the instruments used and the analysis of the six research questions were addressed.
Participants

Upon approval from the Ball State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) (Refer to Appendix B), an application was completed and sent to school corporations in Indiana for recruitment of elementary school general education teachers (grades 1-3) in South Bend and Chicago. South Bend and Chicago were chosen because both communities are metropolitan, urban, and Midwestern locales with varying ethnic distributions for the Hispanic population (11.0-27.3%) and Asian/Native American population (1.3-5.2%) (2009). Following the approval from South Bend Community Schools Corporation (SBCSC) and Chicago Public Schools (CPS) (Refer to Appendix C), all principals of access and interest were contacted. All principals from South Bend Community Schools Corporation were contacted (19). Principals of interest from Chicago Public Schools included schools from North/Central, NorthWest, and the Westside, because the North/Central (60625) district had the most diversity in the U.S., as claimed by one teacher; the NorthWest (60634) had a high Hispanic population; and the Westside (60651) had notable access to teachers of interest (elementary school general education teachers). Random selection was not enforced, because this sample size depends on the willingness of the contacted teachers to participate in the study.

As the target sample, thirty teachers from ten schools consented to completing one survey and three observations. Five teachers taught in SBCSC and twenty-five teachers taught in CPS. Participants were teachers of grades 1-3 who had students who have a heritage language background. Participants answered almost all the background items, including listing their years of teaching experience and which languages they studied or spoke fluently. Of these participants, twenty-nine were female (96.7%) and
one was male (3.3%), which reflects the percentages in the field of education (Martino, 2008). The age range is 26 to 63 years among twenty-six participants (86.6%), with an average of 30.3 years. The years of teaching experience range from one to thirty-two years, with an average of 12.3 years. The years of teaching students who speak a heritage range from zero to thirty-two years, with an average of 10.3 years. Grades taught in the past include first grade among four participants (13.3%) and second grade among two participants (6.7%). Eighteen participants (60.0%) were Caucasian or of European descent (i.e., Romanian) See Table 2.1 for ethnicity breakdown among participants.

Table 2.1

Ethnicity of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial/Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian (including self-referential)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Canadian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German/Scottish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian/Lithuanian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (Latin American; including self-referential)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Puerto Rican      3       10.0
Colombian         1       3.3
African American  3       10.0
Korean American   1       3.3

Participants were asked to report their years of language use and study and the language(s) spoken fluently and studied in school. The years of studying a language other than English range from two years to twenty-five years among nine participants (63.3%) with an average of 4.9 years. The years of speaking a language other than English range from two years to forty-five years (60.0%), with an average of 13.1 years. See Table 2.2 for the frequency and percentages of the languages spoken fluently and studied academically. The language that nine participants (30.0%) spoke fluently was Spanish. The language that nineteen participants (63.3%) studied the most was Spanish, while six participants (20.0%) studied French.

Table 2.2

Language Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoken fluently (total below)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native speakers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native speakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were asked to respond to conditions that might relate to beliefs and use of heritage language accommodations. Fifteen participants (50.0%) thought their teacher education program introduced heritage language learning/teaching. Twenty participants (66.7%) had parents or family members who spoke a language other than English. Of these participants, the number of family members who spoke a language other than English ranged from one to five with an average number of 1.7 relatives. Including participants who had parents who spoke a language other than English as well as participants who didn’t have parents who spoke a language other than English, thirteen participants (43.3%) had parents who expressed interest in bilingualism.

Of the thirty participants, twenty-two participants were elementary school general education teachers and eight participants were bilingual/special education teachers. Although the projected sample targeted thirty elementary school general education teachers, eight bilingual teachers and one special education teacher were suggested by the principal and were willing to participate. These eight teachers who were willing to
participate were welcomed, because their responses gave invaluable insight into how elementary school general education teachers’ responses compare. Since most studies of heritage language maintenance (HLM) are conducted on language teachers, this study provides a novel approach by focusing on elementary school general education teachers using surveys and observations.

Procedure

Over the course of two to three weeks from April to June 2011, participants completed one survey and participated in three observations. All the observations involve the researcher observing a class session of about thirty minutes. Participants received a hard copy of the survey and consent forms with a random code after the first observation session was completed. To ensure confidentiality, participant names and addresses were not used at any time throughout the study. After agreeing to the informed consent form (Refer to Appendix D), participants completed the survey, which only required approximately 10-20 minutes, at their own convenience. The survey was administered in person and collected on the last day of the observations. Extra hard copies of the survey were available just in case the teacher may have forgotten to complete the survey.

Each participant was observed for the length of a class session (thirty minutes) three times over the span of three weeks (thirty minute observations per week) so that students and participants could acclimate to the presence of the researcher, particularly in the first week (Mertens, 2010). Each participant’s classroom consisted of a range of one to twenty-eight students who have a heritage language background, with a mean of 10.86 students and a mode of three students (five teachers had three students who have a
heritage language background). In some cases, even though the ideal spread of observations is one observation per week, observations (of one teacher) were scheduled twice in one day or twice in one week, based on teachers’ availability. There were a total of thirty-six days of observations, with a range of one to six observations per day and an average of three observations per day ($M = 2.5$). Observations were recorded using the “checklist of accommodations” and the checklist was used for analysis. Dichotomous coding and comments about specific classroom resources and activities were reported to provide evidence and support for HLM in the classroom. Behaviors that qualified as accommodations included how teachers implement strategies that recognize and build upon resources and assets that students who have a heritage language background bring to school, based on a checklist of general accommodations (Brisk et al., 2002; Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.3). If the behavior was present in the classroom, the type of accommodation was checked “observed” in the observation checklist. The researcher embraced an “invisible” role (complete observation design) and did not participate in discussing (i.e., giving advice on) current activities with teachers, so as to not influence the teacher’s classroom. Each teacher who agreed to do the survey participated in a total of three observations (30 teachers = 90 observations). All data gathered from the survey and observations were used to answer six research questions and to ensure no confounding variables as far as the researcher knows went unexamined.

**Survey**

The purpose of the survey was to elicit factual information about teachers’ background, history with language learning and their personal beliefs about the negative and positive aspects of heritage language learning and teaching (Refer to Appendix A,
To elaborate on teachers’ history of language learning and personal beliefs, forty-three items of background information (28), which include open ended items (5) and Likert items (15), were used from the Benefits of Heritage Language for Schooling Scale, Personal Benefits of Heritage Language Scale, Attitudes of Bilingualism Scale, Importance of English-only Scale (Lee & Oxelson, 2006), and the Language Attitudes of Teachers Scale (Boyd, 2000).

Based on the responses from 154 participants (pilot test), exploratory factor analysis with extracting principal components generated the four factors used in this study: positive beliefs about heritage language learning, positive beliefs about heritage language teaching, negative beliefs about heritage language learning, and negative beliefs heritage language teaching (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.1). As a reminder, heritage language learning and heritage language teaching are shorthand expressions to label belief categories: positive beliefs about heritage language learning, positive beliefs about heritage language teaching, negative beliefs about heritage language learning, and negative beliefs about heritage language teaching. Heritage language learning focuses on students when teachers incorporate multicultural and multilingual inclusion in a non-judgmental and open classroom, also known as heritage language teaching. Positive beliefs about heritage language learning include items like *I believe bilingualism is a skill to be learned at home*. Positive beliefs about heritage language teaching include items like *I believe teachers should encourage students to maintain their heritage language*. Negative beliefs about heritage language learning include *I believe everyone in this country should speak English and only English*. Negative beliefs about heritage language teaching include *I believe general education teachers who do not understand their*
students’ heritage languages will not be able to assess students who have a heritage language background (Refer to Lenski, 2006, for more information on how mainstream teachers can assess ELL students using performance based assessment). An additional item will be added to address one of the research questions, the item I value heritage language maintenance in the class I teach.

A total of five open-ended items were featured in the survey and were elicited as background information. Three open-ended items asked participants to describe their multicultural exposure/experience, their reactions to their multicultural exposure/experiences, and the impact this exposure/experience has on their teaching. Two open-ended items addressed two of the research questions, which asked participants to describe the accommodations used in meeting the needs of students who have a heritage language background, the sources of their information, the reasons they use these strategies, and the institutional support provided to teachers to enable them to incorporate accommodations, if applicable.

Classroom Observations

The purpose of the observation is to document a checklist of behaviors that represent positive beliefs about heritage language learning and positive beliefs about heritage language teaching. Most importantly, the observation provided a concrete categorical basis in relation to what teachers believe (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.3). The underlying rationale is based on the notion that cognitive change translates to behavioral change (Borg, 2006; Pajares, 1992). Thus, the observation checklist is a useful tool to highlight implicit beliefs enacted in the classroom. Ultimately, this technique
clarifies the relationship between accommodations and beliefs and addresses the potential conflict of idealized theories of self that are embedded in surveys (Carspecken, 1996).

The checklist of observed accommodations (26 total) was adapted from an available elementary/middle school scale of foreign language teacher’s perspective (Fortune, 2000), a statement of shared goals and fundamental beliefs to promote heritage languages (Scalera, 2000), and classroom techniques when a teacher is not fluent (Hinton, 2003). Each item on the teacher’s belief survey is matched to observable accommodations in the checklist to the best of the researcher’s ability. The item *I believe the maintenance of the heritage language is important for the student's identity* was matched with *Encourages students to actively engage in exploring and discovering the richness of their linguistic and cultural heritage*. One item, *I value heritage language maintenance in the class I teach*, was not matched to a behavioral strategy, because a number of behaviors or strategies cannot capture this item directly without explicit interpretation. Only by asking the participants directly can this item be validated.

