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According to the National Center for Education Statistics, over 4.9 million public school students in the United States are emergent multilingual students (also referred to as English language learners or ELLs), and by 2025, it is estimated that one in four U.S. students will be an emergent multilingual student (NCES, 2019). Research on preparing mainstream teachers to effectively work with linguistically and culturally diverse student groups has shown the promise of preservice field experiences with emerging multilingual students; however, little is known about how these experiences impact teachers’ work, especially their practices, particularly in the long term. This interpretive study aims to investigate new in-service teachers’ perspectives on a multilingual-focused field experience during pre-service teacher preparation and its lasting impact on teaching practices. Drawing on a data corpus of a series of semi-structured interviews, a focus group, field notes, teaching artifacts, and previously-completed field-based pre-service assignments, four cases were examined and themes constructed to highlight new teachers’ beliefs and practices on serving emergent multicultural students.
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Chapter 1: Context of Study

As a non-native speaker of English and a first-generation immigrant, I entered the United States public school system in the early 1990s in a small midwestern school district. At the time, my siblings and I were the first recorded emergent multilingual students to attend this public school. I was confronted with a classroom and learning environment in an entirely foreign language that did not have any supports available to me. Additionally, the teachers and administration were so ill-prepared to serve emergent multilingual students that I was held back an academic year due to the assumption that I was not at the same academic level as my peers. It was not until I slowly began acquiring the English language that teachers realized I was not behind academically but that the language barrier in conjunction with cultural differences prohibited me from demonstrating my knowledge and understanding of academic material.

Throughout my initial years in the American school system, I felt I was offered little opportunity for success due to my teachers’ lack of understanding of my needs and differences as an emergent multilingual and culturally diverse student. The continuous feelings of being viewed as “less than” in comparison to my native English-speaking peers despite being fluent in four other languages caused me to be critical of the education system in which I was raised. By the time I graduated high school, I was painfully aware just how much the system was failing emergent multilingual students; thus, the seed was sown that would grow into my desire to become an educator myself and do better for linguistically diverse students. I obtained degrees in K-12 teacher education, English as a Second Language education, and foreign language
education and spent many years working in public schools in various US states. Still, I felt my efforts were simply not reaching enough students. I wanted to have a broader impact; I wanted to help promote more widespread and lasting change. Eventually, I decided to pursue advanced degrees and become an educator of teachers to help promote awareness of inclusive instructional practices.

As a teacher educator, one of my greatest goals is to prepare future teachers for inclusive practices to integrate emergent multilinguals into their mainstream classroom in order to avoid a traumatic experience such as my own. I want to share my love of teaching and my knowledge of foreign language learning with other individuals working in education particularly in areas where linguistic and cultural diversity is limited. This passion is what originally brought me to Missoula and the University of Montana.

In 2016, a spread of Missoula community members lobbied to bring a refugee resettlement program to the area in light of the global migration crisis. This led to a large influx of culturally and linguistically diverse families moving to the area and a spike in numbers of emergent multilingual students enrolled in the Missoula city and surrounding area school districts. From this, a partnership between the University of Montana Teacher Education Program and the Missoula City School District formed to offer preparation in inclusive pedagogy for pre-service teachers enrolled in the elementary teacher education program. A pilot program was developed in which teacher candidates would participate in an emergent-multilingual focused field experience that specifically partnered teacher candidates with classrooms containing emergent multilingual students in the area’s schools, initially referred to as the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. Teacher candidates spent a minimum of 40 hours in the classroom working with at least one emergent multilingual student one-on-one, in small
groups, and as part of the whole class. As part of this field experience, teacher candidates developed learner profile reports outlining the emergent multilingual student’s cultural and linguistic background, English language proficiency, and academic progress over time.

I was fortunate enough to become involved with this pilot, and the basis of my dissertation research became rooted in finding the impact the pilot program had on the participating teacher candidates. I am a firm believer that learning takes place in the context of real-world challenges. For that reason, investigating teacher candidates’ beliefs and practices before, during, and after participating in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience was of particular interest to me. I utilized a qualitative interpretive study design with elements of a multiple case study in order to investigate new in-service teachers’ perspectives of the impact the pre-service Inclusion and Integration Field Experience had on their teaching practices in the in-service classroom. The hope is that the findings of my study can add to the existing body of knowledge both on a programmatic and a national level as it offers insight into the lasting impact of field experiences working with emergent multilingual students in teacher preparation programs. Unlike most existing studies on emergent multilingual-focused teacher preparation, this study took place in a state showing relatively limited cultural diversity even in urban areas. Additionally, the findings on practices spanned beyond teacher preparation and into in-service teaching, another unique characteristic of my study.

Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students: Terminology

Before analyzing the problem and discussing the existing body of knowledge, it was imperative that I take a look at the terminology used when describing students from culturally diverse backgrounds speaking a language other than English. One term utilized by government bodies to characterize these students is Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students, a term that
highlights shortcomings and deficits. It must be noted that LEP is also used to describe students that only speak English yet may possess a limited repertoire. Another common term currently used is English Language Learner (ELL), a term that reduces the deficit connotation but still does not highlight that the student possessed valuable and unique knowledge of one or more other languages (Valdes, Bunch, Snow, & Lee, 2005). The labels English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a New Language (ENL) suggest that these students are only fluent in one other language while many are already proficient in multiple languages at the time of learning English. One element that all of these terms have in common is that they place the focus on the limited English proficiency and carry a deficit connotation to them (Kleyn & García, 2019). Like a growing number of scholars in the field, I opt to use the term emergent multilingual student (an extension of the term emergent bilingual which assumes English is a second language whereas it actually might be a third, fourth, or seventh language). This term places a focus on the language skills a student already possesses in an asset-view while also highlighting that the student was currently learning an additional language (in our case, English).

Even though the preferred term is emergent multilingual student, I saw myself obligated to use the term ELL at times when discussing the works of seminal authors as this was their original wording. I used these terms interchangeably and only to ensure I was reporting on the work of others accurately by using the respective authors’ language. The pilot program investigated in this study was originally referred to as the ELL Inclusion and Immersion Pilot, which aligned with a local school district's “ELL Services Unit.”. I continued to use this title throughout my study.

Statement of Problem
The 2019 census conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics showed that the American public-school student population is made up of nearly 10% emergent multilingual students, a total of over 4.9 million students which is projected to grow exponentially (NCES, 2021). By 2025, it is expected that one in four public-school students will be an ELL student (NCES, 2021). Emergent multilingual students continue to be at high risk for academic failure. According to the Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition (2020), for emergent multilingual groups, the high school graduation average is 20% lower than that of their native speaking counterparts. In 2018, only 68% of emergent multilingual students graduated while 85% of native English-speaking students graduated. Today, 4th-grade ELL students perform 37% lower than their non-ELL counterparts in reading while 8th-grade ELL students perform 35% lower than their non-ELL counterparts. Similar trends are true for math and science (NCES, 2019).

Over the past two decades, a growing focus on inclusive educational practices has emerged in teacher preparation programs in an attempt to better serve the increasing number of emergent multilingual students (Villegas et. al, 2018); however, it is widely recognized that many pre-service teachers are ill-prepared to work with students who speak languages other than English in the mainstream classroom (Coady, Harper, & de Jong, 2011; Cochran-Smith et. al., 2015; Polat, 2010; Shaw et al., 2014). In fact, many teachers continue to express apprehensions about being able to successfully combine students’ diverse language backgrounds with academic expectations in the content areas despite modified programs that place a focus on preparing candidates to work with emergent multilingual students (Acquah & Commins, 2015).

Those programs and innovations that have been implemented vary greatly in the courses they require and the type of experience they offer the candidates (Cochran-Smith et al.,
2015). The studies that have been conducted to evaluate such programs show similar outcomes: teacher candidates who complete coursework on integrating non-native speakers and students of linguistic diversity in the mainstream classroom initially feel more prepared to teach emergent multilingual students than peers not taking such courses. However, once in the classroom, the instructional practices between these two groups show little difference and in-service teachers continue to express that they lack the knowledge and skills to successfully serve emergent multilingual students (Bisai & Singh, 2020; Cochran-Smith et al., 2015; Luke, 2018; Parker & Hood, 1995; Sleeter, 2001).

An initial issue described by Sleeter (2001) over two decades ago was the lack of relevant field experiences where teacher candidates were engaging with emergent multilingual students in a meaningful manner. A 2018 literature review conducted by Villegas et. al. illustrated the development in this area of teacher preparation by highlighting 20 studies in which teacher preparation programs contained one or more courses with a focus on preparing teacher candidates to serve the emergent multilingual population through relevant field experiences. Villegas et. al. (2018) found that teacher candidates’ beliefs about emergent multilingual students and beliefs about their own role teaching emergent multilinguals were impacted by exposure to and opportunities to interact with linguistically diverse student groups. In their review, 15 out of 20 studies investigated teacher candidate beliefs before and after the preparation program; however, almost none of the studies went on to investigate the lasting impact of the preparation programs on in-service practices.

The main problem faced by researchers and teacher educators is the limited knowledge of the lasting impact teacher preparation programs with emergent multilingual-based field experiences have on in-service teaching (Freiman-Nemser, 2018). To date, many studies focus
on teacher preparation *only* without moving the scope of the study past the preservice period and into the in-service years (Acquah & Commins, 2015; Coady, Harper, & de Jong, 2011; Cochran-Smith et al., 2015; Polat, 2010; Shaw et al., 2014). As can be interpreted from the findings of two prominent literature reviews of the field, understanding the link between pre-service and in-service beliefs and practices is an underexplored area in preparing mainstream teachers to work with emergent multilingual students (Lucas et al., 2018; Villegas et al., 2018). In the hopes of beginning to address this gap in research, I designed and conducted a study that investigated second-year inservice teachers who had participated in a preservice field placement in which they worked in direct contact with emergent multilingual students. I studied these new teachers' perspectives on their experiences and on the impact of the field experience on their current practices.

**Overview of Study and Research Questions**

In this study, I sought to better understand pre-service field experiences and their impact on in-service teaching practices. I studied the experiences and perspectives of four in-service teachers who participated in the same teacher preparation cohort and were partnered with emergent multilingual students during a field experience. The central area of interest included teachers’ beliefs before, during, and after the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience as well as the lasting impact on their practices into their in-service teaching.

**Research Questions**

This interpretive study was guided by two central research questions. Each of the two central questions was supported by three sub-questions.
1. What are early career teachers’ perspectives on their experiences in a preservice emergent multilingual student-focused field placement pilot (Inclusion and Integration Field Experience)?
   1. How do early career teachers describe their beliefs related to serving emergent multilingual students before the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?
   2. How do early career teachers describe their placements in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?
   3. How do early career teachers describe their participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?

2. How do early career teachers describe the influences of a pre-service Inclusion and Integration Field Experience on their current beliefs and teaching practices?
   1. How do early career teachers describe their beliefs related to serving emergent multilingual students immediately after the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?
   2. How do early career teachers describe their practices related to serving emergent multilingual students after the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?
   3. How do early career teachers describe their current teaching practices?

Significance of Study

This study contributes to the limited body of literature investigating the experiences and perspectives of those who participate in multilingual-focused field experiences. Further, it adds to what we know about how such field experiences shape educators’ beliefs and practices in the
short term and in the long term. This is significant, of course, for teacher education faculty and leaders at this institution, but also offers insight for other programs and the broader field.

In addition, the location and context of this study also makes it a valuable contribution to the existing literature on teacher preparation for working with emergent multilingual students. The study took place in an area that had previously exhibited limited visible linguistic diversity particularly in public school enrollment. The influx of refugee families starting in 2016 created a local and more obvious “demographic imperative” (Fisher-Ari et al., 2021; García, Jensen, & Scribner, 2009) for increased investment and attention to growing teachers’ capacity in linguistically inclusive education. Notably, this growth in cultural and linguistic diversity in the area mirrored national trends, which makes this a particularly useful setting and sample for other researchers and educators working in contexts with new and increasing levels of diversity. That said, despite the refugee resettlement and influx, this district still has far less linguistic diversity than many areas across the U.S., so the field experience innovation at the center of this inquiry is relevant to teacher education programs struggling with the challenge of preparing teachers for diverse contexts while situated in mostly-white, mostly-monolingual communities.

It is my hope that the findings from this study can provide insight into teacher education opportunities that successfully prepare teachers to work with emergent multilingual students. The findings also highlight shortcomings in the supports and opportunities currently offered to emergent multilingual students in the elementary grades which could illustrate a need for professional development for in-service teachers that may previously not have been introduced to linguistically inclusive practices. For these reasons, investigating individual participants’ experiences was imperative. My aim was to investigate which specific aspects of the pilot and the field experience had a lasting impact on the beliefs and practices of individual participants as
a means to, hopefully, offer insight into ways to improve classroom and program contexts as a path of improving learning for teacher candidates.

My main goal in conducting this study was to contribute to the larger effort of creating more inclusive and sustaining education systems. The more we know as a field about how pre-service experiences shape teachers’ practices, and thus, daily opportunities for multilingual learners, the better equipped we are to create widespread preparation practices that foster systems in which students from all cultural and linguistic backgrounds feel welcomed and valued during their school years.

Overview of the Dissertation

In the following chapter, I offer clarification on terms frequently used in this field of study as well as in this dissertation. I also discuss current trends in ideologies and views of cultural diversity in the United States. Next, I describe the theoretical framework in which my study is rooted followed by an in-depth investigation of the existing scholarship in this field in the form of a literature review.

In Chapter 3, I outline my methodologies. This includes the design of my study with justification for these decisions as well as a list of the central and supporting research questions. I include considerations about researcher positionality and possible limitations of this study. Further, I discuss the participants and the data sources utilized to gather data from the participants. In this chapter, I also preview my processes for data collection and analysis.

Chapter 4 provides a detailed discussion of my data collection. Here, I outline my decision-making for the data collection process as well as my coding. I describe the three cycles of coding I conducted for each of the four cases as well as the following cross-case analysis.
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In the final chapter, I address my findings following my data analysis. I organize these findings into a series of assertions. Next, I discuss possible implications for the field. Following the implications, I discuss in detail the limitations of my study including my researcher positionality. Finally, I offer recommendations for future research resulting from my study. The final chapter is followed by appendices and the references.
Chapter 2: Literature Review & Theoretical Framework

The rising trend for emergent multilingual students in U.S. schools caused many educators to realize the need for language supports in the mainstream classroom; however, the success or failure of such linguistically inclusive education largely depended on effective teacher preparation that went beyond simply assuming that language specialists were responsible for supporting non-native speakers (Ballantyne et al., 2008).

The purpose of this literature review is to highlight development in linguistically inclusive pedagogy, define key terms, and describe existing findings on trends in teacher beliefs and practices related to working with emergent multilingual students. Investigating the existing body of literature is crucial to understanding the orientation of this study, how the findings of this study tie in, and the value they carry to the field.

Contextual Ideologies and Definitions

Prior to discussing the literature review, I include a discussion of the context and current social ideologies that are relevant to my study. Additionally, I introduce central terms relevant to this field of study and my dissertation. I discuss linguistically inclusive pedagogy, globalization, beliefs, practices, and linguistically inclusive teaching practices.

Linguistically Inclusive Pedagogy

In a mainstream classroom, students stemming from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds possess varying and unique ideologies, opinions, and needs. Students likely possess family structures and practices unique to their culture, carry varying degrees of experience with formal education, and have unique interpretations of social norms for interacting with peers and adults (Waitoller & King Thorius, 2016).
For teachers, this means that a one-size-fits-all approach to teaching is not only irrelevant but also unjust as it does not set students up for equal opportunity to succeed. Linguistically inclusive pedagogy is defined as pedagogy that takes the uniqueness of each student into account by generating a classroom community in which heritage (or native) languages are viewed as an asset rather than a deficit; here, instructional practices are utilized that place value on multilingualism and view learning English as a collaborative journey explored through the diverse lenses of the entire class population (Bisai & Singh, 2020). Such practices include a collaborative classroom environment in which emergent multilingual students as well as native English speaking students collaborate and interact both in written and oral language, the cultural narrative from all classroom members are investigated and valued, and content and format of mandated language proficiency and state testing is integrated into classroom routines (Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2017). Linguistically inclusive classrooms stand in direct opposition to educational monocultures, or classrooms that cater pedagogy to a single dominant language and culture (Luke and Grieshaber, 2004).

In the following sections, I discuss how an awareness came about that linguistically inclusive pedagogy is needed, what experts say on this topic, and how teachers’ beliefs and practices relate to linguistically inclusive pedagogy.

**Globalization and Redefining Mono-national Models of Immigration**

Historically, education in the United States has largely been practiced through a monocultural lens (Luke, 2018). Monoculturalism is the process of allowing for the expression of the single dominant culture in a community, in this case the dominant culture of the school or classroom. In monocultures, individuals of minority cultures are often expected to assimilate to the dominant culture (Rhoads, 1999). Monoculturalism ties in with mono-national models of
assimilation and immigration which suggest that indigenous people and immigrants proceed through a unidirectional transition from their heritage culture to the majority culture. While promising trends to dispel such views existed in past decades, there is a current and growing political movement to maintain monoculturalism in U.S. schools (Luke, 2018; Luke & Carrington, 2003; Luke and Grieshaber, 2004; Smagorinsky, 2022).

Luckily, a large number of emergent multilingual students live a life of transnationalism, a life in which they take on the identities and traditions of two or more communities in which they live or have lived (Hahn, 2020) with one foot rooted in their heritage and home cultures, norms, and traditions while the other foot rests in the practices and norms of the majority culture they encounter in their surrounding community. Students do not simply originate from a country or community of heritage where they left their identity behind to settle in a “new” country or community to fully adopt the dominant culture (Luke, 2018).

This shift demands that we redefine immigration in a trans-national sense since individuals generally develop a sense of self taking root in both the community left as well as the community relocated to. The same is true for our emergent multilingual students in mainstream classrooms. Ensuring teachers view emergent multilingual students through a multicultural lens can positively impact the students’ learning experiences (Carrington, 2003; Luke, 2018).

**Defining Teacher Beliefs and Practices**

Though research on teacher thinking is abundant, debate remains on how the findings can be used to improve teacher education programs particularly for preparing teacher candidates to serve culturally and linguistically diverse students. Few would dispute that teachers’ perceptions and judgments are influenced by their beliefs which, in turn, affect their behaviors in the classroom. Understanding teachers’ and teacher candidates’ belief structures is essential to
improving teacher education programs (Ashton & Webb, 1968; Brookhart & Freeman, 1992). Unfortunately, beliefs is a term rarely defined by researchers, and there is no one consensus definition used consistently in literature.

Pajares (1992) describes the issue of defining beliefs as “at best a game of player’s choice” (p. 309). He explains that the confusion generally centers on the distinction between beliefs and knowledge. The challenge lies in pinpointing where knowledge ends and beliefs begin. The most common distinction is that belief is based on evaluation and judgment while knowledge is based on objective fact (Pajares, 1992). Beliefs are the taken-for-granted thoughts about physical and social reality. They encompass ideas about what oneself and others are like and can be formed through experience, a succession of events, or by chance (Pajares, 1992; Bryan, 2012). Sigel (1985) defines beliefs as “mental constructions of experience [...] often condensed and integrated into schemata or concepts” (p. 351). These constructs are powerful enough to guide thought and behavior. Oftentimes, we cannot factually support our beliefs yet we are sufficiently confident in them that we accept them as truth and base our actions and behaviors on them (Bryan, 2012; Dewey, 1933; Harvey, 1986).

Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014) define beliefs in terms of value and attitude. They begin by defining value as the importance we attribute to ourselves, another person, a thing, or an idea. Next, an attitude is the way we feel about ourselves, others, things, or ideas. Beliefs are composed of our values and attitudes plus our personal knowledge, experiences, opinions, prejudices, morals, and other interpretive perceptions of our social world (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). This definition also suggests that beliefs generally cannot be supported by facts yet guide our actions and behaviors.
My study focused on beliefs pertaining to the roles of teachers and teaching. Educational beliefs center specifically on beliefs teachers hold about their profession, their students, the learning process, their colleagues, their subject matter, their role and responsibilities as teachers of a specific subject matter, and the purpose of schooling in general (Porter & Freeman, 1986). For the purpose of this study, beliefs refers to teacher candidates’ thoughts and mental constructs about emergent multilingual persons, emergent multilingual students in schools, foreign language instruction in the mainstream classroom, as well as their personal role in serving emergent multilingual students in the mainstream classroom.

Just as our beliefs guide our actions and behaviors in our daily lives, a teacher or teacher candidate’s beliefs about their role in serving emergent multilingual students informs their practices in their classroom (Bryan, 2012; Dewey, 1993; Fitzgerald & Palincsar, 2019; Harvey 1986; Pajares, 1992; Sigel, 1985). Grossman (2011) defines teaching practices as the ways in which teachers understand and implement classroom instruction. Teaching practices include offering engaging and explicit academic instruction, implementing learning supports, and building relationships with students and their families for the purpose of helping students reach academic goals and standards (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Fitzgerald & Palincsar, 2019; Grossman, 2011; Macsuga-Gage, Simonsen, & Briere, 2012). In this study, practices refers to teachers’ actions and behaviors aimed at facilitating student learning so that students reach the academic goals and standards of the classroom.

**Defining Inclusive Teaching Practices**

Inclusive teaching practice aims to develop a classroom community that offers rich learning opportunities to all students. However, due to the complexity of the concept, inclusive practice is extremely dependent on contextual factors in national and local settings causing the
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approach to be left open to a wide range of interpretations (Black-Hawkins, 2017). Reclaiming practice from ill-serving approaches requires a shared effort on behalf of all involved. “[I]nclusive education is everybody’s business” (Slee, 2011, p. 83).

For mainstream teachers striving for linguistically inclusive practices, this demands expertise across three primary dimensions including (a) understanding emergent multilingual students from a multilingual and multicultural perspective; (b) understanding how language and culture shape school experiences and inform pedagogy for multilingual learners; and (c) possessing the ability to mediate a range of contextual factors in the schools and classrooms where they teach (de Jong, et al., 2013).

Understanding emergent multilingual students from a multilingual and multicultural perspective is not something gleaned from a list of characteristics but requires careful observation of and intentional interaction with each student to learn about their home contexts, heritage language(s), and cultural background, collectively referred to as a student’s Funds of Knowledge (Gonzalez et al., 2005; Whitburn & Plows, 2017). Information about each student’s linguistic and cultural background combined with English language proficiency assessment data must be utilized to set specific short- and long-term language and literacy objectives and provide scaffolded support to foster progress towards reaching these objectives (Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2017).

Next, mainstream teachers should consider how cultural and linguistic diversity shapes school and educational experiences for students. Yoon et al. (2018) stress the importance of Critical Global Literacies, an instructional framework that teaches students to view the world through a multitude of cultural lenses and to develop personal identities as responsible global citizens. This type of pedagogical approach places value on the diversity that makes up a
classroom and school population by giving a valued voice to every member. A focus should be placed on teaching about and through the lens of represented cultural and linguistic backgrounds in the class (Yoon et al., 2018).

Additionally, teachers should possess an understanding of translinguaging which is the interplay between a student’s native language (referred to as L1) and a student’s subsequent language (referred to as L2) (Wei, 2018). For some students, English language registers used in schools might be their third, fourth, or even seventh dialect/language. For this reason, advocates of inclusive teaching practices argue that teachers should possess training in second or subsequent language acquisition. Most notably, teachers should understand how learning a second or subsequent language differs from learning the first language (Gunderson et. al., 2019).

For example, the stages of progression in learning the L1 differ quite notably from learning the L2. In the L2, an initial silent period is appropriate and not to be confused with limited academic ability (de Jong et. al., 2013). Various frameworks are available to teachers for successfully serving emergent multilingual students. One front-runner is University of Wisconsin-based WIDA, a comprehensive approach to supporting emergent multilingual learners that offers professional development for teachers as well as specific tools for classroom instruction (WIDA, 2021).

Finally, teachers should be able to understand the contextual factors of the school, state, and country in which they teach. This dimension refers to understanding district and federal policy to which they must adhere when working with emergent multilingual students (oftentimes referred to as ELL students in policy text)(de Jong et. al., 2013). While federal policy mandates supports for ELLs, states and individual school districts often have individual and unique supports and frameworks in place for serving emergent multilingual students. What are these
supports and frameworks? Are there specialists available to aid the mainstream teachers in successful inclusion? These are questions teachers must consider in order to achieve best practices in linguistically inclusive instruction (National Clearinghouse for English Language Education, 2021).

**Key Practices that Foster Learning for Emergent Multilingual Students**

To expand on effective teaching that serves emergent multilingual students, I conducted a search on empirical findings that outline further best practices for serving emergent multilingual students. These findings suggest that a great starting point is looking at classroom management and daily routines. While beneficial for the entire student population, linguistically diverse students particularly benefit from a structured routine that allows them to predict what will happen and know what to expect (de Jong, 2021; Le Seaux & Galloway, 2018). Routines allow students to participate in classroom activities without the struggle of having to continuously make sense of new instructions. Marsh (2018) recommends practices such as setting behavior norms, following easily apparent schedules or steps, offering clear objectives and instructions modeled by the teacher, providing visual support, and reusing learned processes. These practices serve to develop routines that foster independence.

In conjunction with developing routines, a series of studies (August & Shanahan, 2008; de Jong et al., 2013; Echevarria & Voigt, 2010; and Goldenberg, 2013) found that implementing cooperative learning activities that allow students to demonstrate understanding in meaningful contexts rather than solely recalling facts strongly benefit emergent multilingual students. Such activities include group work, projects, discussions, poster presentations, role play, and more. In addition to cooperative learning activities, findings also showed (August & Shanahan, 2008; de Jong, 2021; De Jong et al., 2013; Echevarria & Voigt, 2010; Goldenberg, 2010; and Howard et
al., 2007) that emergent multilingual students benefit greatly from social supports such as class discussions and opportunities to collaborate with peers. Interacting with others helps develop oral competencies thus supporting growth in other areas such as grades, test scores, and literacy learning.

Further, several studies (August & Shanahan, 2008; de Jong et al., 2013; Echevarria & Voigt, 2010; and Goldenberg, 2013) expand on Krashen’s (2003) work on comprehensible language input. The findings show that emergent multilingual students demonstrate higher levels of progress when learning activities align with comprehensible language input. Krashen (2003) defines comprehensible language input as language a learner can understand yet is slightly more advanced than their proficiency level. For example, repetitive language rich with vocabulary familiar to the student combined with some new or unfamiliar terms allows students to make meaning through use of context. Combining spoken and written language with visual support further allows students to make meaning of unfamiliar content.

To accurately determine the comprehensible input for individual students, appropriate assessment of language proficiency is also a central element of best practices for serving emergent multilingual students (Castellón et al., 2015). Familiarity with frameworks for gauging language proficiency is central to determining a student’s abilities and offering learning opportunities that challenge them. Assessment through such frameworks should be ongoing and intentional so that learning activities accurately reflect students’ progress (de Jong, 2021; de Jong et al., 2013; Howard et al., 2007; Goldenberg, 2010). An example of such a framework includes the WIDA Can Do Descriptors that assess students based on the skills they possess across domains such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing (WIDA, 2021). This framework is utilized in this study to describe student proficiency.
Knowledge of this array of best practices can help better prepare teachers for serving emergent multilingual students in the classroom. However, knowledge alone generally is not sufficient to ensure a culturally inclusive classroom (Pajares, 1992).

**Pedagogy for Serving Linguistically Diverse Students**

As mentioned in the previous sections, developing a community that is welcoming to diverse cultures, languages, and traditions is the first step in creating an inclusive classroom. This includes culturally relevant pedagogy that teaches content from various and diverse perspectives and incorporates students’ unique backgrounds in every-day instruction (de Jong, 2021; Cummins, 2005; González & Moll, 2002). In the following sections, I outline existing literature relevant to inclusive pedagogy for emergent multilingual students. First, I discuss the importance of direct contact with linguistically and culturally diverse students during teacher preparation. Next, I summarize findings from literature on emergent multilingual-focused field experiences during teacher preparation.

**The Importance of Direct Contact with Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students**

The beliefs teachers hold about cultural and linguistic diversity are significant to the way teachers implement their practices in the classroom. Even though teachers may have good intentions for serving emergent multilingual students, their biases may result in linguistically non-inclusive teaching practices (Peregoy & Boyle, 1997). Even teachers who want the best for emergent multilingual students may discriminate without realizing it (Pajares, 1992). In this section, to further support the value I hope my study can provide, I include a review of the existing findings on the nature of teachers’ beliefs about serving emergent multilingual students and the relationship between beliefs and practices.
Polat (2009), for example, conducted a comparative analysis of pre- and in-service teacher beliefs about readiness and self-competency in serving ELLs. In his study, he utilizes beliefs questionnaires to conduct a multivariate analysis of 171 pre- and in-service teachers. Polat finds that beliefs about serving ELLs appear to be tied to background experiences interacting with emergent multilingual individuals. Additionally, self-competency is distinctly higher among individuals who have prior experiences interacting with emergent multilinguals as well as among in-service teachers (over pre-service teachers) that have had emergent multilingual students in their classroom. Polat notes that one major shortcoming of his study is that he was not able to follow pre-service teachers into their in-service years to gain an understanding of changes in beliefs over time. Instead, he surveys pre-service and in-service teachers as isolated events (Polat, 2009).

