

The Induction and Mentoring Experiences of New English as a Second Language and Bilingual Teachers

Rebecca Raine Raab

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Curriculum and Instruction

Bonnie S. Billingsley
Thomas O. Williams, Jr.
Gresilda Tilley-Lubbs
Bettibel Kreye

October 1, 2020
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: new teachers, English as a Second Language, bilingual education, induction, mentoring

Copyright 2020, Rebecca Raine Raab

The Induction and Mentoring Experiences of New English as a Second Language and Bilingual Teachers

Rebecca Raine Raab

ABSTRACT

The focus of this dissertation is on the induction and mentoring experiences of new English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual teachers. Included in the dissertation are three manuscripts: a systematic literature review of the experiences of and supports for new ESL/bilingual teachers, a descriptive analysis of their induction, and an inferential analysis (i.e., regression) of the extent to which working with a mentor improved their first-year instruction.

The first manuscript (Chapter 2) is a systematic review of peer-reviewed articles documenting the experiences of and supports for new ESL/bilingual teachers in U.S public schools. Findings from 32 studies published from 2002-2020 were synthesized into three overarching themes (i.e., instructional contexts and roles; social contexts of teaching; formal induction supports). Many new teachers experienced challenges in their instructional contexts and roles and struggled to connect socially with others in their schools, leading to physical segregation and marginalization. Moreover, only a few studies elaborated on specific induction and mentoring supports. Manuscript 1 concludes with suggestions for researchers and implications for K-12 school leaders, teacher educators, and new ESL/bilingual teachers.

The second manuscript (Chapter 3) presents the findings of a secondary descriptive analysis of new ESL/bilingual teacher induction using the nationally representative 2011-12 Schools and Staffing Survey Teacher Questionnaire. Findings provide a first of its kind national profile of their induction supports, levels of perceived preparedness for the first year, and demographic characteristics, as well as a comparison to new general educators. Findings indicate that a lower percentage of new ESL/bilingual teachers than general educators received important induction supports (i.e., administrator feedback, same-subject mentoring, and frequent mentoring) and were not well prepared for critical teaching tasks (e.g., assessing students). Demographically, a higher percentage of new ESL/bilingual teachers than general educators were teachers of color. The manuscript concludes with directions for future research and implications for teacher educators and school leaders.

The third manuscript (Chapter 4) investigated which mentoring components (i.e., same-subject mentors, frequency of mentoring, and other mentoring activities), predicted new ESL/bilingual teachers' perceptions that their mentors helped improve their first year of teaching. Using a nationally representative sample of ESL/bilingual teachers. I found that frequent weekly mentoring, help with developing student assessment tools, and help with paperwork/record keeping were statistically significant predictors of the extent to which new ESL/bilingual teachers indicated their mentors improved their first-year teaching. I conclude with suggestions for future research and improving mentoring programs for new ESL/bilingual teachers.

The Induction and Mentoring Experiences of New English as a Second Language and Bilingual Teachers

Rebecca Raine Raab

GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

The induction and mentoring experiences of new general educators are well documented; however, we know little about the experiences of new English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual teachers. This dissertation, comprised of three manuscripts, explores their induction and mentoring experiences. Chapter 2 reviews the literature published between 2002-2020 on the experiences of and supports for new ESL/bilingual teachers. Findings revealed that new ESL/bilingual teachers experienced challenges in instructional contexts and their roles, struggled in social contexts with other teachers and administrators, and sometimes felt marginalized and physically segregated in their schools. Moreover, evidence of induction and mentoring supports were limited. Chapter 3 presents findings from a secondary descriptive analysis of new ESL/bilingual teacher induction using nationally representative data. Findings suggest that low percentages of new ESL/bilingual teachers perceived themselves to be prepared in the first year for key teaching tasks and others did not have common induction supports. Moreover, these findings were compared with new general educators' revealing differences in descriptive results. Chapter 4 explores the mentoring experiences of new ESL/bilingual teachers. Using a nationally representative sample and regression, findings reveal that a number of new ESL/bilingual teachers did not have weekly mentoring with same-subject mentors, nor did they participate in important mentoring activities. Regression results revealed that weekly mentoring, help with paperwork/record keeping, and help with developing student assessments were statistically significant predictors of the extent to which new ESL/bilingual teachers perceived that their mentors improved their first-year teaching. Discussions in each manuscript provide suggestions for future researchers and implications for school leaders and teacher educators.

Dedications

This dissertation is dedicated to my dear friends Caryn Caruso, Lezly Taylor, Jennifer Maguire, Michelle Rasheed, and Jade Arditti.

Your friendship made this possible. Thank you for your support through the years. I am grateful for the all the laughter, the advice, and the shoulders to lean on and occasionally cry. When I look back at this time, I will always think how lucky I was to do this alongside each of you.

Acknowledgments

This journey would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of many people. First, I would like to thank all the students I have had the pleasure to teach at Virginia Tech. Without teaching, I am not sure I would have finished; however, our time together, learning and growing, refueled me, and pushed me down the path.

Next, I would like to thank my committee members. First, I am forever grateful to Dr. Bonnie Billingsley for her never-ending support and encouragement. She pushed me to be a better scholar, spending countless hours with me on manuscripts and projects. I would not be here without her dedication. I am also grateful to Dr. Tom Williams for his dedication to this process. He helped me to understand the SASS and NTPS. His patience and belief that I could do quantitative research and finish, pushed me to keep going. I am also grateful to Dr. Kris Tilley-Lubbs for her decades long support and passion for ESL/bilingual education. She helped build the foundation for which this research is based. And to Dr. Betti Kreye, who like Dr. Tilley-Lubbs, passionately advocates for multilingual learners. She also helped mold me into the scholar I am today. I will never forget Teacher Education Curriculum with her and Dr. Billingsley. My favorite course at Virginia Tech.

I would also like to thank my parents, Anne and Tom, and my brother, Scott. They have always provided unconditional love, encouragement, and a writing refuge. Many versions of this were written at our family's property on the Banister River in Halifax County—a place full of memories, blue herons, beloved pets, and ancient pines.

Lastly, I would like to thank Jack. He helped me to believe that the impossible was possible. He always knew I would finish, even when I thought it would never happen. I am forever grateful for his companionship throughout this journey.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
General Audience Abstract	iii
Dedications... ..	iv
Acknowledgements	v
List of Tables	x
Preface/Attribution.....	xi
Chapter 1: Introduction to Dissertation.....	1
Purpose of Dissertation	2
Terminology.....	3
Overview of Dissertation Chapters	4
Chapter 2 Abstract	4
Chapter 2 Research Questions	4
Chapter 3 Abstract	5
Chapter 3 Research Questions	6
Chapter 4 Abstract	6
Chapter 4 Research Questions	7
References.....	8
Chapter 2: The Experiences of New Bilingual and ESL Teachers: A Review of the Literature...12	
New Teacher Experiences and Induction	13
Teaching in Bilingual and ESL Contexts.....	13
Method	15
Selection Criteria	15
New Bilingual/ESL Teachers in the U.S.	15
New Teachers' Experiences and Induction Support	16
Timeframe of Study	16
Search Procedures	16
Electronic Search	16
Strategic Journal Search.....	17
Ancestral Search	17
Professional Contacts.....	18
Analysis.....	19
Findings.....	19
Overview of Studies.....	19
Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks	19
Methodological Approaches	24
Teacher Characteristics	24
Settings.....	24
Instructional Contexts and Roles	25
The Effects of Language Policies and Local Guidelines	25
Pedagogical Challenges	27
Planning, Teaching, and Assessing MLLs.....	27
Accessing Instructional Resources	28
Collaborating with Others.....	29
Responding to Student Behavior	30

Teacher Roles Beyond Instruction.....	30
Advocates.....	30
Translators.....	31
Leaders.....	31
Paperwork.....	31
Conclusions about Instructional Contexts and Roles.....	32
Social Contexts of Teaching.....	33
Relationships with Others.....	33
Administrators.....	33
General Educators.....	33
Bilingual/ESL Teachers.....	34
Former Faculty and Researchers.....	34
Segregation and Marginalization.....	34
Physical Segregation.....	35
Teacher Marginalization.....	36
Racism and Microaggressions.....	36
English as Marginalizing.....	37
Student Marginalization and Segregation.....	37
Conclusions about Social Contexts of Teaching.....	38
Formal Induction Supports.....	39
Mentoring.....	39
Additional Formal Supports.....	40
Conclusions about Formal Induction Supports.....	41
Discussion.....	41
Methodological Critique and Future Research.....	43
Use of Theories and Frameworks.....	43
Perspectives of New Teachers Over Time.....	43
Include More Data about Participants and Settings.....	43
Considerations for Future Research.....	44
Consider Specific Teacher Groups and Contexts.....	44
Examine National Trends.....	44
Examine Bilingual and ESL Induction.....	44
Understand Factors Related to Attrition.....	45
Implications for Practice.....	45
K-12 Leaders.....	45
Teacher Educators and Preparation Programs.....	46
New Bilingual/ESL Teachers.....	46
Conclusion.....	47
References.....	48
Chapter 3: New ESL and Bilingual Teachers' Induction Experiences in U.S. Schools.....	60
Defining Induction and Review of the Literature.....	61
New Teacher Induction.....	61
Induction Supports.....	62
Preparation and First-Year Experiences.....	63
Purpose and Research Questions.....	64
Methods.....	65

Instrumentation	65
Respondents	66
Procedure and Variables Analyzed	66
Findings.....	69
Demographic Profile.....	69
Research Question 1: Induction Supports.....	71
Research Question 2: First-Year Preparedness.....	74
Discussion	77
Limitations	80
Implications for Future Research.....	81
Induction Supports and Mentoring	81
Investigating Teachers’ Perceived Preparedness	82
Connecting Race/Ethnicity in Induction Research	83
Conclusion	83
References.....	84
Chapter 4: What Predicts ESL/Bilingual Teachers’ Perceptions of Mentors Improving First-Year Teaching?.....	92
Conceptual Framework and Review of the Literature.....	93
Mentoring “Done Right”.....	94
Same-Subject Mentors	94
Frequency of Mentoring	95
Mentoring Activities	96
Purpose and Research Questions	97
Method	98
Instrumentation	98
Sample.....	99
Variables Analyzed.....	100
Teacher Assignment.....	100
Assigned a Mentor/Master Teacher	100
Frequency of Mentoring	100
Same-Subject Mentor.....	100
Mentor Provided Supports	101
Extent of Mentor Improving First-Year Teaching.....	101
Procedures.....	103
Results.....	104
Demographic and Preparation Characteristics.....	104
ESL/Bilingual Teachers’ Experiences with Mentoring	105
Predicting the Extent of Mentors Improving First-Year Teaching.....	107
Discussion.....	109
Future Research	111
Longitudinal Investigations	111
Mentor/Mentee Pairings.....	111
Effects of Mentoring Components.....	112
Implications for Policymakers and School Leaders.....	112
Limitations	113
Conclusion	114

References	115
Chapter 5: Conclusion to the Dissertation	122
Contributions to the Field	122
Closing Remarks	124
References	125
Appendix A: Institute of Education Statistics (IES) Security Disclosure Risk Reports	126
Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter	127

List of Tables

Chapter 2

Table 1. Search Strategy and Yield.....	18
Table 2. Summary of New Bilingual and ESL Teacher Research.....	20

Chapter 3

Table 1. Variables Used in Study	67
Table 2. Teacher Demographics and Characteristics.....	70
Table 3. Race/ethnicity of New Teachers	71
Table 4. Induction Supports Received in the First Year	72
Table 5. Frequency of Mentoring in the First Year	73
Table 6. Extent of Mentor Improving First Year Teaching	74
Table 7. New Teachers' Perceptions of First Year Preparedness	75
Table 8. New Teacher Preparation Components	77

Chapter 4

Table 1. Sample Characteristics of New ESL/Bilingual Teachers with Mentors.....	99
Table 2. Variable Specification Chart.....	101
Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of New ESL/Bilingual Teachers with Mentors ..	104
Table 4. Race/ethnicity of New ESL/Bilingual Teachers with Mentors	105
Table 5. Frequency of Mentoring	106
Table 6. Mentoring Components of New ESL/Bilingual Teachers with Mentors	106
Table 7. Extent of Mentor Improving First Year Teaching	107
Table 8. Regression Results for Extent to which Mentor Improved First-Year Teaching.....	108

Preface/Attribution

APA requirements were used to determine authorship of Chapter 2. After I passed the prospectus exam, I asked Dr. Billingsley to work with me on a revision of the manuscript in Chapter 2, thus, she earned second authorship of this final paper. It is currently under a second review at the *Bilingual Research Journal*.

Chapter 1

Introduction to Dissertation

This dissertation arose from a personal dilemma. One that originated in my own story of new teacher attrition. After much contemplation, I wanted to further explore why I left teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) in U.S. public schools despite enjoying my work. I was also curious as to why other colleagues had left as I knew that I was not the only ESL teacher who had left the field. I was so curious that I wrote about each of my five years in the classroom to better understand what happened during my induction into the profession (Raab, 2018).

