Investigating Preservice Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and Motivation to Teach English Language Learners (ELLs)  

Reem Ibrahim  

Abstract:

This study investigated preservice teachers’ self-efficacy and attitude in working with ELLs in Arkansas. The investigator employed a within-subject design to examine the interrelationships among social cognitive variables (self-efficacy, motivation, and teachers’ preparation programs) and their role in predicting preservice teachers’ confidence to teach ELLs in their future classrooms. The main finding of this study is that preservice teachers who are attending educational programs have high-levels of motivation and self-efficacy to work with ELLs in Arkansas. Furthermore, the results of this study revealed that preservice teachers show a strong and positive correlation between their level of confidence to engage ELLs in class activities, to create instructional strategies tailored for ELLs, and to manage ELLs classroom environment. Finally, the results of this study found that speaking a second-language and the level of intrinsic motivation are significant predictors of preservice teachers’ self-efficacy to work with ELLs in their future classrooms. In general, these results are consistent with previous findings produced in the context of preservice and in-service teachers.
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INTRODUCTION

Over the past 30 years, research has shown that the population of students in the United States has become increasingly linguistically and culturally diverse (Lee & Buxton, 2013; Villegas et al., 2018). The increased number of English Language Learners (ELLs) stems from a boom of immigrant families moving to the South, drawn to jobs in construction, agriculture, and food-processing industries. Consequently, the number of ELLs in PreK-12 schools is one of the fastest-growing student populations in the United States, with over 5.1 million students enrolled in public-school systems in fall 2019 (10.4 percent increase from 9.2 percent in fall 2010), with a predicted increase to 40% by 2030 (Statistics, 2022). This figure represents a demographic shift in the U.S. which indicates that the number of ELLs enrolling in schools will continue to increase.

Out of the fifty states, the state of Arkansas ranked as one of the top five states, with the highest ELL growth rate of 102% (Carnock, 2017). In the 2021 academic year, Arkansas public schools enrolled 39,155 ELL students, or 8.3% of the total student population and 7% in open-enrollment public charter schools. Approximately 18% of ELLs were also in special education. To prepare teachers, the state of Arkansas utilizes certification requirements for ELL instructors, and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing issues authorizations for teachers providing services to ELLs. This credentialling includes authorizations for teachers providing specially designed content instruction delivered in English, content instruction delivered primarily in the primary language, and instruction for English-language development.

Research has shown that several factors can contribute to teachers’ success in their classrooms, such as training programs, motivation, the teacher’s characteristics, and self-efficacy (Klassen & Chiu, 2011). Unfortunately, research has indicated that mainstream teachers feel unprepared to work with ELLs, and teachers report feeling less confident working with ELLs than with other student populations (Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010; Siwatu, 2011). For example, many teachers working with ELLs do not believe that they are adequately prepared to meet students’ learning needs, particularly in academically demanding subjects such as science (Janzen, 2008). This sense of teachers’ low levels of efficacy often results from lack of experience and knowledge of how to address the complex educational needs of ELLs (Lee, 2005; Lee & Buxton, 2013).

Additionally, researchers have questioned whether teachers are prepared to effectively address the needs of a culturally diverse population within classroom settings and environments (Heafner & Plaisance, 2016). Low levels of efficacy mean that preservice teachers will be less likely to focus on ELLs and provide them with the high-quality instruction necessary to reach academic success (Washburn, 2008). Without an increase in preservice teachers’ efficacy for teaching ELLs, future teachers will not be able to properly meet the needs of higher enrollments of ELLs in schools and may view students’ first
languages as barriers when working with ELLs (Torres & Tackett, 2016; Wall, 2017). Therefore, finding prepared and confident teachers to design effective instructional models suited for ELLs is among a variety of difficulties in many of the nation’s public schools, especially in the highly ELL-populated cities.

Researchers have considered that teachers’ self-efficacy is one of the essential factors that impacts their performance in the classroom; therefore, is receiving growing attention in educational research (e.g., Pas et al., 2012; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007; Soodak & Podell, 1996; Wheatley, 2005; Zee & Koomen, 2016). For example, studies have found that teachers’ sense of self-efficacy has a major influence on how they approach challenges in the classroom (Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Klassen, Tze, et al., 2011; Künsting et al., 2016). Similarly, many studies have concluded that teachers with high levels of efficacy for teaching tend to utilize a variety of instructional strategies and good educational practices that are positive for students’ engagement and achievement outcomes, even when faced with challenging situations (e.g., Fives & Alexander, 2004; Heneman III et al., 2006; Lin et al., 2002; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007).