A 2011 study by Coady, Harper, and de Jong investigates in-service elementary teacher beliefs of preparation and self-efficacy for working with emergent multilingual students in the state of Florida. The participants stem from one elementary teacher preparation program. Eighty-five teachers are surveyed about their experiences in this program and findings show that teacher graduates consider direct contact with emergent multilingual students in the form of field experiences to be the most beneficial component of the program. Additionally, teachers with background experiences interacting with multilingual individuals and those teachers speaking more than one language themselves express higher self-efficacy than their counterparts (Coady et al., 2011). These findings echo that of other research: direct contact with emergent multilingual students in field experiences during teacher preparation correlates positively to higher self-efficacy and feelings of preparedness (Bollin, 2007; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; de Jong, 2021; Gandara et al., 2005; Lucas & Gringberg, 2008; Zeichner, 1996).
A series of studies investigating the interplay between beliefs and practices found that the cultural and philosophical beliefs teachers have about emergent multilingual students are significant to the way they shape their practices (Karabenick & Noda, 2004; McAllister, 2000; McNab & Payne, 2003; Vartuli, 2005). As previously mentioned, even if teachers have good intentions towards serving emergent multilingual students, cultural biases can lead to unintentional discrimination of emergent multilingual students (Peregoy & Boyle, 1997). A growing body of empirical research shows that teacher education programs can bring about positive change in teacher beliefs thus leading to more inclusive practices. The amount of coursework taken during teacher preparation programs in relation to serving emergent multilingual students and second/subsequent language acquisition positively correlated with more positive beliefs about serving emergent multilingual students in the mainstream classroom.

Additionally, in all of these studies (Carley Rizzuto, 2017; Clark-Goff & Eslami, 2015; Grant & Wong, 2003; Karabenick & Noda, 2004; Mantero & Vicker, 2006; Walker-Dalhouse et al., 2009), direct contact working with emergent multilingual students appears to be the most prominent factor bringing about this change. Authors that use questionnaires to gather participant-feedback find that the number one response suggesting progress is having the opportunity to work with one or more emergent multilingual students.

Again, for most of these studies, data was gathered in isolated instances, leaving the field with limited knowledge about longer-term impact (Grant & Wong, 2003; Karabenick & Noda, 2004; Mantero & Vicker, 2006). While the studies show that coursework and field experiences can have positive effects on beliefs, limited research is available on the changes in beliefs over time and how this change affects practices (Carley Rizzuto, 2017; Clark-Goff & Eslami, 2015; Walker-Dalhouse et al., 2009).
I strive to help address this gap by investigating teacher beliefs and practices spanning several years from pre-service to in-service. Since a central area of interest in my study is the field experience in which pre-service teachers participated, it is important to look at the existing body of literature on pre-service field experiences specific to working with emergent multilinguals and the findings relevant to improving teacher preparation.

**Emergent Multilingual-Focused Pre-service Field Experiences**

In a literature review of research on mainstream teacher preparation for serving emergent multilingual students, Villegas et al. (2018) suggest that, along with coursework on linguistically inclusive education, field experiences partnering teacher candidates with emergent multilingual students have a strong correlation with positive changes in beliefs on serving emergent multilingual students (Villegas et al., 2018).

Villegas et al. (2018) explain that teachers’ beliefs about emergent multilingual students and beliefs about their own role teaching emergent multilinguals are strongly impacted by exposure and opportunities to interact with non-native speakers. In fact, the findings from this review depict learning as an active and situated process, a depiction that aligns directly with the theoretical framework of my study. Studies in which students are actively engaged in activities such as tutoring and mentoring emergent multilingual students show a stronger correlation in change of beliefs than their counterparts in which participants solely take coursework without direct contact with emergent multilingual students (Bollin, 2007; Gross & Fitts, 2012; Pappamihiel, 2007).

Of the studies investigating field experiences, all but two examine elementary teacher preparation programs that mandate a 3-credit course on working with diverse student populations with at least some sort of component on second language acquisition theory and instructional
approaches. While dispersed throughout the U.S., all of these studies take place at universities located in metropolitan areas with relatively high cultural and linguistic diversity in the community (Hutchinson, 2013; Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012; Virtue, 2009), particularly in comparison to the setting of my study. A variety of field experiences ranging from 10 to 25 hours working with students in the community accompanied the coursework (Pappamihiel, 2007; Pu, 2012; Zainuddin & Moore, 2004). The findings in these studies are unanimous: direct contact working with emergent multilingual students leads to positive change in appreciation for cultural and linguistic diversity in the mainstream classroom, principles of second language acquisition, and awareness of personal biases as possible barriers for serving emergent multilingual students (Hutchinson, 2013; Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012; Pu, 2012; Zainuddin & Moore, 2004). The following table provides a clearer outline of individual studies’ contexts, research questions, data sources, and findings.

**Figure 1**

*Overview of Existing Literature on Emergent Multilingual Student-Based Field Placements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Participants &amp; Data Sources</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson (2013)</td>
<td>An elementary teacher preparation program in a public university in Pennsylvania that requires a three-credit course on competencies and skills needed to assist ELLs. Mandatory 3 days observing an ESL support classroom over the course of 10 weeks.</td>
<td>How did the pre-service teachers’ attitudes toward ELLs in general and toward working with ELLs evolve through their participation in this course? How did pre-service teachers’ knowledge of working with these students evolve through their participation in this course?</td>
<td>25 pr-service teachers enrolled in the foundations course. Pre- and post-course surveys were administered to gather participants’ attitudes towards serving ELLs. Written reports based on participants’ observations during their field experience.</td>
<td>One positive finding is the significant shift in attitude about ELLs and the way in which they can be supported in the mainstream classroom Exposure to dedicated ESL educators working with culturally and linguistically diverse students introduced participants to specific strategies that altered their beliefs of self-efficacy An overall growth in appreciation for the need to serve ELLs in the mainstream classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimenez-Silva &amp; Olson (2012)</td>
<td>An elementary teacher preparation program at a university located in a metropolitan area of the southwestern US. One required semester long course on second language acquisition theories, strategies, and policies during the second semester of the teacher preparation program that mandated 16 hours of field experience in a low-income school</td>
<td>How or whether participants in Teacher-Learner Communities (TLCs) enabled pre-service teachers to begin to use the theories learned in the teacher education program in their thinking about their future classroom practices with ELLs?</td>
<td>Participants completed written reflections on their time in the field based on Wenger and Lave’s (2001) theory of learning through participation and interaction in a community. Thirty-three of these written reflections were analyzed. Twenty-six pre-service teachers’ completed course evaluation at the end of the semester. Two semi-structured interviews with focus groups of a total of 13 participants</td>
<td>Overwhelmingly positive responses on Likert scale in course evaluation. It must be mentioned that the survey was generic and did not speak directly to serving ELLs in the mainstream classroom. (ie. Asked about relevance of course content to future teaching practices etc.) Overall, findings suggest that TLCs can be a positive source of influence and support; however, there were no direct findings to the relationship to preparing candidates to serve ELLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Institution/Location</td>
<td>Course Requirement</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pappamihiel (2007)</td>
<td>A large Florida university with over 35,000 students. Mandatory course on ELL instruction with a 10 hour field experience requirement working with an ELL partner in the community</td>
<td>A study used to investigate how a community-based service learning project was used to begin to investigate the attitudes and beliefs of preservice content-area teachers toward ELLs. Exames beliefs of preservice teachers.</td>
<td>Data were collected over the course of three years from several cohorts moving through this required course and field experience. Main data came in the form of reflective journals which 130 pre-service teachers completed as part of the class assignment.</td>
<td>Key findings highlight the cultural aha moments participants had in the field while working with ELL partners. These aha moments connected learned theory and reflected changes in attitudes and/or beliefs. The journals highlight positive changes in acceptance and sense of responsibility in supporting ELLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pu (2012)</td>
<td>Liberal arts college in unknown US location. Mandates one course on TESOL in conjunction with 20 field experience hours working with an ELL student.</td>
<td>What are themes of teaching ELLs that emerged from preservice teachers’ narratives? How do narratives inform our understanding of preservice teachers? What are the implications for preparing teachers of ELLs?</td>
<td>Twenty-one participants from this course. Participants created a narrative reflection after their field experience which made up the basis for data collection</td>
<td>The narrative reflection reports were analyzed across five themes. Results showed that it is more valuable for preservice teachers to recognize their own beliefs and values about ELLs rather than learning about isolated theory as acknowledgement of beliefs and values can help eliminate biases and fosters deeper appreciation for serving ELLs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Virtue (2009) studied a teacher preparation program at a US college in an unknown metropolitan location. As a field experience requirement of one ESOL course, pre-service teachers (referred to as interns) participate in “rounds” similar to medical interns. Pre-service teachers participate in a rotation of “rounds” where they work closely with one mentor (an in-service teacher or support specialist) for a specific time before moving on to the next rounds rotation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do the interns tend to see and hear during the ESOL rounds experience?</td>
<td>Twenty-two pre-service candidates in various cohorts over the course of three years, all participating in the ESOL rounds experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do the interns learn from or value in the ESOL rounds experience?</td>
<td>Data sources consisted of researcher’s field notes as well as participants’ observation protocols during their rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways can the ESOL rounds experience be improved?</td>
<td>“Rounds” approach allows participants to see beneath the surface of an ELL’s every-day life in school. This goes beyond the short lessons or activities which the participant may otherwise observe or engage in when partnered with just one ELL in one specific classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observing mentors/specialists positively impacts beliefs of self-efficacy. Direct contact with ELLs results in positive changes in appreciation for serving ELLs.
Zainuddin & Moore (2004)

| A large university in an unknown US location. TESOL-focused introductory course requiring 12 hours of observation and interaction with an ELL over the course of 6 weeks | In what ways do pre-service teachers utilize their growing TESOL knowledge base in their action research with ELLs? Have the pre-service teachers’ beliefs been challenged or altered during the action research? | 16 participants (voluntary) of which 14 are female. Data stem from participants’ field notes and interviews conducted at the end of the field experience. Participants interacted with ELLs through homework tutoring and conducting oral and literacy activities | Participants showed increased appreciation in the following areas: language learning expectations, Role of background knowledge in language acquisition, role of the home language in second/further language learning and nature of comprehensible input, awareness of personal biases and practices as barriers to learning, and their own knowledge gap on cross-cultural differences. Only study that took future practices into consideration |

Despite the largely unanimous findings that direct contact with emergent multilingual students in field experiences positively prepare pre-service teachers for serving emergent multilingual students, I want to highlight that the majority of the studies analyzed in this review focused on teacher candidates’ beliefs about emergent multilingual students and a lesser degree on the skills and pedagogy necessary to serve them. These studies give considerably less attention to the practices teachers implement (Bollin, 2007; Gross & Fitts, 2012; Pappamihiel, 2007). Villegas et al. (2018) describe this lack of attention given to issues of practice as problematic.
De Jong and Naranjo (2019) propose a large-scale curricular change for K-12 teacher preparation programs that would infuse emergent multilingual student teacher preparation in the general teacher preparation program. Financially supported by the US-Department of Education, they conducted a qualitative study to investigate the curricular changes general education teachers undertook to infuse ELL-specific content in the general education courses. The aim of this study is to outline steps taken through analysis of syllabi and learning materials as a means for offering concrete suggestions to other institutions for also infusing emergent multilingual student-specific content in teacher preparation programs (de Jong & Naranjo, 2019).

The study led to more extensive work and a 2021 publication by de Jong. In her book, de Jong outlines a series of skills and practices that should be infused in general education courses including proper assessment of emergent multilingual students’ proficiency, student centered and individualized lesson strategies, collaborative learning opportunities, reassessment for progress and intervention development, and culturally inclusive modeling to combat the antagonistic views towards culturally diverse individuals as is favored in some current political movements (de Jong, 2021).

In a 2022 study, Uzum, Yazan, and Avineri build on de Jong’s work by addressing the pressures of the current social and political movements that are impacting pre-service teachers’ identity development. Based on a constant comparative method and critical discourse analysis, the findings demonstrate that pre-service teachers experience tensions related to their identities and ideologies in addition to their skill development. One prevalent theme includes first-hand experiences with the language barrier when working with emergent multilingual students resulting in limited agency and helplessness in their teaching if they do not speak the first language of the emergent multilingual students. Another recurring theme is a personal identity
crisis as well as a difficulty to foster an inclusive environment for the identities of their students. The authors suggest that these ideological crises should be addressed in teacher education programs to build identity-focused critical teacher learning practices and to help pre-service teachers develop a balance between personal and professional ideologies as a means for claiming ownership of their transformation into social justice-oriented teachers (Uzum, Yazan, & Avineri, 2022).

Identity development for social justice among teachers is particularly relevant in rural communities that do not exhibit large visible diversity and may favor monolingual views of education and lifestyle. Golombek, Olszewska, and Coady (2022) investigate the use of counterstories to combat antagonistic views of non-dominant populations, particularly immigrant families, in such rural communities as a means for humanizing emergent multilingual students in the eyes of mainstream classroom teachers. The study suggests that counterstories impact teacher ideologies positively particularly when direct contact with emergent multilingual students may not be possible during teacher preparation. Further, changing the narrative positively impacts pre-service teachers’ willingness to form collaborative partnerships with families of emergent multilingual students regardless of racial or cultural background (Blair, & Haneda, 2021). In both studies, a primary limitation is acknowledged as the limited scope in which the study took place. Conducting such research with larger study populations would help increase generalizability of the findings.

The Conceptual Framework: Situated Learning Theory

Through the personal experiences of my lifetime both as a student and as a teacher, I have come to view learning as interrelated with the contexts and environment in which it happens. I believe successful learning is interconnected with a person’s real-world experiences,
role within a community, and interactions with other people as is suggested by situated learning theory.

Situated learning theory proposes that learning takes place in a specific time and place and essentially involves creating meaning from the personal experiences of daily living. To situate learning means to create learning opportunities in which the participants experience the complexity and ambiguity of the real world (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Rather than memorizing information out of context, in situated learning, participants create their own knowledge from the results of lived experiences such as the relationships with other participants, hands-on activities, responding to environmental cues, and engaging with social norms developed and maintained by the community that the experience is taking place in (Lave & Wenger, 1991; McLellan, 1996; Stein, 1998).

A central notion of situated learning theory is that students learn by participating in real-world activities rather than obtaining information from carefully prepared packages by an instructor (Stein, 1998); this focus is well-suited for a study of direct clinical experiences. Three central elements of situated learning include context, community, and participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Learning in context refers to creating a learning environment that fosters tasks and skills learners must complete and/or master in order to be successful in practice (Stein, 1998). In my study, the context consisted of the opportunities to learn that the participants were offered such as the preparation for the field experience facilitated by the ELL specialists as well as the actual field experience working with emergent multilingual students in the public schools, both of which allowed the participants to interact with relevant social and cultural norms (Brown et al., 1989). Context is not to be confused with community. Context represents the setting for
experience while community entails the social interaction necessary for reflection and forming meaning (Brown et al., 1989; Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Through community, learners are given the opportunity to reflect, interpret, and make meaning of the experiences in the learning context. Most importantly, community provides the opportunity for social interaction and dialog with others in order to help the learner reflect on their experiences and make meaning. Community allows participants to try out new skills and knowledge and reflect on these practices (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In this study, the community refers to the mentors, the peers, and the students with which the participants are interacting as well as the social norms and cultural expectations within the community.

Finally, participation refers to the exchange of ideas, attempts at problem solving, and active engagement of learners with the community and the context (Lave & Wenger, 1992). In this study, participation refers to the opportunities the participants are given to try out teaching practices for serving emergent multilingual students with each other, with mentors, and with emergent multilingual students in the field experience.

**Summary of the Literature Review and Next Steps**

In this literature review, I discussed common terminology and offered definitions for field-specific concepts. Further, I offered an overview of the social and ideological contexts surrounding inclusive education particularly in light of currently growing political movements in the U.S. Next, I analyzed existing studies relevant to best practices and teacher preparation relevant to linguistically inclusive education and highlighted the gaps in this literature.

With this study, my hope was to add to this existing body of knowledge by investigating in-service teachers’ perceptions of an emergent multilingual student-focused field placement and its impact on their beliefs and practices over time. While existing research literature conveys
some things about the general promise of field experiences on preservice teacher beliefs and practices, limited findings are available on the longer-term impact, or on particularities of experiences and contextual factors in field experiences that shape teacher learning. The following chapter details my methodological approach, data collection, and analysis.
Chapter 3: Methodology

My goal for this study was to understand new in-service teachers’ perspectives on the impact of pre-service field placements working with emergent multilingual students (referred to as the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience) had on their in-service beliefs and practices. I hoped to provide information on the participants’ experiences in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience as well as any changes over time in their beliefs and practices when working with emergent multilingual students in the mainstream classroom (Creswell & Poth, 2018). With my findings, I hoped to provide insight into any changes in beliefs and practices over time before, during, and after the field experience partnered with an emergent multilingual student in an attempt to answer two central research questions supported by several sub-questions.

Research Questions

This interpretive study is guided by two central research questions. Each of the two central questions is supported by three sub-questions.

1. What are early career teachers’ perspectives on their experiences in a preservice emergent multilingual student-focused field placement pilot (Inclusion and Integration Field Experience)?
   1. How do early career teachers describe their beliefs related to serving emergent multilingual students before the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?
   2. How do early career teachers describe their placements in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?
3. How do early career teachers describe their participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?

2. How do early career teachers describe the influences of a pre-service Inclusion and Integration Field Experience on their current beliefs and teaching practices?

1. How do early career teachers describe their beliefs related to serving emergent multilingual students immediately after the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?

2. How do early career teachers describe their practices related to serving emergent multilingual students after the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?

3. How do early career teachers describe their current teaching practices?

**Design of Study**

I utilized an interpretative study design containing elements of a multiple case study approach (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Denzin, 2001; Erickson, 1985; Yin, 2018) to investigate in-service teachers’ perspectives on their participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience pilot as well as their beliefs and practices for serving emergent multilingual students in the mainstream classroom after participating in the pilot. Interpretive research takes an experience-near orientation that views human interaction as a meaningful result of historical and social factors (Erickson, 1985). Further, interpretive research allows the researcher to draw from case study methodologies without restricting the design to specific standards or procedures. Finally, interpretive research allows the researcher to view learning environments as communities (Denzin, 2001; Erickson, 1986).
The interpretive researcher does not start out a study with predetermined a priori concepts; instead, interpretive research aims to allow these concepts to unfold organically (Bevir & Kedar, 2008; Erickson, 1985). In my study, the interpretive design drew on methods from a multiple case study approach as this placed the lived experiences of multiple individuals in the center of the research (Erickson, 1985).

What set this study apart from previously published work on the impact of field experiences in teacher preparation was that the participants were tracked beyond their teacher preparation and into their first years as in-service teachers. The interpretative nature of this study allowed me to portray findings in narrative form utilizing subjective statements from participants to highlight their unique experiences within the social contexts of working with emergent multilingual students (Denzin, 2001). Following the procedure of multiple case study design, I was able to code the data for each participant, or case, individually and construct themes specific to each participant’s lived experience. After coding the data for each case individually, I cross-compared the themes for patterns between the four participants (Yin, 2018). This coding procedure is described in detail in the section entitled Data Analysis.

Context of the Local District, Teacher Education Program, and Field Placements

The study focused on a university-based elementary teacher preparation program in a largely rural state in the Western United States.

District and Community Context

Like most districts in the region where this study took place, this school district has relatively low numbers of ELL-designated students; emergent bilingual students comprised 2.4% of total student population at the time of writing (OPI, 2023). That said, the years between the
reopening of a refugee resettlement office in 2016, and the 2018-19 school year when this study took place, there was a 60 percent influx in ELL-designated students in this district (OPI, 2023). Families fleeing war and devastation in their home countries (in Central and Northeastern Africa and the Middle East) began to settle, at least temporarily, in this area (Brayko, 2018, p. 1); school-aged children from these families joined local schools, growing the existing ELL population which had primarily consisted of Indigenous students. The spiking growth rate of newly-arrived refugee students and the fact that many of these students had lower English proficiency than many other emerging bilingual students led to heightened interest in professional development and support among local educators and school leaders (Brayko, 2018). This context set the stage for a collaborative effort between district personnel and university-based teacher educators to create the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience pilot.

**Teacher Education Program**

In this program, teacher candidates completed two years of prerequisite coursework followed by four semesters, referred to as *levels*, of education coursework paired with clinical experiences. Level I required teacher candidates to invest 46 hours in a K-3 classroom as well as spending 16 hours interning in the University’s lab preschool. Level II required teacher candidates to work in a specific elementary classroom part-time for a total of 40 hours in addition to spending 20 hours working in an after-school program. Level III required students to work full-time in a classroom for four to five consecutive weeks totaling 16 full school days or approximately 123 hours in the field. Level IV required students to complete 16 weeks of student teaching in an elementary or middle school classroom. The required coursework and field experiences for each level are outlined in the following table. (Note: candidates had other
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program coursework requirements that are not listed here, but these courses are considered to be “core” courses taken by cohort members during each level.)

**Figure 2**

*Elementary Teacher Education Program Level Descriptions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level within Program</th>
<th>Core Coursework for each level</th>
<th>Associated Clinical Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I - Learning and Instruction</td>
<td>Educational Psychology and Child Development  &lt;br&gt; Academic Interventions  &lt;br&gt;-Methods PK-4 Early Numeracy  &lt;br&gt;-Methods PK-3 Early Literacy  &lt;br&gt;-Promoting Wellbeing in P-12 Classroom</td>
<td>46 hours working in K-3 classroom; course-field connections focus on individual student case study work (inquiry, assessment, instruction/intervention).  &lt;br&gt;16 hours interning in the University’s lab preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II - Critical Thinking and Problem Solving</td>
<td>Exceptionalities  &lt;br&gt;Integrating Technology into Education  &lt;br&gt;Methods PK-8 Language Arts  &lt;br&gt;General Science: Conservation Education  &lt;br&gt;Ethics and Policy Issues</td>
<td>40 hours working with one or more specific students with a focus on small group work; K-8 classroom twice a week for approx. 8 weeks  &lt;br&gt;20 hours working in an after school program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III - Pedagogy and Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Classroom Management Methods: Teaching and Assessing 5-8 Mathematics</td>
<td>Four to five consecutive weeks working full-time in a K-8 classroom four to five days a week totalling approximately 123 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methods: Teaching and Assessing K-8 Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methods: Teaching and Assessing K-8 Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methods: Teaching and Assessing 4-8 Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV - Student Teaching Semester</td>
<td>Reflective Practice and Applied Research</td>
<td>One full academic semester (16 weeks) working full-time in a K-8 classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teaching K-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Inclusion and Integration Field Experience took place during Level II; all of the program’s teacher candidates were mandated to complete 40 field experience hours in a local elementary school working with students in small group settings (in addition to other requirements). Nine individuals from this cohort of 39 candidates volunteered to participate in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience for their Level II clinical work. Of these nine teacher candidates, eight were white females in their early to mid 20s. One candidate was a white male in his early 20s.
For the pilot, cooperating teachers from local elementary schools that enrolled one or more emergent multilingual students in their classrooms volunteered to host one of the nine teacher candidates in their classrooms to support the student(s). Additionally, these nine individuals participated in a preparation workshop facilitated by ELL specialists from the local school district. In this workshop, the ELL specialists introduced topics relevant to culture, terminology, state context, countries of origin, trauma, and language proficiency testing. The ELL specialists also discussed the University of Madison-Wisconsin’s WIDA Can-Do Descriptors for tracking progress in English acquisition and discussed inclusive instructional approaches for serving emergent multilingual students. I obtained permission from WIDA through the Wisconsin Center of Education Products and Services Department to utilize the WIDA Can Do Descriptors charts in this dissertation. These charts are illustrated in Appendix A in conjunction with the training materials and slides used in the workshop.

During the Level II field experience, interactions with the emergent multilingual student could take place one-on-one, in small groups, or as part of whole-class instruction. Throughout this field experience, teacher candidates drafted learner profile reports outlining the emergent multilingual student’s cultural and linguistic background, English language proficiency across four language domains (reading, writing, speaking, listening), social and academic needs, responses to interventions offered, as well as progress over the course of the field experience. The specific requirements for the learner profile report assignments are shown in Appendix C.

Throughout the duration of the nine to ten week placement, participants joined in a small-group seminar with a university supervisor for an opportunity to seek guidance and ask questions. Additionally, each participant was observed by a faculty supervisor twice throughout their field placement. The observation sessions were followed by a debriefing conversation that
allowed the faculty supervisor to provide feedback. If challenges arose throughout the field placement, candidates were able to connect with their supervisors outside of these observation and debriefing sessions. Further, candidates received a number of assignments that engaged their field work including a language arts lesson plan, a Universal Design for Learning lesson plan, and a technology lesson plan.

Participants

Since I was reliant on voluntary participation in this study, participants stemmed from a convenience sample in which all interested and eligible teachers were selected as participants: Each of these participants according to Creswell and Poth (2016) could “purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon” (p. 159).

The inclusion criteria for selection were: (1) having participated in the Level II field experience partnered with an emergent multilingual student, (2) having graduated from the institution’s elementary teacher preparation program, and (3) currently being employed as an in-service mainstream classroom teacher. Once a list of viable candidates meeting these criteria was developed, recruitment took place through emails as was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Of the original nine participants in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, five individuals met the inclusion criteria. These five participants were all white females in their early to mid 20ies. Initially, all five agreed to participate; however, one individual withdrew from the study during the data collection phase due to personal circumstances unrelated to the scope of the study. Figure 3 depicts demographic and current teaching information for the four participants that concluded the study. All names of individuals and locations were replaced with pseudonyms.

Figure 3
### Participant and School Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant's Demographic Information</th>
<th>Current School Setting</th>
<th>Grade &amp; Students</th>
<th>School/Class Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1: Sophie Anders</td>
<td>Frontier School Two-Classroom Schoolhouse</td>
<td>1st-4th</td>
<td>7 students total across all four grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 20s White Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diverse sociocultural backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2: Kathryn Brooks</td>
<td>Semi-rural Grades K-5</td>
<td>3rd grade</td>
<td>20+ students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 20s White Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diverse sociocultural backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3: Lexi Winters</td>
<td>Very rural Grades K-8</td>
<td>1st grade</td>
<td>20+ students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 20s White Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited visible cultural diversity across entire school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4: Maria Peters</td>
<td>Semi-rural Grades K-5</td>
<td>3rd grade</td>
<td>20+ students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 20s White Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited visible cultural diversity across entire school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limited visible cultural diversity across entire school
Several documented ELL students in other classrooms
One documented ELL student in another classroom

Limited visible cultural diversity across entire school
One documented ELL student in another classroom

No documented or visible linguistic diversity
No visible cultural diversity
Limited visible cultural diversity across entire school
One documented ELL student in another classroom

No documented or visible linguistic diversity
No visible cultural diversity
One documented ELL student in another classroom
Researcher Positionality

As a former emergent multilingual student during my elementary education, I have experienced the emotions of fear, confusion, frustration, isolation, and anger directly related to the language barrier and the lack of supports received during my education. I felt that I was being viewed as “less than” and not valued or included in the classroom community simply because I did not speak or understand English. These experiences not only impacted my academic progress, but also my self-esteem, behavior, and mental health. Since first entering a teacher preparation program myself, I have set the goal of helping eliminate such detrimental experiences for other emergent multilingual students. Here, I discuss my positionality as posing possible limitations for this study.

First, it should be acknowledged that my personal experiences as an emergent multilingual student place me at risk for entering my data coding with a priori assumptions. Even though my personal experiences are an asset to my dedication to this field, I took precautionary measures to decrease the chance of my own positionality impacting my data coding and analysis. These measures are outlined in detail in the next chapter.

Next, it is important to acknowledge my level of education and training in the field of education, particularly in linguistically and culturally inclusive education. My existing knowledge impacts what I may view as good teaching practice. For this reason, I strive to connect my findings on practices to the definitions and studies I discussed by seminal authors in Chapter 2.