From this inquiry, I discovered that I had struggled for the same reasons that many other new teachers have indicated they struggled for decades (i.e., not experiencing a “sense of success,” low pay, family needs, lack of support; Borman & Dowling, 2008; Johnson & Birkland, 2003, p. 609; Veenman, 1984). While it was cathartic to connect with generations of struggling new teachers and to learn about the research on the induction and mentoring supports meant to curb attrition and increase instructional effectiveness (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Ronfeldt & McQueen, 2017; Schmidt et al., 2017), I quickly observed a major difference—none of these studies were about new ESL or bilingual teachers.

General and special education researchers regularly review early career literature in their fields and synthesize the challenges new teachers face during induction. They do this while exploring the supports (i.e., mentoring, induction programs) these teachers receive to mitigate these struggles (Billingsley et al., 2009; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Researchers regularly conduct national level studies of what specific induction and mentoring components new teachers across the country receive (Raue & Gray, 2015; Gray & Taie, 2015) and explore how these specific induction and mentoring components effect retention and instructional effectiveness (Ronfeldt & McQueen, 2017; Ronfeldt et al., 2014; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Nonetheless, when I searched to find similar research for new ESL/bilingual teachers, I found no literature reviews or national level studies regarding the induction and/or mentoring experiences of these professionals. What did exist were small studies in varied school contexts and locations

across the U.S. (e.g., Wong et al., 2020; Kissau & King, 2015). I thus realized that the field lacked a review of the literature and generalizable, national level studies which explored new ESL/bilingual teachers' early career experiences and engagement with induction supports and mentoring.

This lack of research is concerning for several reasons. One, ESL/bilingual teachers were reported to have the highest attrition rate of all subject area teachers based on a nationally representative sample from the 2011-12 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and Teacher Follow-Up Survey (TFS; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017). This included ESL/bilingual teachers who left teaching at a rate of 6.9% as well as those who moved to other schools (i.e., 12%). Attrition is problematic as when teachers leave their schools, they take knowledge of their students and parents with them, disrupt collegial relationships, and impact student achievement (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). In reports on teacher attrition, scholars have found that new teachers are more likely to leave the profession or move to a different school/district than their experienced counterparts (Boe et al., 2008; DeAngelis & Presley, 2011). Thus, new ESL/bilingual teachers would likely leave at higher rates than their experienced colleagues. This is problematic as many states report ESL/bilingual teacher shortages (U.S. Department of Education, 2020) despite the fact that there is a high need for these educators (Estrada et al., 2019; Heineke, 2018; Sugarman, 2018). Given this and the lack of research in the field, this dissertation fills critical research gaps by exploring the induction and mentoring experiences of new ESL/bilingual teachers in U.S. schools.

Purpose of Dissertation

This dissertation, which is comprised of three manuscripts, explores the induction and mentoring experiences of ESL/bilingual teachers in U.S. public schools. The purpose of the dissertation is to synthesize what is known about new ESL/bilingual teachers' experiences and supports (i.e. Chapter 2) in order to uncover and then explore gaps in the literature. This exploration was done through descriptive and inferential analyses of new ESL/bilingual teacher induction and mentoring experiences using nationally representative data (i.e., Chapters 3 and 4).

The use of national data provides the field with generalizable results concerning new ESL/bilingual teachers' induction and mentoring experiences across the U.S. Additionally, both Chapters 3 and 4 were submitted to and approved by the Institute of Education Statistics (IES).

Terminology

Within the ESL/bilingual field, numerous terms exist which describe both teachers and their students. Within the different chapters, I made decisions regarding terminology depending on the intended journal audience. Thus, this section clarifies the use of terminology throughout the dissertation chapters.

In all chapters, I refer to new teachers as ESL or bilingual. I use the term ESL teacher to describe specialists working with students learning English as an additional language as this is the terminology used in the National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS) and the SASS (i.e., the datasets used in Chapters 3 and 4). I acknowledge that other terms are used for these teachers (e.g., English language, English language learner, English to Speakers of Other Languages, and English language development teachers) and that bilingual teachers differ from ESL teachers as they teach both language and content in a language other than English.

When discussing these groups collectively, I refer to them as either *new teachers* (i.e., Chapter 2), bilingual/ESL (i.e., Chapter 2), or ESL/bilingual (i.e., Chapters 3 and 4). In Chapter 2, I refer to teachers as bilingual/ESL. In this designation, I place bilingual first as I wanted to highlight bilingual teachers as this manuscript is under review at the *Bilingual Research Journal*, a publication which focuses on bilingual education. In Chapters 3 and 4, I refer to these teachers as ESL/bilingual as the two surveys used in these studies (i.e., SASS & NTPS) both refer to these language teachers collectively as ESL. I felt it was vital to include bilingual and subsequently refer to them as ESL/bilingual.

I use the term multilingual learners (MLLs) to refer to students taught by ESL/bilingual teachers in all chapters. However, the federal government uses the term English learner, while others use the additive term emergent bilinguals (Bacon, 2020; García et al., 2008). I prefer the

term MLLs as it is the most inclusive and incorporates students who speak two or more languages at the same time as they learn English in schools (Solano-Campos, et al., 2020).

Overview of Dissertation Chapters

This dissertation includes three separate manuscripts. Chapter 2, titled “The Experiences of New Bilingual & ESL Teachers: A Review of the Literature,” is currently in its second review at the *Bilingual Research Journal*. Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 will be finalized following the dissertation defense and submitted for publication. Chapter 3, titled “New ESL/Bilingual Teachers’ Induction Experiences in U.S. Schools,” will be submitted to the *TESOL Journal*, and Chapter 4, titled “What Predicts ESL/Bilingual Teachers’ Perceptions of Mentors Improving First Year Teaching?,” will be submitted to *TESOL Quarterly*. Below, I provide the abstracts and research questions for each chapter.

Chapter 2 Abstract

Although experiences of new teachers are well documented, the experiences of new bilingual and English as a Second Language teachers have received less attention. This article reviews the experiences of these new teachers, synthesizing findings of 32 studies published from 2002-2020. Most researchers used qualitative methods, while three used mixed methods. We identify challenges these teachers encountered as they addressed the needs of multilingual learners in instructional and social contexts that often lacked supports. Additionally, relatively few studies addressed their formal induction or mentoring experiences. We identify directions for research and implications for school leaders, teacher educators, and new teachers.

Keywords: bilingual teachers, ESL teachers, new teachers, induction

Chapter 2 Research Questions

The following questions guided this inquiry:

1. What are the experiences of new bilingual/ESL teachers in their first years of teaching in U.S. public schools?
2. What is known about the supports provided to these new teachers?

The questions were purposely designed to be broad as this is, to my knowledge, the first literature review of its kind in the ESL/bilingual field. Thus, I sought to capture as complete a picture as possible of their experiences and supports from 2002-2020. Reviews are critical to helping move scholarship forward through identifying research gaps. Gaps identified in this review directly link to the research questions in Chapters 3 and 4 which address induction and mentoring experiences of new ESL/bilingual teachers.

I started with the year 2002 as this is when the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) was signed into law. NCLB marked a major turning point in the working lives of ESL/bilingual teachers as more emphasis was placed on standardized testing—specifically reading and mathematics—and language proficiency assessments shifted to a content focus (i.e. language of math, reading, science, and social studies). This was important as new English Language Development standards were now required (Harper et al., 2007; Menken, 2006; Morita-Mullaney, 2017). This era saw some states move away from bilingual models as English-only movements began to spread across the U.S (Ovando, 2003). The U.S. Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages became the Office of English Language Acquisition after the passage of NCLB which indicated a federal level shift from bilingualism to English-only (Goldenberg & Wagner, 2015). This review not only identifies gaps but also anchors new ESL/bilingual teachers' experiences within this socio-political context.

Chapter 3 Abstract

Although general educators' induction has an extensive research base, little is known about the induction of ESL/bilingual teachers. Using a nationally representative sample, this study provides a descriptive analysis of ESL/bilingual teachers' induction experiences and includes information on the supports they received as well as their preparedness for the first year. It also compares these findings to new general educators. The findings of this study provide the first national profile of new ESL/bilingual teachers' induction and reveal differences in ESL/bilingual and general education teachers' experiences. ESL/bilingual teachers reported less induction support (i.e., frequency of mentoring, communication with administrators, and same-

subject mentors and colleagues), and they reported feeling less prepared than general educators for teaching tasks (e.g., assessing students, differentiating instruction). A higher percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers identified as teachers of color. Directions for future research and implications for teacher educators and school leaders are provided.

Keywords: ESL, bilingual, new teachers, induction, mentoring, preparation

Chapter 3 Research Questions

This secondary descriptive analysis of the 2011-2012 SASS was guided by the following questions:

1. What induction supports do new ESL/bilingual teachers and general educators report receiving in their first year of teaching?
2. What are new ESL/bilingual teachers' and general educators' perceptions of first year preparedness, and what specific preparation characteristics (i.e., student teaching and coursework) did they receive?

These questions guided a two-part inquiry into new ESL/bilingual and general education teachers' induction supports and perceptions of preparedness in their first year of teaching. The results provide the first national profile of new ESL/bilingual teachers' induction experiences including specific induction supports that were provided (e.g., mentoring) and teachers' levels of perceived preparedness for critical teaching tasks (e.g., differentiation). This study was conceived after the gaps in the literature identified in Chapter 2 were discovered (i.e., induction supports and mentoring). Results of this study (e.g., limited same-subject mentoring) led to the need to further explore mentoring components in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4 Abstract

Although new general educators' experiences with mentors are well documented, little is known about the mentoring of new ESL/bilingual teachers. Using regression and a nationally representative sample, this study explored how mentoring components (i.e., same-subject mentors, frequency of mentoring, and specific mentoring activities) were correlated with

predicting the extent to which new ESL/bilingual teachers perceived their mentors as improving their teaching in the first year. Results reveal that frequent mentoring and two activities (i.e., help with paperwork/record keeping and developing student assessment tools) were statistically significant predictors of perceived first-year improvement. The findings provide national data about ESL/bilingual teachers' mentoring experiences, have relevance for what we still need to learn, and have implications for school leaders for improving mentoring programs for new ESL/bilingual teachers.

Keywords: English as a second language, bilingual education, new teachers, mentoring

Chapter 4 Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

1. How many new ESL/bilingual teachers were assigned a mentor in their first year, and of those assigned a mentor, what were their experiences with their mentors?
2. What components of mentoring predict the extent to which new ESL/bilingual teachers perceived their mentors as improving their teaching in the first year?

Using the 2015-2016 National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS), which is a nationally representative dataset, I analyzed descriptive statistics regarding new teachers' experiences with specific components of mentoring (i.e. same-subject mentor, frequency of mentoring, participation in mentoring activities) and ran a regression. The regression analysis explored how the aforementioned mentoring components predicted the extent to which new teachers perceived that their mentor improved their teaching during their first year. This study built on findings from Chapters 2 and 3, and the NTPS was used to answer these questions as this specific survey contains additional mentoring questions not included on the SASS.

References

- Bacon, C. K. (2020). "It's not really my job": A mixed methods framework for language ideologies, monolingualism, and teaching emergent bilingual learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 71(2), 172-187. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487118783188>
- Billingsley, B. & Bettini, E. (2019). Special education teacher attrition and retention: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(5), 697-744. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0034654319862495>
- Billingsley, B., Griffin, C., Smith, S.J., Kamman, M., & Israel, M. (2009). *A review of teacher induction in special education: Research, practice, and technology solutions*. University of Florida, National Center to Inform Policy and Practice in Special Education Development (NCIPP Doc. No. RS-1ES). http://ncipp.org/reports/rs_1es.pdf
- Boe, E. E., Cook, L. H., & Sunderland, R. J. (2008). Teacher turnover: Examining exit attrition, teaching area transfer, and school migration. *Exceptional Children*, 75, 7-31. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F001440290807500101>
- Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(3), 367-409. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0034654308321455>
- Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/teacher-turnover-report>
- DeAngelis, K. J., & Presley, J. B. (2011). Toward a more nuanced understanding of new teacher attrition. *Education and Urban Society*, 43, 598-626. [doi:10.1177/0013124510380724](https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124510380724)
- Estrada, P., Wang, H., & Farkas, T. (2019). Elementary English learner classroom composition and academic achievement: The role of classroom-level segregation, number of English proficiency levels, and opportunity to learn. *American Educational Research Journal*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219887137>

- García, O., Kleifgen, & Falchi, L. (2008). *From English language learners to emergent bilinguals. Equity Matters: Research Review No. 1.* <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED524002.pdf>
- Goldenberg, C. & Wagner, K. (2015). Bilingual education: Reviving an American tradition. *American Educator.* https://www.aft.org/ae/fall2015/goldenberg_wagner
- Gray, L., and Taie, S. (2015). *Public school teacher attrition and mobility in the first five years: Results from the first through fifth waves of the 2007–08 beginning teacher longitudinal study* (NCES 2015-337). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015337.pdf>
- Harper, C., Platt, E., Naranjo, C., Boynton, S., Ramanathan, V., & Morgan, B. (2007). Marching in unison: Florida ESL teachers and no child left behind. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(3), 642-651.
- Heineke, A. J. (2018). The invisible revolving door: The issue of teacher attrition in English language development classrooms in Arizona. *Language Policy*, 17, 77-98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-016-9428-9>
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0034654311403323>
- Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a “sense of success”: New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 581-617. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00028312040003581>
- Kissau, S. P. & King, E. T. (2015). Peer mentoring second language teachers: A mutually beneficial experience? *Foreign Language Annuals*, 48(1), 143-160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12121>
- Menken, K. (2006). Teaching to the test: How No Child Left Behind impacts language policy, curriculum, and instruction for English learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(2), 521-546.
- Morita-Mullaney, T. (2017). Borrowing legitimacy as English learner (EL) leaders: Indiana’s 14-year history with English language proficiency standards. *Language Testing*, 34(2), 241-270.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Pub. L. No. 107-110 (2001).
- Ovando, C.J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current

issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(1), 1-17.