**Sampling Strategy**

In order to obtain a robust sample size, this research study required convenience and snowball sampling. Convenience sampling consisted of having CPS teachers readily available after the study was approved. Snowball sampling involved one teacher informant who recommended other teachers in her school. In March 2011, based on an online database list of SBCSC and CPS schools, each principal of access and interest was contacted via e-mail or by phone to determine whether the study, consisting of survey and observations, could be done. If principals did not respond by email or by phone, visits to the school were conducted to deliver a letter to the principal describing the
background information on the researcher and her research (Refer to Appendix E), a letter of approval from SBCSC or CPS (Refer to Appendix C), and informed consent forms for teachers (Refer to Appendix D). If the principal expressed interest in the study, the principal would inform the researcher to contact teachers of interest. In some cases, the principals would send the researcher to visit teachers of interest by herself, with an administrator, or with the principal herself. In other cases, the researcher was sent to the teachers’ lunch room where presentations about the study, observation visits, and survey protocol took place or to each of the teachers’ classrooms with the support of one teacher informant known by the researcher. After brief discussions with teachers interested in the study and once teachers agreed to participate in the study, three observations were scheduled accordingly. Informed consent was presented and available on site before the first observation and before giving the survey.

Data Analysis

Certain measurements were taken in order to ensure the results of this study were reliable and valid for future comparisons. Cronbach’s alpha was used to discuss testing reliability for surveys. Cohen’s kappa ensured validity for classroom observations. Changes were made to the survey and observation checklist after the focus group. The analysis plan consisted of the six research questions with matched statistical analyses, including MANOVA and DDA.

*Internal Consistency Reliability (Survey)*

Reliability is defined as the consistency of scores obtained from one administration of the survey to another. Pilot studies were conducted to investigate the reliability of the instrument and clarity of the content. For the current study, measuring
reliability with thirty participants could decrease the probability of accurately measuring Cronbach’s alpha, a measure for internal consistency. Based on a previous sample of 154 pre-service, non-language teachers, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with extracting principal components was used to identify four factors in accordance with the scree plot (factor loadings above .347). The responses from that sample were analyzed and produced a Cronbach’s alpha of .867, which surpassed the acceptable value for a reliable scale. Further evaluations of the survey instrument were done with three additional expert reviewers. Their suggestions for improvements were adapted to yield a clear and comprehensible survey.

*Inter-rater Reliability (Classroom Observations)*

In order to ensure inter-rater reliability of the observation checklist instrument, peer briefing was utilized to compare reports from simultaneous observations (Cho & Trent, 2006, as cited by Merten, 2010). The researcher and an outside volunteer participated in two observations. Before the first observation, the outside volunteer underwent a brief training about terms and definitions of behaviors that relate to accommodations. Across the two observations, a range of 81% to 85% (21-22) of twenty-six accommodations were marked the same way between the researcher and volunteer, surpassing the proposed inter-rater reliability score of 80%. An extension of the percentages, Cohen’s kappa was designed to correct for the possibility of change in agreement between the two raters. Based on the guidelines for intersecting K and strength, agreement between the researcher and the volunteer was good for observation one (K = .615) and moderate for observation two (K = .538). Observation one (p = .002) and
observation two \( (p = .005) \) were significant \( (p < .05) \), and thus these results are valid and not due to chance alone.

**Content Related Validity (Focus group)**

Validity is defined as being able to draw appropriate conclusions based on data. The purpose of the focus group is to test the final survey and discuss some of the accommodations to ensure clarity and understanding and to seek feedback and comments. The focus group simulated the participant sampling based on teacher demographics and the ethnic distribution of the school systems. They were asked to weigh in on the survey items, whether the items were positive enough or negative enough, and some of the accommodations if the accommodations were feasible in the classroom. Their input was incorporated in the survey and observation checklist. Ultimately, this focus group provided realistic grounding to what the researcher and the experts provided, thus adding more validity to the study. A semi-structured focus group was conducted in March 2011 in a school near a Midwestern university.

**Analysis Plan**

For the research questions “What do elementary school general education teachers believe about heritage language learning, and heritage language teaching (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.1)?” descriptive statistics (i.e., percentages, means, and frequencies) were utilized to see which items teachers agreed or disagreed with the most. Level of agreement was reported using a five point Likert scale. The scale ranged from lowest to highest: Not Applicable (N/A), Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4). This analysis is appropriate to describe characteristics of the sample.
For the research question “What teacher background characteristics (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.2) relate to the positive and negative beliefs about HLM?” qualitative data analysis and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) were used to see respectively what teachers’ input was regarding multicultural experience and if there were significant differences between groups characterized by their beliefs and background characteristics. The open-ended item that addressed the research question included “Please describe in detail. Have you had any multicultural experiences (travel abroad experiencing a different culture from where you grew up)/exposure (diverse friends; neighbors with some level of interaction)? If so, what?” Roy’s largest root, the test statistic for MANOVA, was used to counter the unequal sample size among groups. Serlin’s effect was used to determine the strength of group differences beyond whether they were significant or not (Kim, 1994; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The independent variables were background characteristics that included gender, age, race/ethnicity, area of specialization, grade taught, past grades taught, years of teaching experience, school corporation, family history of speaking a foreign language, parents’ interest in bilingualism, personal history of speaking a foreign language, fluency of speaking a foreign language, teacher education program, and multicultural experience (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.2). All items on background characteristics were presented in an open-ended fashion (i.e., “What languages did you study throughout your educational career?”) or in a dichotomous fashion (i.e., “yes” or “no”). The dependent variables were beliefs that included positive beliefs about heritage language learning, positive beliefs about heritage language teaching, negative beliefs about heritage language learning, and negative beliefs about heritage language teaching (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.1).
Only results that met the assumptions of independent subjects, multivariate normality (QQ plot /Henze Zirkler-Mardia’s test) and linearity (Box’s test of equality of covariance matrix) were included. In cases where Box’s test was violated but significance was found, nonparametric MANOVA was used to test relationships between categorical variables (i.e., post-graduate degrees, ethnicity, etc.) and the shapes of distributions (i.e., rank transformation). After a successful MANOVA result, descriptive discriminant analysis (DDA) was used to follow up on which types of beliefs groups of teachers (based on background characteristics) hold and which background characteristics contributed the most to the significant difference. This analysis is appropriate to examine the linear relationship between potential numbers of independent variables as a change in the dependent variables.

For the research questions “What accommodations do elementary school general education teachers typically use to assist students who have a heritage language background in the general education classroom?” qualitative data analysis and descriptive statistics (i.e., percentages, means, and frequencies) were utilized to see what teachers’ input regarding accommodations and which accommodations were most tallied. The open-ended item that addressed the research question included “Please describe in the space below and state the source of any strategies, techniques, or materials you have used in meeting the needs of students who have a heritage language background in your classroom.” Grounded Theory based on inductive and en vivo coding was used to identify themes based on teachers’ written responses and constantly build and reshape hypotheses as more analyses were completed. As in Bernand’s (2006) methods, becoming grounded in the data will promote a deeper understanding that is closely tied to
the study of the text and address preconceived notions from research that may not align with the responses from real world teachers. Qualitative responses were categorized and coded to five thematic categories. Participants’ responses were assigned to more than one category. Descriptive statistics utilized the following ratings from the observation checklist: Not observed (0), Observed (1). These analyses are appropriate to describe the accommodations used.

For the research question “Why do elementary school general education teachers choose to either utilize or not utilize certain accommodations?” qualitative analysis was implemented. The open-ended items that addressed the research question included “Please describe in the space below and state the source of any strategies, techniques, or materials you have used in meeting the needs of students who have a heritage language background in your classroom. Why you use them or why you don’t use them?” Responses were categorized and coded according to seven themes from the data.

For the research question “What institutional support is provided for teachers who accommodate (i.e. time, materials, visiting native speakers, etc.)?” qualitative analysis was implemented. The open-ended items that addressed the research questions included “If you do use accommodations to assist students who have a heritage language background, what institutional support is provided for you (i.e., more time, materials, access to native speakers)?” Responses were categorized, assigned into more than one category, and coded according to seven themes from the data.

For the research question “What is the relationship between beliefs from the survey and accommodations in the classroom in relation to HLM?” MANOVA was used to see if there were significant differences between groups of teachers characterized by
accommodations and their beliefs. Roy’s largest root was used to counter the unequal sample size among groups. Serlin’s effect was used when significance was not detected in MANOVA. The independent variables were twenty-six accommodations (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.3). The dependent variables were beliefs, which included positive beliefs about heritage language learning, positive beliefs about heritage language teaching, negative beliefs about heritage about language learning, and negative beliefs about heritage language teaching (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.1). Considering the sample size of thirty participants, there were some issues with functionality of analyses. If only a few participants marked a couple of the accommodations, then analyses could not be run, because the number of participants marking each accommodation (independent variables) must be larger than or similar to the number of beliefs (dependent variables), which is only four. Furthermore, the varying number of participants to accommodations would exacerbate the variance of the dependent variables and the correlation within groups. In these cases where Box’s test was violated but significance was found, nonparametric MANOVA was used to test relationships between categorical variables (i.e., post-graduate degrees, ethnicity, etc.), shapes of distributions (i.e., rank transformation) and normality of distributions (Box’s test of equality of covariance).