Further, at the time of the study, I served as an instructor in the elementary teacher education program in which the study took place. I was actively engaged in working with and mentoring the cohort of teacher candidates from which the participants of this study were
selected. The participants were former students of mine with whom I interacted and developed professional relationships. I offer suggestions for alleviating this limitation in future studies in Chapter 5. Additionally, I kept a detailed log in a researcher’s journal that tracked my thinking and personal perspectives throughout the entire research process starting with drafting the initial proposal all the way through discussion of the final findings. Despite these limitations, it should be noted that my relationship with the participants could also have served as a benefit. The participants’ familiarity in working with me could have fostered a higher level of comfort in sharing experiences, particularly experiences of shortcomings or failures.

Finally, the participants’ positionality likely also impacted the findings. As I mentioned, all four participants chose to participate in the pilot and in my study. From my study alone, it is unclear if the pilot was impactful because the participants were eager and/or if such a clinical field experience would be less impactful if participants are not or less eager to participate. This consideration is also addressed in my recommendations for future research in Chapter 5.

Additionally, the four participants’ educational level may have also played a role in how they experience the clinical field experience. One participant was a graduate student at the time of the pilot and had completed additional coursework on UDL and displayed a more in-depth understanding and appreciation for inclusive instruction. Another participant was pursuing a literacy endorsement and had also completed additional coursework on language pedagogy at the time of the pilot. These details likely affected the participants’ experiences in the pilot.

**Informed Consent and Confidentiality**

Participants were required to complete documentation for informed consent (Appendix B). Consent was required prior to reviewing the previously completed learner profile reports and conducting interviews and the focus group. In the informed consent documentation, participants
were notified of the steps taken to ensure confidentiality. First, each participant was assigned a pseudonym to be used in place of their own name. Next, all participants’ names and other identifying information were removed from the learner profile reports, interview transcripts, focus group transcript, and other artifacts/documents. The key that matched the pseudonyms to real names was stored on a separate USB storage device that was kept locked up separately from all collected data. Only the researcher had access to the key.

**Data Sources**

The instruments used for data collection consisted of the learner profile reports, semi-structured interviews, a focus group (Krueger, 1994), field notes, and teaching artifacts (Yin, 2018) shared by the participants (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Additionally, the slides and training materials provided by the district ELL specialists (see Appendix A) were used as artifacts to contextualize the placements and serve as discussion points in the interviews and focus group.

**Learner Profile Reports**

The first instrument for data collection consisted of the pre-existing learner profile reports which the participants drafted in accordance with the requirements of the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience during Level II of their teacher preparation program (Appendix C). In the clinical experience, each participant was paired with at least one emergent multilingual student to work with throughout the 40 hours logged in the field. The reports outlined the emergent multilingual student’s language proficiency, cultural and social background, as well as interactions between the participant and the emergent multilingual student.

These learner profile reports fell under the realm of Documents (Yin, 2018) and provided a relevant source of evidence for understanding the participants’ beliefs about emergent multilingual students in the mainstream classroom, the teacher’s role, and personal practice. I
analyzed these profile reports and constructed recurring themes through values coding (see data analysis for more information) (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014).

**Semi-Structured Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews are interviews that follow a predetermined protocol of open-ended questions that allow interviewees to answer in free narrative form and share their thoughts and perceptions without risk of the interviewer leading an answer in a specific direction (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Olson, 2016; Yin, 2018). I conducted one semi-structured interview consisting of a series of questions with each participant. These interviews resembled guided conversations. Olson (2016) explains that unstructured and semi-structured interviews allow the researcher to form a relationship with the participant in which the participant feels free to tell their story freely. Further, semi-structured interviews, explains Olson (2016), are particularly ideal in studies where some data has already been collected and the interview questions can be formulated to complement existing data. In this study, the learner profile reports served as initial sources of data and allowed me to generate questions that built on the information presented in the learner profile reports to develop a more complete picture of participants’ experiences in order to answer the research questions (Olson, 2016). Additionally, participants were invited to bring artifacts representative of their typical teaching routines to their interviews. These artifacts supported participants in talking about their teaching practices and are discussed in detail in a later section in this chapter.

Additionally, according to Lave and Wenger (1991), learning and development take place in socially shaped contexts and therefore cannot be viewed as isolated occurrences. These interviews offered me the opportunity to collect data beyond the scope of the field experience as an isolated occurrence. I was able to generate a line of inquiry to investigate the participants’
experiences with emergent multilingual students prior to their teacher preparation program, during their teacher preparation program, and during their in-service teaching. The questions allowed for a free-flowing conversation in which participants could share their experiences as well as their beliefs on influences of the experience on their current beliefs and practices (Olson, 2016).

For these interviews, it was important to note that, despite me wanting to know “why” a particular process occurred, this form of questioning could generate defensiveness on behalf of the interviewee (Becker, 1998). Instead, Becker proposed using “how” forms of inquiry to generate a friendly, non-threatening atmosphere (1998). While conducting these interviews, it was crucial that I avoided a conversational nature to prevent mutual influence between the interviewee and myself (known as reflexivity) (Olson, 2016). By adhering to these procedures, I hoped to gain insight into each participant’s current beliefs and practice in their own mainstream classrooms. All interviews were recorded, transcribed, and transcripts uploaded to MAXQDA, a qualitative analysis software (MAXQDA, 2022).

I asked the following questions:

1. Tell me about yourself and your current teaching position.
   a. What did you do in school today? This week?
2. Tell me about the teaching artifact that you brought with you.
   a. How is this artifact representative of your teaching?
3. What did your classroom and teaching look like during the pandemic and your first year of in-service teaching?
4. Tell me about your background and the cultural diversity in which you grew up.
a. Prior to participating in the Elementary Teacher Education program, are there any specific memories that stick out where you interacted with non-native English speakers?

5. Thinking back on the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, tell me about the ELL student (or students) you were partnered with.
   a. What can you tell me about their cultural background, prior experience with formal education, social and behavioral characteristics, and literacy skills both in English as well as in other languages?

6. How would you describe a specific memory of working with your ELL student that is representative of your time together?

7. How would you describe the ELL student’s relationship with other teachers, professionals, adults, and students?
   a. How did they interact with each other?
   b. What seemed to work and what didn’t?

8. Are there any specific memories that come to mind where you found yourself in a “tricky teacher moment”, a moment that was unique, challenging, or even uncomfortable because of racial, cultural, or social topics/differences?

9. After having had the opportunity to revisit your own Learner Profile Reports, what are significant memories or realizations that came to mind?

10. Were there any big take-aways for you from the ELL-based field placement?
11. If the ELL student were to join your current classroom, what would you do to serve them?

12. Overall, what would you recommend to the Elementary Teacher Education Program at the University?

   a. Would you recommend the ELL-based field placements for all participants?
   
   b. What are changes you would suggest? What did you find particularly beneficial to your learning?

   c. What seemed limiting?

12. Finally, is there anything else you’d like to add?

Focus Group

Focus groups are small, structured groups that allow participants to share opinions and experiences on specifically selected topics through group interaction (Litosseliti, 2003). Krueger (1994) describes the focus group as “a carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment” (p. 6). Focus groups are facilitated by a moderator who offers a series of predetermined, open-ended questions that are carefully and deliberately developed to foster an ongoing discussion without leading participants to specific answers. The moderator provides limited intervention and simply helps keep the discussion on track (Litosseliti, 2003). Focus groups are particularly ideal when the interviewer is interested in the interactions and the results of the interactions between participants (Olson, 2016). With the focus group, I hoped that the opportunity to interact with former peers would prompt additional memories or reflections of the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience that may not have come up during the individual interviews.
I conducted one 90-minute focus group via Zoom with all four participants. At this point, all participants had already reviewed their learner profile reports and participated in their respective individual interview. Even though many topics discussed in the interviews were repeated here, the group collaboration and interaction between the four participants during the focus group did allow for additional beliefs, attitudes, experiences, and feelings being revealed that had not arisen during the interviews. The group dynamic of the focus group triggered memories and experiences that would otherwise have been missed had the participants not jointly revisited their field experiences (Krueger, 1994). As with the interview transcripts, the focus group was also recorded and the transcript uploaded to MAXQDA for coding.

I offered the following prompts during the focus group:

1) Tell us your name and about your current teaching job.
2) What have you been doing in school this week?
3) Thinking back on the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, tell us about the student or students you worked with.
4) What are some instructional strategies and activities you worked on with your student?
5) Tell us about specific experiences or memories that stand out about your time in the field.
6) Tell us about an experience in the field that was particularly unique or challenging because of cultural or linguistic differences.
7) What are topics or strategies from the workshops taught by ELL specialists that you remember and that were particularly helpful during the field experience?
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8) Tell us about an experience of trial-and-error where a lesson you planned did not turn out how you anticipated.

9) Tell us about any big take-aways from the field experience.

10) Tell us about any instructional practices in your current classroom that mirror the field experience.

11) Tell us about anything else that you feel is important to share.

Field Notes

Olson (2016) describes field notes as observations jotted down by a researcher to provide additional insight into interviews, focus groups, and observations. These are generally recorded in the researcher’s own words to highlight questions such as “what am I seeing” or “What are the participants doing?”. Olson (2016) suggests that inexperienced interviewers not take written notes throughout an interview or focus group as this can be distracting to both the interviewer and interviewee. She explains that taking mental notes during the interview or focus group allows the interviewer to stay focused on the speaker and pay attention to non-verbal cues and body language that may be relevant to interpreting the meaning of what participants say. She suggests saving written notes until shortly after the interview or focus group has finished (2016).

I followed Olson’s (2016) approach and, immediately after each interview and the focus group ended, I compiled field notes that expanded on participants’ answers and non-verbal behaviors. These field notes were hand-written on a printed-out list of the interview questions. This allowed me to reflect on the participants’ answers and behaviors and jot down relevant observations categorically by the question which they accompanied. Completing my field notes immediately after each interview and the focus group ensured my observations were fresh in mind and not warped by the progression of time (Olson, 2016).
Once each interview and the focus group were transcribed and uploaded to MAXQDA, I entered the field notes through use of the memo-ing tool in the software. My field notes gave me valuable insight into the mood or intended tone of a participant’s answer since coding took place at a later point in time and emotions would otherwise not have easily been interpreted from the written transcript alone. My field notes played a crucial role in providing the context necessary to fully understand the intent behind some of the given responses.

**Teaching Artifacts**

Merriam and Tisdell (2015) describe artifacts as “the tools, implements, utensils, and instruments of daily living” (p. 171). These serve to provide insight into the physical objects a study’s participants may use to complete actions and behaviors relevant to answering the research questions (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). In my study, the artifacts focused specifically on teaching artifacts that were representative of each participant’s current teaching practices in their in-service classroom. I informed participants prior to the interviews my request that they share an artifact with me that they use on a regular basis or that is representative of regular classroom activities. These artifacts provided insight into current practices and served as prompts to facilitate participant sharing about their current teaching practices.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis serves to organize collected data into relevant groups of information that address the research questions through the lens of the theoretical framework (Creswell & Poth, 2018). For my data analysis, I relied on Saldaña’s (2016) approach to performing multiple cycles of coding based on constructed themes. I completed three cycles of coding for each data source: values, process, and open coding. Values coding allowed me to synthesize the data based on values, attitudes, and beliefs which was particularly relevant for addressing the first central
concept (beliefs) of the main research question. Process coding allowed me to use gerunds (verbs in the -ing form) to relay information and provide insight into the actions rather than simply organizing the data into further subcategories (Saldaña, 2016). Open coding allowed me to review all data sources and highlight emerging themes that did not fall under values or process coding.

All data sources were processed through these three cycles of coding. Since the findings from one data source impacted the lines of inquiry that would be relevant in follow-on sources, I conducted the three cycles of coding for each data source individually. First, I analyzed the learner profile reports through the three cycles of coding. These findings impacted the questions I asked in the interviews. Second, I coded the semi-structured interviews (in which the teaching artifacts were embedded). Finally, I completed the three cycles of coding for the focus group (Saldaña, 2016).

For me, data analysis had already begun as I framed the questions for the interview and focus group protocols. After reviewing the learner profile reports, each question I developed for the protocols reflected my personal thoughts on learning in conjunction with situated learning theory and formed broad expectations of follow-on information I would require to answer my research questions (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). The use of a researcher’s journal helped me track the ongoing data collection from the point of drafting the proposal through the end of data collection and analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This form of memo-ing helped me cycle back and forth between thinking about the existing data and generating strategies for new data collection (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). The following table illustrates how each data source aligned with the two central research questions.

**Figure 4**
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*Relationship Between Data Sources and Central Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Central Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner profile reports</td>
<td>What are early career teachers’ perspectives on their experiences in a preservice ell-based field placement (referred to as the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>How do early career teachers describe the influences of a pre-service Inclusion and Integration Field Experience on their current teaching practices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learner Profile Reports**

As a first step to analyzing the learner profile reports, I edited them by replacing all names with pseudonyms and all locations with a blank (___) to meet the confidentiality criteria set forth in my confidentiality agreement. Then, I assigned pseudonyms to schools and locations. Finally, I uploaded these edited learner profile reports to MAXQDA for coding.

My first cycle of coding focused on values coding which entails investigating the values, attitudes, and belief systems of participants (Saldaña, 2016). I initially read through Participant 1’s learner profile report and then jotted down an array of values and beliefs that stood out. I
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utilized these as initial codes which I entered into MAXQDA. Next, I read through the same profile report again; however, in this second read-through, I coded each sentence or statement as I read it before moving on. This resulted in many additional codes and sub-codes pertaining to values, beliefs and attitudes being constructed.

During the first cycle of coding, I condensed the data into the most meaningful chunks that pertained to similar values and attitudes. These chunks formed patterns and themes that became more easily accessible for answering the first central research question (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). I followed the same steps for the remaining three learner profile reports. Image 1 illustrates the values codes I constructed. These codes addressed the research questions “what are early career teachers’ perspectives on their experiences in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?” and “how do early career teachers describe their beliefs related to serving emergent multilingual students before the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?”.

During the second cycle of coding, I followed the same steps as in the first cycle by reading through the first profile report in its entirety to construct initial themes that fall under process coding and then by adding codes as I worked through the report sentence by sentence. I followed suit with this process through all four learner profile reports. It must be noted that when I constructed additional themes and added new codes in subsequent profile reports, I went back to any previous reports to check for that particular code.

Process coding relies on verbs in the gerund or -ing form such as facilitating, observing, and guiding (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). Analyzing the profile reports for mention of active processes and behaviors both on part of the participant and emergent multilingual student served to answer the research questions “how do early career teachers describe their placements in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?” and “how do early career teachers describe
their participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?”. Figure 5 depicts the codes I created for these two cycles of coding.

**Figure 5**

*The Coding Cycles and the Generated Codes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Cycle</th>
<th>Coding Type</th>
<th>Generated Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Cycle</td>
<td>Values Codes</td>
<td>• Beliefs about Teachers/Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Lacking Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Beliefs about Emergent Multilingual Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Services/Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Beliefs about Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Personal Shortcomings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Personal Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Self-Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Personal Role/Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Cycle</td>
<td>Process Codes</td>
<td>• Participant Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Answering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Observing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Supporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Prompting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Helping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Guiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Emergent Multilingual Student Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Solving Math Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Observing &amp; Mimicking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Speaking w/Caregiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Following Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Socializing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Being Distracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Answering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Pointing/Gesturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Whole Class Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cooperating Teacher Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Speaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I also completed a third cycle of coding for any open codes, or codes that did not fall within the values or process codes. Here, I intended to generate codes for any topics that seemed relevant or were recurring. No particularly unique codes emerged in this third cycle. In fact, all of the data I coded in this third cycle, I ended up grouping within fitting categories I had already established during my first two cycles of coding.

**Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Group**

Both the semi-structured interviews and the focus group served to address the questions “how do early career teachers describe the influences of a pre-service Inclusion and Integration Field Experience on their current teaching practices?”, “how do early career teachers describe their beliefs related to serving emergent multilingual students after the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?”, and “how do early career teachers describe their practices related to serving emergent multilingual students after the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?”. As with the learner profile reports, I conducted three cycles of coding in the following order: values, process, and open coding.

For both of these data sources, the third cycle of coding exhibited the biggest growth in constructed themes. I added a large number of codes based on recurring topics the participants brought up and that spoke to the research questions. I organized these new codes into main and subcategories for easier oversight and to make the data more readily available for interpretation (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

The codes in image 3 are also color-coded based on the theme/category they fell under. I organized the codes into overarching themes. The most prevalent codes are depicted in orange,
which represent whole-class actions and activities the participants mentioned observing or facilitating. The codes depicted in light green were the second most prevalent and all referred to the actions and behaviors the emergent multilingual students partook in. I felt these were crucial themes since the participants spoke frequently to their participation and interaction with the activities taking place in the classrooms and these themes spoke these sub-questions: (1a) How do early career teachers describe their placements in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience? (1b) How do early career teachers describe their participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?

Two other crucial themes were depicted in purple and pink. These two themes focused on participants’ reflections on their own background, preparation, practice, strengths, and areas requiring improvement. These codes were particularly relevant for answering these sub-questions: (2a) How do early career teachers describe their beliefs related to serving emergent multilingual students after the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience? (2b) How do early career teachers describe their practices related to serving emergent multilingual students after the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?

**Teaching Artifacts & Field Notes**

Even though the teaching artifacts and the field notes were analyzed and coded in conjunction with the interviews and the focus group, these served a slightly different purpose as a data source. The teaching artifacts served to answer an entirely different question: “How do early career teachers describe their current teaching practices?” The field notes did not serve to address any one specific question; instead, they served to provide relevant context and observations to ensure participants’ statements were interpreted through the lens of the
participant and not the lens of the researcher (Olson, 2016). The field notes essentially consisted of an extension of the data gathered in both the interviews and the focus group.

**Summary of the Methodology**

This chapter took a closer look at my research design. I outlined the structure of my interpretive design with elements of a multiple case study and offered a justification. I provided relevant information to the four participants as well as my own and the participants’ positionality. Finally, I discussed the data sources used to address the two central and several supporting research questions and my analysis procedure in the form of three coding cycles for each data source.

The next chapter will offer an in-depth analysis of the findings relevant to the research questions. As aligned with multiple-case study design (Yin, 2018), I discussed my findings first for each case individually followed by a cross-case comparison. For each case, I discussed findings organized by the two central research questions. First, I analyzed how the participants spoke about their experiences during the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience (question 1). Next, I described how the participants reflected on the connection between the experiences in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience and their current beliefs and practices (question 2). These two categories were discussed in terms of the three elements of Situated Learning Theory, context, community, and participation, as a means of investigating when and how learning took place (Lave & Wenger, 1991).
Chapter 4: Findings

In this chapter, I examine the results of my data analysis process and explain the major themes that I established throughout my three cycles of coding for each participant and data source (Saldaña, 2016). I organize my data analysis according to Yin’s (2018) approach to multiple-case study design. I discuss my findings first for each participant individually followed by a cross-case comparison. For each case, I share findings from two analyses: initially, I discuss the findings from the analysis that addresses the first research question: What are early career teachers’ perspectives on their experiences in a preservice Inclusion and Integration Field Experience pilot? Next, I discuss the findings from the analysis of the data sources that addressed the second research question: How do early career teachers describe the influences of a preservice Inclusion and Integration Field Experience on their current teaching practices? In other words, I began by sharing the respective case participant’s perspectives about their experiences during the pilot followed by the participant’s perspectives about the connection between the experiences in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience and their current beliefs and practices.

The learner profile reports, the semi-structured interviews, my field notes, and the focus group provided the data relevant to investigating early career teachers’ perspectives on their experiences in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience (question 1). I was particularly interested in exploring the individuals the participants spoke of when reflecting on the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, the types of preparation and skills the participants mentioned, the types of activities the participants partook in, and the specific memories participants shared. The semi-structured interviews, the teaching artifacts, my field notes, and the focus group provided the data relevant to investigating how participants describe the influence of the pilot on
their current beliefs and practices (question 2). Here, I focused on how participants described their beliefs on serving emergent-multilingual students after their participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, how participants talked about their current teaching practices, and how participants connected the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience to their current beliefs and practices. Finally, I conducted a cross-case analysis to highlight the recurring themes I constructed in each individual case (Yin 2018).

The four participants stemmed from a group of nine pre-service teachers that all chose to participate in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. The entire cohort of 39 teacher candidates was asked to rate their interest working with an emergent multilingual student on a scale from 1 (little interest) to 5 (high interest). The nine candidates that participated in the pilot all ranked their interest as a 5. For the field placement, these nine individuals were then partnered with an elementary or middle school classroom that included at least one emergent multilingual student. According to the district ELL Services Director, teachers who agreed to be cooperating teachers for the candidates for the pilot field experience did so with the hope that the candidates could support the learning of their emergent multilingual student(s).

In order to protect participant and student identities, pseudonyms are used for all individuals and places. I avoided referencing countries of origin or specific native or prior languages for emergent multilingual students in individual cases to ensure anonymity. However, it is noteworthy that the emergent multilingual students the nine candidates worked with differed greatly from each other. Their countries of origin were based in East Asia, South Asia, the Middle East, and Central/East Africa. Some were newly arrived immigrants while others had already been in the US for several years, some spoke one other language while others spoke multiple, their first and previous languages ranged in similarity to English, they possessed a wide
range of linguistic proficiency in English, and their literacy proficiency in their native and prior languages also differed greatly. This created a unique experience with differing demands for each participant in this study. For this reason, I provide context for each participant, their prior experiences with linguistic diversity, and a description of their placement. These introductions into each case serve to paint a picture of the learning context and community in which each participant found herself.

**Case 1: Sophie Anders**

Sophie Anders (pseudonym) was a white female in her 20s during her participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience and during her first two years of in-service teaching. She grew up in a culturally diverse family with many family members speaking two or more languages. Even though she grew up monolingual herself, she was exposed to her grandmother and father often speaking a language other than English. Additionally, she spent her elementary school years living in an area rich with hispanic culture and language. “It was pretty diverse there, there were a lot of students who had emigrated from Mexico, [...] so there was like a lot of Spanish speaking students,” she explained of her prior experiences with emergent multilingual students, “there was like a range, there were students that were really limited [in English proficiency] and there were students that were super fluent. They just had an accent, and there were probably also students I didn't know spoke Spanish at home.” Sophie explained that these experiences gave her an awareness of the diverse needs of students even before she participated in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience.

During the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, Sophie was an undergraduate student in the teacher preparation program. She was placed in a fourth-grade classroom at an elementary school in the district that participated in a dual immersion program where all students
received classroom instruction in both English and Spanish. (This was a “one-way” dual immersion program, as nearly all students at this K-5 school were from English-speaking households.) Sophie largely worked with students in small-group settings. These small groups generally included Mara, an emergent multilingual student who benefited from academic and social support in English. Mara was the only emergent multilingual student in the classroom and was fairly new to the school.

At the time of this study, Sophie was in her second year of in-service teaching. Of the four participants, Sophie worked in the most unique setting. She taught in a two-room frontier school with a student population of twelve students. In western states, schools boasting a student population of less than 200 students located in a county with a population of less than five people per square mile are referred to as frontier schools. In frontier schools, teachers often instruct students from multiple grade levels in the same classroom at the same time (Harmon & Morton, 2010).

As mentioned, the entire school enrolled a population of twelve students: seven students in grades K-4 and five students in grades 5-8. These two groups alternated between Sophie’s classroom and her co-teacher’s classroom. She taught all subjects except Math to the lower grades and English Language Arts to the higher grades. Sophie also spoke to the makeup of the student population in terms of diversity: “It's pretty diverse in terms of where they're coming from socioeconomically and what their parents do. It's not diverse in terms of race.” She went on to explain that the student population was predominantly white and all students spoke English as their first language; however, the diversity in socioeconomic background and parents’/caregivers’ careers generated a broad spectrum of interests and academic proficiency.

**Sophie’s Reflections on Her Experiences in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience**
While coding the data relevant to Sophie's perspectives on her experience in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, I came to find that the two most prevalent themes included the autonomy she was provided in the field experience as well as the opportunity to reflect on her own teaching as a means for personal improvement. After providing context on her placement, I outline these two themes through her statements both in the learner profile report and the interview.

She described her placement as a fourth-grade classroom led by Miss Smith and made up of 28 students. As I mentioned, all students received instruction in both English and Spanish in core subjects. “I was in fourth grade with Miss Smith at Applewood Elementary School which is a school that does the Spanish program as well, so I could imagine it might be extra difficult for the students that I was with,” said Sophie of her placement in the dual-immersion program during our open-ended interview. Sophie explained that she spent her initial classroom visits observing Miss Smith teaching.

In her Student Profile Report, Sophie described Miss Smith’s teaching practices and daily routines. A recurring theme was the use of small groups and peer work. Sophie repeatedly described observing Miss Smith utilizing direct instruction to introduce topics in various content areas followed by small group work where students worked as a team to engage with the new topic. The group activities often included reflective writing assignments. Sophie also spoke to Miss Smith’s use of learner supports to scaffold groups through student-centered work, “for example, the students used one writing support to structure their informational writing the entire semester. This support was called RACES.” As suggested by Stein (1998), observing Miss Smith’s use of scaffolded supports allowed Sophie to develop a sensitivity to the tasks she
herself would need to master in order to be successful once she would actively begin working with the students.

In addition to her field placement, Sophie also partook in a preparation seminar offered by the school district’s ELL specialist prior to entering the field. Just as with observing her cooperating teacher in the classroom, the training seminar allowed Sophie to build the skills necessary in a relevant and situated context (Courtney, Speck, & Holtorf, 1996). Though she did not explicitly mention the seminar, she did discuss the WIDA Can Do Descriptors that were introduced in the seminar. Using the WIDA Can Do Descriptors was a central task in the learner profile report in describing and tracking students’ English proficiency and progress. Sophie stated that the WIDA Can Do Descriptors offered her structure and a starting point for her observations of the emergent-multilingual student she was partnered with in her placement. She highlighted that the Can Do Descriptors provided her with concrete examples that she then looked for in the student’s abilities and provided her a structured assessment approach to measure progress over her time in the placement. She included the WIDA chart in her Learner Profile Report to provide visual support to her initial observations in the classroom. This chart is illustrated in Appendix A.

**Participant Autonomy.** While Sophie spoke about her observations of the cooperating teacher, Miss Smith, she did not mention any explicit conversations or interactions she may have had with Miss Smith. Instead, the individuals Sophie solely spoke about interacting with were the students. In this section, I analyze the codes pertaining to Sophie’s opportunities to work in direct contact with students and her reflection on these opportunities. She repeatedly talked about the benefits of being given autonomy in selecting and implementing teaching strategies of her choice. This theme first appeared in her Learner Profile Report where she wrote the following:
I usually had a small group of 4-7 students that I would work with during break-out groups. This work would have something to do with the whole group lesson. The students were often tasked with writing informative paragraphs or essays. I would provide support while the students were doing this, be asking leading questions, giving them feedback as they worked, and keeping them on task. These groups always included Mara, with various other levels of students.”

Mara was the emergent-multilingual student with whom Sophie worked closely throughout her time in the field placement. Sophie described in detail the various types of learner supports she observed Miss Smith using or had learned about during her teacher education program and would then try to implement in her own interactions with Mara and the other students in the small groups.

Sophie highlighted that having had the freedom to develop her own lessons, even if they did not always work out as planned, was a very beneficial aspect of the field placement because it allowed her to figure out what worked best for her individual students through informed decisions she made based on what she knew about the student followed by reflecting on which of her choices seemed to serve the student and which choices needed to be re-evaluated. She spoke repeatedly of a lesson she instructed that she considered a failure. She explained that she tried to fit too many activities into one single lesson and reflected that she would split these into multiple separate lessons in the future. Sophie talked in length about how helpful she felt it was to have the freedom to develop her own lessons and learn through these real-world scenarios.

I liked that we had the freedom to sort of choose what are we going to teach, how are we going to teach it, and then the freedom to sort of make that mistake like I did. I think I learned a lot from that mistake. Probably more than if I had not made a mistake, you
know what I mean? And it didn't have to be perfect, we just had to be trying to do our best to apply what we know to support a student”.

Because Sophie’s growth as an instructor was so closely tied to the interactions she had with her students, her learning as part of a community was crucial to her development. She explained that the autonomy in developing her own teaching strategies was what led to organic growth and the ability to truly reflect on the direction she wanted her teaching to go in.