Raab, R. R. (2018). A statistic's five years: A story of teacher attrition. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24(8), 583-591. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1077800417729849>

Raue, K., & Gray, L. (2015). *Career paths of beginning public school teachers: Results from the first through fifth waves of the 2007-2008 beginning teacher longitudinal study*. U.S.

Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

<https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015196.pdf>

Ronfeldt, M., & McQueen, K. (2017). Does new teacher induction really improve retention? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 68(4), 394-410. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487117702583>

Ronfeldt, M., Schwartz, N., Jacob, B. A. (2014). Does preservice preparation matter? Examining an old question in new ways. *Teachers College Record*, 116, 1-46.

<https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=17604>

Schmidt, R., Young, V., Cassidy, L., Wang, H., & Laguarda, K. (2017). *Impact of the new teacher center's new teacher induction model on teachers and students*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI

International. <https://www.sri.com/publication/impact-of-the-new-teacher-centers-new-teacher-induction-model-on-teachers-and-students/>

Smith, T.M. and Ingersoll, R.M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 681-714.

<https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00028312041003681>

Solano-Campos, A., Hopkins, M., Quaynor, L. (2020). Linguistically responsive teaching in preservice teacher education: A review of the literature through the lens of cultural-historical activity theory. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 71(2), 203-217.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487118808785>

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2020). *Teacher shortage areas*.

<https://tsa.ed.gov/#/reports>

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143-178. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00346543054002143>

Wong, J. W., Athanases, S. Z., & Banes, L. C. (2020). Developing as an agentive bilingual teachers: self-reflexive and student-learning inquiry as teacher education resources. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(2), 153-169.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/author/Athanases%2C+Steven+Z>

Chapter 2

The Experiences of New Bilingual and ESL Teachers: A Review of the Literature

Bilingual and English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers are needed to provide instruction to about five million multilingual learners (MLLs; Office of English Language Acquisition [OELA], 2018a). MLLs represent an increasingly diverse, multilingual, and multicultural group of students learning English as an additional language in U.S. public schools and are a group whose collective graduation rate (i.e., 67%) lags behind the national rate of 84% (OELA, 2018b). At the same time, there has been a chronic shortage of bilingual/ESL teachers, particularly in certain states (e.g., California, Washington) where demand for teachers continues to increase (Estrada et al., 2019; Garcia et al., 2019; Hopkinson, 2018; Sugarman, 2018; U.S. Department of Education, 2018). Moreover, enrollment declines in teacher preparation programs across the U.S. mean fewer teachers enter the workforce annually (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016).

Given the chronic shortage, it is problematic that a recent national study found that bilingual/ESL teachers have the highest attrition rate (i.e., 18.9%) across teaching fields, with 6.9% leaving the field, and 12% moving to other teaching positions, substantially higher than the average U.S. attrition rate of 16% (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017). Although research in general education indicates that some attrition is attributed to personal reasons (e.g., family needs, health), many teachers leave because of dissatisfaction due to problematic working conditions (e.g., salary, principal and colleague support, instructional resources; Boe, et al., 2008; Borman & Dowling, 2008). Moreover, teachers with fewer years of experience are more likely to leave than more experienced educators (Guarino, et al., 2006; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011), and new teachers often struggle with numerous aspects of their jobs, including student behavior, struggling with what and how to teach, and inadequate supports (e.g., Billingsley et al., 2009; Kardos & Johnson, 2010; Mathews et al., 2017). However, no reviews of new bilingual/ESL teachers' experiences were found. It is important to understand the experiences of

new bilingual/ESL teachers in a climate of high teacher shortage and attrition in order to retain them and to support their effectiveness.

New Teacher Experiences and Induction

Given that the first years of teaching can be overwhelming and challenging (Johnson et al., 2004; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Veenman, 1984), both formal and informal induction supports are critical to new teachers' development (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Schmidt et al., 2017). Formal induction or planned systems of support may consist of only one support (e.g., mentoring; DeCesare et al., 2016) or may include varied types, such as orientation sessions at the school or district level, professional development (PD), reduced teaching loads/responsibilities, collaboration with others, and instructional feedback from leaders and mentors (Glazerman, et al., 2010; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995). Informal supports are also valued by teachers and include relationships with other teachers, administrators, and staff as well as family and friends (Billingsley et al., 2004), and may help new teachers feel a sense of belonging as they are supported by others (Mathews et al., 2017). In contrast, when teachers have infrequent or problematic interactions with others, they may experience isolation or dissatisfaction (Burke et al., 2015). Moreover, teachers' experiences and needs may vary by field (e.g., mathematics, bilingual/ESL, special education), suggesting the need to consider the unique needs of teachers in specific assignments (Billingsley et al., 2009).

Teaching in Bilingual and ESL Contexts

In general, bilingual/ESL teachers are responsible for teaching varied academic content, including teaching English as an additional language and another language (e.g., Spanish) if teaching in bilingual settings (Estrada et al., 2019). They may teach across multiple grades and schools and perform roles beyond language and/or content instruction (Markham, 1999; Trickett et al., 2012). For example, they serve as liaisons between parents, general educators, and administrators (Brooks et al., 2010), tutor parents (Craig, 2019), translate English-only resources for use in bilingual settings (Amanti, 2020), and advocate for the academic and social needs of MLLs (Craig, 2019; Markham et al., 1996; Trickett et al., 2012). These varied responsibilities

can contribute to fragmented roles and stress, which interfere with their teaching and collaboration with colleagues (Brooks et al., 2010; Markham et al., 1996; Markham, 1999; Weinstein & Trickett, 2016). However, despite these demands, many teachers find joy in working with MLLs and their parents (Craig, 2019; Trickett et al., 2012).

Bilingual/ESL teachers, per federal non-regulatory directives, provide English language instruction to MLLs so they acquire English language proficiency (U.S. Department of Education, 2016). Numerous approaches to teaching English as an additional language exist, ranging from English-only models to dual language programs where MLLs and non-MLLs learn both English and another language together (Sugarman, 2018). However, despite varied approaches and evidence touting the benefits of bilingual education (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2014; Umansky & Reardon, 2014), ideological debates about the language of instruction affect MLLs and their teachers (Alfaro, 2018; Goldenberg & Wagner, 2015; Ovando, 2003). More specifically, since states and localities interpret federal directives, teaching conditions and instructional priorities vary geographically (Estrada et. al., 2019; Heineke, 2017; Ovando, 2003; Warhol & Mayer, 2012). Several states including Arizona, California, and Massachusetts passed language policies in the late 1990s/early 2000s which greatly restricted bilingual education (Heineke, 2017). Recently, California and Massachusetts reversed their policies (Buenrostro, 2018; Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2018); however, Arizona continues to have the most restrictive policy in the U.S. (Heineke, 2017). For example, Arizona's policy requires that MLLs receive four hours of English language development (e.g., grammar), which often excludes content instruction (e.g., science). Moreover, the policy contributes to districts struggling to hire and retain ESL teachers and excludes MLLs from engagement with their non-MLL peers (Heineke, 2017, 2018).

Researchers also suggest that there is a lack of prestige and a peripheral status associated with being a bilingual/ESL teacher, leading to feelings of marginalization and challenges in forming relationships (Brooks et. al., 2010; Creese, 2002; DelliCarpini, 2009; Trickett et al., 2012). For example, some teachers described that administrators and colleagues do not regard

them or their subject matter highly (Fradd & Lee, 1997; Morita-Mullaney, 2017). Others indicate limited shared decision making (DelliCarpini, 2009; Trickett et al., 2012), with the needs of students often viewed as the “sole responsibility” of bilingual/ESL teachers (Bacon, 2020; Brooks et al., 2010, p. 148). These specific challenges faced by bilingual/ESL teachers may be particularly difficult for new teachers, especially if they do not have support from mentors, colleagues, and administrators.

Given the challenges faced by these teachers, it is crucial to better understand what is known about new bilingual/ESL teachers, their experiences, and the supports they receive. Our synthesis was guided by two overarching questions: (1) What are the experiences of new bilingual and ESL teachers in their first years of teaching in U.S. public schools? and (2) What is known about the supports provided to these new teachers? We refer to new bilingual/ESL teachers as *new teachers* throughout this review and use either *new bilingual* or *new ESL teacher* if a specific study addressed only one of these teacher groups.

Method

We sought peer-reviewed articles providing descriptions of new teachers’ experiences and induction supports. Below, we describe our selection criteria, search procedures, and analysis.

Selection Criteria

We sought studies from 2002 to May of 2020, reviewing each study to assure it focused on new teachers’ experiences in the U.S. and met the timeframe for our study.

New Bilingual/ESL Teachers in the U.S.

We only included studies in the U.S. given the variability in teaching English as an additional language world-wide and other variability in national policy, which likely influence how programs are organized for language learners. *New teacher* was defined as having assignments in bilingual/ESL classrooms in K-12 public schools in their first five years of teaching, and we excluded studies that did not clearly state respondents’ years of experience (e.g., Osterling & Webb, 2009; Guerrero, 2003). We included studies of new general educators if

researchers disaggregated findings about new bilingual/ESL teachers (e.g., Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011, 2012; Athanases & de Oliveira, 2008).

New Teachers' Experiences and Induction Support

We only included studies that clearly provided new teachers' perspectives about their experiences during the first five years (e.g., challenges, relationships with others, curriculum, materials) and/or engagement with induction supports (e.g., mentoring, professional learning).

Timeframe of Study

We were interested in new teachers' experiences since the enactment of No Child Left Behind (NCLB; 2002) as this period of accountability required a greater emphasis on standards-based learning and high-stakes testing in content areas (Menken, 2006). After NCLB, teachers' work changed as they moved toward focusing on teaching content-based English language development standards, and MLLs became a subgroup with "an explicit policy focus" (Solano-Campos et al., 2020, p. 205; Sugarman, 2018). Findings after the passage of NCLB have the most relevance to understanding new teachers experiences today.

Search Procedures

We used four search procedures to identify studies meeting the above selection criteria, including an electronic search, a strategic journal search, an ancestral search, and recommendations from colleagues. Table 1 identifies the number of articles identified in each phase of the search, and Table 2 provides a summary of the selected studies.

Electronic Search

We developed a Boolean phrase and tested its functionality in preliminary searches by using EBSCOhost's Education Research Complete and selecting the Education subject databases (Education Research Complete, ERIC, Teacher Reference Center, SocINDEX with full text, and Women's Studies International). Our final searches used the following Boolean phrase: *induction OR mentor* OR support OR teacher support OR collaborat* OR experience* AND beginning OR beginner OR novice OR early career OR first year OR new AND English as a second language teach* OR ESL teach* OR ESOL teach* OR English language teach* OR EL teach**

OR *English language learner teach** OR *English learner teach** OR *English language development teach** OR *ELD teach** OR *bilingual teach** OR *bilingual education teach** OR *emergent bilingual teach** OR *second language teach**. We ran this search three times over the period of the project to ensure a comprehensive search and to identify any additional articles.

This electronic search produced 2,319 results after exact duplicates were removed. The results were saved into the folder on EBSCOhost, downloaded as CSV files, and then saved as Excel files. The first author then combined the Excel files into one document to allow for review of the titles and abstracts. Next, we reviewed titles and abstracts of each result, eliminating studies that clearly did not meet our selection criteria (e.g., conducted in another country). We downloaded and reviewed the studies meeting our criteria, carefully reviewing each article's purpose statement, research questions, participant information, and findings. We erred on the side of caution, reviewing each study in detail if the abstracts were not sufficiently detailed to make a decision. In summary, 17 of the 2,319 articles produced by the electronic search met our selection criteria.

Strategic Journal Search

We searched two primary research journals, *Bilingual Research Journal* and *TESOL Quarterly* as well as *Urban Education* since 11 articles that met criteria from the electronic search included urban settings. This strategic journal search from 2002 to May of 2020 yielded one additional paper from *TESOL Quarterly* (Motha, 2006b) and one from *Urban Education* (Acosta et al., 2018).

Ancestral Search

We conducted an ancestral search by carefully reviewing the reference lists of the articles that met criteria for our study to identify additional papers that were cited in these studies. We found 36 additional articles through the ancestral search, and 11 met our selection criteria.