Furthermore, many researchers indicate that individuals’ self-efficacy is associated with their positive attitudes and closely linked to their self-regulated learning skills, where individuals with stronger self-efficacy perception are more likely to plan, monitor, and regulate their work (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003; Pintrich, 2004; Savolainen et al., 2012; Savolainen et al., 2022; Seifert, 2004; Yada et al., 2018). Thus, an individual’s self-efficacy has strong influence on a teacher’s behavior and is related to a wide range of instructional variables and learning outcomes (Lackaye & Margalit, 2006; Pajares, 1996; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Many researchers consider social cognitive theory one of the major theories that discuss the self-efficacy construct. Bandura (1986) identified self-efficacy as a method of self-judgment that influences decisions about what behaviors to undertake, the amount of effort and persistence put forth when faced with obstacles, and finally, the proficiency in the behavior. Further, individuals’ self-efficacy reflects what they believe they can accomplish with the knowledge they have mastered during their learning, and it does not refer to a person’s skill at performing specific learning-related tasks. Therefore, self-efficacy assesses individuals’ judgment of their ability to apply knowledge and skills in a broader context.

Although much attention has been directed to the efficacy beliefs of preservice teachers and their correlation with teaching/learning behaviors in the classroom (Milner & Hoy, 2003), examining preservice teachers’ self-efficacy and attitude towards working with ELLs in Arkansas has received little attention in the literature. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate preservice teachers’ self-efficacy and attitude in working with second-language learners in Arkansas.
Literature Review

Research has explored factors affecting preservice teachers’ self-efficacy and attitude towards teaching English to ELLs. Although the literature covers a wide variety of such discussions, this review will focus on five major themes which emerge repeatedly throughout the literature. The themes this literature review will discuss are teachers’ self-efficacy and motivation, teachers’ self-efficacy and attitudes, teachers’ beliefs in language teaching, teachers’ misconceptions regarding teaching ELLs, and teacher-preparation programs.

Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and Motivation

Self-efficacy is grounded in the theoretical framework of social-cognitive theory that underscores the evolution and exercise of human agency over what they do through being self-organizing, proactive, self-regulating, and self-reflecting (Bandura, 2006). Researchers have identified teachers’ self-efficacy as the measure of teachers’ belief about their preparedness to teach and to help students achieve educational goals. Many scholars have attested that teacher self-efficacy plays a significant role in students’ success in the classroom (Hoy, 2000; Jerald, 2007). Other scholars have described teachers’ self-efficacy as the educators’ confidence in their own skills to achieve classroom outcomes. In general terms, teacher self-efficacy refers to the teacher’s belief in employing his or her abilities to bring about valued outcomes of engagement and learning among students, including difficult and unmotivated students (see Bandura, 1977; Tschannen-Morin et al., 1998). Therefore, teachers’ beliefs may impact ELLs academic outcomes due to their use of different teaching strategies and accommodations they implement in classroom instructions (Lauermann & Karabenick, 2013).

Bandura (1986) defined self-efficacy and confidence as two distinct constructs. Self-efficacy refers to an individual’s belief in their ability to perform a particular task or achieve a specific goal successfully. It is the perception of one’s capability to carry out a specific action successfully in a particular situation. On the other hand, confidence refers to an individual’s overall belief in themselves, their abilities, and their potential to succeed in various situations. Although, confidence is a more general construct than self-efficacy and is not necessarily task-specific, a person may be confident in their abilities overall, but they may not necessarily have high self-efficacy in a specific task or situation.

Much research has also found that teachers with a high sense of self-efficacy are more enthusiastic in teaching (Allinder, 1994; Guskey, 1984), more committed to teaching (Coladarci, 1992; Evans & Tribble, 1986; Trentham et al., 1985), and more likely to stay in teaching (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1982). Bandura and Adams (1977) argue that people with higher levels of self-efficacy beliefs are more prepared to teach. Researchers have indicated that preservice teachers’ self-efficacy has an influence on whether the teaching methods and the educators’ knowledge would be successful or unsuccessful. Moreover, scholars have
demonstrated that preservice teachers have better levels of self-efficacy compared with in-service teachers (Benz et al., 1992; de la Torre Cruz & Arias, 2007; Fives et al., 2007; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Research has found that the inability of some in-service teachers to teach ELLs may stem from teachers’ lack of cultural competencies, understanding of second-language acquisition, or comprehension of the language-learning process that confronts ELLs (Bull et al., 2012; Harris & Jones, 2010; Hoover, 2012; Wall, 2017).