Sophie’s learning experiences came full-circle through her personal reflections on which strategies worked and which did not (Brown, 1994). She took students’ feedback and ability to meet learning targets into direct consideration when offering an analysis of her own successes and shortcomings. One incident that Sophie described as particularly insightful was a failed attempt at developing a lesson guided by Universal Design for Learning (UDL). She mentioned this experience several times and recurring codes included whole-group work, teacher guidance, student-centered, writing, manipulating objects, failed attempt, and room for improvement. She said the following:

I wrote and taught one whole group lesson to the class. I designed it to be as UDL as possible and had Mara in mind while making sure there were several options for participating and engaging with the material. The point was to physically manipulate word parts and then fill in a worksheet with what we had learned. Unfortunately, I missed the mark for Mara. The moving parts combined with the worksheet confused them. I believe that this particular activity constrained Mara’s learning environment.

What Sophie described as a failed attempt at teaching a UDL lesson was a noteworthy example of an opportunity for such problem solving. She acknowledged, “I tried to do too much all at once, and it didn't work for my teaching. I, to this day, I remember that lesson and I try not
to do too much like that. [...] that stands out to me because I'm still the same way, I want to do everything, but I have to remember that everything is too much, sometimes for [all] learners not just Mara because they were an ELL but every student.”

In her learner profile report, Sophie described another example of her personal growth that stemmed from continued interaction with the students in her field placement. She opened up about personal feelings of inadequacy and insufficient knowledge:

In the beginning of the semester, I was nervous that I would not build connections with the students or that I did not have to offer what they needed from me. I realized pretty early on that I am good at building connections with students because I care about building those connections! As time went on, I also realized that I actually did have adequate support to offer to students. This realization came to me one day when a student needed some help with a grammar worksheet that she was doing outside of the regular classwork. I did not know off the top of my head what a preposition was, but I knew what strategy she could use to find out. I directed the student to a parts of speech book that the class had put together, and supported her as she looked through to find what she needed and applied it to her work.

Sophie explained in our interview that the anxieties of not being able to support students effectively were associated with the fear of not possessing the content knowledge necessary to offer supports. She went on to explain that the opportunities to problem solve and make decisions in real-time helped her overcome these insecurities. “My most considerable improvement was my ability to work confidently with students. This confidence came from all of the hours I have spent interacting with students.” This is a recurring theme that Sophie kept
returning to, and I expand on this theme in the following section relating to Sophie’s current teaching beliefs and practices.

Sophie’s Perspectives on the Influence of the Pilot on Her Current Beliefs and Practices

The main component that sets this study apart from many existing inquiries is that I tracked the participants beyond their teacher education program and into their first in-service years as mainstream classroom teachers. At the time of the semi-structured interviews and the focus group, Sophie was in her second year of in-service teaching as a mainstream elementary teacher. In the interview and the focus group, the codes reflected three recurring themes which included the lasting impression that working in direct contact with emergent multilingual students had on Sophie, the scaffolded supports she received in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, and the connection she saw between the pilot and her current teaching practices. I discuss these themes to answer the question: How do early career teachers describe their beliefs and practices related to serving emergent multilingual students?

Direct Contact

During our interview, I asked Sophie to reflect on her desire to participate in the pilot in order to answer the questions How do early career teachers describe their beliefs and practices related to serving emergent multilingual students before the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. Again, she spoke of her personal experiences attending a culturally and linguistically diverse elementary school. She also spoke of one specific memory during her elementary teacher preparation program.

I wanted to first and foremost participate in the ELL pilot because I know that there's a large population of students in _____ and the surrounding areas that are English language learners. And I wanted to be the best teacher I can be, and so I wanted to be well versed
in teaching those students. I didn't want to get into a classroom, have an English language learner, and not have anything for them and have them feel like unsupported by their teacher. What pushed me to do it was I was working at a preschool at the time, and we had a couple of students who were from ___, [...] They were English language learners and their mom was an English language learner too. And it was really hard to communicate with those kids. they were both about four years old, I think the little one was three and her older brother was four. And that was just like in the flesh here's a situation where you I don't know what to do to support these kids. So yeah that was like an eye opener for me. I can know how to teach reading but do I know how to reach all of my kids?

While Sophie spoke of this experience, what I found most noteworthy was that, despite having grown up in a linguistically diverse community, it was her first-hand experience working with emergent multilingual students while assuming the teacher’s role and the feeling of underpreparedness that ultimately motivated her to participate in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. Direct contact with linguistically diverse students and her own feelings of underpreparedness had a lasting impression on her.

Sophie’s experience working with the two emergent multilingual students in the preschool led to a tacit understanding of how important it is to possess a repertoire of skills and practices in order to meet the needs of diverse students. In her personal reflection, Sophie spoke to her underpreparedness. She highlighted the realization that she needed additional training and learning experiences working in direct contact with emergent multilingual students in order to better prepare herself for her future in-service teaching. This experience was one of the main
contributing factors that drove Sophie to participate in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience.

Scaffolded Support. The Inclusion and Integration Field Experience itself formed an intricate community not just for Sophie and her students but also for her and her fellow teacher candidates. Sophie and the other participants were offered support from university mentors and introduced to teaching strategies by district ELL specialists to prepare them for their work in the field placement. Then, in their field placements, the participants were given the freedom to try out these strategies as they saw fit. In the interview, Sophie spoke to this scaffolded support system as a means for allowing her to experiment with her own teaching approaches and to reflect on their successes or failures. “The placement had the freedom, but also the structure that allowed us to like test out what we were learning.” Recurring codes were the ability to experiment with various teaching strategies, the opportunity to share ideas and approaches with fellow participants, and the leeway to make mistakes and learn from them. She stated, “This could have been possibly the most informative placement that I had while I was teaching. The biggest thing about it, I think, was [the pilot] gave us sort of this guiding question like, how do we support this student, and [the expectations] didn't say, ‘I need you to write a lesson plan that hits these kinds of standards’, [it] just said, ‘how do you support this student’, and giving us that framework versus giving us a bunch of rules.”

Sophie explained that the open-ended structure of the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience closely mirrored what work as an in-service teacher ended up being like. For her, having the opportunity to interact with students and make independent decisions about the types of activities she would teach and the types of supports she would implement directly prepared her for running her own classroom after completing the teacher education program.
It informs the way I interact with my students and the way that I plan things. And even if I haven't written a plan, because sometimes I don't have time to write plans for eight grade levels. Sometimes I just have to do things on the fly, and I'll look at my curriculum book, and it'll ask me to do something, and I'll just do it a different way because that's the way I was informed in school, so I like to think [...] the ELL pilot informed me the same way.

In the interview, Sophie referenced her university faculty mentor and the support she received from this individual. Her mentor observed her in the field twice and held debriefing sessions during both classroom visits. Sophie remembered how helpful the debriefing sessions were because it allowed her to share her personal reflections and thoughts on her failures with a colleague and receive input and suggestions from a content expert without being told strictly what to do or how to structure her teaching. She particularly recalled how beneficial these conversations were because she was offered a variety of strategies and approaches she could try without being instructed to try one specific method. This scaffolded support provided her with the knowledge necessary to succeed but did not inhibit her in her own journey to find what works best for her and her students.

**Responsiveness to Individual Students’ Needs**

To address the question, *How do early career teachers describe their practices after the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience?* I asked Sophie during our interview to share a teaching artifact that was representative of her in-service teaching. Because she taught eight different grade levels in her teaching position, she chose two teaching tools/practices to share. One was representative of her work with the students in grades one through four which she
referred to as the “Littles,” and the other was representative of her work with the students in grades five through eight which she referred to as the “Bigs.” Sophie shared:

Discussion is representative of my teaching because I support talking and learning from other people and also trying to articulate what you know, is one of the best ways to refine your learning and refining your knowledge, I think. So that's for the Bigs. The Littles still do a lot of talking too, but I think something that is representative of my teaching for the Littles, one thing that I do the most is phonics instruction with the Littles for their reading. Because, in order to understand reading, you have to be proficient at it, and I have this mat; I printed them out they are, like all different. They have stars and stuff so with the older kids, multi syllable words. with the younger kids, it's like three phoneme words. And we break apart those words and use the mats to read them, you know, like, for my kindergartener we might be reading the word ‘mat’ and they might you know put three blocks on the three stars and sound it out and touch it. For my first graders, we might do a two-syllable word with some phonemes that we’re learning. Each star is a syllable and we might write the letters that make those sounds in there, so I think it's representative of my teaching because I am a big fan of the actual science of how we learn to read.

Sophie talked in length about the challenges of instructing multiple grade and proficiency levels in the same classroom. Through trial and error, she found that using small group work or discussions was an effective way of teaching a topic or content area without having to have a completely different set of instructions and guidelines for each student at their grade level. With this approach, she was able to introduce a general topic or activity and allow students to explore the topic at their own proficiency level by sharing what they know in discussion or
showing their knowledge in the more individualized small groups. These strategies became representative of her teaching because they eliminated the waiting time where students would be sitting without a task until Sophie got around to them. She connected this to her time in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience because working with Mara and other students in small groups forced her to think about activities that would keep all students engaged at their respective proficiency levels even if one individual student required more one-on-one support.

In the interview, I also asked Sophie to think back on her time in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience and reflect on any experiences that she thought may have directly impacted her current teaching practices. She explained that, “I don't really have any English language learners [currently], but it still informs [...] how I set my classroom up and how I word things. And I just feel that it made me more aware of the way we teach reading in English.” She explained that having had the opportunity to work with emergent multilingual students opened her eyes to the individual needs of students regardless of cultural or linguistic background. Sophie tied this back into her practices of using discussion and small group work because those types of teaching tools allowed her to individualize learning based on each student’s specific needs and backgrounds. Again, student centered instruction, small group work, and discussion were codes that arose in this conversation.

Finally, Sophie talked about changes she would make to her current teaching if an emergent multilingual student joined her classroom today. She referenced several strategies that she utilized during her participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience that she felt were effective with the emergent multilingual student she worked with in the field experience. The single most recurring code was visual support. She spoke mainly of providing visual supports such as labeling objects around the classroom, providing visual supports on
handouts, and ensuring classroom instructions she provides are accompanied by written visual copies. She explained that a lot of her instruction currently took place orally and that she would want to find alternative modes both of instruction and for students to share knowledge and demonstrate understanding so that any emergent multilingual students’ opportunities to participate wouldn’t be so strongly impacted by the language barrier.

**Case 1 Summary**

During our time conversing, I prompted Sophie to share what she remembers from her experience in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, to think back on any memories interacting with emergent multilingual students prior to the pilot, and to reflect on how these experiences may have impacted her current teaching beliefs and practices. Major themes that emerged in our interactions included the benefits of the autonomy teacher candidates were given during the pilot as well as her personal ability to embrace her failures during the pilot and learn from them. When asked to connect her experiences in the pilot to her current teaching, the central themes included the influence that working in direct contact with emergent multilingual students had on her, the scaffolded supports she received during the pilot, and the continued realization that student-centered instruction was and remains crucial for meeting individual students’ needs.

**Case 2: Kathryn Brooks**

Like Sophie, Kathryn Brooks (pseudonym) was a white female in her 20s during her participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. Kathryn was the only graduate student that participated in my study. She had completed additional coursework on inclusive education in comparison to the other candidates which likely impacted her understanding of
serving diverse learners and may have affected her decision-making and reflection process during the clinical field experience.

In the placement, she was placed in a third-grade classroom of 24 students that, aside from one emergent multilingual student, contained limited cultural and linguistic diversity. The students predominantly stemmed from white working class families. Kathryn spent most of her time in this placement working with students one-on-one or in small groups of two to three students in a pull-out situation in the hallway.

Kathryn herself grew up in a community that reflected this classroom make-up. She stated that, during her own primary school years, she does not recall having any emergent multilingual students in her school or classrooms. She described the community in which she grew up as mostly white and lower working class with limited cultural diversity or appreciation for diversity. She added that her parents attempted to supplement this lack of diversity by doing a lot of traveling as a family to introduce their children to other cultures and communities. Kathryn explained that this created an awareness of existing diversity despite not experiencing this in her home community.

To expand on her personal experiences with cultural and linguistic diversity prior to the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, I asked Kathryn if she recalled why she chose to participate in the pilot. She described an experience working in direct contact with emergent multilingual students during an earlier semester of her teacher preparation program.

I was doing my first field experience [...] and noticed very immediately that it was a factor in their school district and then specifically at [the school I was placed at]. They did have a lot of ELL students. And the variety of teacher responses to that was very, you know, there's a wide range of how teachers interact, and how they knew how to support
them, and talking to my mentor teacher, she had a lot of awesome strategies. But you know, like some of her co-workers, maybe didn't and that kind of encouraged me to want to have more of those tools in my toolbox.

Kathryn explained that seeing the cultural and linguistic diversity during her first field placement made her aware that teachers needed to be prepared to support diverse students in the mainstream classroom. She felt this was something that had not been sufficiently stressed in her coursework thus far, nor did she feel she was prepared to support linguistically diverse students. This realization prompted her to want to increase her own skills and knowledge for serving emergent multilingual students.

At the time of the study, Kathryn was working as a third grade teacher in her second full year of in-service teaching. She had 23 students in her class, and even though her classroom did not contain any emergent multilingual students, she stated that there were emergent multilingual students present in the parallel third grade classrooms at the school she worked at. In her teaching, Kathryn utilizes a lot of student-centered activities such as small group work, discussion, and peer-teaching.

Kathryn’s Reflections on Her Experiences in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience

During the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, Kathryn was placed in a third grade classroom with 24 students. She described the classroom as not containing a lot of cultural diversity aside from one emergent multilingual student, Zoya. The cooperating teacher largely focused on whole-group instruction while those students needing additional support were pulled out for one-on-one work.
Throughout her initial time in this placement, Kathryn spent the majority of her time observing the cooperating teacher. She recalled that the cooperating teacher almost exclusively utilized teacher-centered whole-class instruction in which the teacher was lecturing and students were expected to listen silently and take notes. These lectures were generally followed by student silent work practicing or applying the new material.

Several central themes emerged from my first two rounds of coding for this case’s data set. The main theme was the almost complete lack of student-centered or individualized instruction catered towards the diverse needs of the students that was present in the placement. Next, Kathryn talked extensively about the disconnect between the classroom teacher and the intention behind the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. Lastly, Kathryn spoke about the benefits of the WIDA Can Do Descriptors in helping her develop her structure her lessons.

**Lacking Individualized Instruction**

Kathryn explained that even though this field placement offered her the opportunity to learn in context (Stein, 1998) by observing the types of supports students received, she stressed that she largely learned from observing a lack of supports and witnessing what was not working for Zoya and other students that would have benefited from individualized supports.

Kathryn reflected: “A major drawback I saw during this level two experience was the heavy emphasis on whole group instruction and individual assignments. Students in this classroom very rarely had the opportunity to work in small groups, a setting that Zoya excelled in when given the chance”.

In her learner profile report, Kathryn wrote, “I saw a disappointing amount of differentiation in this classroom. I may have been hyper aware of this because of this Inclusion and Integration Field Experience program and being in *Inclusion & Collaboration* this semester,
but it was almost alarming to the vast majority of teaching and learning not include
differentiation or principles of UDL.” Kathryn described this as a missed opportunity to support Zoya.

During our interview, I asked Kathryn to expand on this sentiment. She referred back to
the preparation offered by the ELL specialist as well as the graduate-level course she referenced,
_Inclusion and Collaboration_, that addressed teaching approaches for offering all students equal
opportunity to demonstrate understanding. She explained that she felt she was being provided the
skills and tools necessary to support diverse learners during her coursework but that the
cooperating teacher and para-instructors in her placement were not familiar with or willing to
utilize such supports in their teaching. Instead, students with diverse academic needs were
simply pulled out from mainstream instruction. “I think the pull-out method of tutoring that is the
default for students needing additional support has substantial drawbacks. I think it reinforces
students feeling ‘different’ from their peers and hyper aware that they are ELLs,” Kathryn
explained when talking about her work with the emergent multilingual student. She explained
that she spent the majority of her time supporting this student out in the hallway either by
himself or with a small group of other students.

Another topic Kathryn highlighted was the negative impact the constant pull-out had on
Zoya’s social growth. She shared:

It also removes them from the classroom environment and puts them into a space where it
is very visible that they are receiving extra help. I think teachers could work to minimize
this pull-out method by providing additional opportunities to incorporate ELL tutors _in the classroom, such as meeting with students during reading conferences or in small guided reading groups._
Kathryn did note that Zoya became more comfortable in participating in whole-class endeavors as his speaking proficiency increased. She stated that he “seemed more engaged and participatory in class. I observed the teacher also being more attentive to their questions and contributions.” However, Kathryn felt that she did not see social emotional growth in Zoya because he simply was not given the opportunity to interact with peers in academic settings.

I didn’t notice any significant social changes for Zoya, and I think they still feel a bit isolated from their peers. I think this in part comes from the fact that they are a cultural minority and I don’t see multiculturalism being valued or promoted in this particular classroom. I think additional emphasis on promoting a welcoming and diverse classroom may help Zoya feel more included in the classroom community.

Kathryn was clearly reflecting not only on her own learning context but began thinking about the community in which her students found themselves (Lave, 1988). She reiterated the limited opportunities for social interaction that Zoya was offered and that she felt this severely inhibited his progress. In her reflection, her personal level of education particularly as a graduate student that had taken additional coursework on inclusive instruction in comparison to the other participants became evident in her deeper reflection on how students’ individual needs should be addressed.

**Disconnect Between the Program and the Cooperating Teacher**

As Kathryn mentioned, she spent most of her time working with Zoya in a pull-out setting out in the hallway. After her initial realizations that this approach was not meeting Zoya’s needs, she advocated to work with him together with other students in small groups rather than one-on-one. During these small group sessions, Kathryn practiced implementing many of the learner supports and UDL practices she was introduced to during the ELL preparation and her
other coursework. She explained that she did receive support from her cooperating teacher in mapping out lesson activities, “My cooperating teacher and I worked together to determine appropriate tasks for Zoya and I to complete each week.” However, Kathryn went on to explain that her cooperating teacher did not seem to fully appreciate Kathryn’s presence as a support person.

I remember feeling like my mentor teacher didn't quite understand the Program. And the goals of me working with that student, so I think, maybe [...]Inform them so that they kind of understand that it was also a tool to help them in their teaching, rather than just for you know the university students Because I felt like sometimes the teacher I was working with felt kind of disconnected from what I was doing with that student. And there wasn't like a big emphasis on like sharing that information that I was gathering.

Here, the information Kathryn was referring to included the types of supports and teaching strategies that Zoya responded to positively, the strategies and activities that did not seem as beneficial, the areas in which Zoya was making progress, and the areas in which he needed additional support. She expressed that she felt this would have been beneficial information for the cooperating and para-teachers to inquire about and have. Unfortunately, they did not show interest in learning about the supports that benefited Zoya and the other students in Kathryn’s small groups, nor did they show initiative to utilize supports in the mainstream instruction. Kathryn stated that she felt a short workshop or seminar for cooperating teachers would have been very helpful in ensuring the cooperating teacher had a better understanding of the intent behind the pilot. She explained that she had the impression her cooperating teacher thought of her simply as one more body there to help out.
FIELD EXPERIENCES AND NEW TEACHERS’ BELIEFS AND PRACTICES

**WIDA Can Do Descriptors and Determining Best Practices Through Individualized Instruction.**

As Kathryn reflected on the challenges she faced by being placed in a classroom that did not individualize instruction, she highlighted that the preparation session offered by the ELL specialists prior to the field experience gave her a framework for structuring her time with Zoya. While her cooperating teacher gave her guidelines for the specific assignments she had to work on with Zoya, she was given the freedom to select her own instructional approaches.

My primary role in my cooperating teacher’s classroom was to provide supplementary support to my ELL student. After my student’s ELL tutor was reassigned to a different school a month into my field experience, I started going in to observe three half days a week to help fill this gap. Usually twice a week, Zoya and I would work out in the hallway together during Daily 5 reading time. Zoya is frequently absent, so we often worked on assigned writing assignments or reading responses that they had missed. We also focused on pre-reading or re-reading classroom texts to support their reading comprehension and vocabulary development.

Kathryn again referenced the benefits of individualized instruction as well as small-group work. She tracked the progress Zoya was making and utilized her findings to adjust and structure her practices for supporting him better in future lessons. For this, she used the WIDA Can Do Descriptors. In the learner profile report, Kathryn detailed the benchmarks Zoya was at when they first began working together. She tracked his progress in the various categories of the Can Do Descriptors throughout the weeks she worked supporting him. She wrote:

Zoya can identify main ideas and details, sequence events in simple stories, use context clues and illustrations to determine meaning of words/phrases, and can distinguish
between figurative and literal language in context. I noticed an improvement in Zoya’s reading comprehension over the last few months. Although they still read at a very fast rate, they are more willing to go back and reread texts when they can’t immediately remember something. At times Zoya still focuses on getting through the pages quickly, rather than slowing down to understand what they are reading. I think reading comprehension will continue to be an instructional priority for Zoya.

Kathryn used the WIDA Can Do Descriptors to assess Zoya’s progress in listening, speaking, reading, and writing and then adjusted her own teaching strategies based on the areas Zoya required additional support. As she noted in the previous quote, Kathryn documented a growth in Zoya’s reading and measured this as an increase from a reading score of 3.5 in February to a reading score of 4 in May. Kathryn used these data to determine the supports she felt would best suit this particular student.

In order to help Zoya progress, Kathryn focused on offering a lot of support during writing and slowly withdrawing partial support over time as Zoya developed independence. She described that this scaffolded approach was very effective with him because she was able to monitor his problem solving attempts and only offer input when he got stuck or sidetracked. She recalled, “when we worked together to complete writing responses, such as Claim Evidence Reasoning (CER) assignments, he responded well to discussing his responses verbally as a way to plan together what he was going to write. However, he would often lose track of what he was writing and needed a reminder of what he had said.” She also noted that talking through ideas with peers and using illustrations helped Zoya stay focused on what he was writing about.

During, like, one of the lessons I taught, um, we did a compare and contrast with two different texts. And they did group roles, and I remember he really liked working in
groups and that wasn't necessarily like super common in their classroom. And I remember he was the artist during that task, and he just loved it. Like he got super into it and I had, like, strategically given him that role, because I knew he would enjoy it. But it was just really fun to see him, like, interacting with his peers in a really positive way and feeling very successful and sometimes he didn't during those reading lessons, um yeah, so I remember that being very successful for both of us.

During our interview, Kathryn reflected on her learning opportunities during the field experience. Again, she talked about the various opportunities she had to try out the teaching strategies and supports she learned about during her coursework and ELL preparation. She spent a lot of time talking about being able to try out various learner supports that cater towards a wide range of learner types. Working one-one-one with Zoya or in small groups with Zoya and one or two other students allowed her to figure out which strategies seemed to meet Zoya’s needs most appropriately by individualizing instruction and taking note of the types of supports he seemed to excel with. She explained that this opportunity to learn from real-world teaching opportunities helped her build her confidence. She wrote the following in her learner profile report:

The primary areas that I believe I improved on this semester were designing learning experiences that more fully integrate UDL and differentiation, building confidence in my ability to communicate [...], and using strategies to support students with their writing. Areas that I want to continue working on are developing instructional routines for small groups that include ELLs and building my teacher toolbox of academic interventions.

**Kathryn’s Perspectives on the Influence of the Pilot on Her Current Beliefs and Practices**
During our interview, Kathryn shared extensively about her current teaching position and the types of teaching strategies and activities that were common to her practice. She also reflected on how she felt her teaching identity today was a product of her teacher education program and, more specifically, the field experience in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience.

Before addressing the research questions in our interview, I asked her to provide context of her current teaching setting. At the time of the study, she was working in her second year of in-service teaching as the lead teacher in a 3rd grade classroom of 23 students. The classroom exhibited limited cultural or linguistic diversity; however, one emergent multilingual student was a member of the parallel 3rd grade class. I asked Kathryn to share about some things they had been working on in her class. She said:

Last week, [...] leading up to spring break, we're trying to keep engagement high, so we were doing a pollination lesson for three days using mystery science. It ended up really fun, you know, like create paper flowers and transfer pollen between the two and see how the pollen moves and have a ton of fun, and it was very messy because there was coffee grounds and cornmeal all over my classroom.

Kathryn explained that this activity was representative of her general teaching practice because she advocates for student autonomy and places the responsibility for learning back on the students. She felt that, as third graders, they are mature enough to handle the responsibility. As much as possible, Kathryn utilizes interactive learning activities that place students at the center of the task while she herself takes a more supportive role to guide students through the learning process. The freedom to discover knowledge on their own terms was placed at the forefront of Kathryn’s practice.
Structured Routines

In our interview, I asked Kathryn if she felt any of her current practices were influenced by her teacher education program and, more specifically, the ELL integration and inclusion pilot. She recalled that working in that field placement during the pilot was one of the first times she had the opportunity to develop her own lessons with free-choice of teaching strategies. She felt that this might have been where her appreciation for student-centered instruction originated.

Kathryn spoke of using routines to help Zoya complete daily tasks with lessened support. She explained that having a pattern to their sessions with the same expectations helped build his confidence and increased motivation since he knew what to expect as well as what was expected of him. Such routines also encouraged him to stay on task during their sessions working together. She recalled that routines and structure really helped him as a language learner but that these also seemed to help the other students she worked with during the pilot. Once the students became familiar with the routine, they required less support from her.

Kathryn felt that these experiences with using routines as a support led to her subconsciously implementing a lot of routines and structure into her mainstream classroom during her in-service years. She stressed that these routines were the key to ensuring her student-centered teaching approach was successful. She explained, “some of mine struggle more with that independence, but I think definitely once it becomes part of their [daily] routine, it works really well.” A recurring code here was the routine and repetition that she developed in her day-to-day teaching so that students knew what to expect, how to get started on assignments, and where to find answers and support if instructions or steps were not clear.

Daily Five Routines
Another recurring code from both the interview and focus group with Kathryn was the Daily Five routine. The Daily Five is a literacy framework that Kathryn was introduced to during her teacher preparation program. This framework split students into groups/stations where they completed tasks related to literacy through a structured routine that fostered independence (Boushey & Moser, 2009). Kathryn remembered observing classroom teachers using Daily Five as an opportunity to spend time with those students that required extra support while the majority of the class was busy working in their stations. Later, as an in-service teacher, Kathryn felt the Daily Five structure would be a great tool to enhance her student-centered teaching approach. She explained that she was already using Daily Five reading centers every day and that having the opportunity to meet with individual students during those rotations had proved to be very beneficial. The routine allowed all of her students to make meaningful use of their time without direct support or instruction from her. She also found that the centers improved students’ literacy performance because of the frequent practice. So, during her second year of in-service teaching, Kathryn decided to try to expand Daily Five beyond just reading. She developed five centers that all evolved around math. Similarly as with the reading and literacy stations, she introduced each math station individually to the whole class through modeling and guided practice to allow students to familiarize themselves with and master the routine of each station. Once the students obtained independence in the five tasks/stations, Kathryn began implementing these as timed group rotations in the same way Boushey and Moser (2009) originally intended for the literacy stations to work.

Kathryn talked about the challenges of finding time to ensure all students were mastering new topics before moving on to the next. Using the Daily Five for math was her solution to this problem. “In third grade, we have so many new concepts and they really vary in what kids need
to be working on. So that model really helps me,” she said. Some stations contained fluency work, others consisted of partner work to allow for checking each others’ answers. While students were given the opportunity to practice and hone existing skills at the stations, Kathryn met with those individuals that had not yet fully mastered these new concepts and needed additional support. A recurring code in this discussion was the importance of student autonomy and students independently taking responsibility for their own learning. These aspects became a central theme as Kathryn shared about her current teaching practices.

**Pull-Out Support**

When asked to reflect back on what she had written in her learner profile report, Kathryn spent a lot of time talking again about the pull-out supports she observed in her placement. Zoya and some of his peers were not offered scaffolds or supports in the mainstream classroom. Instead, they were pulled out and instructed in a one-on-one setting in another location. She highlighted that this approach seemed to be a disservice to Zoya and other students because they did not allow for social interaction or peer collaboration. She found it interesting to read her own critiques of this approach during her placement as pull-out is something utilized heavily in her current classroom.

Kathryn also reflected on how the pull-out approach really seemed to single students out during her placement in the pilot. She recalled that

It was interesting to think back on the times, where one of my kind of critiques was the pull-out that I did with him and that I think [it] exaggerated differences rather than a push in support, and that just kind of came back to my attention and made me think about when I have students pull-out versus pushing in for support right now. Most of our support is pull-out and that just kind of made me think about [...] how that is addressed
with the class. [...] We all learn differently, and we all have different supports, and I think I have a lot of students who are in our gifted program this year, so my class is pretty used to [...] lots of people coming and going.

During our interview, Kathryn spent a significant amount of time comparing and contrasting the pull-out approach during the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience with the pull-out approach in her current school. She noted that a big difference was how pull-out was viewed and handled as an entire class or even school-wide community. In Zoya’s classroom, Kathryn observed no discussion or talk explaining to students that everyone learns differently or requires different tools to succeed. Instead, pull-out seemed to cause this disruption to instruction where everyone waited silently for the student or students receiving extra support to leave before the class continued with their lesson. This seemed to single out students.