Professional Contacts

Two additional articles were suggested by knowledgeable people in the field, one from a reviewer of the original manuscript, and both met selection criteria (i.e., Amos, 2016; Wong, et al., 2020).

In summary, a total of 32 studies met our selection criteria, yielding 17 articles from the electronic search, 2 through the strategic journal search, 11 through the ancestral search, and 2 through professional contacts (see Table 1).

Table 1

Search Strategy and Yield

Search strategy	No. of potential articles	Final yield*	Specific studies meeting search criteria
Electronic search	2,319	17	Athanases & de Oliveira (2008); Baecher (2012a, 2012b); Cahnmann-Taylor et al. (2009); Cahnmann & Varghese (2005); Casey et al. (2013); George (2009); Heineke (2018); Kissau & King (2015); Liggett (2010); Malsbary & Appelgate (2016); Motha (2005); Musanti (2017); Ovando & Casey (2010); Rodríguez (2007); Varghese (2008); Yeh (2017)
Strategic journal search	2	2	Acosta et al. (2018); Motha (2006a)
Ancestral search	36	11	Achinstein & Ogawa (2011, 2012); Amos (2016); Arce (2004); Carroll et al. (2008); de Oliveria & Athanases (2007); Heineke & Cameron (2011, 2013); Motha (2006b); Varghese (2006); Varghese & Stritikus (2005)
Professional contacts	2	2	Amos (2020); Wong et al. (2020)
Total	2361	32	

*After considering selection criteria

Analysis

The analysis occurred in four phases. First, we printed, read, and annotated each study by hand. Second, we holistically summarized each study using a research template that included research questions, purposes, theoretical/conceptual frameworks, methodologies, participants, and findings. Third, we coded each summary for new teachers' experiences and evidence of induction supports (e.g., lack of bilingual resources, mentor unhelpful). We checked codes for accuracy by rereading the findings and noting any additional codes. Finally, we grouped the initial codes into broader concepts (e.g., accessing instructional resources; mentoring), and then grouped these concepts under three overarching themes: instructional contexts and roles, social contexts of teaching, and formal induction supports. Lastly, after completing the initial draft, we reread the studies, to ensure accuracy of the synthesized results.

Findings

In this section, we first provide an overview of studies' theoretical and conceptual frameworks, methodological approaches, teacher characteristics, and settings (see Table 2 for a summary). Second, we focus on the substantive findings, including the three major themes that emerged from the analysis: (1) instructional contexts and roles, (2) social contexts of teaching, and (3) formal induction supports. Specific quotes from studies are included since new teachers' voices are critical to understanding their experiences.

Overview of Studies

Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

Twenty-five of the 32 studies referenced a theoretical or conceptual framework. Theories/conceptual frameworks focused on race/ethnicity (e.g. Critical Race Theory; Amos, 2016), Linguicism (e.g., Liggett, 2010), culturally responsive teaching (e.g. Achinstein & Ogawa, 2012), and sociocultural theory (e.g., Wong et al., 2020), among others (see Table 2).

Table 2

Summary of New Bilingual and ESL Teacher Research

Researcher(s) & Year	Summary of research purpose/questions	Theoretical or Conceptual Framework	Teachers & Settings	Methods
Achinstein & Ogawa (2011)	Examined personal/professional roles of Latinx teachers and the school conditions supporting or challenging these roles.	Influence of ethnicity, background, & school contexts on socialization	1 ESL (F, Latina); S; urban; CA	Qualitative; interviews, observations, surveys, & focus groups; longitudinal
Achinstein & Ogawa (2012)	How did “teachers of color engage in culturally responsive teaching” and their response to accountability policies (p. 7)?	Culturally responsive teaching, accountability policies	2 ESL (F, Latina); S; urban; CA	Qualitative; interviews, observations, & focus groups; longitudinal
Acosta et al. (2018)	Examined teachers sharing action research in bilingual settings.	Diffusion of Innovations Theory; Activity Theory	9 bilingual (8 F, 1M, Latinx); E; urban; TX	Qualitative; interviews
Amos (2016)	Examined how Latina teachers responded to how other teachers and administrators engaged with and treated them.	Whiteness & Critical Race Theory	2 bilingual (F, Latina); E; rural, Pacific NW	Qualitative; interviews & observations; longitudinal
Amos (2020)	Examined teachers of color, race, and alienation through relationships with White school staff.	White racial frame & Latinos	2 bilingual (F, Latina); E; rural; Pacific NW	Qualitative; interviews, observations, & artifacts; longitudinal
Arce (2004)	“Examines how socially conscious novice educators...resist multiple layers of hegemonic structures” (p. 227).	Bilingual education, power, & hegemony in education	5 bilingual (2 M, 3 F, Latinx); E; urban & semi-urban/rural; CA	Participatory research
Athanases & de Oliveira (2008)	Examined new teachers identifying and enacting acts of advocacy for their students.	Advocating for educational equity	2 bilingual (F, 1 White, 1 Armenian American); E; urban & rural; CA	Qualitative; focus groups

Baecher (2012a)	Examined MA TESOL graduates' instructional contexts, challenges, and reflections on their preparation program.	No theory identified	77 ESL; E & S; urban; NE	Mixed methods; surveys, interviews, observations; focus group
Baecher (2012b)	Examined teacher leadership among new teachers.	No theory identified	24 ESL; urban; New York City	Qualitative; survey data & interviews
Cahnmann & Varghese (2005)	Explore challenges of teachers in urban settings by examining their practices.	No theory identified	1 bilingual (F, Latina); E; urban	Comparative ethnography
Cahnmann-Taylor et al. (2009)	Investigated teachers' professional conflicts.	Arts-based transformative educational inquiry	45 bilingual; GA	Qualitative; performative focus groups
Carroll et al. (2008)	Explored how teachers "construct imagined communities in relation to the regimes of truth... in their lives" (p. 166).	Imagined communities; regimes of truth	4 ESL teachers (F, 1 Korean, 3 White); E & S; Mid-Atlantic	Comparative ethnography
Casey et al. (2013)	Examined challenges and support needs of alternatively certified teachers.	No theory identified	89 bilingual & special ed; urban; TX	Mixed methods; survey
de Oliveira & Athanases (2007)	Examined new teachers' advocacy for students and challenges that occurred.	Preparation to teach and advocate for ELLs	2 bilingual (F); urban & rural; CA	Qualitative; focus groups
George (2009)	Investigated "new teachers' professional beliefs and practices" (p. 26).	Political and ideological clarity and care	3 ESL (F, White); S; suburban, North Carolina	Qualitative; narrative inquiry; ethnography
Heineke (2018)	Examined how Arizona's language policy and stakeholders affected teachers.	Language policy in practice	3 ESL teachers (1 M, 2 F); E & S; suburban; AZ	Qualitative; vertical case study

Heineke & Cameron (2011)	Investigated TFA teachers implementing language policy and the application of their TFA training to do so.	Sociocultural theory: co-construction of language policy	7 ESL (1 M, 6 F); E & S; urban; AZ	Qualitative; interviews
Heineke & Cameron (2013)	Investigated TFA teachers' conceptualization and implementation of language policy.	Sociocultural theory; identities in practice	14 ESL (3 M, 1 F, 12 White, 1 Asian, 1 bi-racial); E & S; urban; AZ	Qualitative; interviews
Kissau & King (2015)	Explored benefits of peer mentoring.	No theory identified	54 ESL & foreign language teachers (12 ESL mentors); SE	Mixed methods: Likert-style and open-ended survey items; interviews
Liggett (2010)	Explored how language use marginalizes and influences the inclusion of MLLs and their teachers.	Linguicism	6 ESL (F, White); E & S; rural & urban; New England	Qualitative; interviews & observations
Malsbary & Appelgate (2016)	Examined how a teacher struggled to teach MLLs while negotiating the effects of national, state, and local policies.	Sociocultural policy research	1 ESL (F, White); S; urban; CA	Qualitative; case study
Motha (2005)	Examined the "relationship among the physical body, language pedagogy, and... beauty" as a social construct (p. 18).	Critical pedagogy, feminist theory, & sociocultural theory	2 ESL teachers (F, 1 Koran, 1 White); E & S; suburban; Mid-Atlantic	Qualitative; informal meetings; interviews; observations; artifacts;
Motha (2006a)	Explored how ESL "as an institutional construct is shaped" by teachers (p.76-77).	Postcolonialism & Education	4 ESL (F, 1 Korean, 3 White); E & S; East Coast	Qualitative; ethnography
Motha (2006b)	Examined "the ways in which race is significant in the teaching, language, and identities of teachers" (p. 496)	Racial & Linguistic Identity	4 ESL (F, 1 Korean, 3 White); E & S; Eastern U.S.	Qualitative; ethnography

Musanti (2017)	Investigated a teacher's "repertoires of practice" while "negotiating...bilingual education discourses" (p. 147).	Repertoires of Practice & Teacher Noticing	1 bilingual (F, Latina); E; TX	Qualitative; case study
Ovando & Casey (2010)	Explored the experiences, supports, and needs of alternatively certified teachers.	Leadership & Alternative Certification	3 bilingual (1 M, 2 F); E; urban	Qualitative; interviews & observations
Rodríguez (2007)	Examined first-year perceptions of paraeducators who became teachers.	No theory identified	2 bilingual (F, Latinas); E; urban, New York City	Qualitative; interviews
Varghese (2006)	Explored the tensions, contradictions, and practices of new teachers.	Sociocultural theory & bilingual teacher prep	4 bilingual (1 M, 3 F, Latinx); E & S; urban; NE	Qualitative; interviews, observations, & artifacts
Varghese (2008)	Examined how new Latinx teachers "viewed and enacted their roles as language policy agents" (p. 289).	Cultural Models & Bilingual Education	4 bilingual (1 M, 3 F, Latinx); E & S; Urban; NE	Qualitative; interviews & observations
Varghese & Stritikus (2005)	"What factors are involved in teachers' mediation and response to language policy?" (p. 75)	Language policy and sociocultural theory	6 bilingual (1 M, 5 F, Latinx); E & S; urban & rural; PA & CA	Qualitative; cross-case analysis
Wong et al. (2020)	Examined a teacher's ability to make decisions and teach by self-reflecting and using student-learning inquiry.	Sociocultural theory and teacher agency	1 bilingual; (F, Latina); E; CA	Qualitative; longitudinal case study
Yeh (2017)	Explored how two bilingual teachers learned to teach math.	No theory identified	2 bilingual (F); E; urban; CA	Qualitative; interviews, observations, & artifacts; longitudinal

Note. F = female; M= Male; E = elementary schools; S= secondary schools, middle and high
E, S, N, W and combinations refer to geographical areas of the US; State abbreviations are also used.

Methodological Approaches

The 32 studies included qualitative (29) and mixed methods (3). Seventeen of the studies focused on new bilingual teachers and 15 focused on new ESL teachers. Overall, these studies had relatively small samples, the smallest including case studies of one new teacher (e.g., Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016; Musanti, 2017) and the largest including 77 new ESL teachers (Baecher, 2012a). Additionally, several used convenience samples (e.g., Varghese, 2006, 2008), and some researchers worked with participants in preservice programs prior to recruiting them as participants (e.g., George, 2009).

Teacher Characteristics

Some researchers provided the gender and race/ethnicity of the new teacher participants in their studies (see Table 2). For studies reporting participants' gender, all had female participants (i.e., 27), while nine of the studies included males (e.g., Arce, 2004). Additionally, of those researchers reporting race/ethnicity, some included only new Latinx teachers (e.g., Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011), only White teachers (e.g., George, 2009), while some included teachers from more than one race/ethnicity (e.g. Heineke & Cameron, 2013).

Settings

Researchers provided information about school level, geographic locality (i.e. state, regions), and urbanicity (see Table 2). Some researchers focused on new teachers from elementary (e.g., Wong et al., 2020) or secondary schools (e.g., Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016); however, several did not specify school level (e.g., Kissau & King, 2015). Varied states, regions, and cities were represented among these studies, although some did not indicate the geographic location (e.g., Ovando & Casey, 2010). Not surprisingly, more of the studies were conducted in states with large populations of MLLs, including California (9 studies, e.g., Yeh, 2017), Arizona (3 studies, e.g., Heineke, 2018), and Texas (3 studies, e.g., Acosta et al., 2018). Although four studies included teachers in mixed settings (e.g., rural and urban settings; Liggett, 2010), 15 were conducted only in urban schools (e.g., Baecher, 2012a), two in rural schools (Amos 2016a, 2016b), and three in suburban schools (e.g., George, 2009).

Instructional Contexts and Roles

New teachers' experiences were influenced by the specific instructional contexts in which they worked and the expectations of the state or district. First, we explore the use of different language policies or local guidelines (i.e., federal, state, or district/school) as several studies focused on how teachers interpreted, implemented, and/or resisted policies/guidelines (e.g., Heineke & Cameron 2011, 2013; Varghese, 2008). Then, we discuss teachers' pedagogical challenges and roles beyond instruction.