Summary

The methodology began with a brief description of the participants and the procedure for administering the survey and conducting the observations. The instruments were then discussed regarding their sources and how they were used. To assess internal consistency (reliability) of the survey, Cronbach’s alpha determined an acceptable value for a reliable scale. To assess inter-rater reliability of the observation checklist,
percentages and Cohen’s kappa determined a moderate to good agreement between the researcher and the volunteer. Finally, the analysis plan of the six research questions included descriptive statistics, MANOVA, DDA, and qualitative analysis based on grounded theory to explore the complex relationship between beliefs and accommodations.
CHAPTER IV

Results

Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine how elementary education general education teachers view heritage language learning and teaching and accommodate students who have a heritage language background. Descriptive statistics, MANOVA, DDA, and qualitative analysis based on grounded theory were utilized to assess Teachers’ Beliefs of Heritage Language Maintenance Survey and observation checklist. Descriptive statistics (i.e., percentages, means, and frequencies) denoted the level of agreement and disagreement of beliefs, presence of accommodations, and frequency of accommodations. MANOVA differentiated the types of beliefs participants would have about heritage language maintenance (HLM), based on their background characteristics and accommodations. DDA determined the direction of association on the types of beliefs teachers hold.
Question #1: Survey Data Analysis and Results

What do elementary school general education teachers believe about positive and negative beliefs about heritage language learning and heritage language teaching (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.1)?

Based on frequencies, the majority of participants strongly agreed with positive beliefs about heritage language learning and strongly disagreed with negative beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching, with the following trends. Around fifty percent of participants strongly agreed that bilingualism is a skill to be learned at school (40%) and that teachers could assist HLM if they were taught how to accommodate students in a general education setting (60%). Thirty-seven percent of participants agreed or strongly agreed and over thirteen percent of participants disagreed or strongly disagreed on whether monolingual teachers can foster multiliteracy. Disagreement patterns follow participants who strongly disagreed that students should leave their heritage language and culture behind when they step into the classroom (90%) and that everyone in this country should speak English (70%). See Table 3.1 for the estimated percentages of the level of agreement according to respondents, based on frequencies of Likert stems. For example, eighty percent of the participants strongly agreed that knowledge of the heritage language is valuable for the students’ identity.
Table 3.1

Positive and Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning and Heritage Language Teaching (Frequencies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Percent in Response Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the heritage language is valuable for the students’ identity.</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The maintenance of the heritage language is valuable for strong family ties.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingualism is a skill to be learned at school</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is valuable to be multilingual in our society.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should encourage students to maintain their heritage language.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers can assist heritage language maintenance if teachers were taught how to accommodate students in a general education setting.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should allow students to share their heritage language and culture with every opportunity.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should maintain the heritage language throughout the school year.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers value heritage language maintenance.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone in this country should speak only English.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Code1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools should only allow English to be spoken in the classroom.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a heritage language prevents students from fully assimilating into this society.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monolingual teachers cannot foster multiliteracy since they are not multiliterate.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should leave their heritage language and culture behind when they step into the classroom.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers who do not understand their students’ heritage languages will not be able to assist students who have a heritage language background.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question # 2: Survey Data Analysis and Results**

*What teacher background characteristics (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.2) relate to the positive and negative beliefs about HLM?*

Based on MANOVA and DDA, teachers’ subject area of specialization (1) and teachers’ indication of HL strategies, techniques, and methods determined the types of beliefs teachers would have about HLM. Out of twenty-nine items of background characteristics, twenty-six background characteristics, most notably multicultural experiences, were not statistically significant with positive and negative beliefs about HLM (not significant $p > .05$). Based on qualitative data, sixteen Caucasian teachers out of thirty teachers cited one or more multicultural experiences in their lifetimes, but only
twelve teachers listed accommodations used (Refer to Appendix F). Fifteen Caucasian teachers believed their multicultural experiences had an impact on their teaching (Refer to Appendix F). Based on Serlin’s effect, over a hundred percent in beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching account for the difference in scores, whether participants studied a language other than English in school or not. The lowest Serlin’s effect of less than .001 in beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching accounted for the difference in scores based on age, years of teaching, and years of teaching students who have a heritage language background. In terms of the lowest Serlin’s effect size, there were too many divisions in age, years of teaching and years of teaching students who have a heritage language background that skewed the strength of contributing to group differences. See Table 3.2 for $p$ values and Serlin’s effect sizes of significant and non-significant background characteristics.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$p$ Value</th>
<th>Serlin’s Effect Size ($\omega$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject area of specialization</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL strategies, techniques, and methods</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School corporation</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of relatives who speak a foreign language</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who have parents who expressed interest in bilingualism</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>t-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education introduced heritage language learning or methods</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher degree or postgraduate studies</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language studied throughout education</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of studying a foreign language</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of speaking a language other than English</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural experiences</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of multicultural experiences on teaching</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>&lt;.01*</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching students who have a heritage language background</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Heritage language</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Heritage language</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English studied in education (first)</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>17.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent in language other than English (first)</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Characteristic</td>
<td>Significance Level (p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English studied in education (second)</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent in language other than English (second)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second subject area of specialization</td>
<td>.025*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of study of second subject area taught</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of study of first subject area taught</td>
<td>.039*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade taught for the school year 2010-2011</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Grades taught</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant despite the fact that Box’s M was not met or carried out.

Based on nonparametric MANOVA, seven background characteristics were not statistically associated with beliefs. Six background characteristics were statistically associated with beliefs but Box’s Test of Equality of Covariance matrices were not computed due to presence of fewer than two nonsingular cell covariance matrices. Nonparametric MANOVA replicated significant p values of MANOVA in only four background characteristics (ethnicity, age, years of teaching, and years of teaching students who have a heritage language background). Overall, since MANOVA and the nonparametric MANOVA results did not meet the linearity assumption (Box’s M) and achieve significance (p > .05), the robustness of the results are questionable. See Table 3.3 for Box’s M values and p values of potentially significant background characteristics (based on the previous MANOVA analysis).
Table 3.3

*Background Characteristics that were Not Associated with the Positive and Negative Beliefs about HLM (nonparametric MANOVA)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Box’s M</th>
<th>p  Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of relatives who speak a foreign language</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher degree or postgraduate studies</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of studying a foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of speaking a language other than English</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural experiences</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of multicultural experiences on teaching</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching students who have a heritage language background</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second subject area of specialization</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of study of first subject area taught</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Box’s M test cannot be calculated.
According to MANOVA results, subject area of specialization \[ F(9, 20) = 3.30, p = .013, \omega = .56 \], school corporation \[ F(4, 25) = 3.07, p = .035, \omega = .11 \], and HL strategies, techniques, and methods \[ F(4, 20) = 3.52, p = .03, \omega = .09 \] significantly differentiated the types of beliefs participants would have about heritage language maintenance. A descriptive discriminant function analysis was performed to investigate differences among subject areas, school corporations, and whether a teacher indicated HL strategies or not (independent variables). The discriminant function for subject areas revealed a significant association between groups and positive beliefs about heritage learning and teaching, accounting for 59.75% of between group variability. Based on the structure matrix, negative beliefs about heritage language teaching and learning (.769) and positive beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching (.754) maximized the relative importance of the independent variables. Classification showed that over 56.7% were correctly classified. The discriminant function for whether a teacher indicated HL strategies or not revealed a significant association between groups and positive beliefs about heritage language teaching, accounting for 41.99% of between-group variability. Based on the structure matrix, positive beliefs about heritage language teaching and learning maximized the relative importance of the independent variables (.769). The cross-validated classification showed an overall 83.3% were correct. The discriminant function for school corporations revealed a significant association between groups and negative beliefs about heritage language teaching and learning accounting for 32.94% of between-group variability. Based on the structure matrix, negative beliefs about heritage language teaching and learning maximized the relative importance of the independent variables (.623). The cross-validated classification showed that 83.3% were correctly
classified. Group means, as shown in Table 3.4, displays the level of agreement across the various background characteristics.

Table 3.4

*Levels of Agreement for Beliefs about HLM across Background Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Characteristics</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education*</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language*</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education*</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HL strategies, techniques, or methods</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL Strategies, techniques, or methods</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chicago Public Schools</th>
<th>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</th>
<th>3.59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Bend Community Schools Corporation</th>
<th>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</th>
<th>3.65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Only subject areas of specialization with factors of the highest contribution to beliefs were cited.