The school Kathryn was working at at the time of this study offered a wide variety of individualized programs in many subject areas to match students’ proficiency levels. For almost every subject, Kathryn explains, students move around between different classrooms to receive instruction from different teachers in groups matched with peers of similar proficiency levels. “I think my kids are pretty normalized, like everyone needs different supports, everyone goes and sees different teachers, and that's not really a big deal.” She also talked about a grade level intervention program called WIN which refers to “What I Need”. This program takes place every day and requires students to move to intervention groups for reading and math. Since all students across the five third grade classes partake in this program and attend different groups, Kathryn says, “I think that really helps to emphasize everyone has different needs and that’s normal.”

*Multiculturalism in the Classroom*
A final noteworthy theme that Kathryn spoke about is generating a classroom community that is welcoming to everyone’s uniquenesses and differences. She explained that, even though she does not have a lot of cultural diversity in her current classroom, she emphasizes that everyone comes from different backgrounds and has a unique culture which makes every individual special.

I try really hard to have conversations in social studies and bring in multicultural literature to really still have those conversations with kids, and even if there are not like racial differences [in the classroom] but still getting kids to understand that, like, culture comes in a lot of different versions and everyone has a culture and everyone celebrates that, so still trying to bring in that multicultural component, even if I don’t have a ton of diversity in my classroom in a more traditional sense.

To accomplish this, Kathryn utilized a multicultural project with her third graders earlier in the school year. In the project, students were tasked with describing family traditions that they practiced at home to highlight that everyone has a home-culture. Next, students were asked to compare and contrast some of their family traditions and practices with classmates to highlight that everyone has unique and special things they practice or celebrate. Kathryn felt this was a great way to set the stage and foster open minds before introducing the class to cultures that were not represented in the classroom.

She also felt this was an important step to take to help generate a smooth integration should an emergent multilingual student join the class in the future. Creating open-minds that have already learned how to appreciate differences is central to helping a new student feel integrated and comfortable in the classroom. She hopes that developing an accepting classroom culture would also open the possibility for peer mentorship when new students join the class.
Case 2 Summary

Throughout this study, Kathryn shared a lot of interesting recollections from her time in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. The central themes that I constructed included: the lacking individualized instruction in her field placement, the apparent disconnect between the purpose of the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience and the cooperating teacher’s understanding of the program, the strengths and benefits of the WIDA Can Do Descriptors, and the structured routines she learned to utilize while working with Zoya.

She reflected on these experiences and drew conclusions on how they have impacted her current teaching beliefs and practices. Kathryn connected her use of structured routines with Zoya to her appreciation of the benefits of the Daily Five in her current teaching. She also discussed the positive and negative attributes of pull-out supports. Finally, she highlighted the importance of creating a classroom community appreciative of multiculturalism regardless of the cultural make-up of the individuals in the class.

Case 3: Lexi Winters

Lexi Winters (pseudonym) was also a white female in her early 20s during her participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. At the time of this study, she was in her first year of in-service teaching. Lexi grew up in a city in a western state that exhibited higher cultural diversity than other nearby towns and cities due to its close proximity to two military bases. The influx of servicemembers from various U.S. states and foreign countries generated a fluctuating cultural diversity in the community. Lexi recalled having had an elementary school classmate from Hawaii, several from the southern United States, and one from Guam. Though she described the school and community environment as predominantly middle-class and white, she noted that she was also exposed to and interacting with other cultures. She
Lexi grew up aware of the uniqueness of different cultures. Additionally, the school district Lexi attended through twelfth grade enrolled a significant percentage of Native American students which Lexi felt added to her awareness of cultural diversity as well as the differences in learning and disseminating knowledge. And finally, Lexi spoke of the school for the deaf and blind which was located just across the street from her own elementary school. She recalled that students from the school for the deaf and blind would join programs at the school she attended, so it was a basic understanding in her school community that different students require different supports in order to be successful.

Lexi’s placement in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience pilot was unique compared to that of the other three participants. Instead of being partnered with a specific classroom, she was partnered with two specific students. The two students consisted of a sibling pair in second and fifth grade which had only recently moved to the United States. Even though they spoke more than one language fluently, both had no prior experience with formal education and possessed minimal literacy skills in their prior languages. When Lexi began working with these two students, she classified their English proficiency as averaging between the Entering and Beginning stages based on the WIDA Can Do Descriptors. In a select few stages, the students, particularly the fifth grader, Hailey, were on the verge of reaching some skills in the Developing stage of the Can Do Descriptors. Lexi worked with the pair individually in the classroom followed by a pull-out scenario or with both together in a pull-out scenario.

At the time of this study, Lexi taught third grade in her first year of in-service teaching. The school she worked at enrolled several emergent multilingual students including a student who had just moved from a Spanish speaking country at the beginning of the school year. Because of her ELL endorsement she completed during her undergraduate studies, Lexi was
asked to take on a leadership role in mentoring that student’s classroom teacher in implementing culturally and linguistically inclusive practices and activities. This became a recurring theme throughout our interview as Lexi began talking about the influence the ELL inclusion and integrations pilot had on her current role as a mentor to another teacher.

**Lexi’s Reflections on Her Experiences in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience**

Three central themes emerged from the data relevant to Lexi’s reflections about her experiences in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. She spoke repeatedly about the value of individualized instruction, the benefits indirect and student-centered instruction serve, and the importance of acknowledging primary and other discourses for each student. After providing context on her placement, I outline these three themes through her statements in the learner profile report, the interview, and the focus group.

As mentioned, Lexi was not placed in one single classroom; rather, she alternated between a second and a fifth grade classroom to support second grader, Henry, and fifth grader, Hailey. In Henry’s classroom, she would join him for his reading, writing, and math sessions to offer support. Lexi stated that regardless of the subject or topic, they would always end up going out into the hall or to another room for pull-out work shortly after a lesson started because Henry quickly became frustrated and disruptive when faced with academic work. She explained that spending eight hours a day in school and being asked to complete such specific tasks was simply too demanding for this student who had no prior experience with formal education, so his frustrations were reflected in his disruptive behavior. By catering her pull-out instruction towards his strengths, Lexi attempted to curb his frustration and replace it with feelings of accomplishment and success. She quickly found that he excelled at math and thus incorporated mathematics in her language instruction wherever possible.
The fifth grader, Hailey, on the other hand, was a very quiet, shy, and withdrawn individual that initially did not speak up or participate in large group or whole-class settings. Lexi spent a lot of time working with Hailey in a pull-out scenario and focused lesson topics on dance and music in hopes of bonding with Hailey over these shared interests and to create an environment in which Hailey felt safe to participate.

Prior to her field placement, Lexi also partook in the preparation seminar offered by the school district’s ELL specialist. From the seminar, she highlighted how helpful learning about the school district’s emergent multilingual students’ geographic, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds was. She connected this to the importance of acknowledging the differences in a student’s primary, secondary, and further discourses which turned out to be one of the recurring themes that emerged through my data analysis. I expand on this in a future section.

**Individualized Instruction**

As I was coding the Learner Profile Report, the interview, as well as Lexi’s contributions during the focus group, it quickly became evident that individualized instruction was the most prominent theme in her reflection about her time in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. Lexi repeatedly mentioned that instructional approaches catered specifically towards the needs of each individual student played a crucial part in both Henry and Hailey’s tremendous growth throughout the semester.

Lexi spoke highly of her cooperating teacher and of the tutor in Henry’s second grade classroom. The cooperating teacher worked with Daily Five workshop rotations both in English Language Arts as well as in Math and would use these rotations to also meet with students either individually or in small groups to check in and offer support. Lexi and the other tutor would alternate moving with Henry through his rotations to provide support. For Henry, this approach
meant that the activities could be modified to match his abilities while challenging him just
enough to foster growth. Modifying activities to his proficiency levels ensured that he could be
working on the same material as his classmates without causing him to shut down from
frustration of being asked to complete a task that was simply out of reach for him.

Lexi spoke highly of her one-on-one time with Henry during these rotations. She
explained: “I served Henry by assisting him in the morning during reading/ writing workshop
and word work. I gave him the opportunity to complete the same assignments as his classmates
while adjusting the requirements and supporting him when he needs it.”. She observed both the
cooperating teacher and the tutor working one-on-one with Henry, and she began implementing
similar strategies that she observed. One strategy that was catered specifically towards Henry
entailed offering less support with each session while encouraging Henry to problem-solve
through activities himself; however, he seemed to lack the strategies necessary for navigating
feelings of frustration and failure, so it was very important to be present and available to offer
support as soon as he became stuck in order to avoid him shutting down and/or acting out. Lexi
felt having this support-person ready and available was the biggest contributing factor to his
progress. She wrote, “The support that I provided was so beneficial to his learning, I feel that if
he were always able to have a sit-in tutor by his side he would be able to complete so much!”

For Hailey, the benefits of individualized instruction lay in building her confidence. Lexi
was told that even though neither student had any experience with formal education, Henry may
have had some exposure to literacy and academic learning due to his gender but that Hailey
would not have been able to enjoy such experiences as a female in the culture and living
situation they stemmed from. Additionally, there were concerns about and speculations of
preexisting physical and/or sexual trauma for Hailey as she initially did not respond positively to
male teachers or tutors. Because of these considerations, Lexi felt individualized instruction was crucial to help Hailey feel safe in her learning environment and to form a relationship with her that encouraged her to open up to an adult.

During their one-on-one time in pull-out sessions, Lexi would generate conversations that were of interest to Hailey. “She loves her home continent and everything about it, so I often ask her questions about it and she really opens up,” Lexi explained, “I remember that something we really bonded over was music, so she would show me music videos of the music that was from [her home country] and the different dances and the drums and the outfits. She would just really get excited talking about that, so that's something that we would do a lot.” These conversations served two purposes: on the one hand, they directly contributed to Hailey’s speaking proficiency moving into the Developing stage on the Can Do Descriptors. Simultaneously, encouraging Hailey to discuss topics she was passionate and knowledgeable about built her confidence. In her Learner Profile Report, Lexi highlighted the success of these one-on-one sessions and wrote, “this has strengthened her friendships with her classmates, and it has been very fun to see. She has been opening up with me a lot more in the past few weeks, and I know she has been doing the same with her classmates.” Lexi explained that this transition from the shy and withdrawn girl that Hailey was into this outgoing and social individual was incredible to witness. Lexi stated on her final learner profile report “Hailey can’t wait to go to recess and play with her friends every day and she interacts with all her classmates throughout the day.”

For both Hailey and Henry, individualized instruction played a crucial role in helping them thrive in their school communities and learning environments.

*Indirect and Student-Centered Whole-Class Instruction*
A next theme that arose repeatedly in the data was whole-class instruction that focused on student-centered work and took an indirect rather than a direct instructional approach. Burden and Byrd (2010) describe indirect instruction as an approach that places students at the center of learning through active participation and contribution. In this approach, students are engaged in higher-end thinking by actively problem-solving through activities, participating in project-based learning, and integrating their own knowledge and experiences into the learning process. Examples of indirect instruction include group work, discussion, graphic organizers, and self-evaluation (Burden & Byrd, 2010).

Again, Lexi praised the cooperating teacher from Henry’s second grade class: “Henry benefitted immensely from the indirect instruction utilized in the second grade. They would often work in partners or groups on worksheets with graphic organizers and other supports on foundational skills.” These collaborative activities allowed Henry to learn from his peers by observing and mimicking their behaviors. Peer modeling of what might be considered the most basic behaviors appropriate to and common in a classroom situation were paramount for Henry who lacked experience with and background knowledge of such foundational skills. Additionally, he could mimic peers’ behaviors for completing specific assignments when oral instructions were not initially clear to him. Finally, he was able to talk about the content with classmates which led to increased understanding of the actual material. All of these collaborative opportunities to learn contributed to Henry’s progress.

Hailey was not offered such instruction. Lexi described Hailey’s fifth-grade class as focusing on direct instruction with the teacher lecturing while students worked quietly: “Being in a class that utilizes primarily direct instruction [made it] difficult for her to follow along at a sufficient rate to take in and really learn all of the information. She rarely had the opportunity to
discuss with her classmates or problem solve and this was an issue.” Here, Lexi referenced the WIDA Can Do Descriptors and pointed out that Hailey’s proficiency in listening and reading was not sufficient to grasp all of the challenging topics presented in fifth grade simply by listening to the teacher talk about it and reading what the teacher wrote on the board. Lexi held the perspective that, as with Henry, “Hailey would have learned more if she had been placed in a class with more indirect instruction.” Hailey seemed to be offered student-centered learning opportunities during pull-out sessions.

**The Importance of Primary Discourse**

A final recurring theme that Lexi frequently addressed was the importance of acknowledging different languages students speak in different realms of their lives. “Students speak a lot of different languages, sometimes even within the same language,” she said to her peers during the focus group, “if he spoke at home with his family, [...] that’s a certain language, and English with his friends is another, and then English with his teachers is a third, so it’s a lot of different languages to speak.” With additional clarifying prompting from me, I learned Lexi was referring to ideas from James Paul Gee (2004). Lexi referred to Gee’s suggestion that languages, both spoken and written, influence social and cultural perspectives. In other words, how we talk and interact in various realms of life particularly in the formative years directly impacts how we view the world and behave in different situations (Gee, 2004).

Lexi explained that taking Henry and Hailey’s primary discourse into account when planning instructional activities for them was crucial since they were so new to the U.S. and to formal education. Incorporating elements from their primary discourse served to build a sense of familiarity and comfort in the school environment that was often very overwhelming for both students.
With Henry, incorporating the primary discourse largely involved incorporating his interests and strengths rather than incorporating specific language. Using topics he was familiar with in the lessons fostered higher motivation and desire to participate. For example, Lexi spoke of using soccer, a sport Henry had played in his home country, into her lessons. In one activity, she wanted Henry to practice telling stories with a chronological sequence, so she asked him to tell her how soccer works. What do players do first? Next? Last? He seemed most interested in talking about topics that he knew about from before the move to the U.S. yet that continued to play a role in his new surroundings at school. Soccer was one such example.

For Hailey, this was quite different. Here, the primary discourse focused not only on things that interested her in her home country but also specifically on her native language. Hailey loved talking about her home country, the culture, and traditions. She enjoyed teaching Lexi names of things in her native language. Lexi, who speaks French, quickly noticed that there were many similarities between Hailey’s native language and the French language. She used this as a tool in her English lessons with Hailey and often introduced new vocabulary in both English and French and asked Hailey how to say the term in her native language. They would then compare and contrast the vocabulary in all three languages to determine which languages were the most similar and if they found parallels between words. This motivated Hailey because she was able to contribute her own expertise to the conversation. Lexi described this as a very empowering activity for any student that might be feeling lost and foreign in their new environment.

Lexi’s Perspectives on the Influence of the Pilot on Her Current Beliefs and Practices

At the time of the study, Lexi was teaching third grade in an elementary school in a western state. The school incorporated grades Kindergarten through four and enrolled approximately 520 students with around 120 third graders. Lexi worked as one of five third
grade teachers. Lexi described the area as “the biggest small town” in that portion of the state with “a lot of farm and ranch kids” and limited cultural diversity. The town did boast an international employer that brought some families to the area from other countries. Lexi explained that she had one immigrant student in her class though they had been in the country several years and possessed strong English skills. Additionally, an emergent multilingual student just started at the school at the beginning of the school year, and this student possessed limited English proficiency. Lexi was assigned to mentor that student’s classroom teacher in offering linguistic supports, a topic Lexi returned to throughout our interview and focus group together.

To provide additional context about her current teaching position, I asked Lexi to share some strategies she uses in her class and possibly some activities she has been working on recently. She immediately spoke to daily rotations in English Language Arts and that she is working on implementing these in Math as well; however, at the time of the study, her class exhibited various behavioral issues that caused independent work to be extremely challenging for many of her students. She was using small group work for math to gradually scaffold her students towards increased independence.

**Fostering Independence as a Means to Allow for Individualized Instruction**

One of her biggest takeaways from the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience was the positive impact that individualized instruction had on the two students she worked with. She mentioned that this was something she witnessed in all three of her field experiences during her teacher preparation and knew she wanted to bring with her into her own in-service classroom.

Her initial struggle was with figuring out how she would accomplish this without some students sitting around idly while she was focusing on other students. She recalled observing her cooperating teacher in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience use the Daily Five
rotations to ensure everyone was engaged in something meaningful while she worked on individualized activities with a single student or a small group. She saw how much it benefited both Henry and other students in his class that his teacher, the tutor, or Lexi were able to work with him one-on-one and cater activities specifically towards his proficiency level and strengths during each of those rotations. She decided to implement the same approach in her own classroom.

Since her class struggled with working independently and staying on task, getting started was not easy. She stressed the importance of routines to help students overcome their challenges. She explained, “that was just really important because I kind of realized with my [class’] behaviors it was happening so much that I would have to stop what I was doing.” She added that the school’s reading specialist came in to help her get her rotations started and to support her in introducing each rotation to the class to foster that necessary independence. She explained, “I wanted to do something where they could really be independent and know exactly their routine every single day, know who's in their group, and know what's expected of them.”

To facilitate the rotations, Lexi used strategic grouping. Again, the ultimate goal behind teaching her students to be independent and implementing the daily rotations was so that she could meet with individual students or small groups and offer individualized instruction while the remainder of the class was also engaged in meaningful learning. She felt that by strategically grouping the students for the rotations, she could also individualize instruction during the rotations. “I just divided my kids into five groups. I did it by skill just so that I could cater to them a little better,” Lexi recalled.

Her experience thus far has been so positive, that she is in the process of expanding this type of independent work to math so that she can eventually also implement daily rotations in
math as a means for giving her the opportunity to meet with students individually or in small
groups for individualized instruction and support in math.

**Generalizing Supports Intended for Emergent Multilingual Students to other Learners**

The second major theme related to the impact of the Inclusion and Integration Field
Experience focused on Lexi’s current use of specific supports and approaches she learned via the
placement. This is notable given that she did not currently have any students who were identified
as emerging multilingual/ELL. She felt that these supports benefit most students regardless of
linguistic ability or special needs. She tied this practice together with Universal Design for
Learning.

One strategy she began implementing during the Inclusion and Integration Field
Experience and still uses today is offering visual support particularly for instructions she delivers
orally. She either writes them on the board, displays them with the projector, or passes them out
as part of a handout. This aid was extremely beneficial to her students who struggled with
staying on track because it allowed her to break instructions down into smaller and more
manageable steps that helped students stay focused. They could read and complete one step at a
time. This was a strategy she initially implemented with Henry who also faced challenges with
staying focused if he became overwhelmed with having to complete a large, multi-step task. For
Hailey, she used this aid to break instructions down into more readily understandable language,
and to allow Hailey to read the instructions at her own pace.

A second visual support Lexi still uses in her teaching today is labeling. She explained
that this can serve as a visual support for emergent multilingual students that are working on
building vocabulary as well as a support for students with limited or low writing and spelling
proficiency. She uses labeling on more complex content-specific images during lessons as well
as in her every-day classroom. She said, “even just little things like labeling classroom objects was one thing that I kind of figured out in [the pilot] that would also help lower fluent English students too”.

Another practice Lexi first observed in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience that she utilizes heavily in her current teaching is strategic grouping. During the pilot, Lexi noticed how beneficial working in small groups or with a partner was for Henry. He thrived if he was grouped with peers that were working on content at a similar proficiency level. On the one hand, he benefited from watching and imitating peers’ behaviors, and he really bloomed when he had the opportunity to also show off his own abilities. On the other hand, he had a tendency to shut down if he was partnered with peers that were working on activities far above his own proficiency levels.

Lexi spoke about this in her current classroom. For the English Language Arts rotations, she grouped students based on their proficiency levels to allow her to develop more individualized activities for each group. Additionally, she also took students’ personalities and social factors into consideration when creating groups as a means to increase productivity and peer support while simultaneously decreasing the chance of students distracting each other and goofing around.

**Case 3 Summary**

When examining data related to Lexi’s perspectives and experiences during the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, I found that Lexi mainly spoke to individualized instruction for the two emergent multilingual students. In Henry’s case, she witnessed the benefits of individualized as well as indirect, student-centered instruction first-hand in the mainstream classroom and expanded on this method in her one-on-one time working with him. In Hailey’s
classroom, individualized instruction was largely absent, but because of the benefits she witnessed Henry reap, she also implemented this approach when working with Hailey. For both students, she coupled her individualized instruction with aspects of the students’ primary discourse.

In her current teaching, Lexi often reflects back on her experiences during the pilot by implementing strategies that benefited Henry and Hailey. To foster independence and generate opportunities for individualized instruction, Lexi implements Daily Five rotations. Additionally, she feels that most supports catered towards emergent multilingual students also aid many other learners, so she strives to incorporate ones she experimented with during the pilot into her current teaching practice.

**Case 4: Maria Peters**

The final participant, Maria Peters (pseudonym), was also a white female in her early 20s at the time of the study. Maria was in her second year of in-service teaching in a small town in a western state. Her first year of in-service teaching took place remotely due to the COVID-19 Pandemic while her second year took place in person. Maria described the community, school, and her own classroom as predominantly consisting of middle-class white families and students.

One unique characteristic about Maria is that she grew up in a foreign country. She spent the majority of her childhood and her primary education years abroad. There, she attended an English-speaking school that boasted a student body speaking over 30 different languages and stemming from an even larger number of different cultures. She shared her class with students with very diverse language backgrounds: some spoke several languages fluently with strong literacy proficiency in multiple languages, others were fluent in other languages and only just learning English, still others were like her and only spoke English. In this classroom, it was
common practice that individual students or groups of students worked on different activities as best suited to their strengths and needs. The different cultural backgrounds and traditions were also omnipresent in the classroom environment. Her family moved to the United States after Maria completed primary school. She completed High School in a southwestern state.

Maria cited this experience as a driving factor for joining the ELL integration and inclusion pilot. After she moved to the United States and attended both High School and University in areas with limited visible cultural and linguistic diversity, she realized that linguistically and culturally inclusive instruction like she herself enjoyed during her primary education is not the norm in many American school districts. She recalled, “I was kind of craving diversity. And I thought this would be a great opportunity to see it in [this town] because when I first came here for college, I didn't see it. I was like, ‘oh, I'm pretty sure there's not much diversity here’.” She missed the multicultural nature of her childhood environment and hoped the pilot would not only expose her to such diversity again but would also offer her the tools and skills necessary to create a culturally and linguistically inclusive classroom environment in her future teaching. She added, “as the years progressed, I kind of was starting to notice people are coming here, and there are a lot of refugees from other countries [...] so that's why I wanted to join and see what I could do”.

As part of the pilot, Maria participated in the workshop offered by the district’s ELL specialists, the same workshop as the other three participants. In both the interview and the focus group, Maria spoke of the ELL specialist as well as her university faculty mentor and highlighted the support and guidance she received from both. In her field experience, Maria was placed in a fifth-grade classroom that contained one emergent multilingual student, Mika. This was Mika’s first year at this school even though he had already been in the community longer. Maria
explained that Mika had transferred schools and classrooms within schools multiple times though she did not know the reason. She explained that this had been a frustrating situation for teachers, parents, and Mika alike and likely impacted his behaviors and negatively affected his progress in learning English. During her time in the classroom, Maria had some though limited opportunities to work with Mika in small groups or one-on-one. She spent most of her time observing or supporting the whole class.

Today, Maria is a first-grade teacher in her second year of in-service teaching. As I mentioned previously, she spent her entire first year teaching remotely due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This posed a lot of challenges particularly with student motivation and participation. She stated that she began the school year with 19 students and, by the end, only 10 students would log on to the class online tool and complete any work. For that reason, she was particularly grateful to return to in-person instruction for her second (and current) year of teaching.

Maria’s Reflections on Her Experiences in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience

Of the four participants, Maria faced the most challenges during her field experience. She was placed in a fifth grade classroom at an elementary school located in a city in a western state. The school enrolled just under 500 students in grades one through five. Maria described the student population as mostly caucasian stemming from lower middle class families. The entire school enrolled one single emergent multilingual student that received language supports. This student, Mika, was a member of the fifth-grade class that Maria was partnered with.

In her placement, Maria spent the majority of her time walking around and supporting students as-needed during whole-class instruction. On occasion, she would work with Mika in
small groups or one-on-one in a pull-out scenario. A paraprofessional was also assigned to Mika, so when she was present, she would work with him one-on-one in another location while Maria remained in the classroom with the remainder of the class for mainstream instruction.

Because of this arrangement, Maria did not enjoy the same opportunities for hands-on practice working with Mika as the other participants did with the emergent multilingual students in their respective placements. Maria also was not given the same level of autonomy in selecting instructional strategies and developing lesson activities as her peers in other placements. This was largely due to the cooperating teacher and the paraprofessional that worked with Mika. She was not receptive to Maria's presence or involvement and did not seem to understand or appreciate the purpose of the pilot. This, of course, became the central theme when I asked Maria to reflect on her experiences in her field placement.

*Limited Hands-On Practice in Direct Contact With the Emergent Multilingual Student*

Maria recalled that she visited the 5th-grade classroom every Tuesday and Thursday. On these days, the class began the day with math. For the first half hour to hour, Mika would remain in the classroom and participate in mainstream instruction. During this time, Maria would float around the room and help students as-needed. So as to not single out Mika, she would help other students as well as him. After this initial session, the paraprofessional would arrive to pick up Mika for his pull-out tutoring. Maria explained that the paraprofessional insisted on doing the tutoring alone. Maria was only allowed to observe these sessions twice. She remembers, “I wasn't really allowed to do much of it, and most of the time, I got asked to step aside and go back inside the classroom.”

The paraprofessional’s behavior towards Maria only worsened as time in the field experience progressed. Maria soon was not allowed to work with Mika one-on-one at all and
spent all of her time observing whole-class instruction and supporting those students while Mika was away for tutoring with the paraprofessional. After several weeks, Maria contacted her university faculty mentor to ask for advice. The faculty mentor and the school district’s ELL specialist took action to resolve the situation and speak with the paraprofessional to clarify Maria’s role as the main support person for the emergent multilingual student. Unfortunately, by this point, Maria’s field experience was more than halfway over.

During our interview, Maria shared her frustrations about the limited amount of time she was able to work hands-on with Mika. She said, “I feel like I didn’t do a lot” and explained that this severely impeded her ability to try out the strategies and supports she learned about during the workshop and throughout her teacher preparation coursework. This lacking direct contact working with an emergent multilingual student caused the pilot to feel like a missed opportunity for Maria.

This realization of a missed opportunity resurfaced during the focus group. After hearing from peers about their fruitful hands-on opportunities to develop their own lessons and try out many different interventions, Maria reiterated that, due to her limited hands-on time working with her emergent multilingual student, she did not have the chance to take the theory she had learned in the workshop or in her coursework and try it out in practice. Towards the end of her field placement, after her university faculty mentor and the ELL specialist had intervened, she did get to work with Mika one-on-one during his math lessons; however, she felt it was too late at this point because she spent those sessions finally getting to know him, his strengths, and his interests. She felt that by the time she fully learned how she would be able to best support him to foster progress, the field experience had come to an end.

**Partnerships With Other Professionals**
A second central theme in Maria’s data revolved around the relationships teacher candidates have with other professionals throughout such field experiences. Both in the interview and in the focus group, Maria suggested that the relationships candidates have with cooperating teachers, paraprofessionals, university faculty mentors, specialists, and additional professionals can “make or break the experience.” In her case, it was the absence of a collaborative partnership with the paraprofessional that really affected her opportunities to learn. Additionally, the cooperating teacher did nothing to intervene or advocate for Maria despite seeing what was happening.

Maria explained that the paraprofessional simply did not want her there. At the same time, she felt that the cooperating teacher did not fully grasp the purpose of the pilot. She seemed to view Maria as an additional body in the classroom to walk around and help all students as needed. She did not view Maria as an individual with specific training on linguistic supports that was here to work with the emerging multilingual student.

Because of how her cooperating teacher waved her off when she voiced her desire to work more with Mika, Maria was reluctant to reach out to her university faculty mentor. She explained that this felt like going behind the cooperating teacher’s back. Luckily, she did reach out to her faculty mentor and highlighted how empowering her exchange with the mentor felt. She felt heard and that her feelings were validated by the prompt and collaborative action her faculty mentor and the ELL specialist took in communicating with the cooperating teacher to explain Maria’s intended role in the classroom.