The Effects of Language Policies and Local Guidelines

Most studies acknowledged the roles that federal, state, and and/or local guidelines played in new teachers' work. Some studies focused on state language polices such as California's Proposition 227, which banned bilingual education from 1998 to 2016 (Buenrostro, 2018; Varghese & Stritikus, 2005). Others looked at the effects of Arizona's Proposition 203 on new teachers, which requires English-only instruction through the state's English Language Development (ELD) model (Heineke, 2018; Heineke & Cameron, 2011, 2013). Several also highlighted how local guidelines shaped teaching contexts (Amos, 2016; Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Varghese, 2006, 2008).

The effects of language policies or guidelines on new teachers' instructional experiences varied. For example, some new teachers in Arizona acknowledged that because of the state's strict English-only ELD model (Heineke & Cameron, 2011), their students missed content instruction (e.g., math, science), were segregated from non-MLLs, and were taught in settings which devalued their home languages. Some teachers did not comply with the restrictive ELD mandates by integrating content and language instruction and valuing the use of Spanish in their classrooms (Heineke & Cameron, 2011, 2013). Other new teachers taught in districts and schools with "hazy" language guidelines (Amos, 2016; Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Varghese & Stritikus, 2005, p. 80). For example, a new bilingual teacher stated:

It was first all Spanish, and then they told me to use Spanish with a little English...Then one day I was told to switch to all English...Then around November, they told me to go

back to Spanish...Then, I went to all English again and then I went all the way back to all Spanish. (Amos, 2016, p. 48)

Without clear language guidelines, teachers struggled, felt unsuccessful, and unsupported, (Amos, 2016; Rodríguez, 2007; Varghese, 2008; Varghese & Stritikus, 2005). Moreover, some language guidelines contradicted teachers' professional and personal beliefs about the role of additional languages in instruction; thus, some openly resisted, rebelled, and/or fought for bilingualism (Cahnman & Varghese, 2005; Heineke & Cameron, 2011; Varghese, 2008; Varghese & Stritikus, 2005). However, some teachers with minimal academic or personal background in language learning and/or their students' home languages/cultures, appropriated restrictive policies (Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016; Heineke & Cameron, 2013).

Additionally, several researchers identified challenges that new teachers encountered as they navigated accountability policies connected to NCLB and state standardized testing (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011, 2012; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016, Musanti, 2017; addressed in more detail under pedagogical challenges). For example, school leaders' concerns about MLLs' standardized test scores created conditions where new teachers felt pressure to raise scores (Arce, 2004; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016). In other settings, it reduced their instructional autonomy (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2012) or increased the use of segregated settings (i.e., placing MLLs in self-contained ESL classes; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016). Additionally, several new teachers' felt judged and unfairly compared to other teachers due to their MLLs' test results (Heineke, 2018; Heineke & Cameron, 2013; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016; Rodríguez, 2007).

Teaching MLLs also involves compliance with federal requirements for testing and monitoring MLLs' English language proficiency. Baecher (2012a) found that 64.5% of new teachers in her study "were responsible for placement, testing, and compliance of their school's ESL program with local, state, and federal mandates" (p. 583), but that many did not feel their preparation program prepared them for these tasks.

Pedagogical Challenges

New teachers encountered pedagogical challenges including (1) planning, teaching, and assessing MLLs, (2) accessing instructional resources (3) collaborating with others, and (4) responding to student behavior.

Planning, Teaching, and Assessing MLLs. New teachers struggled in varied ways as they planned, taught, and assessed their students. For example, in a survey of alternatively certified new bilingual teachers, 47% indicated that lesson planning was a concern, with 53% indicating teaching grade-level content knowledge was challenging (Casey et al., 2013). A new bilingual teacher even stated, “I didn’t know how to meet the expectations and needs of my students. I didn’t know how to make them feel I knew about what they were learning...I had trouble delivering instructions...” (Casey et al., 2013, p. 297). Teachers also struggled with their MLLs’ varied language proficiency levels (Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016; Motha, 2006a, 2006b; Musanti, 2017), and some struggled to teach students with limited literacy skills and other learning needs (i.e., disabilities; Baecher, 2012a; Heineke & Cameron, 2011). Others felt unprepared and inadequate to even approach language and content instruction (Baecher, 2012a; Casey et al., 2013; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016).

Teaching MLLs varied content standards was a particular challenge. A new high school ESL teacher stated, “Different content comes up...you are also worried about language standards...I need to find ways to put the other content areas, not just English, but...history, and God help me, math and science” (Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016, p. 39). Similarly, new bilingual teachers had the added challenge of teaching both content and language instruction in two languages, and some taught in programs without clear guidelines on how much instruction to provide in Spanish and English (e.g., Amos, 2016). Other new bilingual teachers struggled with planning and delivering language and content in both languages while also preparing students to transition to English-only settings (Musanti, 2017; Ovando & Casey, 2010; Rodríguez, 2007; Varghese, 2006, 2008; Varghese & Stritikus, 2005).

Some teachers also indicated that they had less instructional autonomy in schools given strict adherence to standards-based instruction and/or standardized testing. For example, a new ESL teacher in California stated, “At our [staff] meetings, they always talk about standards, standards. So that’s why I kind of shy away from [culturally responsive teaching]” (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2012, p. 15). Similarly, a new bilingual teacher in Texas stated, “TAKS [Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills Test] dictates which programs we adhere to...instead of using our best judgement to select the curriculum that is right for students” (Casey et al., 2013 p. 300). Additionally, two first year teachers struggled to separate their daily instruction from the standardized tests, with one using the tests to guide her daily instruction (Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016) and the other drilling students on testing taking strategies (Musanti, 2017). The new bilingual teacher in Musanti (2017) recognized that focusing on test preparation ran counter to her beliefs about educating MLLs. Similarly, another teacher stated, “When it comes it comes to testing, I have no control...I have to set aside anything I believe is more important or...culturally relevant” (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011, p. 2533). Some new teachers also expressed the inappropriateness of standardized tests highlighting how they disadvantaged MLLs by not taking into account alternative ways to demonstrate content knowledge and linguistic abilities (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011, 2012; de Oliveria & Athanases, 2007; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016; Wong et al., 2020). Thus, the accountability policies resulting in standards-based instruction and/or standardized testing, affected new teachers’ instructional autonomy and at times conflicted with their instructional priorities.

Accessing Instructional Resources. Many new teachers described that they did not have access to appropriate curricular resources. The lack of resources was particularly challenging for new teachers in bilingual settings as they had to transform English content into a second language, a time-consuming task (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011; Amos, 2016, 2020; Wong et al., 2020), or purchase materials in the second language (Amos, 2016). Others mentioned needing training to use English-only resources in bilingual contexts, and some were required to use scripted curricula, pacing guides, and/or curricular initiatives introduced in English but not

provided in the second language (Achinstein, & Ogawa, 2011, 2012; Amos, 2016; Rodríguez, 2007). Some administrators also limited and controlled what materials teachers received (Casey et al., 2013; Motha, 2006a; Varghese, 2006, 2008). Even when resources were available, some teachers did not receive them in a timely manner, understand them, or receive training to use them (Amos, 2020; Casey et al., 2013; Musanti, 2017; Ovando & Casey, 2010). Additionally, several were educated in and/or desired to teach Latinx MLLs in culturally/linguistically relevant and socially just ways (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011, 2012; Arce, 2004; Mustani, 2017; Wong et al., 2020), but lacked materials and resources needed to fulfill this purpose (Arce, 2004; Yeh, 2017).

Collaborating with Others. Lack of preparation for collaborative teaching contributed to difficulties for some new teachers. In a study of teacher education graduates, Baecher (2012a) found that 50% of the ESL teachers in elementary settings expressed “the need to be better prepared for collaborative ESL program models” (p. 584). Another challenge for new ESL teachers was the lack of school expectations for collaboration, including support from principals and general educators, the lack of allocated time to collaborate and co-plan, and/or inadequate training on how to collaborate (Baecher, 2012a; George, 2009; Liggett, 2010). In a study of new ESL teachers, one teacher even stated, “they put a mandate that we need to collaborate, but they haven’t really supported it or said this is how it’s going to work” (George, 2009, p. 43).

Despite challenges to collaboration, some new teachers described positive experiences with general educators, and several reshaped collaboration in schools to support their MLLs and colleagues (George, 2009; Motha, 2006a). For example, one new ESL teacher sent weekly emails to general educators with strategies for working with MLLs (George, 2009). Additionally, there were several accounts of positive collaboration among bilingual teachers as a new teacher regularly planned and shared resources with a grade level bilingual colleague (Yeh, 2017). Similarly, several new bilingual teachers worked together to adapt curricular resources they felt were not inclusive of Latinx students (Arce, 2004), and others shared action research findings (Acosta et al., 2018).

Responding to Student Behavior. Several researchers found that new teachers struggled with student behavior. Ovando and Casey (2010) concluded that new teachers did not ask for help with behavior because they felt it would be a “sign of failure” (p. 154). Teachers also used varied approaches to address behavior. For example, a new White ESL teacher only allowed English in the classroom as a behavior management strategy since she found students translating for others was a distraction during instruction (Malsbary & Appelgate 2016). Conversely, a Latina bilingual teacher embraced a multilingual setting, adapting her classroom management needs to meet students’ different communication preferences (Wong et al., 2020). Amos (2020) also highlighted how two Latina bilingual teachers found success with behavior, linking their shared cultural expectations with MLLs as a benefit. One teacher even revealed “I didn’t have any behavioral issues in my class” (p. 653).

Teacher Roles Beyond Instruction

New teachers perform roles beyond instruction as they served as advocates, translators, leaders, and managed paperwork. As one new ESL teacher stated, “I wish we had training in counseling because I feel like I am half counselor, half teacher, and half advocate” (George, 2009, p. 39).

Advocates. Many new teachers were graduates of teacher preparation programs where teaching for advocacy and equity were foundational to their preparation, and/or they were former MLLs who wanted to improve and change the education system they had struggled with as children (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011, 2012; Arce, 2004; Athanases & de Oliveria, 2008; de Oliveria & Athanases, 2007; Motha, 2005, 2006a, 2006b; Varghese, 2006, 2008; Wong et al., 2020; Yeh, 2017). Thus, many viewed advocating for MLLs as a crucial part of their work. Some worked closely with parents, starting a bilingual parent group (Athanases & de Oliveria, 2008), informing parents about the ESL program (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011), organizing library field trips (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007), serving as a bridge between home and school (Amos, 2016; Athanases & de Oliveira, 2008; de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007; Wong et al., 2020), and tutoring parents and students after school (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011). They also advocated in

schools by exposing segregation and tracking (Athanases & de Oliveria, 2008), helping MLLs gain access to general education classes (George, 2009; Liggett, 2010), gifted programs (Motha, 2006a), and technology resources (Athanases & de Oliveria, 2008). Some also ensured MLLs had culturally and linguistically relevant curricula (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011, 2012; Arce, 2004; Athanases & de Oliveria, 2008; Motha, 2006a; Wong et al., 2020). Many also encouraged MLLs, as well as others in the school community, to view the ability to speak and learn in multiple languages as an asset, rather than a deficit (Arce, 2004; Cahnmann-Taylor et al., 2009; Heineke & Cameron, 2013; Liggett, 2010; Motha, 2005, 2006a, 2006b; Musanti, 2017).

Translators. New teachers who were bilingual or multilingual were frequently asked to translate (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011; Amos 2016, 2020; de Oliveria & Athanases, 2007; Athanases & de Oliveria, 2008). For some, this took away time to plan instruction, teach, and collaborate with other teachers (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011; Amos, 2016, 2020). For example, two bilingual teachers believed their ability to speak Spanish was a main reason they were hired, and they found that colleagues expected them to translate report cards and letters home (Amos, 2016, 2020). In fact, Amos (2016) suggested that schools exploited these teachers as they “were expected to be free and convenient translators” (p. 47). Thus, for some new teachers the role of “translator” interfered with their role of teacher.

Leaders. Several new teachers served as instructional leaders, ESL coordinators, and lead teachers. New teachers became leaders through educating others about teaching MLLs through PD initiatives or positioning themselves as experts, writing curricula, and serving as ESL coordinators/lead teachers (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011; Baecher, 2012b; George, 2009; Liggett, 2010; Motha, 2006a; Yeh, 2017; Varghese, 2006, 2008). Some teachers were surprised at having to lead more experienced colleagues, and some administrators encouraged new teachers to pursue leadership opportunities (Baecher, 2012b).

Paperwork. Several studies identified paperwork as a struggle for new teachers, although they did not elaborate on the nature of the paperwork (Casey et al., 2013; Ovando & Casey, 2010; Rodríguez, 2007). However, it is probable that paperwork was connected to

compliance requirements, as one new teacher was responsible for the compliance reports for her school (Baecher, 2012b).