Based on the most contribution to relative importance among the factors (Table 3.4), participants who studied to be general education teachers moderately agreed with beliefs about heritage language teaching and learning ($M = 3.81$), more than participants who specialized in English as a second language ($M = 3.00$) or special education ($M = 3.75$). Participants who specialized in English as a second language ($M = 2.00$) or in special education ($M = 2.00$) disagreed with negative beliefs about heritage language teaching more than participants who studied to be general education teachers ($M = 1.64$). Participants who did not indicate HL strategies, techniques, or materials (i.e., flexible groupings, books on tape) tended to agree with positive beliefs about heritage language
teaching and learning ($M = 3.72$) more than participants who indicated HL strategies ($M = 3.56$). Participants from South Bend ($M = 1.87$) strongly disagreed with negative beliefs about HLM more than participants from Chicago ($M = 1.71$). A little over half, or fifty-six percent, in beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching accounted for the difference in scores based on what specialty teachers teach. Eleven percent in beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching accounted for differences in scores based on where teachers taught. Nine percent in beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching accounted for the differences in scores based on strategies, techniques, or materials for students who have a heritage language background. Overall, the majority of participants indicated agreement for positive beliefs about HLM and disagreement for negative beliefs about HLM based on knowledge of HLM through the area of specialization or the experience of learning over time.

Question # 3: Qualitative and Observation Data Analysis and Results

What accommodations (Refer to Appendix A, Table 1.3) do elementary school general education teachers typically use in the general education classroom to assist students who have a heritage language background?

There is a contrast between what participants indicated with regard to accommodations and what was observed of those participants. A high majority of participants (73.3%) provided input on various accommodations, but on average, participants were observed using six out of twenty-six accommodations. Based on qualitative data, the majority of participants ($n = 10$) stated accommodations involving bilingual students that included the following responses: sharing culture and language, reading in flexible groupings, bilingual families assisting in the classroom, bilingual
teachers working with general education teachers. Numerous participants also highlighted the use of multi-modal accommodations like books on tape (n = 6); HL literature like ELL textbooks (n = 6); teaching methods like reading and speaking in the heritage language (n = 6); and authentic materials like crafts (n = 5). See further qualitative data in the Appendix F.

Most participants were not observed exercising accommodations that reflect positive beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching. On average, participants used at most six out of twenty-six accommodations at more than fifty percent of participants’ three observations. Of all the observed accommodations, most participants created a non-threatening learning environment (93%) and used body language, the physical response (teacher enacts behavior while saying the action), realia (authentic materials including mass media, i.e., newspaper), visuals, and manipulatives to communicate meaning (90%). No participants were observed extending students’ language repertoires by teaching synonyms and antonyms, structural similarities and differences between HL and target language (i.e., contrastive analysis) (100%), or helping students to recognize the uses and purposes of their heritage language both in their immediate environment and in a global society (100%). Some participants did not use authentic songs, poems, literature, rhymes, or artifacts to teach language and culture (97%) or teach story-telling using units, simple sentences, or the heritage language recording of the story (97%). Overall, non-observed accommodations outweigh observed accommodations across classrooms. See Table 3.3 for the percentages of accommodations present or not present in teachers’ classrooms based on frequencies.
For example, seventy percent of participants were seen to encourage students to actively engage in exploring and discovering the richness of their linguistic and cultural heritage.

---- Table 3.5

**Accommodations to Assist Students who have a Heritage Language Background (Frequencies)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodations</th>
<th>Percent in Observed Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher encourages students to actively engage in exploring and discovering the richness of their linguistic and cultural heritage.</td>
<td>Not Observed: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses language skills and cultural experiences that students bring with them as an integral part of instruction.</td>
<td>Not Observed: 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses authentic songs, poems, literature, rhymes, or artifacts to teach language and culture.</td>
<td>Not Observed: 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher solicits and draws upon prior knowledge (i.e., reference to last week’s topic or chapter) and experiences with new themes.</td>
<td>Not Observed: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher recognizes diverse learner needs based on linguistic and cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>Not Observed: 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is sensitive to the cultural backgrounds of students &amp; incorporates those cultures into his/her instruction.</td>
<td>Not Observed: 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is accommodating to the various levels of language proficiency in English and in heritage language.</td>
<td>Not Observed: 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher invites native speakers of the heritage language to participate in the classroom for assistance, vocabulary teaching.</td>
<td>Not Observed: 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher selects and adapts instructional material in HL for learners’ developmental level.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher slows down and simplifies language when developmentally appropriate.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher helps students to recognize the uses and purposes of their heritage language both in their immediate environment and in a global society.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher displays a variety of words, phrases, and written text in HL throughout the classroom and hallways.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes available a variety of target language reading and resource materials in HL such as dictionaries, thesaurus, or encyclopedia in the HL.</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher communicates and consistently reinforces clear expectations about language use in HL.</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher creates a non-threatening learning environment.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher creates opportunities and activities to assist students in noticing and producing less frequently used, accurate HL in oral and written forms.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses a variety of effective feedback techniques including elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests, repetition, recasts, explicit correction, and non-verbal cues encouraging HL.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes use of a variety of grouping techniques such as dyads, think-pair-share, and small groups to encourage HL.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses repetition and review through many different activities like hand puppets, games-Simon says, etc.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher rephrases and repeats messages in a variety of ways including in the HL.  

The teacher teaches story telling (i.e., using units, simple sentences, heritage language recording of the story).

The teacher teaches at least two new words (i.e., verbs, nouns, etc.) in HL.

The teacher incorporates phrases in the heritage language (i.e., conversational phrases like discourse markers “let’s see,” “well”).

The teacher extends students’ language repertoires by teaching synonyms and antonyms, structural similarities and differences between HL and target language (i.e., contrastive analysis).

The teacher uses body language, TPR (the physical response i.e., “stand” – rise up from chair), visuals, realia (authentic materials mass media), and manipulatives to communicate meaning.

The teacher uses output-oriented activities such as role plays, simulations, drama, debates, presentations, and hand puppets.

---

**Question # 4: Qualitative Data Analysis and Results**

**Why do elementary school general education teachers choose to either utilize or not utilize certain accommodations?**

Based on qualitative data, responses for institutional support were evaluated, given that participants did not address their reasons for accommodating or not accommodating in the classroom. Six participants (20.0%) indirectly addressed the reasons teachers utilize accommodations by responding to the level of institutional
support provided for teachers. They indicated that schools provide minimal financial support, schools do not provide dual language programs, and schools do not provide enough time for school day activities. See further qualitative data in the Appendix F.

Question #5: Qualitative Data Analysis and Results

What institutional support is provided for teachers who accommodate?

Based on qualitative data, the majority of participants cited parent volunteers, bilingual staff, native speakers and translators, and curriculum leaders as providing institutional support (n = 15). A number of participants indicated accessible instructional materials like modified work for English language learners (ELLs) (n = 14); HL reading materials like dual language dictionaries (n = 10); group flexibility in the classroom like one-on-one (n = 7); multi-sensory resources available like the Internet (n = 7); and teaching strategies like reading questions aloud (n = 5). See further qualitative data in the Appendix F.

Question #6: Relationship between Survey and Observation Data

What is the relationship between positive and negative beliefs from the survey and accommodations in the classroom with relation to HLM?

Based on MANOVA and DDA, there is a significant relationship between six accommodations and beliefs about HLM. Out of twenty-six accommodations, seventeen were not statistically significant with positive and negative beliefs about HLM (not significant p > .05). Sixty-six percent in beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching accounted for the difference in scores, whether participants were sensitive to the cultural backgrounds of students and incorporate those cultures into their instruction or not and whether participants taught at least two new words in HL or not. The lowest
Serlin’s effect of nine percent in beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching accounted for the difference in scores, whether participants extended students’ language repertoires by teaching synonyms and antonyms, structural similarities and differences between HL and target language (i.e., contrastive analysis) or not. While teachers may or may not be sensitive to cultural backgrounds or teach at least two new words in HL, there is barely any attention given to and thus little contribution to group differences in terms of using contrastive analysis. See Table 3.6 for the $p$ values and Serlin’s effect sizes of significant and non-significant accommodations.

Table 3.6

*Accommodations that were Associated and Not Associated with Positive and Negative Beliefs about HLM (MANOVA)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$p$ Value</th>
<th>Serlin’s Effect Size $(\omega)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher encourages students to actively engage in exploring and discovering the richness of their linguistic and cultural heritage.</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher recognizes diverse learner needs based on linguistic and cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is sensitive to various levels of language proficiency in English and in heritage language.</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher invites native speakers to participate in the classroom for assistance and vocabulary teaching.</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher slows down and simplifies language when developmentally appropriate.</td>
<td>.006*</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher displays a variety of words, phrases, and written text in HL throughout the classroom and hallways.</td>
<td>.033*</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes available a variety of target language reading and resource materials in HL such as dictionaries, thesauruses, or encyclopedias in the HL.</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes use of a variety of grouping techniques such as dyads, think-pair-share, or small groups to encourage HL (i.e., peer to peer).</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses body language, TPR (the physical response, i.e., “stand” – rise up from chair), visuals, realia (authentic materials mass media), and manipulatives to communicate meaning.</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses language skills and cultural experiences that students bring with them as an integral part of instruction.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses authentic songs, poems, literature, rhymes, or artifacts to teach language and culture.</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher solicits and draws upon prior knowledge (i.e., reference to last week’s topic or chapter) and experiences with new themes.</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is sensitive to the cultural backgrounds of students &amp; incorporates those cultures into their instruction.</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher selects and adapts instructional material in HL for learners’ developmental level.</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher helps students to recognize the uses of their HL both in their immediate environment and in a global society.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher communicates and consistently reinforces clear expectations about language use in HL.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher creates a non-threatening learning environment.</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher creates opportunities and activities to assist students in noticing and producing less frequently used, accurate HL in oral and written forms.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher creates opportunities and activities to assist students in noticing and producing less frequently used, accurate HL in oral and written forms.</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses a variety of effective feedback techniques including elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests, repetition, recasts, explicit correction, and non-verbal cues encouraging HL.</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses repetition and review through many different activities like hand puppets, games—Simon says, etc.</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher rephrases and repeats messages in a variety of ways including in the HL.</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher teaches story telling (i.e., using units, simple sentences, heritage language recording of the story).</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher teaches (or student teaches) at least two new words in HL (i.e., new word of the day, month etc.).</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher incorporates phrases in the heritage language (i.e., conversational phrases like discourse markers “let’s see,” “well”).</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher extends students’ language repertoires by teaching synonyms and antonyms, structural similarities and differences between HL and target language (i.e., contrastive analysis).</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher uses output-oriented activities such as role plays, simulations, drama, debates, presentations, and hand puppets.</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*: * Significant even though Box’s M was not met or carried out.