Ultimately, she did not feel that her cooperating teacher intended to limit Maria’s opportunities to learn, she thinks the cooperating teacher simply was not sufficiently informed on the purpose of the pilot. “I think it was a very unfortunate situation, but I think it was also eye
opening to everyone involved that we need to train our teachers for these kinds of scenarios,” Maria said in the focus group, “I think, to a large extent, it was her lack of understanding [of the pilot] which I think just reaffirms the importance of this kind of like our ELL workshop and having this kind of training for [cooperating] teachers as well.”

**Individualizing Instruction Based on Prior Knowledge**

A final theme that arose from Maria’s data revolved around the importance of individualizing instruction based on the prior knowledge that a student already possesses. When Maria finally received the opportunity to work one-on-one with Mika, she faced the challenge of finding ways to engage him. In our interview, Maria referenced the WIDA Can Do Descriptors to describe his abilities which fell in the *Entering* and *Beginning* stages across all realms.

Because Mika possessed very limited English proficiency, Maria relied heavily on picture cards for communication. Oftentimes, however, Mika did not recognize what was depicted on the picture cards because of the differences in his background knowledge compared to that of individuals having grown up in the area where this study took place. During one such activity, Maria recalls, “we were looking at animal cards and, in [our state], we have bears and we have cats and we have dogs. He didn't know what any of those were, but if I brought out other animals that live in other parts of the world, he knew them instantly. So, like lion and tiger, and I was like well we don't have those here, but he knew them, and he got so excited with them, and he would [try to] tell me about them.” From this experience, Maria realized how important taking a student’s background knowledge into consideration is. She began making a more conscious effort to learn about Mika’s interests and experiences and to cater lessons to topics he possessed prior knowledge on.
From this point on, Maria purposefully integrated Mika’s interests, such as soccer, into activities that reflected his abilities based on the WIDA Can Do Descriptors. She also shared her own background growing up on the same continent and in a similar area as him. This really helped her generate a connection with Mika and help him feel that he possessed valuable knowledge that related to their academic activities rather than feeling like he knows nothing about the topics covered in his schooling. Mika especially bonded with Maria over similar experiences and shared knowledge of their countries that they had lived in. She says, “I think he never had related to someone like me. Like he’s thinking, ‘you know where I'm from, and you know this; you know that.’ so that was nice.”

For Maria, finding shared interests or shared knowledge was a great strategy to encourage Mika to open up. Additionally, taking the student’s knowledge and interests into consideration when planning activities really helped Mike feel more motivated and become engaged in the learning process.

Maria’s Perspectives on the Influence of the Pilot on Her Current Beliefs and Practices

Maria was in her second year of in-service teaching working as a first grade mainstream classroom teacher in a rural town in a western state. The school enrolled just over 500 students in grades Kindergarten through 8th. Even though this was Maria’s second year teaching for this school, this was her first year delivering face-to-face instruction. During her initial year of in-service teaching, Maria taught remotely through Google Classroom and Zoom due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Many students in Maria’s class exhibited challenging behaviors and struggled with staying on task during given assignments. She relied heavily on partner work and on student-
centered instruction to help keep students engaged. She also collaborated with the special education teacher for specific interventions to use with specific students/behaviors. As a whole, Maria described the transition from remote to in-person instruction as challenging for her students. They seemed to lack stamina in staying focused and on task.

“Can Do” Wording Rather Than “Can’t Do” Wording One key take-away from the pilot that Maria felt impacted her teaching practices today was the positive wording used in the WIDA Can Do Descriptors. She recalled planning lessons for Mika based on his proficiency within the Can Do Descriptors and focusing on his strengths. She explained that this is an approach she now generalizes to her lesson planning for all students in order to individualize instruction for the many different needs in her classroom.

Because Maria’s current class struggled with staying on task, she felt that the common core standards made it very challenging to assess proficiency since many students struggled even just to get started on an activity. In our interview, she said, “it’s helpful to focus on what they can do, so the WIDA wording was really helpful because it's hard to put those students in our standards or categories when they just can't do any of it.” Initially, she found herself developing lesson objectives based on standards and mentally saying, “well, they can’t do this. They can’t do that. They definitely can’t do that.” Finding a place to start was a challenge because the standards rarely seemed to reflect skills and behaviors her class could do.

To overcome this issue, she explained that she began using “can do” phrases like in the WIDA descriptors to outline her students’ abilities. In her lesson planning, she would build on these existing skills and abilities with a goal of reaching the common core standards. Ultimately, utilizing the positive “can do” style of wording as in the WIDA Can Do Descriptors helped her
find a starting point for individualizing instruction and developing meaningful learning activities for her students.

As a support to accomplish this approach, Maria often used partner work so that students could collaborate in a student-centered community where they slowly learn accountability for their own progress. This also helped engage students with content at their proficiency level without singling individuals out.

**Utilizing Students’ Background Knowledge to Foster Engagement**

Another strategy that Maria felt she first learned to appreciate in the inclusion and integration pilot was integrating students’ background knowledge and interests to increase motivation and foster engagement. During the focus group, Maria shared her lesson on animals with her peers. As I mentioned above, Maria was teaching a lesson on different animals during a one-on-one session with Mika. She utilized picture cards as visual supports to help Mika connect animal names with their images. She quickly realized that Mika did not recognize many of the animals represented on the cards; he lacked the necessary background knowledge since these animals were not native or present in Mika’s country of origin.

Maria modified her lesson to include animals native to the region that Mika stemmed from and recalled how excited Mika was when he recognized the animals in the images and could tell Maria about them. At this point, Maria also shared with Mika that she lived in a nearby country for most of her childhood and also had personal experiences with many of the same animals. “I could tell he found [the topic] much more interesting. I would try to relate animals that he knew into animals that we have here in [our state], and he began talking about camels. I was like, ‘I know camels too from where I grew up’. We built a relationship over [these] similar experiences,” Maria shared with her peers in the focus group. Getting to know Mika on a
personal level and understanding the types of things he already knew quite a bit about helped her develop lessons that grasped his interest. She found that he was much more motivated to learn and try to speak about a topic if he possessed some prior knowledge on the matter already.

She shared with the other participants in the focus group how this experience influenced her current teaching. Because many students in her in-service class exhibited challenging behaviors and struggled with staying on task, Maria brainstormed strategies she could implement to support her class. Her time working with Mika and the successes she had with individualizing his instruction by integrating his prior knowledge came to mind. She tried using a similar approach with her first graders incorporating topics into instruction that were relevant to individual students’ home lives as well as topics that were prevalent in the community. She used students’ background knowledge as an opportunity to form expert groups, allow students to expand on what they already know, and investigate new and more challenging topics and skills. This scaffolded approach helped keep students engaged and motivated for longer periods of time.

Case 4 Summary

The many challenges Maria faced during her field placement in the inclusion and integration pilot resulted in eye-opening realizations both for her personal development as a teacher as well as for the organization of the pilot. Maria reflected on the limited hands-on experience she enjoyed during the field placement which was tied directly to the partnership with collaborating professionals. For her, these two concepts had the power to make or break the experience. For her, they leaned to the negative during her time in the field.
The challenges she faced during the field placement led to key take-aways that she later applied in her in-service teaching. She spoke to the importance of individualized instruction which she carried on to her in-service teaching. She also modeled her objective development after the positive language utilized in the WIDA Can Do Descriptors. Finally, because of her experiences in the pilot, she continued the integration of students’ background knowledge and primary discourse into lesson activities.

**Cross-Case Analysis**

To better understand the findings from all four cases, I compared the central themes that emerged from each individual case with each other. In this section, I discuss the themes related to participants’ experiences during the field placement as well as those related to participants’ current beliefs and practices in the mainstream classroom. I organize this section by listing themes in order of prevalence. Those themes that were highlighted most are discussed first followed by themes highlighted with decreasing frequency.

Originally, I intended to discuss this cross-case analysis in two phases: first, I wanted to discuss the themes related to the participants’ experiences in the field placement; next, I wanted to discuss the themes related to the participants’ current teaching beliefs and practices. However, once I began writing out my findings, it became evident that such a separation was a disservice to my analysis because the participants often talked about these themes in a cause-and-effect manner explaining that their experiences in the field placement (cause) directly impacted their current beliefs and practices (effect). Thus, separating these themes seemed to take away from the insights the participants’ statements offered. Additionally, this separation would have led to a repetitive description of my findings as I would have had to list many of the themes in both
subsections. The presence of many of these themes in both subsection is illustrated in the two tables below.

I opted to discuss all of these themes according to prevalence rather than split into the two categories. This categorization served to identify the biggest take-aways from the data collection. The following tables outline all of the themes that arose during coding and specify which participants spoke about each theme either relating to the field experience or their current in-service beliefs and practices.

**Figure 6**

*Themes Related to Experiences during the Field Placement as Addressed by Each Case*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes Related to Experiences During the Field Placement</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structured Rotations including Daily Five</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing individualized and/or student-centered instructional activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism in the mainstream classroom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy in developing lessons</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Contact with emergent multilingual students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolded Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnect between the purpose of the pilot and involved professionals at the field placement locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDA Can Do Descriptors as a guiding tool for lesson development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull-Out Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Discourse and/or students’ prior knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering learner independence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7**

*Themes Related to Current Teaching Beliefs and Practices as Addressed by Each Case*
Themes Related to Experiences During the Field Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generalizing supports intended for emergent multilingual students to other/all learners</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Rotations including Daily Five</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing individualized and/or student-centered instructional activities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism in the mainstream classroom</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolded Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDA Can Do Descriptors as a guiding tool for lesson development</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull-Out Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Discourse and/or students’ prior knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering learner independence</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Themes Present Across All Four Cases

Of the twelve themes, three themes arose in all four cases. The first was the participants’ use of the supports intended for emergent multilingual students and generalizing these as supports that can serve all students regardless of language proficiency. The second theme was the use of Daily Five and structured rotations to allow for teacher time to work with individual students or small groups while other students were also engaged in meaningful tasks. The third theme centered on developing individualized and student-centered instruction.

All four participants talked about how the supports they were introduced to during the pilot have served them in their current in-service teaching even though none of the participants currently have any emergent multilingual students in their classrooms. In Case 1, Sophie spoke about figuring out what worked for her student during the field placement through trial and error and taking those strategies that worked for him and applying them to other activities. She found that student-centered discussion was a great starting point because a student’s input gave insight into their learning preferences. This is an approach she continues to use in her in-service
teaching. She implements a lot of discussion both as a whole class or in small groups as a means for finding a starting point to individualize instruction and meeting the needs of all learners. Additionally, because her learners stem from different grade levels, she uses daily rotations as a further means for individualizing instruction and offering tasks at all learners’ proficiency levels while she works with one student or one group individually.

In the second case, Kathryn also spoke to a trial and error approach to figuring out what worked best for learners. Just like Sophie, she experimented with various strategies until she found ones that proved promising for individual learners. Even though she first learned about many of these strategies during the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience with the intent of using the strategies to support emergent multilingual students, she generalized these supports to all of her learners in her in-service teaching. Once she determined which strategies seemed to serve which students best, she developed stations in structured rotations and grouped students strategically according to their strengths and learning needs in order to maximize on individualized instruction. She explained that using rotations for individualizing instruction was so successful in her classroom that she also began utilizing these in subjects other than just English Language Arts including math and science.

In case 3, Lexi also spoke repeatedly about the importance of individualized instruction. She saw the positive impact individualized and student-centered activities had on Henry while the lack of such activities seemed to negatively impact Hailey. Her use of individualized instruction and the resulting growth that she witnessed when working with both of these students directly impacted her use of individualized activities in her in-service classroom. Just like Sophie, Lexi also used structured rotations to ensure all students are engaged in meaningful tasks while she is busy working with individual students or small groups. Even though she did not
have any emergent multilingual students in her mainstream classroom at the time of this study, Lexi mentioned that she used several of the supports that benefitted Henry and Hailey in her current classroom as a support for all of her learners. She embedded these strategies into the structured rotations wherever possible.

And finally, in Case 4, Maria also spoke of individualized instruction that allowed her to implement supports on an as-needed basis to meet the needs of each learner in her current classroom. This was particularly important in her class because many of her students struggled with grade-level tasks. Like the other three participants, Maria utilized the structured rotations to keep all students engaged in meaningful work while freeing her up to work with a small group to offer the guided support they required to progress towards meeting individual goals.

**Themes Present Across Three of the Four Cases**

Recurring themes mentioned by three of the participants included multiculturalism in the mainstream classroom as well as the autonomy they were given in developing lessons during the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. Sophie, Kathryn, and Lexi all noticed that the emergent multilingual students they were partnered with during the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience really thrived when the uniqueness of varying cultures was discussed and they were given the chance to contribute to the conversation by sharing about their own culture. They all felt that the presence of multiculturalism in the academic setting positively correlated to increased motivation and likely positively affected students’ social growth. All three participants were in agreement that insufficient multicultural integration was present in their emergent multilingual students’ mainstream classrooms, and that this caused the students to feel isolated and even alienated in the classroom community. Sophie recalled an occurrence of peers asking
the emergent multilingual student insensitive questions that stemmed from ignorance of other cultures and lacking skills of how to talk about cultural differences in a respectful manner. These observations led to Sophie integrating multiculturalism in her current mainstream classroom across all subjects both directly or indirectly. Additionally, she models for her students how to respectfully discuss differences and how to appreciate everyone’s uniqueness as a positive attribute.

Kathryn and Lexi shared similar experiences of observing a monocultural classroom community that did not place value on differences during the pilot. Both participants now focus on including multicultural projects in their mainstream classrooms and investigating every-day classroom topics through diverse lenses. For all three participants, observing the isolating effect a lack of multiculturalism can have on students from diverse backgrounds motivated them to discontinue such patterns in their own mainstream classroom.

The second theme discussed by three participants dealt with the importance of autonomy in developing lessons during the pilot to allow participants to experiment with the different supports and strategies they learned during the workshop and their university coursework. Sophie particularly stressed how important this was for her identity development as a teacher. She mentioned that she felt she possessed this neat repertoire of strategies that she learned about in theory, but thanks to the pilot, she was finally able to try these strategies out in practice. She quickly found out that not all strategies worked equally well for her and definitely not all strategies worked equally well for all learners. She explained that this trial and error approach prepared her more than any other aspect for in-service teaching and learning how to develop her own classroom agenda. Kathryn shared similar thoughts on how being given the opportunity to make mistakes and adjust activities accordingly helped build her confidence and prepare her for
the responsibility of developing all learning activities for all of her students as an in-service teacher.

Maria had quite a different experience with opportunities to develop her own lesson plans during the pilot. Because of the challenging situation with the paraprofessional in her placement, Maria initially was not given any opportunities to develop and implement lessons or activities. She mentioned repeatedly how detrimental this was to her growth as a future teacher. It was not until after the faculty mentor and the ELL specialist intervened that Maria finally was given the chance to plan lessons and implement them with students. Through these experiences, Maria shared many of the same insights as Sophie and Kathryn; however, the shorter amount of time and fewer opportunities that Maria had working in direct contact with the emergent multilingual student and developing activities autonomously prevented Maria from reaching the same depths of insight and teacher identity development as her peers.

**Themes Present Across Two of the Four Cases**

Seven of the twelve themes that emerged during coding were mentioned by two participants. These included the importance of working in direct contact with emergent multilingual students during teacher preparation, scaffolded supports for meeting learners’ needs, the disconnect between the purpose of the pilot and the professionals at the field placement locations, the WIDA Can Do Descriptors as a guiding tool for lesson development, Pull-Out Supports, integrating Primary Discourse and students’ prior knowledge into learning activities, and fostering learner independence. Image 8 depicts the section of the table of the Cross-Case Analysis illustrating which two participants spoke to each theme.

**Figure 8**
Cross-Case Analysis: Themes Discussed by Two Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Contact with emergent multilingual students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolded Supports</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnect between the purpose of the pilot and involved professionals at the field placement locations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDA Can Do Descriptors as a guiding tool for lesson development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull-Out Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Discourse and/or students’ prior knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering learner independence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants talked about many of these themes in conjunction with each other. For example, both Sophie and Maria spoke of the importance of working in direct contact with an emergent multilingual student during the field experience in order to experiment with the scaffolded supports they learned about in the workshop and coursework. Sophie stressed that working in direct contact with an emergent multilingual student gave her confidence because she realized that she could reach students through scaffolded supports regardless of their learning needs. Maria, on the other hand, took a strong stance on the importance of working in direct contact with emergent multilingual students because she initially did not have this opportunity in her placement and felt the extent of this disservice to her teacher preparation. While she felt her time working in direct contact was too short, she did say that she would never have realized just how important it is to consider a student’s prior knowledge or primary discourse if she had not had this opportunity to work with Mika in direct contact. The realization led to her use of scaffolded supports for reaching and engaging him.

In conjunction with talking about her experiences working in direct contact with Mika, Maria also stressed that she felt better communication or training for the cooperating teachers
would be crucial to improving the pilot. She felt there was a significant disconnect between what her purpose was in the field experience in conjunction with the aim of the pilot and what the cooperating teacher seemed to think her role in the classroom was. Kathryn mentioned the same of her experience in the field placement. The cooperating teacher that Kathryn worked with took no interest in the work Kathryn was doing with Zoya, nor did she take Kathryn’s findings into consideration when planning instruction. For Kathryn, this was the result of lacking training and preparation for professionals involved in the pilot. She described this as a missed opportunity that could have been used to enhance Zoya’s learning environment. Had the cooperating teacher collaborated with Kathryn, she felt Zoya’s experiences in the mainstream classroom could have been improved.

Kathryn coupled this disconnect with the classroom teacher’s decision to solely provide Zoya with supports in a pull-out scenario. In mainstream instruction, he was not offered student centered opportunities that would have better allowed him to demonstrate understanding, another missed opportunity since Zoya thrived when working in small groups and given the opportunity to discuss content with peers. Instead, he was only offered student centered supports in a pull-out scenario working one-on-one with Kathryn or another tutor.

Lexi observed the same scenario with Hailey. The cooperating teacher in Hailey’s mainstream classroom mainly used teacher-led instruction with silent work. For Hailey, this presented added challenges for understanding and keeping up with lessons. Like Zoya, Hailey would have thrived in student-centered learning communities that allowed her to discuss with peers and actively participate in the learning process. Unfortunately, she largely only received these types of supports during her pull-out sessions with Lexi. Lexi added that she felt the pull-out supports were very beneficial for Hailey; however, similar student-centered and
individualized strategies should have also been implemented in the mainstream classroom to foster a more effective learning environment for Hailey.

Both Lexi and Maria talked about the WIDA Can Do Descriptors as a valuable tool to guide them through lesson development. Lexi utilized these descriptors to assess Hailey and Henry’s proficiency levels and plan individualized activities that reflected their abilities and challenged them appropriately without causing them to feel overwhelmed and give up. Lexi explained that this was particularly important for Henry because he had a strong tendency to shutting down when he felt tasks were out of reach. By using the Can Do Descriptors, Lexi was able to develop learning tasks that overlapped between what Henry could do and skills that he needed to continue working on.

Interestingly enough, Maria did not talk about her use of the Can Do Descriptors during the field experience; however, she felt the Can Do Descriptors were extremely beneficial in her mainstream classroom in her in-service teaching despite not having any emergent multilingual students in her classroom. She explained that many of her first graders lacked even basic skills, so it was extremely challenging to develop lessons around the Common Core Standards. Instead, she utilized the ability-focused wording that the Can Do Descriptors model to develop her own learning objectives and standards that were grounded in the tasks and skills her students could already do. She combined this with taking students’ background knowledge and Primary Discourse into consideration. When developing meaningful learning activities, she considered the types of things her students might be exposed to or learn about in their home lives. She coupled this information with the types of skills they should be learning in first grade to develop objectives targeted at specific students or groups of students based on what they could already
do. These objectives served as a starting point and allowed Maria to segue into working towards the Common Core Standards.

Lexi also spoke about the importance of taking students’ Primary Discourse into account. She shared a specific example of the lesson about animals that she had prepared for Henry and realized he did not recognize the animals that were common to the western United States. Once she considered his native country and the background knowledge he might possess because of his origin, she was able to initiate conversations about animals he was familiar with. She emphasized how excited Henry was to talk about topics he was knowledgeable about and said taking background knowledge or the Primary Discourse that students partake in in their homes and home communities is something she attempts to accomplish in her current teaching.

The final topic that arose in two cases was fostering learner independence. Sophie and Lexi both spoke of the importance of teaching students to work without continuous teacher support in order to free the teacher up so that they have the opportunity to work with other students. Both Sophie and Lexi use the Daily Five or other structured rotations to accomplish this. In Sophie’s classroom, this is particularly important because she instructs learners at different grade levels, so she requires the opportunity to work with specific students without others sitting by idly. By introducing the entire class to structured rotations, she can ensure everyone is working on a meaningful task while she offers support to individual students or groups.

Lexi also utilizes structured rotations to teach students how to work independently on a meaningful task. She models desired behaviors and utilizes posters with positive descriptions of desired behaviors at each station. These steps allow her students to move to their assigned stations and complete the task with minimal teacher support. For Lexi, this means that she can
meet with students in small groups for individualized instruction. Both Sophie and Lexi state that fostering independence is a crucial aspect to their classroom atmosphere that allows them to individualize instruction and provide tiered supports where needed without risking that many students are sitting idly without a meaningful task to work on.

**Summary of Findings**

The findings showed that, even though the participants were assigned separate field placements and now work in various and unique classrooms and schools, many of the themes they talked about overlapped. Pertaining to the field placement, the most talked about theme was the use of Daily Five as a means for developing individualized and student centered learning activities. These themes were followed by the importance of multiculturalism in the mainstream classroom, the autonomy participants either were or were not offered in developing lessons in their placements, the importance of the direct contact working with one or more emergent multilingual students, the opportunity to experiment with scaffolded supports as an instructor as well as receiving supports themselves from their mentors, the disconnect that was present in some of the placements between the intent of the pilot and how cooperating teachers viewed the pilot, utilizing the WIDA Can Do Descriptors as a tool for developing meaningful learning activities for students, the benefits and shortcomings of pull-out supports, the value of investigating and incorporating students’ background knowledge and primary discourses, and fostering learner independence.

Pertaining to their teaching beliefs and practices in their current mainstream classrooms, all participants’ talked about utilizing the supports intended for emergent multilingual students which they learned about in the pilot now in their current classrooms. They all generalize many of these supports to a broader range of students regardless of documented language learner
status. Next, participants highlighted the use of structured rotations and Daily Five as a means for developing student-centered activities and allowing time to deliver individualized instruction to individuals or small groups. Other topics that arose included fostering multiculturalism in their classrooms, offering scaffolded supports, utilizing the WIDA Can Do Descriptors as guiding tools for developing lesson objectives, implementing pull-out supports when appropriate, integrating students’ background knowledge into learning activities, and fostering learner independence.

In the following chapter, I will discuss the significance of these findings. First, I will address what the findings tell us about the pilot and will make recommendations for improving the pilot. Next, I will discuss what these findings suggest for teacher preparation programs in general and make a recommendation for programs interested in integrating similar field placement opportunities. Third, I will discuss what these findings suggest for K-12 schools and make recommendations for school districts. Finally, I will discuss what the findings suggest for students and their families and make recommendations to families with students enrolled in K-12 schools.
Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to: (1) investigate new in-service teachers’ perspectives about their experiences in a pre-service clinical field placement during teacher preparation (Inclusion and Integration Field Experience) that partnered teacher candidates with emergent multilingual students, and (2) to better understand how these experiences may have shaped their current beliefs and practices. The central area of interest included teachers’ beliefs and practices over time: before, during, and after the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience Pilot.

The study was guided by a theoretical framework that drew predominately from Situated Learning Theory which proposes that learning takes place in a specific time and place and involves creating meaning from the personal experiences of daily living (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Additionally, my understanding of teacher preparation for culturally and linguistically inclusive teaching drew on research investigating teacher preparation programs that specifically include coursework and field experiences thematizing emergent multilingual instruction (Bollin, 2007; Gross & Fitts, 2012; Hutchinson, 2013; Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012; Pappamihiel, 2007; Villegas et al., 2018; Virtue, 2009;).

I utilized an interpretative study design containing elements of a multiple case study approach (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Denzin, 2001; Erickson, 1985; Yin, 2018) to investigate in-service teachers’ perspectives on their participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience as well as their beliefs and practices for serving culturally and linguistically diverse students in the mainstream classroom after participating in the pilot. This interpretive study was guided by two central research questions:
FIELD EXPERIENCES AND NEW TEACHERS’ BELIEFS AND PRACTICES

1. What are early career teachers’ perspectives on their experiences in a preservice emergent multilingual student-focused field placement (Inclusion and Integration Field Experience)?

2. How do early career teachers describe the influences of a pre-service Inclusion and Integration Field Experience on their current beliefs and teaching practices?

I analyzed my data across three coding cycles (Saldaña, 2016) and constructed themes based on the recurring topics the candidates mentioned. I organized these themes by the two central research questions. At the end, I conducted a cross-case analysis to describe how the themes from each case compared to each other.

For this chapter, I re-read across my findings and my literature review to develop six assertions from my data corpus. I separated the assertions by the two central research questions (Erickson, 1986). The first four assertions pertain to the first research question: experiences during the field placement.

1. In a teacher preparation program that aims to foster culturally and linguistically inclusive practices, a field experience that places teacher candidates in direct contact with emergent multilingual students is paramount.

2. The success of a field experience program with a goal of increasing appreciation for culturally and linguistically inclusive instruction is heavily reliant on adequate communication and collaboration between the program’s leadership and the cooperating teachers from the placements to ensure all participating parties understand the goal.
3. Faculty mentorship and scaffolded support facilitate the transition for teacher candidates from learning about teaching strategies in theory during coursework to implementing these in practice during the field experience.

4. Autonomy to experiment with various strategies and develop lessons and activities in the field placement allows teacher candidates to learn through trial-and-error in a real-world scenario.

Assertions five and six pertain to the second central research question: the influences of the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience on current beliefs and practices.

5. Preparation for teaching emergent multilingual students enhances teachers’ work with all students.

6. Preservice experiences with learning structures and routines that allow for customized learning carry into inservice practices.

In the following section, I describe each assertion in detail and outline the significance of each assertion for teacher preparation in the future.

Distinct Characteristics of Field Placements Lead to Distinct Preparation Opportunities in Four Assertions Pertaining to Distinct Characteristics that Lead to Distinct Preservice Preparation Opportunities

The following four assertions outline ideal characteristics of field placements to promote and foster linguistically and culturally inclusive teaching beliefs and practices in a teacher preparation program in response to the first research question. Each assertion is tied to one or more of the three phases of Situated Learning and connects these phases to the experiences of participants in teacher preparation.
Assertion One: Direct Contact With Emergent Multilingual Students in a Clinical Field Experience During Teacher Preparation is Paramount to Developing Inclusive Educators

My first assertion is based on evidence collected throughout my data corpus that working in direct contact with one or more emergent multilingual students exhibits a prominent impact on the teacher candidates’ beliefs and practices on learning about and implementing inclusive teaching practices. These findings align with those of other research conducted on teacher preparation that offers field experiences placing candidates in direct contact working with emergent multilingual individuals (Bollin, 2007; Carley Rizzuto, 2017; Clark-Goff & Eslami, 2015; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Grant & Wong, 2003; Gandara et al., 2005; Karabenick & Noda, 2004, Lucas & Gringberg, 2008; Mantero & Vicker, 2006; Villegas et al., 2018; Zeichner, 1996). In a teacher preparation program that aims to foster culturally and linguistically inclusive practices, a field experience that places teacher candidates in direct contact with emergent multilingual students is paramount to developing inclusive educators.

Empirical research shows that teacher education programs can bring about positive change in beliefs on culturally and linguistically inclusive teaching thus leading to more inclusive practices. In all of these studies (Carley Rizzuto, 2017; Clark-Goff & Eslami, 2015; Grant & Wong, 2003; Karabenick & Noda, 2004; Mantero & Vicker, 2006; Walker-Dalhouse et al., 2009), direct contact working with emergent multilingual students appeared to be the most prominent factor bringing about this change. The findings of my own study align with these conclusions.

While reviewing my data corpus, it became clear that the participants’ beliefs about emergent multilingual students and beliefs about their own role teaching emergent multilinguals were positively impacted by exposure and opportunities to interact with emergent-multilingual
students both before and during the ELL Inclusion and Collaboration Pilot. Just as Villegas et. al. (2018) discuss in the findings from their literature review, my own findings portrayed the candidates’ growth and learning as an active and situated process, a depiction that aligns directly with the theoretical framework of the study. All four participants in the study spoke of experiences interacting with emergent multilingual students prior to the pilot. These experiences ranged from memories of having emergent multilingual classmates during their own K-12 education years to working with emergent multilingual students in a previous field experience in their teacher preparation program.