Conclusions about Instructional Contexts and Roles

Many new teachers encountered formidable challenges as they navigated language policies or guidelines and taught multiple content subjects and language(s) to MLLs. Some were restricted in how, where, and what they taught (e.g., Heineke, 2018; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016), and others lacked sufficient policy guidance for teaching in two languages (e.g. Amos, 2016; Varghese, 2008). The lack of necessary instructional resources also added to their instructional demands (e.g., Amos, 2016, 2020). Several new ESL teachers also felt unprepared to collaborate with general educators (e.g., Baecher, 2012a) and/or worked in schools where collaboration was not supported (e.g., George, 2009). Moreover, many performed additional roles, such as translating, which added to their workloads (e.g., Amos, 2016).

Some of these challenges are also experienced by veteran teachers, suggesting these struggles likely continue over time. For example, researchers find bilingual teachers in dual language programs lack materials and spend considerable time translating English-only resources (Amanti, 2020; Freire & Valdez, 2017). Bell and Baecher (2012) found that ESL teachers wanted to collaborate but “the current culture of their schools did not support collaboration” (p. 504). Moreover, Trickett et al., (2012) found that high school ESL teachers performed many non-teaching roles which contributed to stress. Thus, leaders and researchers need to further investigate the instructional contexts and roles of new teachers to try and identify solutions to these challenges, as these may interfere with their instructional effectiveness over their career. It is also of note that new teachers made few references to problems with student behavior, which are frequently referenced in the general education literature as problematic (e.g., Nemer et al., 2019; Veenman, 1984). It is possible that the focus of the studies did not provide opportunities to discuss student behavior or that other instructional challenges were more pressing. Future research might consider new teachers’ experiences with student behavior, specifically MLLs’ socio-emotional needs (Ferlazzo, 2019).

Social Contexts of Teaching

In this section, we discuss findings related to relationships new teachers had with others, and we consider their segregation and marginalization in schools.

Relationships with Others

We discuss findings on new teachers' relationships with administrators, general educators, other bilingual/ESL teachers, and former teacher educators and/or researchers.

Administrators. The relationships new teachers had with administrators ranged from supportive (e.g., Ovando & Casey, 2010; Rodríguez, 2007; Wong et al., 2020) to challenging (e.g., Amos, 2016, 2020). Several new teachers felt supported by administrators, specifically principals (Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016; Ovando & Casey, 2010; Rodríguez, 2007). For example, Ovando and Casey (2010) explain that “praise from the principal was found to enhance not only teachers’ morale and self-confidence but also the level of effort they put forth and their instructional practices” (p. 153). Conversely, some teachers shared that administrators lacked knowledge of language policies, MLLs, and how to effectively help teachers collaborate with others (Casey, et al., 2013; Liggett, 2010; Rodríguez, 2007; Varghese, 2006, 2008). New teachers in several studies also described intimidating interactions with administrators (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011, 2012; Amos, 2016, 2020; Casey et al., 2013). For example, a new ESL teacher felt intimidated after she began to engage parents in the community, something her administration did not want her to do (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011, 2012). Another teacher engaged a union representative to help resolve a conflict with an assistant principal who questioned her professionalism and legitimacy (Amos, 2020). Thus, administrators were an important support for some teachers (e.g., Ovando & Casey, 2010) and a source of stress for others (e.g., Amos, 2020).

General Educators. Some new teachers described positive interactions as they worked with supportive general educators (George, 2009), as they were helpful and accommodating to MLLs (Baecher, 2012b; Liggett, 2010), and shared resources and co-planned with them (Baecher, 2012b; Yeh, 2017). Conversely, other new teachers indicated that these relationships

were challenging, with some general educators holding and expressing deficit notions about MLLs, and some refused to work with MLLs (Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Cahnmann-Taylor et al., 2009; George, 2009; Varghese, 2006, 2008). A new teacher articulated this challenge, stating, “the relationships with teachers has turned out to be one of the hardest things” (George, 2009, p. 42). Relationships were sometimes positive and negative within the same school (Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; George, 2009; Liggett, 2010).

Bilingual/ESL Teachers. Several studies provided examples of new teachers maintaining supportive relationships with other bilingual/ESL colleagues (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011; Acosta et al., 2018; Arce, 2004; Athanases & de Oliveira, 2008; George, 2009; Kissau & King, 2015; Liggett, 2010; Yeh, 2017). For example, one new teacher called another new ESL teacher at the same school a “lifesaver” (George, 2009, p.41), and another co-planned and shared resources with a grade-level bilingual colleague (Yeh, 2017). Additionally, new bilingual teachers shared action research findings with bilingual colleagues supporting their instructional practices and their self-efficacy (Acosta et al., 2018).

Former Faculty and Researchers. Several former faculty and researchers provided support to new teachers. For example, George (2009) created a monthly support group for new teachers, and another researcher hosted informal teas and dinners where they discussed experiences and challenges (Carroll et al., 2008; Motha 2005, 2006a, 2006b). Similarly, Yeh (2017) spent three years with the same new bilingual teachers as they developed their bilingual mathematics teaching, and Arce (2004) and Musanti (2017) regularly provided instructional support for the new bilingual teachers in their studies. Additionally, a new ESL teacher worked with a researcher to learn how to better include her MLLs’ home languages in instruction (Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016). Therefore, some new teachers had access to outside guidance and feedback from experts as a result of being study participants.

Segregation and Marginalization

Both new teachers and their students experienced segregation and marginalization in their schools, including physical segregation, teacher marginalization, racism and microaggressions,

English as marginalizing, and student marginalization and segregation.

Physical Segregation. Some new ESL teachers were assigned teaching spaces at a distance from the general education classes, separating teachers and MLLs and their students from the school community (e.g., Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011, 2012; George, 2009; Liggett, 2010; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016). Examples of their separate teaching spaces included a basement known in the school as “the dungeon” (George, 2009, p. 40), “a modular unit outside of [the] main school building” (Liggett, 2010, p. 225), a distant classroom without a working intercom (Liggett, 2010), a shared closet with five additional school personnel (George, 2009), public spaces such as the library, a hallway, or an unused room (Liggett, 2010), a school’s “time out room” for students with behavior challenges (Liggett, 2010, p. 225), an isolated area of the school away from other ESL teachers (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011), and even a room off the teachers’ lounge with several refrigerators where “it was not uncommon during a tutoring session to see an arm reach through the door to open the refrigerator and grab a lunch bag or snack item” (Liggett, 2010, p. 225). Moreover, several new itinerant teachers did not have permanent teaching spaces or offices in their schools (George, 2009; Liggett, 2010), and in the words of one, “It’s like there’s no place to work, it’s maybe out in the hallway...library, or...when you think you have a place to work something may come in the way and they shoo you out or whatever” (Liggett, 2010, p. 224). The consequence of these separate (and often subpar) physical environments is explained by Liggett (2010) when she stated that teachers were unable “to provide a predictable and stable setting for their students to learn” (p. 225). Moreover, physical distance prevented interactions between new teachers, their students, and general educators (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011). In addition, the nature of pull-out, push-in, and self-contained ESL or bilingual program models contributed to physical segregation. For example, some new teachers stated they supported MLLs at the back or sides of the room in push-in environments rather than co-teaching with general educators (George, 2009). Others recognized that MLLs’ in some bilingual programs were separated from others (e.g., general educators and students; Musanti, 2017).

Teacher Marginalization. Researchers found that some new teachers felt marginalized as they did not feel part of the school (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011; Amos, 2016, 2020; Arce, 2004; George, 2009; Liggett, 2010; Motha, 2006a), were isolated from colleagues (Acosta et al., 2018; Heineke, 2018; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016), or felt misunderstood (Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Varghese, 2006, 2008). For example, one new ESL teacher stated, “I don’t feel like I’m a part of the culture of the school. I feel separate the way a lot of the ESL students feel and I feel separate for being an ESL teacher” (Liggett, 2010, p. 227).

Several new teachers perceived their professional “status” as different, which contributed to perceptions of marginalization. Specifically, one new ESL teacher stated, “... you’re a second-rate citizen just by virtue of the trade. They [general educators] think we’re resource teachers, specialist teachers. They figure if we had the skills, we’d be classroom teachers” (George, 2009, p. 43). Another new ESL teacher stated, “We’re there because the state says we have to be there...whereas they [general educators] are there to do a job...They are the real teachers and we are just there to help out...like a glorified TA” (George, 2009, p. 43-44). Relationships with general educators also contributed to feeling marginalized as some new teachers shared that general educators did not want to teach MLLs, which made forming relationships challenging (Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Cahnmann-Taylor et al., 2009; Motha, 2006a, 2006b). Others felt intimidated by general educators (Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Cahnmann-Taylor, et al., 2009), felt “professional inadequacy” when their MLLs’ academic performance was compared to non-MLLs (Heineke, 2018, p. 90; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016), and some believed they had to prove themselves to colleagues (Amos, 2016, Carroll et al., 2008).

Racism and Microaggressions. In several studies, new teachers of color described problematic interactions with their colleagues (e.g., Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Motha, 2006a, 2006b) as well as microaggressions (Amos, 2020), and at least some appear to be consistent with racism (e.g., Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Motha, 2006a, 2006b). For example, Amos (2016, 2020) described how two Latina bilingual teachers struggled with their professional status with White general educators and principals. Amos (2020) described that one new teacher,

attempting to learn from a senior White colleague by observing her teach, was reproached, with the colleague stating, “Are you gonna take my job away?” (Amos, 2016 p. 13). Two Latina teachers indicated that they received anonymous hate mail, leading them to withdraw from colleagues and one eventually left the school (Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Varghese, 2006, 2008). These experiences propelled new ethnically/racially diverse teachers to further isolate themselves from colleagues (Amos, 2016, 2020; Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Varghese, 2008).

English as Marginalizing. Several new teachers considered that the teaching of English exclusively could be constructed as marginalizing since English is a colonizing language and standard English is racially charged (Motha, 2005; 2006b). New teachers encountered dilemmas about which version of English to teach (e.g., standard, African American Vernacular English, World Englishes; Motha, 2006b) and how culturally constructed concepts, such as beauty (e.g., White), were transmitted through teaching standard English (Motha, 2005). Additionally, new teachers in bilingual programs felt the dominance of English and Whiteness in their schools (Arce, 2004; Yeh, 2017). A new bilingual teacher in a dual-language program noticed an “emerging marginalization” among the Latinx, Spanish speaking students, as White culture and English were dominant even in the bilingual environment (Arce, 2004, p. 241). This dominance was not lost on the new teachers, as they struggled with schools’ constructions of English and native English speakers as the dominant language/culture and model of success (Arce, 2004; de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007; Heineke & Cameron, 2011).

Student Marginalization and Segregation. Deficit views of MLLs by other students and teachers were evident in several studies. For example, several new ESL teachers worked in schools where the ESL programs were “socially constructed as a deficit” (Motha, 2006b, p. 509), with English speaking students and former MLLs teasing MLLs for not speaking English and general educators wanting MLLs to be taught in separate settings (Carroll et al., 2008; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016; Motha, 2006a, 2006b). Additionally, MLLs wanted to exit ESL classes quickly and did not want to be seen in the ESL classroom or with ESL teachers (Motha, 2006a). Similarly, Musanti (2017) described how MLLs were placed only with other MLLs, while those

who exited the program were in English-only classrooms with non-MLLs. Segregating MLLs emphasized their differences, rather than similarities, and prevented them from fully engaging in the academic and socio-cultural life of the school (Arce, 2004). Some also indicated that MLLs were not included in school cultural activities (e.g., international night), were not considered for school-wide tutoring programs or gifted education, were not part of school newspaper activities (Motha, 2006a), and endured lower expectations, which contributed to their separation from other students (Heineke & Cameron, 2011, 2013; Liggett, 2010; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016; Motha, 2006a). Moreover, several new teachers had to address deficit thinking with regards to MLLs' achievement in school (Amos, 2020; de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007). For example, a new bilingual teacher noticed that the Spanish assessment her MLLs were given was less challenging than the English version, a finding that required her to alert her school about the discrepancy (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007). Similarly, MLLs in another bilingual classroom performed well on a Spanish assessment; however, a monolingual, White general educator, instead of congratulating and supporting this new teacher's success stated, "You must have drilled them to the test. Or something's wrong with the Spanish version of the test" (Amos, 2020, p. 652) indicating again deficit views and low expectations for MLLs.

Conclusions about Social Contexts of Teaching

Social contexts presented opportunities and challenges for new teachers. Support from other bilingual/ESL teachers as well as former faculty/researchers, provided opportunities for some to collaborate, share resources, and learn from each other (e.g., Arce, 2004; Motha, 2006a). Problematic experiences revolved around weak or strained relationships with administrators and/or general educators (e.g., Amos, 2016, 2020). In addition, segregated learning environments contributed to teachers' feelings of marginalization and isolation (e.g., George, 2009; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016). Moreover, some new teachers of color, specifically Latinx, described experiences with racism (e.g., Amos, 2016, 2020). This is disconcerting given the growing diversity of our nations' student population as well as the large number of Latinx MLLs (e.g., 76% spoke Spanish in school year 2016-17; OELA, 2019). Future research should consider

the influence of social contexts on both teacher effectiveness and retention as well as leaders' roles in facilitating a collective sense of responsibility for MLLs.

Formal Induction Supports

About a quarter of the studies addressed formal induction supports such as mentoring and professional development (PD).