Based on nonparametric MANOVA, one accommodation was not statistically associated with beliefs. Two accommodations were statistically associated with beliefs but Box’s Test of Equality of Covariance matrices was violated ($p < .05$). Overall, since MANOVA and nonparametric MANOVA results did not meet the linearity assumption...
(Box’s M) and achieve significant \((p > .05)\), the robustness of the results are questionable.

See Table 3.7 for Box’s M values and \(p\) values of potentially significant accommodations (based on previous MANOVA analysis).

Table 3.7

*Accommodations that were Not Associated with the Positive and Negative Beliefs about HLM (nonparametric MANOVA)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Box’s M</th>
<th>(p) Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is sensitive to various levels of language proficiency in English and in heritage language.</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher slows down and simplifies language when developmentally appropriate.</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher displays a variety of words, phrases, and written text in HL throughout the classroom and hallways.</td>
<td>(&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on MANOVA results, nine accommodations significantly differentiated the type of beliefs participants would have about HLM \((p < .05)\). Based on DDA, only six accommodations were included in the final analysis. A descriptive discriminant function analysis was performed to investigate differences among six accommodations (independent variables). The discriminant function for participants who encouraged students to actively engage in their linguistic and cultural heritage or not revealed a significant association between groups and positive beliefs about heritage learning and teaching, accounting for 23.32\% of between-group variability. Based on the structure matrix, positive beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching (.767) maximized the relative importance of the independent variables. Classification showed that over
76.7% were correctly classified. The discriminant function for participants who recognized diverse learner needs or not revealed a significant association between groups and positive beliefs about heritage language teaching, accounting for 36.72% of between-group variability. Based on the structure matrix, positive beliefs about heritage language teaching and learning maximized the relative importance of the independent variables (.642). The cross-validated classification showed an overall 83.3% were correctly classified. The discriminant function for participants who invited native speakers or not revealed a significant association between groups and negative beliefs about heritage language learning, accounting for 12.18% of between-group variability. Based on the structure matrix, negative beliefs about heritage language learning maximized the relative importance of the independent variables (.930). The cross-validated classification showed an overall 73.3% were correctly classified. The discriminant function for participants who made available target language resources or not revealed a significant association between groups and negative beliefs about heritage language teaching and learning, accounting for 27.45% of between-group variability. Based on the structure matrix, negative beliefs about heritage language teaching and learning (.706) maximized the relative importance of the independent variables. The cross-validated classification showed an overall 60.0% were correctly classified. The discriminant function for participants who used grouping techniques or not revealed a significant association between groups and negative beliefs about heritage language learning, accounting for 2.56% of between-group variability. Based on the structure matrix, negative beliefs about heritage language learning maximized the relative importance of the independent variables (.718). The cross-validated classification showed an overall 83.3% were
correctly classified. The discriminant function for participants who used body language or visuals or not revealed a significant association between groups and negative beliefs about heritage language learning, accounting for 26.11% of between-group variability.

Based on the structure matrix, negative beliefs about heritage language learning maximized the relative importance of the independent variables (.570). The cross-validated classification showed an overall 83.3% were correctly classified. Group means, as shown in Table 3.8, display the level of agreement across the various accommodations.

Table 3.8

Levels of Agreement for Beliefs about HLM across Accommodations (Descriptive Statistics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodations</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher encourages students to actively engage in exploring and discovering the richness of their linguistic and cultural heritage.</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher did not encourage students to actively engage in exploring and discovering the richness of their linguistic and cultural heritage.</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher recognizes diverse learner needs based on linguistic and cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher did not recognize diverse learner needs based on linguistic and cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher invites native speakers to participate in the classroom for assistance, such as vocabulary teaching.</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher did not invite native speakers to participate in the classroom for assistance, such as vocabulary teaching.</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher makes available a variety of target language reading and resource materials in HL such as dictionaries, thesauruses, or encyclopedias in the HL.</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher did not make available a variety of target language reading and resource materials in HL such as dictionaries, thesauruses, or encyclopedias in the HL.</td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher made use of a variety of grouping techniques such as dyads, think-pair-share, or small groups to encourage HL (I.E. peer to peer).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</th>
<th>2.25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher did not make use of a variety of grouping techniques such as dyads, think-pair-share, or small groups to encourage HL (I.E. peer to peer).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</th>
<th>3.57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher uses body language, TPR (the physical response, i.e., “stand” – rise up from chair), visuals, realia (authentic materials mass media), and manipulatives to communicate meaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</th>
<th>3.60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher did not use body language, TPR (the physical response, i.e., “stand” – rise up from chair), visuals, realia (authentic materials mass media), and manipulatives to communicate meaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</th>
<th>3.58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the greatest contribution to relative importance among the factors (Table 3.8), participants who encouraged students to actively engage in exploring and discovering the richness of their linguistic and cultural heritage ($M = 3.68$) moderately
agreed with positive beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching, more than participants who did not encourage students \((M = 3.42) [F (4, 18) = 15.60, p = .001, \omega = .16]\). Participants who did not recognize diverse learner needs based on linguistic and cultural backgrounds \((M = 2.78)\) slightly disagreed with positive beliefs about heritage language teaching and learning, more than participants who recognized diverse learners \((M = 3.49) [F (4, 20) = 2.96, p = .04, \omega = .33]\). Participants who invited native speakers to participate in the classroom for assistance or teaching \((M = 1.54)\) strongly disagreed with negative beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching, more than participants who did not invite native speakers \((M = 1.57) [F (4, 25) = .58, p = .02, \omega = .36]\). Participants who did not make available a variety of target language reading and resource materials in HL such as dictionaries, thesauruses, or encyclopedias in the HL \((M = 1.55)\) strongly disagreed with negative beliefs about heritage language teaching and learning, more than participants who made available resources \((M = 1.72) [F (4, 19) = 3.04, p = .04, \omega = .34]\). Participants who used a variety of grouping techniques such as small groups to encourage heritage language \((M = 1.46)\) strongly disagreed with negative beliefs about heritage language learning, more than participants who did not use techniques \((M = 1.58) [F (4, 21) = 4.20, p = .01, \omega = .25]\). Participants who used body language, the physical response (saying “stand” while rising up), visuals, realia (authentic material), and manipulatives \((M = 1.52)\) strongly disagreed with negative beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching, more than participants who did not use body language, etc. \((M = 1.99) [F (4, 25) = 2.96, p = .04, \omega = .23]\).
Summary

The results began with a brief description of the response rate. In terms of beliefs, teachers strongly agreed with positive beliefs about heritage language learning and strongly disagreed with negative beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching with the following trends. Although elementary school general education teachers mostly hold positive beliefs about HLM, most teachers’ background characteristics did not associate significantly with beliefs about HLM. In terms of accommodations, most teachers were not observed exercising accommodations that reflected positive beliefs about heritage language learning and teaching. While most teachers did not exemplify most accommodations in the classroom, six accommodations associated with beliefs about HLM were observed.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Overview

While there is much research on how teachers teach the English language and how students acquire English, there is little research about elementary school general education teachers’ views and accommodations concerning heritage language learning. Relevant research from non-language teachers has utilized surveys focusing on teachers’ perceptions (e.g., Lee & Oxelson, 2006; Mantero & McVicker, 2006). The purpose of the current study was to examine how elementary school general education teachers view heritage language learning and teaching and accommodate students who have a heritage language background. Support was not obtained for the association with teachers’ background characteristics on their beliefs. However, the results endorse past research for institutional support, barriers, and accommodations. Most importantly, the relationship between accommodations and positive and negative beliefs about heritage language maintenance (HLM) addresses the complex nature of teachers’ views and accommodations. Furthermore, results provide a basis for educational implications of teachers’ beliefs and classroom behavior, but not without limitations and recommendations.
The Relationship between Multicultural Experience and Beliefs & Accommodations

In terms of background characteristics, past research does not support teachers’ input about multicultural experience. More than half of the teachers (particularly Caucasian) cited one or more multicultural experiences in their lifetime, but less than half of the teachers listed accommodations used. Furthermore, multicultural experience in teaching was not statistically significant in determining the type of beliefs. Thus the alternative interpretation is that mainstream teachers were not translating their multicultural experiences into practice. This interpretation goes against the notion that if teachers are exposed to more multilingual diversity, they will acquire a more positive attitude when working with ESL students (Gomez et al., 2009; Ryan, Carrington, Selva, & Healy, 2009). More research needs to be done to explore the potential reasons mainstream teachers could be misinformed about native cultures of students or have low expectations of ESL students (Youngs & Youngs, 2001), even when they have multicultural experiences. Furthermore, these results lead to the question of whether cultural awareness or cultural training for mainstream or general education teachers is enough to embrace positive beliefs about HLM in action.