Sophie and Kathryn both spoke of their encounters with emergent multilingual students during a previous semester in their teacher preparation program which led to the realization that they were ill-prepared to meet those students' needs in the classroom. Despite having good intentions towards serving students with diverse academic needs, it wasn’t until they were exposed to classroom scenarios where these needs were present that Sophie and Kathryn realized the magnitude of their own shortcomings as well as the misconceptions they may have had about culturally and linguistically inclusive teaching. Both stated that this realization directly led to them volunteering for the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience.

Working in direct contact with emergent multilingual students offered candidates the opportunity to situate learning within a *community* for the purpose of applying the new skills and knowledge they learned about in theory (Lave & Wenger, 1992). Further, this type of learning in real-world scenarios fosters reflection on candidates’ own abilities implementing the newly acquired skills and strategies. The lack of a field experience that places candidates in direct contact working with linguistically and culturally diverse students would prohibit candidates
from constructing meaning in this context of a learning community where they are given the opportunity to reflect on a suitability of different practices in different scenarios.

This was particularly evident in Lexi’s example. The opportunity to interact with the two emergent multilingual students allowed her to join practice with analysis and reflection. As a teacher new to working with emergent multilingual students, she was challenged with interpreting and analyzing experiences through the interactions with her students. Not only did this allow Lexi to construct meaning in a learning community with her student, this example is also highly reflective of the participation element of Situated Learning because the experience allowed for social interaction, reflection, figuring out what wasn’t working, and problem-solving for a more effective approach (Stein, 1998).

As I mentioned in a previous section, in this study, the community and participation involve the mentors, the peers, and the students with which the participants are interacting as well as the social norms and cultural expectations within the community. These all are crucial elements necessary to allow the candidates to reflect on and grow from lived experiences in school contexts. My data suggests that working in direct contact with emergent multilingual students positively impacted the participants’ perceptions of the importance of serving students with diverse needs as well as their desire to improve their own ability to successfully do so. Because of their participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, the participants began asking themselves questions about their own beliefs and practices that they previously did not know they should be asking. This led to a continued effort on behalf of all four participants to continuously strive for more inclusive practices beyond their teacher preparation program and into their in-service years. Additionally, all four participants felt that this field experience
prepared them proportionally more so for in-service teaching than any other experience during their teacher preparation program.

**Significance of Assertion One: Direct-Contact with Emergent Multilinguals Can Lead to Inclusive Practices**

The overwhelmingly positive impact that working in direct contact with emergent multilingual students had on the participants in my study leads to an easily comprehensible conclusion that aligns with trends from existing studies: working in direct contact with diverse students in teacher preparation leads to beliefs of a more comprehensive teacher role of serving individual students with diverse needs in the mainstream classroom.

On one hand, having the opportunity to practice implementing strategies intended for diverse learners alleviates some of the concerns of not possessing the skills or know-how to do so. On the other hand, such an opportunity also dispels the idea that meeting diverse needs is not the mainstream classroom teacher’s role (Bryan, 2012; Pajares, 1992; Porter & Freeman, 1986). Both in this study and in previous research, participants frequently expressed concerns about underpreparedness for serving diverse students in the mainstream classroom (Coady, Harper, & de Jong, 2011; Cochran-Smith et. al., 2015; Polat, 2010; Shaw et al., 2014). Learning about strategies and getting to practice those in a field placement working with students with diverse needs allows teachers to draw concrete conclusions about their teaching abilities and reflect on shortcomings. In this study, reflection led to the realization that participants were more capable than they originally believed themselves to be.

Because a teacher’s belief system impacts their practices (Grossmann, 2011), witnessing and learning in context how crucial individualized instruction in the mainstream classroom is for
diverse learners is a powerful means for developing responsive classroom teachers that offer a valued voice to every member of the classroom community (Yoob et al., 2018). Working in direct contact with emergent multilingual students allows teacher candidates to witness in real-time how reliant students are on supports and interventions during mainstream instruction. In this study, the lack of supports taking place in the mainstream classroom in both Kathryn and Lexi’s cases led to a realization that students with diverse needs not only require but deserve supports in the mainstream instruction as well as during pull-out sessions. These realizations fostered a profound change in the participants’ beliefs about their own roles as future mainstream classroom teachers.

**Assertion Two: Level of Coherence and Communication Between Stakeholders Impacts Learning**

The learning context refers to an instructional environment in which learners are presented scenarios that mirror the skills they will require in practice (Stein, 1998). As I previously mentioned, through engagement within the learning community, learners are given the opportunity to reflect, interpret, and make meaning of the experiences in the learning context. Most importantly, community provides the opportunity for social interaction and dialog with others in order to help the learner reflect on their experiences and construct meaning. Lave and Wenger (1991) agree that a disconnect within the learning community can lead to a disruption in the exchange of thoughts and ideas that allow learners to reflect on their progress and evaluate their own beliefs and practices. This type of disconnect was evident in two of the cases of this study. Effective communication between the teacher preparation program offering a field experience and the cooperating teachers hosting teacher candidates during this field experience is
essential to ensure all participating parties share a common goal in mentoring teacher candidates through effective learning opportunities.

Of the four participants in my study, two were assigned placements where cooperating teachers’ actions aligned with the pilot’s aims while two participants were assigned placements where cooperating teachers’ actions did not align with the pilot’s aims. The experiences of the candidates in these two groups differed vastly and illustrate just how detrimental a disruption in communication and goal-setting on behalf of the specialists and teachers involved can be on the outcome for the candidates.

Sophie and Lexi were placed in classrooms where the cooperating teachers shared the pilot’s goal of offering the candidates the opportunity to work in direct contact with emergent multilingual students as much as possible with the freedom to develop lesson activities and experiment with various teaching strategies. Both talked about experiences of transitioning between observing their cooperating teachers and working with emergent multilingual students as a small group or in a pull-out scenario to practice teaching strategies. Their cooperating teachers were receptive to them trying out different strategies and reporting back on which were effective and which needed to be adjusted or changed.

Both Sophie and Lexi’s experiences encompassed all elements that make up Situated Learning Theory. They partook in social interaction with other individuals in the learning community, observed the goals and ideologies within the context, were given the opportunity to actively participate within the community, and participated in the exchange of ideas about their own role with more experienced members of the community (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Effective communication between all individuals involved in a teacher preparation field experience can
impact the common goal of supporting and providing opportunities to investigate teaching strategies both through observation and hands-on application.

Kathryn and Maria’s experiences differed quite drastically from Sophie and Lexi’s. Their cooperating teachers did not seem to understand the goal or aim of the pilot, nor were they supportive or receptive to developing the type of effective learning community that nurtures an exchange of ideas (Stein, 1998).

Kathryn was placed in a classroom whose cooperating teacher did allow her to work in direct contact with an emergent multilingual student; however, she seemed to view Kathryn as simply another body in the room to keep students occupied rather than a fellow educator with a repertoire of knowledge and skills. The context element of Situated Learning Theory was present, but the community element was lacking. During her one-on-one or small group sessions working with the emergent multilingual student in the classroom, Kathryn was able to experiment with the strategies and tools she had previously learned of for supporting linguistically diverse students; however, she experienced a disconnect in her learning community because she was not able to have dialog and conversations with her cooperating teacher about her observations, findings, and ideas for improvement (Brown, 1994; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Not only was this a disservice to her as she did not receive feedback from a mentor, Kathryn explained that this was also a disservice to the students since she felt that she had made several interesting observations and discoveries about strategies that were particularly effective for the emergent multilingual student. Her cooperating teacher was not receptive to exchanging ideas with Kathryn. Despite this missing piece, Kathryn was able to reflect on her personal role in the classroom as well as her contributions to the emergent multilingual student’s academic growth.
Like Kathryn, Maria also experienced her learning community as incomplete. In Maria’s case, the cooperating teacher and a paraprofessional did not seem to understand the goal or aim of the pilot and, as a result, did not provide Maria with the opportunity to work hands-on with students and, more specifically, prohibited Maria from working in direct contact with the only emergent multilingual student in the classroom. As a result, Maria felt excluded from the community in which she was supposed to be interacting and exchanging ideas. Further, her opportunities to learn never reached the participation phase of situated learning until her university faculty mentor and the ELL specialist from the pilot intervened to clarify the intent of the pilot.

As I described in the previous chapter, Maria was frustrated about the limited amount of time she was able to work with the emergent multilingual student and explained that this severely reduced her ability to try out the strategies and supports she learned about during the workshop and throughout her teacher preparation coursework. Though she was able to make up for this a bit after her faculty mentor and the ELL specialist intervened, she felt that had there been more effective communication between the facilitators of the pilot and her cooperating teacher from the start, her field placement would not have felt like a missed opportunity.

The comparison between Sophie and Lexi’s experiences to Kathryn and Maria’s experiences illustrate the importance of effective communication between all involved parties to ensure everyone understands and works towards a common goal. They further illustrate that a disconnect in this communication and goal-setting can negatively impact the intended learning experience for the teacher candidate. Simply being present in a classroom is not sufficient to guarantee learning on behalf of the candidate. Just as research shows that linguistically diverse students exhibit increased learning when taking part in real-world scenarios with peers, so do
FIELD EXPERIENCES AND NEW TEACHERS’ BELIEFS AND PRACTICES

teacher candidates when working in direct contact with students and fellow teachers (Bisai & Singh, 2020; Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2017; de Jong, et. al., 2013). The cooperating teacher plays a significant role in the candidate’s successful learning as the cooperating teacher is central to developing the learning community in which the candidate is offered opportunities to implement the teaching practices they learned about in theory, discuss these with colleagues, and reflect on successes and opportunities for improvement (Jong, 202; Uzum, Yazan, & Avineri, 2022; Walker-Dalhouse, Sanders, & Dalhouse, 2009). For the teacher candidate, this is of profound importance as the effectiveness of the field experience can have very positive results for a new teacher as in Sophie and Lexi’s experiences, or it can turn into a missed opportunity and even a waste of precious time that could be spent working with students as in Maria’s experience.

For the facilitators of the field experience and, in extension, for the teacher program, effective communication to ensure everyone works toward a unified goal is particularly important in light of the amount of time, effort, and funding that organizing such a field experience requires. From a business perspective, a teacher preparation program must consider a cost-benefit comparison to evaluate the outcome in relation to the resources invested. If the field experience fails to serve the candidates in a positive or intended manner, it is likely to be discontinued in the future. A decades-long criticism of teacher preparation programs has been the disconnect between the program and the in-service classroom (Eckert, Payne, Hands, & Roselle, 2014; Feiman-Nemser, 2018; Heineke, Kennedy, & Lees, 2013; Hutchinson, 2011; Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012; Kolano & Childers-McKee, 2015). Improved communication between involved individuals from the program and the host site of the field experience(s) can bridge this gap.
For the cooperating teachers and other professionals at the host locations that are involved in the field experience, truly understanding the aim of the field experience is key to utilizing the teacher candidates as an asset in the classroom. For this, onboarding that offers new perspectives to in-service teachers may be of benefit. This is visible in Sophie and Lexi’s examples. The cooperating teachers viewed these two candidates as fellow specialists with an important skill set that could be utilized to support students in determining strategies that best meet their needs and in implementing these strategies to work towards academic goals. Understanding that Sophie and Lexi possess these skills allowed their cooperating teachers to utilize the two candidates in a manner that freed the cooperating teachers up to invest their own time and energy in other areas needing attention.

**Assertion Three: Faculty Mentorship is an Essential Support for Teacher Candidates in Clinical Field Experiences**

Situated Learning suggests that meaning systems are only truly created when learners interact with each other through the exchange of ideas and attempts at problem solving. The act of problem solving generally stems from the reflective component mentioned in the *community* and is taken one step further in the *participation* element as the learners attempt to grow from their personal analysis (Lave & Wenger, 1991). First through community, learners are given the opportunity to reflect, interpret, and make meaning of the experiences in the learning context. Community allows participants to experiment with new skills and knowledge and reflect on these practices. Most importantly, community provides the opportunity for social interaction and dialogue with other specialists in order to help the learner reflect on their experiences and construct meaning (Lave & Wenger, 1991).
It should be noted that the community entails more than simply obtaining and mastering the skills and technical knowledge necessary to complete a specific task in a real-world scenario. In a learning community, members share a set of beliefs and values that inform their behaviors and generate a sense of joint enterprise and identity. These shared values and beliefs guide the exchange of ideas and serve to support every member of the community in developing a repertoire of resources, tools, and routines used to accomplish tasks and goals (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

In this study, the teacher candidates found themselves at the center of the community. Here, they faced very new scenarios and challenges which they largely had only learned about in theory. They relied heavily on the ELL specialists, the faculty mentors, and the cooperating teachers for support in navigating these new challenges and overcoming obstacles.

In all four cases, the faculty mentorship aided the participants in settling into their field placement. The mentors provided support where needed, offered encouragement and praise where deserved, and stepped in when necessary. Coherent mentoring practices provided needed support for the participants. Further, conversations with mentors ensured a productive exchange of ideas and allowed participants to reflect on the context of their learning and their own participation within the learning community (Stein, 1998).

Assertion Three is significant for two key reasons. First, effective faculty mentorship provides a support network for teacher candidates that all participants in my study felt was linked to their success in the field experience. Within this learning community, the faculty mentor takes on many roles including but not limited to teacher, advisor, confidante, agent, and role model. All four participants spoke about the debriefing sessions they had with their mentors and the value of being able to hear input on their teaching as well as share their own reflections with
someone. Additionally, Maria and Kathryn spoke about their faculty mentors as being go-to individuals when problems arose. And finally, all participants mentioned the support they received from mentors when they felt insecure or needed advice on implementing strategies.

This is significant since teacher candidates are assigned unique and differing clinical field placements. As is true for instruction of students with diverse needs, teacher candidates in their diverse placements also require individualized support (de Jong, 2021; de Jong & Naranjo, 2019; Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012). A one-size-fits all approach is not appropriate. The faculty mentor must take on many roles in order to support their teacher candidate in the unique scenarios and challenges they may face in their placement (Bollin, 2007; de Jong, 2021; de Jong & Naranjo, 2019; Gross & Fitts, 2012; Uzum, Yazan, & Avineri, 2022).

As the teacher, the faculty mentor serves as a resource in the event the candidate encounters a gap in their own knowledge or possesses the knowledge yet are not sure how to convert the theoretical knowledge into practice. As an advisor, the faculty mentor serves as a sounding board to guide the teacher candidate through reflection and problem-solving as a means to overcome challenges. As a confidante, the faculty mentor listens to the concerns and feelings of the candidate without judgment. As an agent, the faculty mentor acts on behalf of the candidate should conflicts or issues arise. As a role model, the faculty mentor leads by example in a manner that illustrates to the candidate how interactions in academic settings can appropriately be navigated (de Jong, 2021; de Jong & Naranjo, 2019; Gross & Fitts, 2012; Uzum, Yazan, & Avineri, 2022).

The last of these roles, the role model, leads me to the second significance of this assertion. The faculty mentor does not solely serve as a role model for navigating interactions in academic settings, but also models interactions between teacher and learner. All of the roles that
the faculty mentor takes on and displays to the candidate are roles that the candidate, in turn, can and should take on during their relationship with the student(s) they are working with during the field experiment (Clark-Goff & Eslami, 2015).

The faculty mentor serves as a sounding board and offers advice, they provide support with various strategies to scaffold the candidate towards independence. They encourage the candidate and motivate them to keep trying when expectations become challenging. They are there to catch the candidate when they fail. These all are skills the candidates will practice and hone as their time working in direct contact with students continues. Having a faculty mentor that models these behaviors is, in itself, a very important support to show candidates what a healthy relationship between educator and learner looks like. In other words, the mentor is modeling the behaviors that the teacher preparation program is essentially attempting to bestow on the candidates (de Jong, 2021; de Jong & Naranjo, 2019; Gross & Fitts, 2012; Uzum, Yazan, & Avineri, 2022).

**Assertion Four: The Power of Autonomy for Teacher Candidates in Field Experiences**

Linguistically inclusive teaching practices are varied, contextually dependent, and require a variety of skills including understanding emergent multilingual students from a multilingual and multicultural perspective, understanding how language and culture shape experiences and inform pedagogy for multilingual learners, and possessing the ability to mediate a range of contextual factors in classrooms where they teach (de Jong, et. al., 2013; Echevarria & Voigt, 2010; Goldenberg, 2013; and Luke, 2018). While teacher candidates can be presented with the knowledge about these skills in neatly packaged clusters of information in theory, simply learning about these phenomena as an outsider is not sufficient. These skills must be practiced and honed in real-world contexts that are sensitive to the application of these skills in the manner
in which they will be practiced in in-service teaching (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Luke, 2018; Verplaatse & Migliacci, 2017).

The participants of my study completed coursework and attended a workshop facilitated by ELL specialists that addressed many of the skills necessary for inclusive instruction; however, they unanimously felt that they did not truly learn these skills until they practiced them in their field experiences. Sophie, for example, felt that she had a good understanding of developing learning activities that serve the needs of various learner types before entering the field experience. She had learned about various strategies in the workshop and in some of the courses. Ultimately, it wasn’t until her work in the classroom with the emergent multilingual that she began understanding the importance of individualized instruction catered towards the specific needs of each student rather than including as many supports as possible without targeted goals. Kathryn, on the other hand, had a better understanding of how learner needs should be identified and supports catered directly towards those needs likely due to her additional coursework on inclusive instruction as part of her graduate studies. Despite this more advanced understanding, she explained that she did not fully appreciate the importance of implementing these supports in mainstream instruction opposed to just in one-on-one work until she observed an emergent multilingual student attempting to navigate his learning opportunities in whole-class instruction that offered no supports.

In all four cases, through the opportunity to try out different teaching strategies in varying scenarios, the participants were able to draw conclusions about the learner needs, preferences, backgrounds, and strengths that the emergent multilingual students brought with them to the table. The participants evaluated each teaching situation in real-time and made on-the-spot decisions about strategies that would best meet the students’ needs in that precise moment. This
autonomy to develop their own teaching activities and implement them freely while reflecting on the successes or shortcomings of these attempts led to salient learning. As is reflected in other research findings, the agency over decision-making and reflection leads to a more salient learning experience than attempting to absorb the theory about teaching strategies outside of the context (de Jong, et. al., 2013; and Uzum, Yazan, & Avineri, 2022).

The significance of Assertion Four is that the opportunity to autonomously select teaching strategies and problem-solve through their implementation in real-time most closely reflects what teaching in an in-service classroom will be like. All four candidates felt that the scenarios they found themselves in where they had to improvise on the spot were among the most meaningful learning opportunities that translated directly to what they should expect of in-service teaching.

Sophie stated that the open-ended structure of the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience closely mirrored what work as an in-service teacher ended up being like. For her, having the opportunity to interact with students and make independent decisions about the types of activities she would teach and the types of supports she would implement directly prepared her for running her own classroom after completing the teacher education program. She reflected that this freedom to make independent decisions about the types of activities she wanted to teach and the types of supports she wanted to try out prepared her for in-service teaching precisely because she was challenged with thinking on her feet and problem-solving in real-time if things did not translate from theory to practice as she expected.

Both Maria and Lexi talked about the impact the challenges they encountered during the field experience had on their in-service teaching. In the field placement, both had made experiences with lessons that did not support their learners quite as successfully as they had
FIELD EXPERIENCES AND NEW TEACHERS’ BELIEFS AND PRACTICES

hoped because they made assumptions about their students’ background knowledge or primary discourse. Both highlighted these experiences in conjunction with being able to debrief with mentors to reflect on the challenges and brain-storm alternate approaches as valuable learning opportunities. The conversations that the mentors facilitated and the thinking-processes that the mentors modeled encouraged these participants to continuously reflect on their decision-making and to continue practicing matching supports and strategies to the needs of learners. These experiences played a crucial role for their practices in their current in-service classrooms that focus on investigating and incorporating every students’ background knowledge and primary discourse as part of the planning and scaffolding process for future lessons (Gonzalez et al., 2005; Whitburn & Plows, 2017). In all four cases, the opportunities to practice implementing different strategies, reflect on their decision-making, and evolve from their reflections directly influenced how these participants make decisions about supporting students in their classrooms today.

Two Assertions About the Impact of an Emergent Multilingual-Focused Field Experience on In-Service Teaching

The following two assertions outline the big take-aways from the Inclusion and Integration Pilot that the four participants felt still impact their in-service teaching today. These assertions respond to the second research question: How do early career teachers describe the influences of a pre-service Inclusion and Integration Field Experience on their current beliefs and teaching practices? Even though the pilot was aimed at preparing the candidates to serve culturally and linguistically diverse students, the participants independently generalized their take-aways to a broader student population as a means for serving all students in their classrooms.
Assertion Five: Preparation for Teaching Emergent Multilingual Students Enhances Teachers’ Work with All Students

In their coursework and in the workshop offered by ELL specialists, the candidates were introduced to strategies and supports that target linguistically diverse learners. Throughout the field experience, the candidates practiced implementing these strategies and supports while working with one or more emergent multilingual students. One of the aims of this field experience was to equip the candidates with a repertoire of tools and practices to serve emergent multilingual students in their future classrooms. Now in their second year of in-service teaching, none of the four candidates have documented emergent multilingual students in their classroom, yet they all successfully implement many of the strategies they utilized in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience in their current classrooms and advocate for their use regardless of the cultural or linguistic makeup of a class.

When asked to reflect on the impact, if any, the field experience had on their current teaching, the participants’ first answer was unanimous. They talked about observing how beneficial individualized instruction was to students with special needs. They explained their use of certain strategies and the benefits for the emergent multilingual students in their field placements. These students often lacked the background knowledge necessary to successfully complete new learning activities. The participants spoke repeatedly about their successes supporting students by individualizing instruction and implementing strategies that were catered to the learners’ specific needs, an approach discussed in much of the existing literature (Bisai & Singh, 2020; Fitzgerald & Palincsar, 2019; Grossman, 2011; Macsuga-Gage, Simonsen, & Briere, 2012; and Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2017. These observations and practices directly impacted the participants’ practices in their current in-service classrooms.
All four participants individualize instruction and implement many student-centered activities in their current teaching as a direct result of their experiences during the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. These strategies were either modeled after ones they observed their cooperating teachers utilize or ones they themselves practiced when working in direct contact with students during the field experience. The strategies they now implement in their in-service classrooms include offering visual support for instructions, assigning group and collaborative activities, strategically grouping students, and utilizing structured routines to foster independence (de Jong, et al., 2013).

The participants also spoke about the impact that the assignments and requirements of the pilot had on their current teaching. Three participants addressed the lesson plan assignment. For these three individuals, utilizing UDL principles as was required in the assignment has now become a standard practice in their daily lesson planning. All four participants recalled the WIDA Can Do Descriptors as a means for assessing students strengths and weaknesses. The participants use similar systems in their current classrooms to assess students’ abilities and develop appropriate objectives.

The significance of assertion five is that when supports for serving emergent multilingual students are implemented in a broader sense, the learning environment becomes rich with student-centered and individualized learning opportunities that follow UDL principles and benefit all learner types. Learning opportunities that are sensitive to a student’s background knowledge, skills, interests, and motivation and offer various modes for demonstrating understanding in a meaningful context may be essential to some; however, they benefit all learners (August & Shanahan, 2008; de Jong, 2021; de Jong et al., 2013; Echevarria & Voigt, 2010; Goldenberg, 2010; and Howard et al., 2007). In this study, these principles are
approached largely through the individualized nature of instruction that is a result of the participants generalizing supports intended for emergent multilingual students to the entire class.

Many of the other supports the participants utilize in their current classrooms generate meaningful contexts within which students can learn. Discussion encompasses engagement, action, and expression through a low-pressure exchange of ideas. Group activities allow for students to select their own mode for demonstrating what they learn, visual support and modeling of expectations and instructions offer various modes of representation, and small-group collaborative instruction allows for student engagement, individualized representation, and student expression.

Linguistic inclusive pedagogy combats the idea that one-size fits all for students in the mainstream classroom by bringing each learner’s individuality and uniqueness into the foreground (Bisai & Singh, 2020). The narratives that the four participants shared reflected that individualizing instruction to the needs, interests, area of expertise, skills, and backgrounds of all students fosters an appreciation for diversity and, in turn, multiculturalism. In their classrooms, individualized instruction was common practice, generating a classroom community that normalized supporting diverse needs and championed appreciation for differences and uniqueness rather than showing preference for a single dominant identity as a direct parallel to combating monocultural classroom environments (Luke, 2018, Smagorinsky, 2022).

Assertion Six: Pre-service Experiences with Learning Structures and Routines that Allow for Customized Learning Carry into In-service Practices

Learners often benefit from structured routines that allow them to predict what will happen and know what to expect of a lesson and within the learning community (Marsh, 2018).
Routines allow students to participate in classroom activities without the struggle of having to continuously make sense of new instructions. Structured routines can also lead to increased learner independence and student-centered learning (de Jong, 2021; Le Seaux & Galloway, 2018). All four participants in my study spoke highly of the structured routines that they witnessed in their field placements. For several, the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience was the first instance where they encountered structured routines, especially Daily Five, in context. Daily Five is a framework that splits students into groups/stations where they complete tasks related to literacy through a structured routine that fosters independence (Boushey & Moser, 2009).

The participants recalled observing their cooperating teachers in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience use structured routines to ensure learners were engaged in something meaningful while the teachers worked on individualized activities with a single student or a small group. These observations emphasized just how beneficial structured routines are for fostering student independence, individualizing learning, ensuring every learner is engaged in meaningful work, and managing time for the teacher to support those students who require additional one-on-one instruction (de Jong, 2021; Le Seaux & Galloway, 2018; Marsh, 2018). All four candidates shared teaching artifacts reflective of their in-service teaching that represented the structured routines they utilize in their current classrooms as means for organizing and planning daily learning opportunities and developing a classroom management style.

As a direct result of the pilot, all four participants use structured routines, particularly the Daily Five, as a tool that allows students to work without teacher support and fosters independence. It also serves as a tool to free up the teacher to focus on specific tasks working
with one student or a small group of students (Le Seaux & Galloway, 2018). This requires scaffolding students towards independence so that they learn how to approach activities and overcome challenges without guidance. As was visible in all four cases, students learn to become resourceful in finding answers to questions such as “what should I be doing?”, “how do I go about doing this?”, and “what do I do when I’m finished?” This acquired ability to structure and guide their own learning process leads to accountability for their progress because students are directly responsible for their use of available time and resources in completing expected tasks (Boushey & Moser, 2009). They are not reliant on or restricted by anyone else’s contribution or participation in their learning. If they do not complete the expected tasks, they cannot hold anyone but themselves accountable. This teaches students how to be accountable members of the learning community (Boushey & Moser, 2009).

As reflected in the studies discussed in the literature review, individualizing instruction and offering multimodal means for demonstrating understanding is paramount among best teaching practices for diverse learning (August & Shanahan, 2008; Bisai & Singh, 2020; de Jong, et al., 2013; Goldenberg, 2010). All four participants spoke about their increased appreciation for individualizing instruction as a direct result of the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. They also spoke about the challenges they faced in their in-service teaching in making the time and space for individualized instruction for every member of the classroom community. For all four participants, one answer lies in structured routines. Scaffolding students through habitual use of structured routines to independence allowed the participants to invest more time working with individual students or small groups that required extra support. The students working independently were still engaged in meaningful learning context generated by the structured routines while the teachers were able to direct their attention to specific students or
groups. Thus, the structured routines served as an effective tool for developing meaningful learning contexts and engaging the needs of all learners.

**Final Reflections**

In this section, I provide my final thoughts on this dissertation study. First, I address the implications of this study. Next, I discuss the limitations of this research. Finally, I consider the opportunities for future research.

**Implications**

It is my hope that this study added to the existing findings on the benefits and importance of a field experience during teacher preparation that places candidates in direct contact with linguistically and culturally diverse students as a means for fostering inclusive teaching practices. In an era where a political movement favoring monocultural ideologies is gaining a foothold across our nation, providing teacher candidates with sustainable skills for inclusive teaching and the expertise to model inclusive behaviors for their future students is of utmost importance (Smagorinsky, 2022). As researchers and educators, it is imperative to continue the dialogues and promote the practices that foster inclusivity and do not give way to a regression to strictly monocultural ways of thinking and teaching (Luke, 2018).

A first implication of this study is that teacher preparation programs which contain targeted clinical field experiences that strategically partner teacher candidates with linguistically and culturally diverse students develop teachers with inclusive teaching practices and the ability to successfully serve a diverse student population. Learning about and having the opportunity to practice strategies catered towards serving students with linguistically and culturally diverse needs results in a salient impact on both the beliefs and practices of serving students with diverse
needs in in-service teaching. This means that such teacher preparation programs increase the likelihood of in-service teachers taking on leadership roles early on in their careers. The direct contact working with diverse students and the opportunity to learn from reflecting on the suitability of various strategies results in career teachers that are better equipped to successfully serve a diverse student population and also mentor other teachers in such practices.