Self-efficacy theory posits that students who believe themselves to be capable are more likely to be motivated; those who believe themselves incapable will not be motivated (Seifert, 2004). Much research shows that self-efficacy influences academic motivation and learning achievement (Pajares, 1996; Schunk, 1995). Therefore, teachers’ motivation is an important concept related to their performance and persistence in their profession. Educational research has given special attention to preservice teachers’ motivation due to its impact on teachers’ self-efficacy and the teaching environment (Klassen, Al-Dhafri et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Researchers have argued that preservice teachers who are intrinsically motivated are more likely to have better teaching performance, which would reflect on students to develop more interest in learning (Klassen, Tze et al., 2011; Malmberg, 2006; Reeve et al., 1999; Roth et al., 2007; Wild et al., 1997).

**Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and Attitudes Towards ELLs**

Many researchers have examined the relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and their attitudes and found inconsistent results (e.g., Chan, 2016; Drysdale et al., 2017). While a considerable number of studies have reported strong and positive correlations between teachers’ self-efficacy and their attitudes, other studies reported weak or insignificant relationships between these two constructs. For example, some studies found that there is a strong and positive relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and their attitudes towards ELLs (Karabenick & Noda, 2004). Conversely, other studies found weak or no conclusive evidence on the causal relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and their attitudes (Chan, 2016; Drysdale et al., 2017; Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010).

**Teachers’ Beliefs in Language Teaching**

Scholars have identified teachers’ beliefs as a set of ideals that teachers hold true regarding teaching, students, learning environment, and educational concepts. Research has described teachers’ beliefs as “drive” that helps shape their teaching and interaction with students. For example, teachers’ beliefs have been found to influence teachers’ behavior in the classroom, govern their lesson planning, guide learner development, lead their curricular priorities, control their decision-making process, and manage their interactions with their learners (Farrell & Ives, 2015; Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2017; Kuzborska, 2011; Molle, 2013).

Research highlights the importance of teachers’ beliefs on their teaching, such as guiding and informing teachers’ thoughts and behaviors and shaping the foundation for their actions in their classrooms (e.g., Calderhead, 1996). Further, researchers have found
that teachers’ beliefs may have an impact on the students’ behavior and learning outcomes (Mantero & McVicker, 2006; Rueda & Garcia, 1996). Similarly, researchers have found that teacher beliefs have a profound impact on their opinion regarding teaching culturally diverse students. For example, researchers found that teachers would judge students’ learning abilities based on their own perceptions, which may result in negative opinions regarding students who are from culturally diverse countries (Lucas et al., 2008). While many studies have shown that teachers generally have expressed encouraging opinions about teaching culturally diverse students, other studies found that some teachers were hesitant to teach ELLs and that teachers who speak one language are more likely to have deficit-based beliefs towards ELLs (e.g., Byrnes & Kiger, 1994; Byrnes et al., 1997; Garmon, 2005; Hadaway, 1993; Pettit, 2011). However, other researchers have indicated that, although teacher beliefs are associated with their behavior in the teaching environment, they do not guide their action in the learning process (e.g., Tillema, 2000).

**Teachers’ Misconceptions Regarding Teaching ELLs**

Scholars have argued that there are common misconceptions among teachers about teaching ELLs and how a student learns a second-language. Often, these common misconceptions result in teachers’ using ineffective teaching strategies, which may lead to negative implications for ELL or inhibit learning. For example, a common teachers’ misconception relates to the length of time required to acquire and develop proficiency in a second language (Pettit, 2011). Scholars have indicated that teachers who tend to place ELLs in unnecessary language services do so because they underestimate the influence of the student’s knowledge of their first language and the science behind language learning. Consequently, some teachers fail to utilize explicit language in their instructions (De Jong & Harper, 2005; Hardin et al., 2009). Another common misconception among teachers the belief that all ELLs acquire English at the same pace through a universal process, or that instructions for native speakers should be the same instructions used to teach ELLs. Additionally, researchers have found that implementing non-ELL teaching strategies would not be adequate for ELL to develop academic language competencies. Therefore, researchers cautioned that these misconceptions could hinder preservice teachers from using more innovative methods suitable to teach ELL (Busch, 2010; Wong, 2010).