The Relationship between Area of Specialization and Beliefs

The relationship between the area of specialization and beliefs about HLM is not well-supported or clear-cut in research. Findings that included teachers who studied to be general education and agreed to positive beliefs about HLM are contrary to past research, as indicated by the relationship between type of teacher education and teachers’ attitudes towards students’ HLM (Lee & Oxelson, 2006). The results are divergent from the theory that teachers without specific English language learner (ELL) preparation would
least likely support bilingualism or more likely have negative language stereotypes (Samway & McKeon, 2007). While support was obtained for the undeniable association between the area of specialization and the type of beliefs, most teachers hold positive beliefs about HLM. Overall, results from this study suggest that other explanations besides background characteristics are needed to explore the relationship between teachers’ beliefs about HLM and other variables of interest.

The Relationship between Institutional Support and Accommodations

Based on the qualitative portions of the survey, past research did not support teachers’ input about accommodations and institutional support. Results of various translated items and materials like summaries in Spanish and the use of labels were reinforced by Karathanos’ (2010) study of teachers’ surveys and course documents. The evidence for the accommodations supplied by the researcher matched what Karathanos (2010) found among 227 Midwestern teachers. The current study revealed that teachers have obtained a variety of resources from teacher aides and the Internet. As for barriers to institutional support, teachers in the current study and that of Karathanos (2010) indicated restricted time and the lack of funds as hindrances to accommodating students who have a heritage language background. Even though there is an unequal sample size comparison of 227 versus 30, teachers shared similar approaches to HLM and encountered similar barriers in education.

The Complex Relationship between Accommodations and Beliefs

The various arguments for understanding beliefs and actual practice are not supported or unidirectional. In contrast to the notion of beliefs influencing strongly actual practice in the classroom (Pajares, 1992), past research did not support teachers
who did not make available a variety of target language reading and resource materials in HL such as dictionaries, thesauruses, or encyclopedias in the HL. The current study revealed that teachers who did not make available a variety of target language reading and resource materials in HL strongly disagreed with negative beliefs about heritage language teaching and learning. Therefore, actual performance did not reflect cognitive state of mind (i.e., beliefs) (Guskey, 2002). These results endorse Argyris and Schön’s theory of action (Kane et al., 2002). Through the multiple conceptions approach to beliefs and practice, teachers can have any number of contrasting or congruent beliefs, depending on the choices they make and the circumstances they are in (Caravita & Hallden, 1994; Gunstone, 1994; Foss & Kleinsasser, 1996; Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Young & Kram, 1996). Ultimately, the results of this study caution that teachers’ actual practices cannot be predicted based on their expressed beliefs.

Implications

This research also has practical implications for teachers. First, elementary school general education teachers support the heritage language of students without knowing the heritage language and by indirectly challenging the ideology of English only. Second, this research addresses the importance of actual practice as it relates to beliefs. Among six accommodations, encouraging students to actively engage in exploring and discovering the richness of their linguistic and cultural heritage can potentially influence a change in beliefs with continued use and success. Third, gaining knowledge of accommodations might have far-reaching implications more in terms of HLM than multicultural experiences. Based on the notion that action takes place before awareness of beliefs, it is important for teachers to experience the success of accommodations for
their continued use. Fourth, it is critical for teachers to obtain institutional support to be reinforced for meeting the needs of students who have a heritage language background.

Limitations

Although exploratory, based on utilizing survey and an observation checklist, the present study is not without limitations. First, the instruments may not accurately capture the positive and negative beliefs about HLM, the feasible accommodations in a general education setting, and teachers’ responses to open-ended items (content validity) (Mertens, 2010). To address the limitation of the instruments, a focus group was conducted to ensure survey items and accommodations were realistically grounded. Items were clarified and accommodations were approved. Second, the sample size in terms of a convenience sampling is problematic for generalizability. To address the generalizability issue, a small sample size of thirty is justified, because the study utilized an adequate number of instruments to accurately capture the major objective of the study. Given the combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods used, a sample size of thirty is sufficient. Third, coverage of all teaching methods as related to the observation can be problematic due to timing and length of observation. To address the issue of timing and length of observation, the justification of three observations is to address the novelty effect and the disruption the researcher caused in the first observation. The more the researcher observed in the classroom, the more trust was built between the teacher and the researcher (Bernard, 2006).

Conclusion and Recommendations

While sample size and timing of observations were limitations, this study nevertheless extends what is known about teachers’ beliefs and accommodations
concerning language by providing a perspective on HLM in a general education setting in the U.S. This is a novel study, combining surveys about beliefs and observations about classroom practice where most research focus on surveys and beliefs alone. There is some similarity of findings across teachers’ responses emphasizing the need for institutional support. The main results strengthen alternative evidence of a multi-conceptual relationship between beliefs and actual practice. These results also fill a gap in the literature by contributing to the new and growing literature examining actual practices as an influential factor on beliefs. In contrast to actual practice, multicultural experiences did not match teachers’ beliefs. This alternative evidence also adds a new dimension to previous literature in that the meaningfulness and practicality of having multicultural experiences are in question.

The results and discussion illuminate the finding that it is not enough for teachers to have multicultural experiences or positive beliefs about heritage language maintenance. There are many environmental factors associated with teaching practice as well as beliefs. The current study is to help teachers reflect on their beliefs and accommodations for students who have a heritage language background. Ultimately, some teachers become aware without having positive beliefs, as evident in their use of accommodations.

The current study’s relationship between teacher beliefs and actual practice presents a new area for further research. First, it is recommended that future studies explore the multiple conceptions of varying degrees of beliefs and practices. This recommendation can utilize spontaneous and planned metaphors to appropriately and contextually address latent views and beliefs of teachers in an authentic and dynamic fashion (Levin & Wadmany, 2006). Second, future studies should utilize longitudinal
methodology to accurately represent change in beliefs and accommodations. Time and
gaining rapport would be addressed by extending the duration of the study. Third, future
studies should collect data from a bigger and broader sample size. A broad sample size
would increase the realistic representation of the elementary school general education
teacher population in terms of the pattern of beliefs and actual practice. In conclusion,
more research is needed to find and build ways of understanding teachers’ use of
accommodations to meet the needs of students who have a heritage language background.
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Appendix A

Components of Survey and Observation Checklist

Table 1.1

Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning and Teaching from the survey (Dependent Variables)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning | • I believe the knowledge of the heritage language is valuable for the students’ identity.  
 • I believe the maintenance of the heritage language is valuable for strong family ties.  
 • I believe bilingualism is a skill to be learned at school.  
 • I believe it is valuable to be multilingual in our society. |
| Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching Beliefs | • I believe teachers should encourage students to maintain their heritage language.  
 • I believe general education teachers can assist heritage language maintenance if they were taught how to accommodate students in a general education setting.  
 • I have my students share their heritage language and culture every chance I get.  
 • I address maintaining the heritage language throughout the school year.  
 • In the class(es) I teach, I value heritage language maintenance. |
| Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning | • I believe everyone in this country should speak only English.  
 • I believe schools should only allow English to be spoken.  
 • I believe maintaining a heritage language prevents students from fully assimilating into this society. |
| Negative Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching | • I believe general education teachers who do not speak more than one language would not foster multilingualism.  
 • I ask students to leave their heritage language and culture behind when they step into the classroom.  
 • I believe general education teachers who do not understand their students’ heritage languages will not be able to assist students who have a heritage language background. |
Table 1.2

*Teacher Background Characteristics from the survey (Independent Variables)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School (Corporation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Grades Taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many years of teaching experience do you possess?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What subject area(s) do you teach and specialize in? How long have you studied in these areas? How many years of teaching experience do you have with students who speak a language other than English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your parents or any family members (not your students’ parents or family) speak a foreign language? (yes/no) If yes, how many?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have your parents expressed interest in bilingualism? (yes/no) Which languages did you study throughout your educational career?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you fluent in any other language other than English? (yes/no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which languages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many years of study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many years of use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your teacher education program introduce heritage language learning and/or methods? (yes/no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your teacher education program introduce heritage language methods? (yes/no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your ethnicity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your age in years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please describe in the space below and state the source of any strategies, techniques, or materials you have used in meeting the needs of students who have a heritage language background in your classroom. Why do you use them or why do you not use them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you do use accommodations to assist students who have a heritage language background, what institutional support is provided for you (i.e., more time, materials, access to native speakers)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please describe in detail. Have you had any multicultural experiences (travel abroad experiencing a different culture other than from where you grew up)/exposure (diverse friends; neighbors with some level of interaction)? If so, what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your feelings about these multicultural experiences/interactions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has this multicultural experience impacted your teaching? If so or not, why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.3

*Accommodations from the observation checklist (Independent Variables)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher has high standards and expectations for students and believes that the students can achieve those standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher encourages students to actively engage in exploring and discovering the richness of their linguistic and cultural heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher uses language skills and cultural experiences that students bring with them as an integral part of instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher uses authentic songs, poems, literature, rhymes, or artifacts to teach language and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher solicits and draws upon prior knowledge (i.e., reference to last week’s topic or chapter) and experiences with new themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher utilizes diverse learner needs based on linguistic and cultural backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher is sensitive to the cultural backgrounds of students &amp; incorporates those cultures into his/her instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher is sensitive to various levels of language proficiency in English and in heritage language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher invites native speakers to participate in the classroom for assistance, vocabulary teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher selects and adapts instructional material in HL for learners’ developmental level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher slows down and simplifies language when developmentally appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher helps students to recognize the uses and purposes of their heritage language, both in their immediate environment and in a global society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Beliefs about Heritage Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher displays a variety of words, phrases, and written text in HL throughout the classroom and hallways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher makes available a variety of target language reading and resource materials in HL such as dictionaries, thesauruses, or encyclopedias in the HL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher communicates and consistently reinforces clear expectations about language use in HL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher creates a non-threatening learning environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher creates opportunities and activities to assist students in noticing and producing less frequently used, accurate HL in oral and written forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher uses a variety of effective feedback techniques including</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests, repetition, recasts, explicit correction, and non-verbal cues encouraging HL.