Another implication of this study is that coherent mentorship throughout clinical field experiences should be attained through a form of on-boarding and sense-making for university faculty mentors as well as cooperating teachers. The purpose of the on-boarding is to ensure all participating individuals work towards a shared goal of providing the teacher candidates with the learning opportunities in a meaningful context that allows them to participate in the classroom community. University faculty and cooperating teachers should be provided the skills to serve as a supportive mentor that aids the teacher candidates in reflecting on their learning and drawing meaningful conclusions.

A final implication of this study is that targeted assignments guide teacher candidates through their experience in the field by encouraging them to practice implementing strategies and requiring them to think critically about content learned in coursework while having the freedom to make mistakes and learn from the mistakes made. The assignments must align with the overall goal of the clinical field experience without limiting candidates’ opportunities to independently develop and implement learning activities through excessive prescription of tasks. Rather, the assignments should lay a foundation or starting point for candidates while providing open-ended opportunity for creative and critical thinking.

Limitations of this Study
The trustworthiness of a study can be achieved through four criteria: Credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To ensure credibility of my qualitative study, I triangulated my findings by drawing from multiple data sources. I also utilized data from four participants all placed in different classrooms and schools which informed on varying perspectives on the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience. Further, I practiced a form of member-checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) by discussing my methods and sharing my findings with another faculty mentor that was involved with the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience.

A noteworthy limitation to my study is that time and distance constraints did not allow for member-checking with the four participants after my data collection and analysis was complete. Discussing my findings with the four participants would have enhanced the credibility of my study.

The second criteria for establishing trustworthiness is transferability. Lincoln and Guba (1985) do not suggest that findings from one specific context can be generalizability to other locations; however, they suggest that data gathered from a wide variety of sources and perspectives may provide sufficient information to allow other researchers to make assumptions about the findings and assertions holding true in similar contexts. For this, I drew from many differing data sources stemming both from the initial Inclusion and Integration Field Experience as well as from contemporary sources. I also collected data from four participants in differing placements to provide various perspectives. A limitation of this study is that all four participants volunteered to participate in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience as participation in the field experience was not mandatory for the cohort. The positive impact that this field placement
had on the participants may have been affected by their eager participation. Had they not been
eager to partake, the results may not have been as impactful.

The third criterion, dependability, is limited in my study as I followed a single-researcher
design (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I was solely responsible for data collection, analysis, and
interpretation. The University of Montana Institutional Review Board ensured my dissertation
maintained the health, safety, and wellbeing of all participants, and my dissertation committee
checked my study for fairness and offered recommendations for my methodology design;
however, I was solely responsible for collecting the data, constructing themes, and developing
assertions. Additionally, my advanced levels of education in this field may have also affected my
data analysis. To maintain credibility, I logged all activity from inception of the study through
the end in my researcher’s journal. All entries are date and time stamped with a detailed
description of the steps (physical or conceptual) I took at that time.

My researcher’s journal also serves to maintain confirmability of my study. I logged my
data analysis process meticulously by noting all codes I utilized and explaining why I selected
each code to ensure my process would be repeatable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Further, I
rechecked my findings through all three coding cycles of each of the four cases. Having a second
researcher analyze my data might result in differing codes; however, I feel my thorough
documentation of each phase complete with a detailed rationale for every decision I made
illustrates how I arrived at my findings and assertions.

Opportunities for Future Research

A next step in research entails designing a study where data collection is not solely reliant
on participants’ self-reporting. In this study, data sources consisted of assignments the
participants drafted during the field experience as well as their own thoughts and recollection which they reported directly to the researcher. In a future study, additional data should be collected perhaps through observations and audio/video recordings.

An additional opportunity is to design a study with multiple primary researchers that collect and interpret the data. As mentioned in the limitations, the data in this study were interpreted by one researcher alone. Allowing participants to share their experiences with multiple different individuals can provide insight into the role the researcher may have played, any bias present, and offer greater generalizability for the findings.

A further opportunity for research entails a repeat study in which all members of a cohort are mandated to participate in clinical field experiences that place them in direct contact with linguistically and culturally diverse students. In this study, my participant selection was severely limited to a very small pool of candidates since participation in the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience was voluntary. My hope is that, by investigating programs with similar field experience opportunities where all teacher candidates participate, the data collected will be more diverse. As I mentioned in my limitations section, even though I collected data from the diverse perspectives of four participants, these perspectives were likely impacted by the fact that all four participants expressed a high interest in participating in a field experience catered towards serving emergent multilingual students. I am interested in finding out how these perspectives and perceptions change if data is collected from a diverse range of teacher candidates. It would be particularly interesting to investigate if/how perceptions change if participants exhibit little or no interest in participating in a field experience catered towards linguistically and culturally inclusive instruction.
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It is my hope that further empirical work such as I described above will contribute to the growing body of knowledge in this field. Findings could contribute to this movement to develop more engaging, humane, and effective systems for more learners.
Appendix A: Slides and Training Materials Provided by ESL Specialists During the Preparation Workshop

**WIDA ACCESS Scores and Can-Do Descriptors**
- Give information on the language students are able to understand and produce in the classroom. Describe the increasing quality and quantity of substantive language processing and use.
- Takes an “Asset” and “Potential” perspective rather than “Deficit”.
  - They “can’t do it YET.”
  - The barrier is the language.
  - The growth will be amazing!

**Let’s Chart these examples**

**Reflection**
- What did you learn when you charted Example #1 and Example #2?
- What are some things you can expect these students to do?
- What are some things you can expect these students will need help with?

**Your Role in the Classroom**
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**Your Role in the Classroom**
- Get to know the ELL student
- Use Language Link translation service
- Informally assess and support language abilities and comfort level in the classroom
- Pull the student out of class, when appropriate
- Work with small groups (including ELL student)
- Communicate with the teacher about what the student is and is not able to do (yet)

**Academic Support - Considerations for Teaching ELLs:**
- ELL students must have **equal access** to their grade-level curriculum so that they can meet promotion and graduation requirements.
- ELLs must be given **equal access** to content instruction. Background knowledge is one way to promote access.
- Accommodations and modifications for ELL students are just as important as those in an IEP or 504 plan.

**Support suggestions from WIDA**

**Additional Strategies and Supports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensory Supports</th>
<th>Graphic Supports</th>
<th>Interactive Supports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real-life objects (models)</td>
<td>Charts</td>
<td>In pairs or partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulatives</td>
<td>Graphic organizers</td>
<td>In small or whole groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-dimensional objects</td>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>Using cooperative group structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagrams &amp; drawings</td>
<td>Graphs</td>
<td>With the lesson Web site or software program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines &amp; newspapers</td>
<td>Timelines</td>
<td>In the native language (EL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical activities</td>
<td>Number lines</td>
<td>With assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos &amp; Film</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sketches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trauma and CELLS**
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Trauma and CELLS

ELL students may have varying degrees of trauma.

Trauma emerges in school in a variety of ways and it is important to be reflective about the behavior and interactions of your students.

Not all negative behavior is caused by trauma.

CELLS - Complex English Language Learners, a tool to support school learning teams.

Using Language Link

- Talk with your mentor teacher to get the MCPS account code and language link form.
- Know the language you need for interpretation.
- It can be helpful to give the interpreter context. Example: “I’m a teacher and I’m calling my student’s parent!”
- Talk directly to the parent/student. Don’t say “Please tell them that…”
- Have a few questions ready so you don’t have to think of them on the spot.

[Link: tinyurl.com/1LanguageLink]

Topics for Phone Calls

- Introduce yourself to parents and explain you will be working with the student this semester.
- Give a positive note about the student’s strengths.
- Interview the students themselves to get to know them a little better.

You are not responsible for:

- Calling about behavior issues.
- Calling to relay important school-related information.
Sample Phone Call Script

- Hi! My name is [name], and I am working with [name of student].
- I am a University student learning to be a teacher, and I will be helping [name of student] during the school day this spring.
- I have seen [name of student] do a great job in [class, academic skill, social skill, etc.].
- Do you have any questions for me?
- Thank you! Have a great day!
## Can Do Descriptors: Grade Level Cluster 3-5

For the given level of English language proficiency and with visual, graphic, or interactive support through Level 4, English language learners can process or produce the language needed to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Entering</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Bridging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LISTENING</strong></td>
<td>Point to stated pictures, words, or phrases</td>
<td>Choose content-based pictures or objects from oral descriptions</td>
<td>Follow multi-step oral directions</td>
<td>Interpret oral information and apply to new situations</td>
<td>Carry out oral instructions containing grade-level, content-based language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow one-step oral directions (e.g., physically or through drawings)</td>
<td>Arrange pictures or objects per oral information</td>
<td>Identify illustrated main ideas from paragraph-level oral discourse</td>
<td>Identify illustrated main ideas and supporting details from oral discourse</td>
<td>Construct models or use manipulatives to problem-solve based on oral discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify objects, figures, people from oral statements or questions (e.g., “Which one is a rock?”)</td>
<td>Follow two-step oral directions</td>
<td>Match literal meanings of oral descriptions or oral reading to illustrations</td>
<td>Infer from and act on oral information</td>
<td>Distinguish between literal and figurative language in oral discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Match classroom oral language to daily routines</td>
<td>Draw in response to oral descriptions</td>
<td>Sequence pictures from oral stories, processes, or procedures</td>
<td>Role play the work of authors, mathematicians, scientists, historians from oral readings, videos, or multi-media</td>
<td>Form opinions of people, places, or ideas from oral scenarios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **SPEAKING** | Express basic needs or conditions | Ask simple, everyday questions (e.g., “Who is absent?”) | Answer simple content-based questions | Answer opinion questions with supporting details | Justify/defend opinions or explanations with evidence |
|             | Name pre-taught objects, people, diagrams, or pictures | Retell short stories or events | Re/tell short stories or events | Discuss stories, issues, and concepts | Give content-based presentations using technical vocabulary |
|             | Recite words or phrases from pictures of everyday objects and oral modeling | Describe pictures, events, objects, or people using phrases or short sentences | Make predictions or hypotheses from discourse | Give content-based oral reports | Sequence steps in grade-level problem-solving |
|             | Answer yes/no and choice questions | Share basic social information with peers | Offer solutions to social conflict | Offer creative solutions to issues/problems | Explain in detail results of inquiry (e.g., scientific experiments) |
|             |                     |                     | Present content-based information | Compare/contrast content-based functions and relationships |                     |

The Can Do Descriptors work in conjunction with the WIDA Performance Definitions of the English language proficiency standards. The Performance Definitions use three criteria: 1. linguistic complexity, 2. vocabulary usage; and 3. language control to describe the increasing quality and quantity of students’ language processing and use across the levels of language proficiency.
### Can Do Descriptors: Grade Level Cluster 3-5

For the given level of English language proficiency and with visual, graphic, or interactive support through Level 4, English language learners can process or produce the language needed to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Entering</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Bridging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>READING</strong></td>
<td>Match icons or diagrams with words/concepts</td>
<td>Identify facts and explicit messages from illustrated text</td>
<td>Interpret information or data from charts and graphs</td>
<td>Classify features of various genres of text (e.g., “and they lived happily ever after”—fairy tale)</td>
<td>Summarize information from multiple related sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify cognates from first language, as applicable</td>
<td>Find changes to root words in context</td>
<td>Identify main ideas and some details</td>
<td>Match graphic organizers to different texts (e.g., company/contrast with Venn diagram)</td>
<td>Answer analytical questions about grade-level text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make sound/symbol/word relations</td>
<td>Identify elements of story grammar (e.g., characters, setting)</td>
<td>Sequence events in stories or content-based processes</td>
<td>Read details that support main ideas</td>
<td>Identify, explain, and give examples of figures of speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Match illustrated words/ phrases in differing contexts (e.g., on the board, in a book)</td>
<td>Follow visually supported written directions (e.g., “Draw a star in the sky”)</td>
<td>Use context clues and illustrations to determine meaning of words/phrases</td>
<td>Differentiate between fact and opinion in narrative and expository text</td>
<td>Draw conclusions from explicit and implicit text at or near grade level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRITING</strong></td>
<td>Label objects, pictures, or diagrams from word/phrase banks</td>
<td>Make lists from labels or peers</td>
<td>Produce simple expository or narrative text</td>
<td>Produce extended responses of original text approaching grade level</td>
<td>Level 5: Bridging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate ideas by drawing</td>
<td>Complete/produce sentences from word/phrase banks or walls</td>
<td>String related sentences together</td>
<td>Apply content-based information to new context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copy words, phrases, and short sentences</td>
<td>Fill in graphic organizers, charts, and tables</td>
<td>Compare/contrast content-based information</td>
<td>Connect or integrate personal experiences with literature/content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answer oral questions with single words</td>
<td>Make comparisons using real-life or visually-supported materials</td>
<td>Describe events, people, processes, procedures</td>
<td>Explain strategies or use of information in solving problems</td>
<td>Create grade-level stories or reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Can Do Descriptors work in conjunction with the WIDA Performance Definitions of the English language proficiency standards. The Performance Definitions use three criteria: 1. linguistic complexity; 2. vocabulary usage; and 3. language control to describe the increasing quality and quantity of students’ language processing and use across the levels of language proficiency.
### Strategies and Supports for English Language Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Appropriate Instructional Strategies</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slow down, repeat, paraphrase instructions</td>
<td>Limit/simplify/pre-teach vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplify vocabulary and sentences</td>
<td>Add visual support to lessons/tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize small group instruction when possible</td>
<td>Print instead of write in cursive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify lesson delivery</td>
<td>Provide primary language support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher models/class together/independent</td>
<td>Seat student near teacher and near supportive peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with ELL staff</td>
<td>Allow student to work with supportive peer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Appropriate Assignment Supports</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide teacher notes to help with completion</td>
<td>Modify/shorten/omit section of assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify linguistic complexity of assignment</td>
<td>Provide both oral and written directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow additional time for completion</td>
<td>Provide primary language support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide word banks/vocabulary support</td>
<td>Accept printing instead of cursive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chunk assignments</td>
<td>Add visual support to assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide audio support to reading</td>
<td>Allow answers in first language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Appropriate Assessment Supports</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administer test in small group when possible</td>
<td>Provide word banks/vocabulary support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify linguistic complexity of test</td>
<td>Chunk test sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow additional time to complete test</td>
<td>Modify/shorten/omit sections of test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit answer choices on multiple choice tests</td>
<td>Eliminate True/False test questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read aloud test directions, questions, choices</td>
<td>Provide primary language support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer alternative forms of assessment</td>
<td>Add visual support to assessments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sensory Supports
- Real-life objects (reals)
- Manipulatives
- Pictures & photographs
- Illustrations, diagrams & drawings
- Magazines & newspapers
- Physical activities
- Videos & Films
- Broadcasts
- Models & figures

#### Graphic Supports
- Charts
- Graphic organizers
- Tables
- Graphs
- Timelines
- Number lines

#### Interactive Supports
- In pairs or partners
- In triads or small groups
- In a whole group
- Using cooperative group structures
- With the Internet (Web sites) or software programs
- In the native language (L1)
- With mentors
CTS Language Link

To be used when conversing with parents who do not speak English, for in-person conversations as well as over the phone.

Account # for MCPS: 25307
1-888-338-7394

How to Access Over the Phone Interpretation Services

Step 1: Call 1-888-338-7394
Step 2: Enter Account Number 25307, followed by the # sign
Step 3: Select 1 to be connected directly to your Spanish interpreter, or
Select 2 to be connected directly to your Russian interpreter, or
Select 3 to be connected directly to your Vietnamese interpreter, or
Select 4 to be connected directly to your Somali interpreter, or
Select 9 for all other languages.

*If you require a 3rd party call, press 9 to reach a Customer Service Representative.

WHEN USING LANGUAGE LINK:

Please complete ALL sections of the CTS Language Link form (available from your school secretary) and have your principal sign the form. Keep the top white page and send the rest of the form to Shirley Lindburg (Admin) for coding.

FAQs:

What is a third party call?
A third party call is when you need CTS LanguageLink to call the LEP client and then bridge the call together with you and the interpreter.

How do I make a third party call with CTS LanguageLink?
If you need a third party call, press 9 (even for Spanish) to reach a Customer Service Representative (CSR) and let the operator know you need a third party call. We are happy to assist you with this at no additional charge. Our interpreters are not able to make the third party call directly.

I need another language other than the ones listed. How do I get my interpreter on the line?
Press 9 for other languages and let the CSR know which language you require and they will connect you. If the language is unknown, you may reference the “Point to your Language” visual for help with most requested languages or ask a representative for assistance.

Please contact our Client Relations Team if you have any further questions:

Email: clientrelations@ctslanguagelink.com
Toll Free: 1 (855) 579-2704
TIPS AND ADVICE

How to Work with a Telephone Interpreter

1. Always speak in first person, just as you would in normal conversation. For example, say, “Do you have a fever?” rather than “Ask her if she has a fever, please.”
2. Immediately introduce yourself to the limited-English proficient (LEP) client and explain your reason for calling.
3. Telephone interpretation is “consecutive” interpretation. That means you will experience pauses when the interpreter repeats each statement in the respective language.
4. After you speak one-two sentences or finish a thought, pause to give the interpreter enough time to interpret.
5. Be prepared to explain some things in more detail for the telephone interpreter. Some terminology and concepts may not have an equivalent in the target language.
6. Control the conversation. The telephone interpreter is only there to interpret. You are responsible for making sure the LEP client receives the same service as an English-speaking client.
7. Ask the interpreter and the LEP client questions to ensure they understand what you want to communicate.
8. Avoid asking the interpreter for his/her opinion about the situation being interpreted.
9. We can accommodate three-way telephone interpretation calls. Tell the call center agent the name and phone number of the third party, and they will arrange the call for you. The interpreter cannot facilitate this for you. You must ask the call center agent at the beginning of the call.
10. Follow up by providing us with feedback about your interpretation services.

YOUR ROLE
Telephone interpreters may receive several calls a day—each one requiring special attention in a specific field. When working with an interpreter over the phone, there are a few things you should keep in mind to ensure your call is handled quickly and successfully.

YOUR TELEPHONE INTERPRETER’S ROLE
We expect our interpreters to meet high standards and want to know when they are meeting our expectations. To that end, your feedback is critical.

More questions about telephone interpretation? Contact us at 1-866-610-1338 or email info@ctslanguagelink.com.
Appendix B: Teacher Consent Form

TEACHER CONSENT FORM

Research Title: Pre-service to In-service: An Interpretive Study of ELL-Focused Field Placements and New Teachers’ Beliefs and Practices

Investigator(s): Anya M. Muggli, Department of Teaching and Learning, Phyllis J. Washington College of Education, 32 Campus Drive, Missoula, MT 59812. Telephone: (715)574-0523.
Email: anya.muggli@umontana.edu.

Purpose:
I am Anya Muggli from the Phyllis J. Washington College of Education at the University of Montana. I am an instructor in teacher preparation who spent over ten years involved with second language acquisition and best practices for serving ELL students in the mainstream classroom. I am conducting a research study to investigate how participants of the ELL Inclusion and Integration Field Experience Pilot Program (from here-on referred to as the Pilot) perceive any impacts on their beliefs and practices on serving ELL students in the mainstream classroom.

Procedures:
I am inviting your participation which will involve:

- Reviewing and discussing your Learner Profile Reports drafted during the Pilot,
- Joining a focus group conducted via Zoom lasting approximately 60 minutes,
- Joining a semi-structured interview conducted via Zoom lasting approximately 60 minutes,
- Sharing teaching artifacts representative of your current teaching practices, and
- Agreeing to Video/Audio recordings of each Zoom meeting,

Risks/Discomforts:
There are minimal foreseeable risks or discomforts to your participation.

**Benefits:**

Potential benefits are that your participation will help us identify ways in which WLL-based clinical experiences shape teacher beliefs and practices in order to improve teacher preparation for serving ELLs in the mainstream classroom. It is my hope that we can collaborate on presentations for state and national conferences and/or write and publish a pedagogical article.

**Confidentiality:**

Your responses will be confidential and will not be released without your consent except as required by law. Only the researcher will have access to the interviews, audio/video recordings, transcripts, and notes. All participant information (including a key associating names with chosen pseudonyms) will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in the researchers’ offices or in a password protected computer file for up to five years after the study is completed. The key will be kept separate from data collected during the study. Digital copies of the key will be deleted when data analysis is complete (no longer than 5 years), and if a paper copy exists it will be shredded at this time. Results from this study may be used in reports, publications or presentations, but your name will not be used (unless explicit permission is granted by you to use your name). Instead, you will self-select a pseudonym.

**Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal:**

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty.

**Questions:**

If you have any questions about the research now or during the study contact: Anya Muggli (anya.muggli@umontana.edu or 715-574-0523). If you have any questions regarding your
participation as a research subject, you may contact the UM Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (406) 243-6672.

**Teacher’s Statement of Consent:**

I have read the above description of this research study. I have been informed of the risks and benefits involved, and all my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. Furthermore, I have been assured that any future questions I may have will also be answered by a member of the research team. I voluntarily agree to take part in this study. I understand that I will receive a copy of this permission form.

____________________________________
(Printed Name of Teacher)

____________________________________  _________________________
(Signature of Teacher)                      (Date)

**Statement of Consent to be Audiotaped and/or Videotaped:**

I understand that audio/video recordings may be taken during the study. I understand that if transcripts of audio/video recordings are used for presentations of any kind, names or other identifying information will not be associated with them.

____________________________________
(Printed Name of Teacher)
Appendix C: Learner Profile Report Assignment Requirements

Inclusion and Integration Level 2 Clinical Experience

Initial Student Profile Report

Purpose: We hope you will spend your initial sessions in your field placement learning about a student who is learning English. Learning and reporting about the student’s background, current language proficiency in multiple modes (reading, writing, speaking, listening), and how the student engages in the social context of school will be beneficial in numerous ways. For example, this process will:

· Help you better understand this student’s situation and plan for your work with this student.

· Give you practice utilizing data to analyze language proficiency.

· Give you a baseline of sorts; at the end of the term, you can refer to this initial report to gauge progress over your time together.

The Initial Student Profile Report should include:
FIELD EXPERIENCES AND NEW TEACHERS’ BELIEFS AND PRACTICES

1) An overview of the student’s background (country of origin, circumstances, linguistic background, strengths, funds of knowledge);

2) a brief overview of the student’s English proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, listening (please include ACCESS data if available, as well as other formal/informal sources of data); and

3) a brief description of what you notice about the student’s social behaviors and level of integration in the academic and social realms of school (i.e., typical interactions with teachers and peers, demeanor, affect, participation in academic and social contexts).

Details:

· Please type this. You can organize it by using the three numbered items above (background; overview of language proficiency; indicators of integration) as subheadings. You can choose to either write a narrative or use bullet points under each subheading—whichever helps you synthesize/present a snapshot of this student’s current profile.

· Use first names only or pseudonyms.

· Be sure to draw on data (which could include information garnered from observations, work samples, assessment scores, conversations, etc.), but also offer some interpretation where appropriate. For example, you can provide STAR scores, but put them in context to give a sense of the student’s relative proficiency.

· Remember the main purpose of this mini-report is to build some focus for you as you learn about this student, and so you have an artifact of some kind to look back on at the end of the term—this will help you understand areas of growth, etc.

· We expect this initial report might be around 1.5-2 pages.
Submit your completed report to the dropbox on the Level 2 Clinical Experience Moodle page.

Evaluation Criteria:

This is a credit/no credit class. What I’m hoping to see in your report is careful attention to each of the prompts—this will include evidence that you have made an effort to learn about this student and evidence that you have a working understanding of language proficiency and social factors that impact learning.

Inclusion and Integration Level 2 Clinical Experience

Final Student Profile Report & Final Reflection

Purpose: Now that you have completed your Level 2 fieldwork, we hope you have the opportunity to reflect on several aspects of your experience, as well as your student’s performance and participation and factors that influence these.

The Final Student Profile Report should include:

1) Candidate’s Role. A brief description of your work and role in your classroom.

2) Student’s Language Proficiency. An overview of your student’s current proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and listening by the end of your time working with him/her. Please use the WIDA Can Do descriptors, as well as specific examples of your student’s performance, in this overview. Note any ways in which the student’s current proficiency has changed since your initial profile report.
3) Student’s Social Integration. A brief description of what you noticed about the student’s social behaviors and level of integration in the academic and social realms of school (i.e., typical interactions with teachers and peers, demeanor, affect, participation in academic and social contexts). Have you noticed any changes since your initial profile report? What do you make of the change/lack of change?

4) Analysis of Opportunities. What did you notice about arrangements, routines, and instructional experiences in your placement classroom/school that seemed to constrain or support learning for your student (this includes the work you did)? I realize this in itself could be a 10-page paper; for our purposes, please share highlights.

5) Language Link Exchange. Describe your Language Link exchange. How did you use this tool? What came of it? What suggestions do you have for teachers with regard to this tool?

6) Professional Development. Identify 1-2 aspects of teaching that you think you demonstrated improvement in this semester. What are 1-2 areas that you are wanting to work on at this point? Do you have pressing questions re: the teaching/assessment of ELLs?

Details:

- I recommend that you reread your initial student profile report before writing this. Where appropriate, you are encouraged to make comparisons to the first report.

- Please type this. You can organize it by using the bolded items as subheadings if you wish. You can choose to either write a narrative or use bullet points under each subheading.

- Use first names only or pseudonyms.

- Again, I’m not sure what to say about expected length for this. I’m thinking 3-4 pages?
Evaluation Criteria:

- This is a credit/no credit class. What I’m hoping to see in your report is careful attention to each of the prompts—this will include evidence that you have made an effort to analyze student progress and analyze factors that impact learning. Further, I hope to see you thoughtfully highlighting insights on your own learning and progress.

Appendix D: Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

Reflective Interview with In-Service Teachers who Participated in the ELL Inclusion and Integration Field Experience Pilot Program

Participant: In-Service Teacher

Protocol Notes: Semi-structured interviews are interviews that follow a predetermined protocol of open-ended questions that allow interviewees to answer in free narrative form and share their thoughts and perceptions on their experiences (Creswell & Poth, 2018, Yin, 2018). This interview will provide the participant the opportunity to describe their experiences before, during, and after the ELL-Pilot by answering a series of pre-determined questions. Some questions are accompanied by additional prompts. When deemed appropriate by the interviewer,
the interviewer will offer these additional prompts during the interview to further explore ideas the participant has articulated.

Prior to recording: Reiterate the purpose of this interview and remind participant that they have the right to withdraw at any point. Ensure the participant is ready to be recorded.

[Begin audio recording]

Interviewer states:
· Teacher’s name (pseudonym)
· Interviewer’s name
· Date and time
· Location of interview

Semi-Structured Interview Questions/Prompts:

1. Tell me about yourself and your current teaching position.
   a. How would you describe your current classroom and the types of instructional activities you use?

2. Tell me about your background and the cultural diversity in which you grew up.
   a. Prior to participating in the Elementary Teacher Education program, are there any specific memories that stick out where you interacted with non-native English speakers?
3. Thinking back on the Inclusion and Integration Field Experience, tell me about the ELL student (or students) you were partnered with.
   a. What can you tell me about their cultural background, prior experience with formal education, social and behavioral characteristics, and literacy skills both in English as well as in other languages?

4. How would you describe the relationship you had with your ELL student?
   a. What are some activities and goals you worked on together?
   b. What worked and what didn’t?
   c. Are there specific memories of trial and error that stick out?

5. How would you describe the ELL student’s relationship with other teachers, professionals, adults, and students?
   a. How did they interact with each other?
   b. What seemed to work and what didn’t?

6. Are there any specific memories that come to mind where you found yourself in a “tricky teacher moment”, a moment that was unique, challenging, or even uncomfortable because of racial, cultural, or social topics/differences?

7. After having had the opportunity to revisit your own Learner Profile Reports, what are significant memories or realizations that came to mind?

8. Thinking on your role in your placement and any knowledge or training you possessed, what were you able to bring to the table in this partnership
(you may want to think about what you wrote in your Learner Profile Reports)?

9. Were there any big takeaways for you from the ELL-based field placement?

10. If the ELL student were to join your current classroom, what would you do to serve them?

11. Overall, what would you recommend to the Elementary Teacher Education Program at the University?
   a. Would you recommend the ELL-based field placements for all participants?
   b. What are changes you would suggest? What did you find particularly beneficial to your learning?
   c. What seemed limiting?

12. Finally, is there anything else you’d like to add?
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