**Teacher-Preparation Programs**

Research has examined the influence of pedagogical-methods courses and field-experience courses throughout teacher education programs on preservice teachers’ thoughts and beliefs about their teaching practice (e.g., Clift et al., 2005). Researchers have found conflicting results regarding the impact of teachers’ preparation programs and professional development on ELL teachers. For example, while research has found that there is a direct influence of teachers’ preparation programs on their ability to teach ELLs and there is strong relationship between teachers’ preparation programs and their beliefs about teaching culturally diverse students, other research has found nonsignificant or no influence of these factors on the teachers’ perceptions, and in a few cases, attending training about diversity may lead to teachers’ negative beliefs and attitudes toward ELLs (Garcia & Guerra, 2004; Irvine, 2003; McDiarmid & Price, 1990). For example, Peacock (2001), conducted a study to monitor preservice teachers’ beliefs after attending a 3-year -
long study of TESL methodology and found that the preservice teachers’ beliefs about teaching demonstrated nonsignificant change.

These nonsignificant or no-influence findings contrast with the findings of other studies which reflect that teachers who have taken coursework involving ELL teaching strategies have more positive attitudes toward ELL (Byrnes et al., 1997; Flores & Smith, 2009; Youngs & Youngs Jr, 2001). Additionally, a few studies have found strong evidence that teacher-preparation programs do in fact help change teaching beliefs toward ELLs and that teachers who attend professional development regarding the use of ELLs’ first language in classroom instructions, helped them to become successful ELL teachers (August & Shanahan, 2007; Bernhard et al., 2005; Cho & DeCastro-Ambrosetti, 2005; Friend et al., 2009; Karathanos, 2009; Levine, 2006; Pappamihiel, 2007).

**Purpose of the research**

This study investigated preservice teachers’ self-efficacy and attitude in working with ELLs in Arkansas. The investigator employed a within-subject design to examine the interrelationships among social cognitive variables (self-efficacy, motivation, and teachers’ preparation programs) and their role in predicting preservice teachers’ confidence to teach ELLs in their future classrooms.

**Hypotheses of the study/ Sub-problems**

**H1:** Preservice teachers who are attending educational programs will have strong intrinsic motivation to teach ELLs.

**H2:** Preservice teachers who are attending educational programs will have high confidence to teach ELLs.

**H3:** There will be a strong and positive correlation between preservice teachers’ level of confidence and their ability to create instructional strategies and manage ELLs’ classroom.

**H4:** Preservice teachers’ self-efficacy, years of teaching, and ability to speak a second-language are factors that equally predict their self-efficacy level to teach ELLs in future classrooms.

**METHOD**

**Research Research Model**

This study employed a within-subject design to investigate preservice teachers’ self-efficacy in working with ELLs in Arkansas. The primary source of data was collected from a convenience sampling of 53 graduate and undergraduate preservice teachers enrolled in educational courses in a College of Education in a southern university in Arkansas.
Participants

The participants were 53 preservice teachers enrolled in graduate and undergraduate educational courses during Fall 2022. Participants were 43 female, 9 male and 1 reported as non-binary. The reported age range was as follows: 14 students between 18-21 years, 3 students between 22-25, 4 students between 26-30, 11 students between 31-40, and 21 students 40 years or older. Preservice teachers were enrolled in graduate courses: EDMD 5033 Introduction to Instructional Technology, MAT 5703 Technology for Teaching and Learning, EDMD 6313 Instructional Design and Product Development, EDMD 6163 Internet Resources, EDMD 5053 Online Course Development with Multimedia, and undergraduate course: EDMD 3013 Integrating Instructional Technology). Participants were enrolled in different educational majors: 4 students in early childhood education, 11 students in elementary education, 6 students in other middle level, 15 students high-school and 17 students other teaching majors such as Physical or Special education. Participants were non-science majors and attending different educational majors in Early Childhood, Elementary, Middle-Level, High-School and Physical Education. All of the participants’ native language was English.