Mentoring

Some teachers indicated they had mentors (Amos, 2016, 2020; Arce, 2004; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016; Ovando & Casey, 2010; Yeh, 2017), while others stated schools did not provide mentoring (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011; Kissau & King, 2015). Ovando and Casey (2010) acknowledged that for the three teachers in their study, one mentor was available and helpful, a second was "cold or unfriendly at times", and a third "reported feeling 'frustrated' and 'guilty' that he was often unable to help the teacher" (p. 159). Similarly, the two bilingual teachers in Amos (2016a, 2020) recalled different experiences with their mentors. One new teacher's experience was described as "wonderful" while the other's mentor "did nothing" (Amos, 2016 p. 49), telling her mentee, "I can't help you because I've never taught 3rd grade" (Amos, 2020, p. 654). Another stated that mentoring "was helpful but more...on an emotional level rather, or a personal level rather than a professional level" (Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016, p. 38). Moreover, evidence of mentoring activities was limited but included frequency of mentoring, emotional support, guidance with school procedures, and instructional assistance (Arce, 2004; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016; Ovando & Casey, 2010).

In one program, peer mentoring support was provided by pairing new ESL teachers with peer mentors completing master's degrees in second language learning (Kissau & King, 2015). ESL mentees indicated that their ESL peer mentors provided a variety of supports and non-evaluative instructional feedback. The new ESL mentors found the experience rewarding as they developed leadership skills, shared expertise, and learned about others' instructional challenges. Thus, this study showcased the benefits of learning from same subject-area mentors as well as

the support new teachers can provide each other (Kissau & King, 2015; Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995).

Additional Formal Supports

A number of districts or schools provided PD, however, much of it was not well matched to teachers' needs. Varghese (2006) described a bilingual PD institute in a district developing bilingual policies, and she found a major disconnect as the teachers were looking for guidelines for their classrooms, while their PD leaders focused on theory (Varghese, 2006). Other researchers indicated that new teachers lacked control over PD as state language policy (e.g., Heineke, 2018) or administrators (Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011) drove options. Moreover, some new teachers indicated they wanted PD that was relevant to their teaching contexts and helped them learn to use district/school resources (Amos, 2016; Casey et al., 2013; Ovando & Casey, 2010; Rodríguez, 2009), or improve their Spanish (Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Musanti, 2017). Additionally, others sought PD outside of their schools, demonstrating agency to find the support they needed (Baecher, 2012b; Yeh, 2017).

Other formal induction experiences included new teacher classes (Ovando & Casey, 2010) and the California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) induction program (Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016). Although BTSA was not focused on ESL/bilingual programs, a new teacher stated, "I honestly could say that the best experiences that I have had as far as...improving as a professional would be through by BTSA courses" (Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016, p. 38). Conversely, a new bilingual teacher "was very emotional about her frustration with time wasted in 'new teacher training'... that replicated training she had already had" (Ovando & Casey, 2010, p. 156). Similarly, several teachers took university courses, with some teachers reporting professional growth through action research (Acosta et al., 2018), while others found their courses "did not connect" with their instructional settings (Heineke, 2018, p. 83). Additionally, some worked with coaches (Heineke, 2018; Yeh, 2017) and in professional learning communities (Amos, 2016). For example, a new bilingual teacher worked with a math coach "biweekly for the entire year," which greatly enhanced her bilingual math instruction

(Yeh, 2017, p. 129). In another study, new teachers' coaches focused on compliance with Arizona's language policy, demonstrating the emphasis on state policy (Heineke, 2018).

Conclusion about Formal Induction Supports

Few studies addressed formal induction and mentoring supports, with some teachers indicating they had helpful mentors (e.g., Arce, 2004) and relevant supports (e.g., Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016), while others found supports to be decontextualized (e.g., Varghese, 2006), co-opted by others' agendas (i.e., enforcing policy; Heineke, 2018), or simply not helpful (e.g., mentoring; Amos, 2016). Thus, little is known about the extent or quality of the supports provided to ESL/bilingual teachers, which is disconcerting as evidence suggests that regular and well-designed induction are necessary to help new teachers transition into the profession, improve their instruction and support their retention (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Glazerman et al., 2010; Schmidt et al., 2017).

Although designing induction supports for these new teachers should be a priority, districts may have relatively few bilingual/ESL teachers to serve as mentors or provide discipline specific supports (Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995). Thus, it may be necessary for leaders to reach outside of their schools/districts to find supports, perhaps incorporating virtual mentoring with teachers in other locations (Burke & Dauksas, 2020). Teacher educators might also help teacher candidates identify future sources of support, including professional organizations.

Discussion

This is the first systematic review of new bilingual/ESL teachers' experiences in the first years of teaching. We synthesized 32 studies over an 18-year period, outlining what we learned about new teachers' instructional contexts and roles, the social contexts of teaching in bilingual and ESL programs, and the formal induction supports provided, although fewer studies addressed induction. In this discussion, we summarize key findings, provide a methodological critique, suggest priorities for future research, and outline implications for practice.

In summary, some studies suggest that new teachers had challenging assignments in language programs that were restrictive or undefined (e.g., Heineke & Cameron, 2011, 2013;

Varghese 2006, 2008), with general educators who were reluctant to collaborate (e.g., George, 2009), and in classrooms without the necessary instructional resources (e.g., Rodríguez, 2007). Moreover, additional roles, such as translating (e.g., Amos 2016a, 2016b) added to new teachers' workloads. It is of note that new special education teachers experience similar problems (e.g., inadequate guidance about programs models, insufficient instructional resources, problems with collaboration; Billingsley et al., 2009; Mathews et al., 2017).

Perhaps the most difficult area that new teachers struggled was feeling marginalized and isolated. Some were also concerned about the segregation of MLLs (e.g., Motha, 2006a). This is likely not unique to these new teachers, as experienced bilingual/ESL teachers report similar problems (DelliCarpini, 2009; Estrada et al., 2019). The lack of strong social supports is problematic as positive social conditions are most important to teachers (Johnson et al., 2012). In addition, collaborating with general educators is essential to new teachers' work as they need to coordinate and plan instruction. Moreover, the lack of inclusion for MLLs reported by new teachers may be due in part to a lack of understanding of language programs and the role that all teachers and leaders should play in creating inclusive environments. It is also likely that marginalization and the lack of inclusion are due to socio-political marginalization, racism, and linguisticism experienced by immigrants and individuals of color in the U.S. (Arce, 2019; Estrada et al., 2019; Warhol & Mayer, 2012).

Although formal induction has been studied extensively in general education (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Kardos & Johnson, 2010; Ronfeldt & McQueen, 2017), few studies addressed the induction of these new teachers. Induction may be more important for these new teachers than others, given the lack of other bilingual/ESL teachers in schools, the need for guidance in defining program models, the need for support in navigating school cultures (Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995), and the higher rates of bilingual/ESL attrition (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017). Formal supports and knowledgeable mentors may be able to mitigate some of the problems these teachers experience (Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995).

Methodological Critique and Future Research

The 32 studies used a range of qualitative methodologies with only three incorporating quantitative elements (i.e., Baecher, 2012a; Casey et al., 2013; Kissau & King, 2015). Most of the studies were also small and in limited number of geographic areas. Although some of the studies were clear in articulating the purpose and research questions, describing the participants, settings, and analyses used (e.g., Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011; Acosta et al., 2018), others needed more detail (e.g., Casey et al., 2013; Kissau & King, 2015).

Use of Theories and Frameworks

Researchers used varied theories and conceptual frameworks in these studies as described above. Although these theories/frameworks were helpful given their research questions, researchers may want to consider others, specifically those that are applicable to understanding and improving teachers' induction experiences. For example, Youngs et al. (2011) used sensemaking theory to explore differences in how new special and general educators made sense of their unique instructional and role expectations. Additionally, other researchers have used research on the benefits of induction supports to frame research (e.g., Johnson et al., 2004, 2004; Ronfeldt & McQueen, 2017), which may lead to possible interventions.

Perspectives of New Teachers Over Time

Many researchers included detailed excerpts from interviews, focus groups, and open-ended survey questions (e.g., Cahnmann-Taylor et al., 2009; George, 2009; Kissau & King), providing stakeholders with first-hand accounts of new teachers lived experiences. However, some researchers followed new teachers beyond the first year of teaching, which provided a more complete illustration of new teachers' experiences and supports over time (e.g., Amos, 2016, 2020; Wong et al., 2020; Yeh, 2017). Future research should consider multiple year studies from preservice through the first teaching years.

Include More Data about Participants and Settings

Researchers should provide greater participant demographic data (e.g., states, type of preparation and certification), as this may influence teachers and their experiences. For example,

knowing that studies took place in specific states (e.g., Arizona) provided a specific context for understanding findings of state-level policies that restrict the languages of instruction for MLLs (e.g., Heineke & Cameron, 2011, 2013). Information about participants' initial preparation is also needed as more rigorous preparation and credentialing are linked to teachers feeling more prepared (López & Santibañez, 2018).

Considerations for Future Research

Given the discussion and critique of the findings, we articulate four key research priorities: (1) address the needs of specific teacher groups and varied school contexts, (2) examine national trends, (3) identify the nature of formal induction supports provided to these new teachers, and (4) explore factors related to attrition.

Consider Specific Teacher Groups and Contexts. Given that the studies represent a small sample of new teachers, researchers should consider the extent to which these findings hold for larger samples (e.g., state studies with large populations of new bilingual/ESL teachers) and specific district types (e.g., rural schools). Researchers might also compare the needs of new teachers in elementary vs. secondary settings and high vs. low poverty schools. Researchers should also consider the needs of new itinerant teachers as the demands of moving between different schools is likely to result in unique working conditions and support needs.

Examine National Trends. The National Teacher and Principal Survey, the Schools and Staffing Survey, and the Teacher Follow-up Survey, all federal surveys with extensive research databases of the teaching force, should be used to understand characteristics of new teachers and the induction supports they receive across the U.S. These databases allow for the study of demographics, preservice preparation, induction, and working conditions. These databases also allow for the study of relationships among variables (e.g., Bettini et al., 2019).

Examine Bilingual and ESL Induction. Given the dearth of studies on the formal induction of these teachers, researchers should consider questions such as: (1) how is formal teacher induction structured for bilingual/ESL teachers? (2) to what extent do they participate with all teachers in the district/school and what specific considerations are made for the unique

needs of this group? (3) to what extent do they have mentors with similar backgrounds and who have worked in similar types of positions? (4) what types of induction activities are provided to these teachers, and how effective are these activities? Additionally, given the unique challenges of some new teachers of color in the review (e.g., Amos 2016, 2020), researchers should consider how they experience induction supports.

Understand Factors Related to Attrition. Although our study did not include attrition as a search term, several researchers reported that some new teachers, all Latinx, left teaching or moved to other assignments because of the difficulties they experienced (e.g., lack of instructional resources, social support, racism; Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Rodríguez, 2007; Varghese, 2006). Larger studies are needed to determine the factors related to both early career attrition and retention given high rates of attrition in the field (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017).

Implications for Practice

We address implications for K-12 leaders, teacher educators and preparation programs, and new bilingual/ESL teachers.

K-12 Leaders

District and school leaders should work to improve the instructional and social contexts for new teachers. Leaders need to understand language policies and programs and work with all teachers and staff to understand their responsibilities in educating MLLs (Brooks et al., 2010; Olsen, 2019). In addition, principals need to facilitate MLLs' inclusion in schools (Kotok & DeMatthews, 2018) by helping to craft collaborative and asset-oriented school cultures (Barrera et al., 2019; Lander, 2019), and promoting socially just policies and programs for MLLs (Brooks et al., 2010; Mavrogordato & White, 2020). School leaders should also consider the workloads and roles of new teachers, working to reduce non-teaching demands/roles that pull them away from instruction (e.g., translating, paperwork). Leaders also need to provide access to well-designed induction programs and discipline specific mentors and PD.

Teacher Educators and Preparation Programs

Since “teacher educators are the front line of advocacy” because they educate future teachers, they need to consider how they are preparing teacher candidates to teach MLLs in varied contexts (Faltis & Valdés, 2016, p. 580). Teacher educators should follow-up with graduates to learn about their challenges so they can improve initial preparation (e.g., Baecher, 2012a). Teacher educators should also discuss strategies that future teachers might use to collaborate with leaders and general educators as well as consider solutions for some of the challenges they are likely to encounter. Additionally, teacher educators and school leaders could consider collaborating to provide better induction supports by creating what Farrell (2019) calls “novice-service teacher education” (p. 10). These programs could include teacher candidates, new teachers, teacher educators, and school leaders working together to identify specific needs and provide appropriate supports relevant to new teachers’ contexts (Farrell, 2012, 2019).