- The teacher makes use of a variety of grouping techniques such as dyads, think-pair-share, and small groups to encourage HL.
- The teacher uses repetition and review through many different activities like hand puppets, games-Simon says, etc.
- The teacher rephrases and repeats messages in a variety of ways, including in the HL.
- The teacher teaches story-telling (i.e., using units, simple sentences, heritage language recording of the story).
- The teacher teaches at least two new words (i.e., verbs, nouns, etc.) in HL.
- The teacher drops phrases in the heritage language (i.e., conversational phrases like discourse markers “let’s see,” “well”).
- The teacher extends students’ language repertoires by teaching synonyms and antonyms, structural similarities and differences between HL and target language (i.e., contrastive analysis).
- The teacher uses body language, TPR (the physical response, i.e., “stand” – rise up from chair), visuals, realia (authentic materials mass media), and manipulatives to communicate meaning.
- The teacher uses output-oriented activities such as role plays, simulations, drama, debates, presentations, and hand puppets.
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Institutional Review Board
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Informed Consent Forms

Informed consent form (for survey)

Teachers’ Current Views and Accommodations about Heritage Language Maintenance

The purpose of the study is to determine the extent to which teachers perceive and assess students who have a heritage language background (i.e. non native speakers of English) and to gain current information regarding their views and use of accommodations with regards to Heritage Language Maintenance [heritage language maintenance is honoring and encouraging the learning of the heritage language (immigrant, ethnic or colonial language) while learning of the majority language (i.e. English)] in the classroom setting.

You will be asked to complete a series of items involving basic background information including questions about your parents’ foreign language usage (number, frequency), your foreign language usage (number, frequency, location of acquisition), multicultural exposure (i.e. sources: study abroad, teaching experiences, and interactions with diverse persons- personal or estranged), and items about your views on heritage language maintenance. You will not be asked to provide your name, contact information, address, etc. so as to ensure your confidentiality. It will take approximately 10-20 minutes to complete the survey.

The results of this survey will help the field of education and future teachers better understand current views, beliefs and barriers on making accommodations to students who have a heritage language background. There are no foreseeable risks from participating in this study. I will only ask for a waiver of consent for the survey since the data will be anonymous. If you choose to participate in this survey, you must also agree to participate in the observation. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time for any reason with no repercussions. Taking or not taking this survey will not affect your professional teaching status, or school’s reputation. If you withdraw at any point from the study, any data collected will be used for research purposes at the discretion of the principal investigator. With the completion of the data analysis and dissertation, data will be destroyed in June 2014.

All responses are anonymous with a coded time stamp and will be stored in a portable hard drive only accessible by password. The responses will be entered into a data analysis program, SPSS. Please email Marjurie Ribeiro, principle investigator, maribeiro@bsu.edu or Dr. Mucherah, faculty supervisor, wmucherah@bsu.edu if you have any questions regarding the survey and at any time during the process of this research. For questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact the Office of Research Compliance, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070 or at irb@bsu.edu.

Name (Written & Signed): Date:

Directions:

Please complete the following survey. DUE:______________
Informed consent form (for observations)
Teachers' Current Views and Accommodations about Heritage Language Maintenance

The purpose of the study is to determine the extent to which teachers perceive and assess students who have a heritage language background (i.e. non native speakers of English) and to gain current information regarding their views and use of accommodations with regards to Heritage Language Maintenance [heritage language maintenance is honoring and encouraging the learning of the heritage language (immigrant, ethnic or colonial language) while learning of the majority language (ie. English)] in the classroom setting.

You will be asked to allow a researcher to conduct an observation as a complete observer role. The researcher will focus the observation on what general education teachers do in terms of heritage language maintenance in the classroom. A couple topics to be assessed include accommodations general education teachers typically use to accommodate to students who have a heritage language background and how students who have a heritage language background react to the accommodations set forth. Supervision of data will entail careful detailing of accommodations also taking note of when the observation was conducted (middle of the school year or end of school year). You will not be asked to provide your name, contact information, address, etc. so as to ensure your confidentiality. Observations should last only one class periods, once a week for three weeks.

If you are interested, you have written your name on the sign-up list under the flyer as an agreement to participate in the observation. You have agreed to participate in three observations total, one per week, for three weeks with a total of three visits. Each observation should last 30 minutes (the length of one class session).

The results of this observation will help the field of education and future teachers better understand current views, beliefs and barriers on making accommodations to students who have a heritage language background. The foreseeable risks from participating in this study are minimal. All responses are confidential with a random code number and no identifying information such as name, contact information, and address. Observation checklist will only contain a code number to guarantee anonymity. You will be given a slip with the code number and document type-observation form. There will be no list of code numbers with your name or school. Thus, there will be no index linking participant's names to code numbers. Contact information to which the participant can request to review the aforementioned form is available at the end of their consent form. There will be no mention of any identifiable demographics (i.e. name, contact information, and address) throughout this study and safeguards will be in place for removing all identifying information should this information be shared during the observation session. If you choose to participate in this observation, you must also agree to participate in the survey. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time for any reason with no repercussions. Allowing the researcher to observe or not allowing will not affect your professional teaching status, or school's reputation. If you withdraw at any point from the study, any data collected will be used for research purposes at the discretion of the principal investigator. With the completion of the data analysis and dissertation, data will be destroyed in June 2014.

The observation checklist will be coded in SPSS, a statistical software in a computer that is only accessible by password in which the principal investigator possesses. Please email Marjurie Ribeiro, principle investigator, maribeiro@bsu.edu or Dr. Mucherah, faculty supervisor, wmucherah@bsu.edu if you have any questions regarding the survey and at any time during the process of this research. For questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact the Office of Research Compliance, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070 or at irb@bsu.edu.

Thank you for allowing me to observe your classroom. Your signature on this consent form shows that you have been informed about the conditions, risks, and safeguards of this project.

I have read the information provided and agree to participate in the classroom observation.

Signature_________________________Date_________________________

Please print name_________________________
Month 2011

Hello,

Thank you so much for welcoming my petition to conduct research. I just want to reconfirm that I am looking to survey and conduct non-intrusive, classroom observations on teachers (as defined as mainstream, elementary, monolingual, and non-foreign language teachers) who teach grades 1-3, and who have any number of students (1+ students) who have a heritage language background.

Specific Tasks involving teachers

Teachers who participate in this study will complete a survey regarding foreign language background and experience and views on heritage language maintenance, which will approximately take about 20 minutes or so to complete. This survey will be given on the first week of observations. This survey will be turned in after the three week observations. Non-intrusive observations will be conducted by the researcher using an observation checklist, noting how general education teachers interact with non-native English speakers. Observations should last only one class period (30+ minutes), one time each week for three consecutive weeks (whenever is most convenient). Teachers will participate in three observations altogether.

Recruitment of teachers

It would be great if you can pass this information along to teachers grades 1-3. If it is easier to contact teachers individually, I can personally email them or I can forward you an email to send to them. If a teacher just has one non-native English speaker, I would really look forward to his/her participation in my study. Teachers who fit the description can voluntarily participate in this study. I am in the process of applying for funds to reward teachers for participating in this study.

Scheduling of observations

One observation (one class period or 30-45 minutes) per week for three weeks. There will be three observations in total. One three week block will be scheduled based on teachers’ availability. I will send a reminder a week before the observation. We will confirm or change the subsequent observation on the day of the observation (and accordingly). Let me know a day or two before the scheduled observation if you need to reschedule.
Choose **ONE** option (ideally I would like to conduct during an English/Language arts class or Reading class). **Times can be flexible (I can observe at 8am or 2:30pm).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Updated schedule 4/6/11</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tentative Observation #1</strong></td>
<td>Monday, May 2 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 11-11:30am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 3 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 11-11:30am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 4 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 11-11:30am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
<td>Thursday, May 5 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
<td>Friday, May 6 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 11-11:30am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tentative Observation #2</strong></td>
<td>Monday, May 9 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 11-11:30am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 10 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 11-11:30am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 11 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 11-11:30am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
<td>Thursday, May 12 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
<td>Friday, May 13 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 11-11:30am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tentative Observation #3</strong></td>
<td>Monday May 16 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 11-11:30am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
<td>Tuesday May 17 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 11-11:30am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
<td>Wednesday May 18 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 11-11:30am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
<td>Thursday May 19 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
<td>Thursday May 20 9:00-9:30am 10-10:30:am; 11-11:30am; 1-1:30pm; or 2-2:30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Last Option for the academic year: week of May 23 through week of June 6.*

**Summer School (or Summer Bridge):** week of June 20 through week of July 5.

**Additional information**

Please note this study does not evaluate teachers’ current practice, but rather gain insight about trends in teachers’ beliefs about heritage language maintenance and barriers to assisting students who have a heritage language background. What teachers believe and can & cannot do in the classroom is extremely informative. The results of this study will give more grounds for reality in terms of teachers’ beliefs and barriers on making accommodations to students who have a heritage language background.