Preservice teachers are students who are enrolled in education programs and are undergoing teacher training. Preservice teachers are trained to accommodate ELL students through a combination of coursework, field experiences, professional development, and collaboration with other professionals. They also engage in developing effective strategies for teaching ELLs. These courses cover topics such as second language acquisition, bilingual education, and teaching strategies for ELLs. They also address cultural and linguistic diversity in the classroom and provide preservice teachers with a foundation for understanding the unique needs of ELLs.

Data Collection Tools

The investigator used the following instrumentations to collect data from preservice teachers:

**Demographic Survey**: A 9-question demographic survey. This survey was designed to collect information on preservice teachers’ demographic makeup, such as participants' gender, age range, years in college, major, ethnicity, and teaching experience.

**Preservice Teachers’ Sense of Self-Efficacy Scale**: This study utilized a modified version of the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale designed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The reason for using this scale relates to its comprehensiveness, integrity, and ease of administration. The current study utilized the short form and included three subscales: (1) efficacy in student engagement, (2) efficacy in instructional strategies, and (3) efficacy in classroom management. The 12-question 11-level Likert scale questionnaire was given to preservice teachers to assess their perceived self-efficacy. The 11-point scale ranged between "Cannot do at all" at zero to “Highly certain can
do” at 10. Students were asked about their degree of confidence to successfully complete a task related to working with ELLs. The total reliability of the questionnaire was calculated based on the data collected in the present study and found to be 0.95 by using Cronbach’s alpha, as reported in Table 1.

Table 1
The Total Reliability of the Questionnaire Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.953</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intrinsic Motivation and Belief Scale:** This scale was developed to measure preservice teachers’ intrinsic motivation and beliefs regarding teaching ELLs. The scale consists of seven Likert-scale questions related to seven different questions about motivation and beliefs. Participants are asked to select one of five responses for each of the seven statements from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”.

**Data Analysis**

Participants in all courses completed the demographic, self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation and belief surveys during week 8 of the fall semester 2022. After completing the survey, the investigator analyzed the quantitative data using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to test the research questions and hypotheses.

**Ethical considerations**

In this study, all rules stated to be followed within the scope of "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" were followed. None of the actions stated under the title "Actions Against Scientific Research and Publication Ethics", which is the second part of the directive, were not taken.

Ethical review board name: (Arkansas Tech University Institutional Review Board)
Date of ethics review decision: (October 4, 2022)
Ethics assessment document issue number: (E-2022-11)

**RESULTS**

Prior to analyses, data were screened for systematic patterns of missing data (e.g., when no value was stored for the variable within variable sets) and it was found that the missing values were scattered evenly across variables and groups with small number of cases and no apparent patterns or clusters emerging.
To measure the internal consistency of the self-efficacy survey items (the index of the reliability of the used survey), the investigator calculated the intra-class correlation coefficients to evaluate the consistency of the self-efficacy survey items. The investigator computed the Cronbach’s alpha to measure reliability and internal consistency of the reliability estimate. Normally, the theoretical value of alpha ranges between zero to 1. The collected data from self-efficacy survey in this study showed that the Cronbach’s alpha value was 0.95. This alpha value can indicate with confidence that there is an excellent internal consistency of the reliability estimates in the survey. Therefore, the interrelationship and homogeneity among all the survey items are excellent in terms and all questions are consistent with one another and measuring preservice teachers’ self-efficacy level. Table 2 summarizes the intraclass-correlation coefficient of the self-efficacy survey items.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intraclass Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>F Test with True Value 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.867*</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.951c</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-way mixed effects model where people effects are random and measures effects are fixed.

**Question 1:** What is the level of preservice teachers’ intrinsic motivation to teach ELLs?

To address this question, the investigator conducted descriptive statistical analysis to examine preservice teachers’ level of intrinsic motivation to teach ELLs. The aggregates of total scores show that the average score across 2 items (total of 10 points) of preservice teachers’ level of intrinsic motivation to teach ELLs among female students was (n =43) (M = 9.9, SD = .48) and the level of intrinsic motivation to teach ELLs among male students was (n = 9) (M = 8, SD = 2.45). Table 3 and figure 2 summarize the comparison of preservice teachers’ motivation to teach ELLs in Arkansas.

Table 3

| Preservice Teachers’ Motivation Level to Teach ELL in Arkansas (10 Points) |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|
|                               | Female | Male  |
| Total scale 10 points         | 9.9    | 8     |
| Standard Deviation            | 0.48   | 2.45  |
Total of preservice teachers of motivation is constant when Gender= non-binary.

**Figure 2: Preservice Teachers’ Motivation to Teach ELLs in Arkansas**

**Question 2:** How confident are preservice teachers to teach ELLs in Arkansas?

To address this question, the investigator conducted descriptive statistical analysis to examine preservice teachers’ level of confidence to teach ELLs in Arkansas.

The aggregates of total scores show that the average scores across 12 items (total of 1200 points) of preservice teachers’ self-efficacy to work with ELLs among all students was (n = 53) (M = 747.74, SD = 295.59). The investigator examined the data further and found that the self-efficacy average score among female students was (n = 43) (M = 793.02, SD = 272.81) and the self-efficacy average of male students was (n = 9) (M = 568.89, SD = 340.49). Tables 4, 5, figures 2 and 3 summarize the comparison of preservice teachers’ self-efficacy average scores to teach ELLs in Arkansas.

**Table 4**

*Comparison of preservice teachers’ self-efficacy average scores to teach ELLs in Arkansas*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total scale 1200 Points</strong></td>
<td>793.02</td>
<td>568.89</td>
<td>747.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation (SD)</strong></td>
<td>272.812</td>
<td>340.494</td>
<td>295.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Comparison of preservice teachers’ self-efficacy percent scores to teach ELLs in Arkansas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy percent 100%</td>
<td>66.10%</td>
<td>47.41%</td>
<td>63.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Self-Efficacy Average Scores Comparison to Teach ELLs in Arkansas

Figure 4: Self-Efficacy Scores Percent and Comparison to Teach ELLs in Arkansas

Question 3: Is there a correlation among what is preservice teachers’ level of confidence to create instructional strategies, their ability to engage ELLs, and manage ELLs classroom?
To answer this question, the investigator conducted a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient to assess the relationship between preservice teachers’ level of confidence to create instructional strategies, their ability to engage ELLs, and manage ELLs classroom. The results showed that there was strong and positive correlation between self-efficacy to engage ELLs and self-efficacy to create instructional strategies for ELLs, \( r (53) = .935, p = 0.001 \). Further, the results showed that there is correlation between self-efficacy to engage ELLs and self-efficacy to manage ELLs classroom, \( r (53) = .821, p = 0.001 \). Table 6 summarizes the correlation analysis.

### Table 6

Results of correlation between preservice teachers’ level of confidence to create instructional strategies, engage ELLs and manage ELLs classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy to engage ELLs</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy to create instructional strategies for ELLs</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy to manage ELLs classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Efficacy to engage ELLs</strong></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( .935^{***} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

**Question 4:** What factors best predict preservice teachers’ confidence to teach ELLs in future classrooms?

To address this question, the investigator conducted multiple-regression analysis.

**Multiple-Regression Assumptions:** The regression descriptive statistics output was checked for multicollinearity assumptions between predictor variables and found that correlations between variables were less than 0.6, and, therefore, none of included predictors has multicollinearity. Further, all predictor variables (speaks a second-language, intrinsic motivation, and teaching experience) correlate with the outcome variable (Preservice teachers’ self-efficacy to teach ELLs in Arkansas) at a value greater than 0.3. The linear relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable (preservice teachers of self-efficacy) was checked through the probability plot and found that all points were following a straight line. Then the scatter plot was checked and found that regression standardized residual on the y-axis and the regression standardized predicted value on the x-axis within negative 3 to 3. The standard residual found the minimum was -2.628 and the maximum 1.367. Finally, the investigator checked the Cooks Distance and found that the minimum was .000 and the maximum .677; thus, it was less than 1. ANOVA table showed that there is statistical significance, and, therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The researcher used the R-square (this research has adequate sample size 53 participants).
**Multiple-Regression Analysis:** Regression finding: Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to develop a model predicting preservice teachers’ confidence to teach ELLs in future classrooms. The predictor model was able to account for 21% of the variance in the dependent variable and was statistically significant at $p < .001$. Individual predictors were examined further, and the result indicated that the independent variable regarding speaking a second-language was found to be a significant predictor of preservice teachers’ self-efficacy ($t = 2.960, p = .005$) and the preservice teachers’ intrinsic motivation was found to be a significant predictors of preservice teachers’ self-efficacy ($t = 2.609, p = .012$). Basic descriptive statistics and regression coefficients are summarized in Tables 7 and 8.