The foreseeable risks from participating in this study are minimal. **Teachers’ responses and observations will be held with the utmost confidentiality and your school will not be easily identifiable in my dissertation.** For observations, a random code number will be assigned to which teachers are given their number should they request to review these reports. Safeguards will be in place for removing all identifying
information should this information be shared among teachers. All data collected will be stored in a computer that is only accessible by password in which the principal investigator possesses. Teachers can choose to participate in the study and teachers are free to withdraw from the study at any time for any reason with no repercussions, and taking or not taking this survey will not affect teachers’ professional status, or your school or faculty’s reputation.

Contact information

If you have any questions regarding this study and at any time during the process of this research, please call (708-334-0796) or email me at maribeiro@bsu.edu or the faculty supervisor at wmucherah@bsu.edu. For your rights as a research subject, the following person may be contacted: Research Compliance Administrator, Sponsored Programs Office, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070. Any help would be more than appreciated.

Sincerely,

Marjurie Ribeiro, MA
Educational Psychology Doctoral Student/Instructor
Principal Investigator
Ball State University

Wilfridah M. Mucherah, PH. D.
Associate Professor
Faculty Supervisor
Ball State University
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Responses from Participants addressing the reasons and sources of any strategies, techniques, or materials you have used in meeting the needs of students who have a heritage language background

HL Incorporation in the Classroom (n = 10)

“Bilingual reading groups”
“flexible groupings”
“inviting bilingual families in classrooms”
“work with bilingual teacher”
“bilingual program”
“students [allowed to] use HL in the class”
“students share foods and cultures”

HL Literature (n = 6)

“ELL textbooks”
“summaries in Spanish”
“multicultural stories”
“trade books”
“HL materials”

Multi-sensory Accommodations (n = 6)

“Video”
“Pictures”
“Labels”
“Books on tape”
HL teaching methods (n = 6)

“Teacher speaks HL expressions and reads in HL”

“Repeats questions and phrases”

“Teacher assesses knowledge”

“Teacher uses prior knowledge to connect current knowledge”

“Intense phonics instruction

Authentic Materials (n = 5)

“Pointers”

“model examples”

“hands on activities”

“crafts”

“manipulatives”
Responses from Participants addressing institutional support for accommodations to assist students who have a heritage language background

Supportive Personnel (n = 15)

“bilingual staff office”
“ESL teacher”
“bilingual tutor”
“bilingual teacher”
“parent volunteer”
“native speakers”
“teaching assistant”
“curriculum leaders”
“bilingual program/pull out program”

Accessible Instructional Materials (n = 14)

“online tutoring programs”
“hands on activities”
“reading instruction in native language”
“dual language instruction (science, social studies, and math)”
“modified work for ELLS”
“curriculum in native language”
“supply word bank”
“translate work”
“test administration in Spanish”
“Harcourt reading textbook series in Spanish”
“written translations for at home learning”

**HL Reading Materials (n = 10)**

“heritage language books”

“Dictionaries (Spanish & English)”

**Multisensory Resources Available (n = 7)**

“Internet”

“Spanish math songs”

“CDs”

“Tapes”

“Visuals”

“Graphic organizers”

**Group flexibility in the classroom (n = 7)**

“small groups with students who speak the native language”

“One on one”

**Reasons why institutional support is minimal (n = 6)**

“Money”

“School doesn’t provide dual language programs”

“Need more time”

**Teaching Strategies (n = 5)**

“Use simple language”

“Label in English and Spanish”

“Read aloud questions”

“Familiarize students’ backgrounds”
Responses from Participants indicating multicultural experiences or multicultural interactions with others

Interactions / Relationships with Diverse Persons (n = 23)

“Made friends from different backgrounds”
“Close friends whose parents are first generation in US”
“Diverse friends in high school”
“Japanese friend”
“Ex-husband was from Nigeria”
“Adopted child from a foreign country”
“Six exchange students (Japan, Germany)”
“Parents & Children (daughter) have traveled abroad and shared experiences”
“People of Polish, Hungarian, German, and Belgium backgrounds”
“Interactions with neighbors of different cultures”
“Parents have close friends of Chinese backgrounds”
“Other Latino cultural experiences”

Travel experiences (n = 22)

“Europe (France, Ireland)”
“Mexico, Puerto Rico (Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, South America)”
“Asian countries”
“Middle East”
“Travel abroad: exposure to different cultures”
“Study abroad: London, Spain”
Personal Experiences (n = 10)

“ Took a multicultural class (Latin American Anthropology)”

“Working to get ESL endorsement”

“Lived in Chicago experiencing different cultures”

“Lived in three diverse states”

“Worked in diverse schools (with families and students who came from Mexico)”
Responses from Participants highlighting their reactions to multicultural/interactions with those from other cultures

Positive reactions (N = 30)

“Great experience”
“Felt welcomed”
“Blessing”
“Felt so fortunate”
“Fascinating to learn about customs, food etc.”
“Learned the beauty of other cultures, other dialects and other cultural beliefs”
“Insight into other cultures”
“Love to learn new things and experiencing the way cultures celebrate things”
“Enjoyment”
“Amazed at how different and how alike we all are”
“Important to experience other cultures”
“Understand better”
“Understand children in bilingual education”
“Make students feel connected by letting them know the teacher has visited that place”
“Open up [students’] minds and make them more knowledgeable about other cultures”
“Appreciate (or be accepting of) all people (to embrace all similarities and differences)”
“Ok”
Responses from Participants addressing the impact of multicultural experience(s) has on teachings

Affirmative  (n = 26)

“An eye opener”

“Students learned a lot”

“Teachers share many different expressions with students

“Enhanced my classroom atmosphere”

“Promote culturally responsive teaching environment”

“Become an advocate”

“Respect other cultures”

“[Engage] different strategies”

“Read multicultural books”

“Approach parent relationships and topics we study differently”

“Expose different cultures & share the love for traveling and learning”

“Share experiences from students’ perspective and teachers’ perspective

“Modification in thinking (i.e., compare and contrast), speaking, and sensitiveness”

“More sensitive to the needs of children”

“Open minded”

“Empathetic and conscientious”

“Taking ESL classes has helped me explain, answer [students’] questions, and speak slower.”

“Due to personal experience of losing native language, I always encourage use of native language.”
Appendix G

Evidence of participants exemplifying the encouragement of students to actively engage in exploring and discovering the richness of their linguistic and cultural heritage.

**HL text media (n = 14)**

“word posters (Spanish)”

“newspaper (Chinese)”

“drawings of flags of their country”

“French & English carpet rug”

**HL classroom decorations (n = 2)**

“cultural (wearing Spanish dress)”

“red Chinese wall decoration”

**HL reading materials (n = 20)**

“World Book”

“Spanish book basket”

“Chinese immigrants coming into America book”

“Around the world books”

“Explora tu mundo book”

“dual language books”

“textbooks”

**HL resources (n = 6)**

“differentiated lessons through a computer program”

“Spanish translation for students”

“book on tape”
“read loud”
“elicited Spanish word from a student”

Different languages are spoken (n = 4)
“allows students to count”
“different languages are accepted”
“Spanish is welcomed”

Language content books (n = 5)
“Swahili book”

Language only books (n = 6)
“Spanish”
“Polish”

Dictionaries (n = 7)
“picture dictionary”
“multicultural dictionaries”

Dual language books (n = 14)

Guided reading books (n = 1)

English decoding book (n = 1)
Evidence of participants exemplifying a variety of grouping techniques such as dyads, think-pair-share, and small groups to encourage HL.

Work in groups of 2-3 students (n = 11)

Class split into 2 groups (n = 2)

Groups of 6-7 students (n = 4)
Evidence of participants exemplifying the use of body language, TPR (The physical response i.e. “stand” – rise up from chair), visuals, realia (authentic materials mass media), manipulatives to communicate meaning.

Using body language to exhibit ("behind" "in front;" "driving" following beats, counting, clarify meaning, pts to mouth while sounding out words) (n = 17)

“foot”
“hands clapping”
“fingers pointing”

Tangible objects to understand subject areas (n = 26)

“base 10 blocks”
“shapes, cubes”
“line segments”
“money manipulatives (i.e. coins)”
“biology circulatory system body suit”

Pictoral examples in books (n = 21)

“big picture books (words with words)”
“pictures with numbers”
“alphabet with Spanish words below”
“pictures with alphabet”
“beginning blends with pictoral examples”
“pictures and words with vowels”
HL text media (n = 7)

  “newspaper”
  “labels in English and Spanish”
  “posters”
  “projector”
  “smart board”

HL games (N = 1)

Realia (N = 2)

Writing and drawing a story (n = 3)