**Table 7**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers’ self-efficacy</td>
<td>747.74</td>
<td>295.594</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak a Second Language</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers’ intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>1.278</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Teaching</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Adjusted R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Changed df</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.461*</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>270.294</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>4.397</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Predictors: (Constant), Currently Teaching, Total of intrinsic motivation of preservice, Speak a Second-Language.

b. Dependent Variable: Total of preservice teachers’ self-efficacy

**DISCUSSION**

This study investigated preservice teachers’ motivation and self-efficacy in working with ELLs in Arkansas. The main finding of this study is that preservice teachers who are
attending educational programs were found to have high levels of motivation and self-efficacy to work with ELLs. Further, the results of this study revealed that preservice teachers demonstrated strong and positive correlation between their level of confidence to engage ELLs in class activities, to create instructional strategies tailored for ELLs, and their ability to manage ELLs classroom environment effectively. Finally, the results of this study found that speaking a second-language and the level of intrinsic motivation are significant predictors of preservice teacher’s self-efficacy to work with ELLs.

The first finding of the present study is consistent with previous findings produced in the context of preservice and in-service teachers in other studies. For example, our finding that preservice and in-service teachers who are attending educational training programs showed positive motivation toward teaching ELLs in Arkansas and was found to be similar to other recent studies conducted in the midwestern U.S. or south Texas (Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010; Salas et al., 2006). However, other earlier studies found conflicting results, where preservice teachers were less motivated to teach ELLs (e.g., Artiles & McClafferty, 1998; McDiarmid & Price, 1990). A possible interpretation of these conflicting results may stem from real differences in attitudes among preservice teachers due to their ethnic backgrounds (Salas et al., 2006). Additionally, these results may simply be a product of biased samples as a result of employing a non-random sample to select participants. The present study employed convenience sampling. However, these interpretations need to be examined in future studies.

The second important finding of the present study is that preservice teachers’ confidence to teach ELLs correlates strongly and positively with their abilities to engage ELLs in classroom activities, their ability to create effective instructional strategies for ELLs and their ability to successfully manage ELLs classrooms. This result proved to be consistent with other studies conducted previously with preservice teachers who are attending educational-preparation programs (e.g., Lopez, 2018; Mantero & McVicker, 2006). A possible interpretation of this result is that preservice teachers who are attending educational-preparation programs are trained to use diverse teaching strategies in a wide variety of conditions and with diverse learners, including ELLs and students with exceptionalities. For example, some studies suggested that preservice teachers who attended a semester-long educational course developed empathy and positive perceptions towards ELLs, and felt more prepared to teach ELLs (e.g., Turgut et al., 2016). Conversely, other studies found that preservice teachers who did not receive training related to ELLs pedagogy they felt less confident to teach ELLs (e.g., Bruggink et al., 2016; Everling, 2013; Yoo, 2016).

Finally, the result of the present study indicated that there are two factors that can predict preservice teachers’ confidence to teach ELLs, namely, their ability to speak a second language and their level of motivation to work with ELLs. In general, this result proved to be consistent with other studies, which found that teachers who speak a second-language other than English have higher self-efficacy than teachers who do not (Chu & Garcia, 2014;
Gándara et al., 2005; Paneque & Barbetta, 2006; Siwatu, 2011). A possible interpretation of this result is that preservice teachers’ language background is relevant to how they perceive language learning. The positive effect of a second language could be due to the fact that preservice teachers would not consider language learning to be an impossible task and, consequently, would enhance their self-efficacy. In contrast, preservice teachers who have never learned a second-language would perceive language learning as difficult or nearly impossible. This interpretation was found to be supported by other research, where preservice teachers who studied a second language viewed second-language learning as easy; consequently, they have a high degree of motivation to work with ELLs, are more supportive of ELLs than monolingual preservice teachers, and are more sympathetic toward the challenges facing ELLs in terms of the effort and the motivation required to learn or master a second-language (e.g., Dixon et al., 2016; Ellis, 2004; Salas et al., 2006). Furthermore, other studies found that teachers with at least an intermediate level of proficiency in another language are better prepared to teach ELLs. Consequently, gaining intermediate or advanced proficiency in a language other than English may help preservice teachers gain sympathy for ELLs (Coady et al., 2011).

LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study presents the results regarding preservice teachers' self-efficacy and attitude in working with ELLs in Arkansas and highlights the important role the educational-training programs play in preparing future teachers to work with ELLs. Therefore, it is recommended that future ELL teachers go through pedagogical training to learn about different methods of planning classroom activities, techniques to create effective instructional strategies and classroom management suited for ELLs. Second, the present study emphasizes that learning a second-language by preservice teachers will help them to become supportive and more sympathetic toward the challenges facing ELLs, and, consequently, language learning can help influence preservice teachers’ attitudes toward ELLs.

Although the current study addressed the proposed questions and the theoretical framework, there may be some possible limitations in relation to the population and the absence of previous studies in Arkansas. For example, the participants were just fifty-three preservice teachers selected via convenience sampling from one university. Therefore, a larger sample size recruited from multiple sites would need to be undertaken to fully measure preservice teachers’ self-efficacy and motivation to teach ELLs in Arkansas. Furthermore, the number of participants in this present study was relatively small, and, therefore, it would be difficult to generalize and identify significant relationships or connections within our data set. Another limitation of this study is that there is an absence of previous studies to compare the results or assess the trend of preservice teachers’ self-efficacy and motivation to teach ELLs in Arkansas.
CONCLUSION

The main finding of this study is that preservice teachers who are attending educational programs have high-levels of motivation and self-efficacy to work with ELLs in Arkansas. Furthermore, the results of this study revealed that preservice teachers show a strong and positive correlation between their level of confidence to engage ELLs in class activities, to create instructional strategies tailored for ELLs, and to manage ELLs classroom environment. Finally, the results of this study found that speaking a second-language and the level of intrinsic motivation are significant predictors of preservice teachers’ self-efficacy to work with ELLs in their future classrooms. In general, these results are consistent with previous findings produced in the context of preservice and in-service teachers.
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APPENDIX

Demographic Survey

Gender
- Male
- Female
- non-binary

Fluent in English
- Yes
- No

Age Range
- 18-21
- 22-25
- 26-30
- 31-40
- 41 or over

Years in College
- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior

Major
- 1 Early Childhood Education
- 2 Elementary Education
- 3 Other Middle Education
- 4 High School
Describe Yourself

- 1 American Indian / Native American
- 2 Asian
- 3 Black / African American
- 4 Hispanic / Latino
- 5 White / Caucasian
- 6 Pacific Islander

Currently Teaching

- Yes
- No

Worked with Culturally Diverse Students

- Yes
- No

Speaking a Second Language

- Yes
- No

Preservice Teachers’ Self-Efficacy Regarding ELLs

Please rate your competence in ELL instruction on a 100-point scale with 0 representing “Cannot do at all” and 100 representing “Highly certain can do”. You should answer these questions to the best of your knowledge by circling the choices that most accurately reflect your current situation. All your responses will be confidential.

Please mark your level of confidence of conducting the following tasks with ELLs:

1. Control disruptive behavior of ELL students in the classroom?
2. Motivate ELL students who show low interest in schoolwork?
3. Get ELL students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?
4. Help your ELL students value learning?
5. Craft good questions for your ELL students?
6. Get ELL students to follow classroom rules?
7. Calm an ELL student who is disruptive or noisy?
8. Establish a classroom management system with each group of ELL students?
9. Use a variety of assessment strategies with ELL students?
10. Provide an alternative explanation for example when ELL students are confused?
11. Assist ELL students’ families in helping their children do well in school?
12. Implement alternative strategies for ELL students in the classroom?

Preservice Teachers’ Intrinsic Motivation Regarding ELLs

Please select one response for each of the following statements

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

- I would like to help all students, especially second language and diverse learners.
- I would like to continuously develop my teaching skills to help all students academically, especially second language and diverse learners.

Preservice Teachers’ Beliefs Regarding ELLs

Please select one response for each of the following statements

1. Strongly Agree
2. Somewhat Agree
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

- Teachers should not be expected to adjust their preferred mode of instruction to accommodate the needs of all students.
- Students and teachers would benefit from having a basic understanding of different cultures.
- All students should be encouraged to become fluent in a second language.
- Second language learners should be placed in the regular classroom whenever possible.
- Students living in non-English-speaking households can benefit socially from participating in racially integrated classrooms.