New Bilingual/ESL Teachers

New teachers can also take an active, agentive role in their induction years. While certain school cultures may deter teachers from seeking support, new teachers should know it is appropriate to look for guidance from mentors, school colleagues, former teacher educators, universities, neighboring school districts, and educational organizations. For example, new teachers should consider joining professional organizations, such as TESOL International Association and the National Association for Bilingual Education. Both organizations could provide access to colleagues, resources, and PD through their extensive member networks, publications, and conferences. New teachers are also likely to benefit from cultivating reflective inquiry practices (i.e., journaling, meeting with other knowledgeable colleagues in informal support groups) where they regularly reflect on their professional practices and roles (Farrell, 2012, 2016). As Cahnmann-Taylor et al., 2009 and Kissau and King (2015) found, new teachers can problematize challenges and suggest solutions among themselves. Thus, reflective practices may help new teachers support themselves and each other (Farrell, 2012).

Conclusion

This paper synthesizes the literature on new bilingual/ESL teachers' experiences in U.S. schools, including their instructional and social contexts and the supports they received. Overall, many new teachers' reported challenges in both their instructional and social contexts, and many felt marginalized and described contexts that suggest the need for greater support. A stronger commitment is needed among teacher educators, researchers, school leaders, and policymakers to support new bilingual/ESL teachers by closely analyzing and working with them to improve their instructional conditions in ways that facilitate their success and retain them in their schools.

References

- *Achinstein, B. & Ogawa, R. T. (2011). Change(d) agents: School contexts and the cultural/professional roles of new teachers of Mexican descent. *Teachers College Record*, 113(11), 2503-2551. <https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=16109>
- *Achinstein, B. & Ogawa, R. T. (2012). New teachers of color and culturally responsive teaching in an era of educational accountability: Caught in a double bind. *Journal of Educational Change*, 13, 1-39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-011-9165-y>
- *Acosta, S. T., Chen, X., Goltz, H., Goodson, P., & Padrón, Y. (2018). A case study of novice bilingual education teachers conducting action research and diffusing teaching innovations. *Urban Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918805148>
- Alfaro, C. (2018). The sociopolitical struggle and promise of bilingual teacher education: Past present, and future. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 413-427. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1540367>
- Amanti, C. (2020). The (invisible) work of dual language bilingual education teachers. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(2), 455-470. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2019.1687111>
- *Amos, Y. T. (2016). Wanted and used: Latina bilingual education teachers at public schools. *Equity & Excellence In education*, 49(1), 41-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2015.1122557>
- * Amos. Y. T. (2020). “Are you going take my job away?”: Latina bilingual education teachers’ relationships with white colleagues in a white racial frame. *Urban Education*, 55(4), 640-666. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0042085916656900>
- *Arce, J. (2004). Latino bilingual teachers: The struggle to sustain an emancipatory pedagogy in public schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 17(2), 227-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390310001653880>
- Arce, J. (2019, August). Trump’s anti-immigrant rhetoric was never about legality—it was about our brown skin. *Time*. <https://time.com/5645501/trump-anti-immigration-rhetoric-racism/>
- *Athanases, S.Z. & de Oliveira, L.C. (2008). Advocacy for equity in classrooms and beyond: New teachers’ challenges and responses. *Teachers College Record*, 110(1), 64-104.

<http://www.tcrecord.org/library/abstract.asp?contentid=14535>

Bacon, C. K. (2020). "It's not really my job": A mixed methods framework for language ideologies, monolingualism, and teaching emergent bilingual learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 71(2), 172-187. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487118783188>

*Baecher, L. (2012a). Feedback from the field: What novice preK-12 ESL teachers want to tell TESOL teacher educators. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(3), 578-588. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.43>

*Baecher, L. (2012b). Pathways to teacher leadership among English-as-a-second-language teachers: professional development by and for emerging teacher leaders. *Professional Development in Education*, 38(2), 317-330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2012.657877>

Barrera, A., Keppler, L., & Becker, M. (2019). Cultivating pride in bilingual students: Orgullo collective. *Educational Leadership*, 77(4), 30-33.

<http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/dec19/vol77/num04/abstract.aspx>

Bell, A. B. & Baecher, L. (2012). Points on a Continuum: ESL teachers reporting on collaboration. *TESOL Journal*, 3(3), 488-515. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.28>

Bettini, E., Gilmour, A. Williams, T.O., & Billingsley, B. (2019). Predicting special and general educators' intent to continue teaching using conservation of resources theory. *Exceptional Children*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402919870464>

Billingsley, B., Carlson, E., & Klein, S. (2004). The working conditions and induction support of early career special educators. *Exceptional Children*, 70(3), 333-347.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F001440290407000305>

Billingsley, B., Griffin, C., Smith, S. J., Kamman, M., & Israel, M. (2009). *A review of teacher induction in special education: Research, practice, and technology solutions*. University of Florida, National Center to Inform Policy and Practice in Special Education Development (NCIPP Doc. No. RS-1ES). http://ncipp.org/reports/rs_1es.pdf

Boe, E. E., Cook, L. H., & Sunderland, R. J. (2008). Teacher turnover: Examining exit attrition, teaching area transfer, and school migration. *Exceptional Children*, 75, 7-31.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F001440290807500101>

- Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(3), 367-409.
<https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0034654308321455>
- Brooks, K., Adams, S. R., and Morita-Mullaney, T. (2010). Creating inclusive learning communities for ELL students: Transforming school principal's perspectives. *Theory Into Practice*, 49, 145-151. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405841003641501>
- Buenrostro, M. (2018). *Fact sheet: Proposition 58 Regulations. California School Boards Association.*<https://www.csba.org/en/GovernanceAndPolicyResources/ResearchAndPolicyBriefs/StudentAchievement/EnglishLearners>
- Burke, L., & Dauksas, L. (2020, January/February). The old college try: Can't find good mentors for new special education teachers in your area? Look to colleges and universities. *Principal*, 99(3). <https://www.naesp.org/principal-januaryfebruary-2020-special-education/old-college-try>
- Burke, P. F., Aubusson, P. J., Schuck, S. R., Buchanan, J. D., & Prescott, A. E. (2015). How do early career teachers value different types of support? A scale adjusted latent class choice model. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 47, 241-253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.01.005>
- *Cahnmann, M. & Varghese, M. M. (2005). Critical advocacy and bilingual education in the United States. *Linguistics and Education*, 16, 59-73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2005.10.002>
- *Cahnmann-Taylor, M., Wooten, J., Souto-Manning, M., & Dice, J. I. (2009). The art and science of educational inquiry: Analysis of performance-based focus groups with novice bilingual teachers. *Teachers College Record*, 111(11), 2535-2559.
<https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=15439>
- *Carroll, S., Motha, S., & Price, J. N. (2008). Accessing imagined communities and reinscribing regimes of truth. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 5(3), 165-191.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15427580802285704>
- Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

<https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/teacher-turnover-report>

*Casey, P., Dunlap, K., Brister, H., Davidson, M., & Starrett, T. M. (2013). Sink or swim? Throw us a life jacket! Novice alternatively certified bilingual and special education teachers deserve options. *Education and Urban Society*, 45(3), 287-306.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013124511408075>

Creese, A. (2002). The discursive construction of power in teacher partnerships: Language and subject specialists in mainstream schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 597-616.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3588242>

Craig, C. J. (2019). From starting stories to staying stories to leaving stories: The experiences of an urban English as a second language teacher. *Research Papers in Education*, 34(3), 298-329.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2018.1424929>

DeCesare, D., Workman, S., & McClelland, A. (2016). *How do school districts mentor new teachers? (REL 2016–125)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>

DelliCarpini, M. (2009). Dialogues across disciplines: Preparing English-as-a-second-language teachers for interdisciplinary collaboration. *Current Issues in Education*, 11(2).

<https://cie.asu.edu/ojs/index.php/cieatasu/article/view/1573>

*de Oliveira, L.C., & Athanases, S.Z. (2007). Graduates' reports of advocating for English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(3), 202-215.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487107299978>

Estrada, P., Wang, H., & Farkas, T. (2019). Elementary English learner classroom composition and academic achievement: The role of classroom-level segregation, number of English proficiency levels, and opportunity to learn. *American Educational Research Journal*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219887137>

Faltis, C. J. & Valdés, G. (2016). Preparing teachers for teaching in and advocating for linguistically diverse classrooms: A vade mecum for teacher educators. In D.H. Gitomer & C.A. Bell

(Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (5th ed., pp. 549-592). American Education Research Association.

Farrell, T.S.C. (2012). Novice-service language teacher development: Bridging the gap between preservice and in-service education and development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(3), 435-449. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.36>

Farrell, T. S. C. (2016). Surviving the transition shock in the first year of teaching through reflective practice. *System*, 61, 12-19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.07.005>

Farrell, T. S. C. (2019). 'My training has failed me': Inconvenient truths about second language teacher education (SLTE). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 22(2), 1-16. <http://tesl-ej.org/pdf/ej88/a1.pdf>

Ferlazzo, L. Research action: Ramping up support for long-term ELLs. *Educational Leadership*, 77(4), 16-23.

http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational_leadership/dec19/vol77/num04/Research_in_Action@_Ramping_Up_Support_for_Long-Term_ELLs.aspx

Fradd, S. H., & Lee, O. (1997). Teachers' voices in program evaluation and improvement: A case of a TESOL program. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(6), 563-577.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(97\)80001-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(97)80001-7)

Freire, J. A., & Valez, V. E. (2017). Dual language teachers' state barriers to implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(1), 55-69.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1272504>

Garcia, A., Manuel, A., & Buly, M. R. (2019). Washington state policy spotlight: A multifaceted approach to grow your own pathways. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 46(1), p. 69-78.

*George, C. (2009). Marginalization or collaboration: First year ESL teachers & the middle school context. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, 4(1), 25-52.

Glazerman, S. E., Isenberg, S., Dolfen, M., Bleeker, A., Johnson, M., Grider, and M. Jacobus. (2010). *Impacts of comprehensive teacher induction: Final results from a randomized controlled study (NCEE 2010-4027)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education

Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED565837.pdf>

Goldenberg, C. & Wagner, K. (2015). Bilingual education: Reviving an American tradition.

American Educator. https://www.aft.org/ae/fall2015/goldenberg_wagner

Guarino, C. M., Santibañez, L., & Daley, G.A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 76, 173-208.

<https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00346543076002173>

Guerrero, M. D. (2003). Acquiring and participating in the use of academic Spanish: Four novice Latina bilingual education teachers' stories. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 2(3), 159-181.

https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532771XJLE0203_03

Heineke, A.J. (2017). *Restrictive language policy in practice: English learners in Arizona*.

Multilingual Matters.

*Heineke, A. J. (2018). The invisible revolving door: The issue of teacher attrition in English language development classrooms in Arizona. *Language Policy*, 17, 77-98.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-016-9428-9>

*Heineke, A. J., & Cameron, Q. (2011). Closing the classroom door and the achievement gap: Teach for America alumni teachers' appropriation of Arizona language policy. *Education and Urban Society*, 45(5), 483-505.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013124511413123>

*Heineke, A. J., & Cameron, Q. (2013). Teacher preparation and language policy appropriation: A qualitative investigation of teach for American teachers in Arizona. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 21(33), 1-25.

<https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v21n33.2013>

Hopkinson, A. (2018, October). Amidst teacher shortage new funds help districts train more

bilingual teachers. *EdSource*. <https://edsources.org/2018/amidst-teacher-shortage-new-funds-help-districts-train-more-bilingual-teachers/603005>

Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for

beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0034654311403323>

Kardos, S. M., & Johnson, S. M. (2010). New teachers' experiences of mentoring: The good, the bad, and the inequity. *Journal of Educational Change*, *11*, 23-44.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-008-9096-4>

*Kissau, S. P. & King, E. T. (2015). Peer mentoring second language teachers: A mutually beneficial experience? *Foreign Language Annuals*, *48*(1), 143-160.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12121>

Kotok, S., & DeMatthews, D. (2018). Challenging school segregation in the twenty-first century: How districts can leverage dual language education to increase school and classroom diversity. *The Clearing House*, *91*(1), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2017.1336405>

Johnson, S. M., Kardos, S. M., Kauffman, D., Liu, E., & Donaldson, M. L. (2004). The support gap: New teachers' early experiences in high-income and low-income schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *12*(61), 1-23. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ853526.pdf>

Johnson, S. M., Kraft, M. A., & Papay, J. P. (2012). How context matters in high-need schools: The effects of teachers' working conditions on their professional satisfaction and their students' achievement. *Teachers College Record*, *144*, 1-39.

<https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=16685>

Lander, J. (2019). Seeing their strengths: Let's ditch deficit-based thinking, and instead focus on the strengths of our immigrant students. *Educational Leadership*, *77*(4), 24-28.

<http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/dec19/vol77/num04/Seeing-Their-Strengths.aspx>

*Liggett, T. (2010). 'A little bit marginalized': The structural marginalization of English language teachers in urban and rural public schools. *Teacher Education*, *21*(3), 217-232.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10476211003695514>

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Genesee, F. (2014). Student outcomes in one-way, two-way, and indigenous language immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language*, *2*(2),

165-80. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.2.2.01lin>

López, F., & Santibañez, L. (2018). Teacher preparation for emergent bilingual students:

Implications for evidence for policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(36), 1-43.

<https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.2866>

*Malsbary, C. B., & Appelgate, M. H. (2016). Working downstream: A beginning EL teacher negotiating policy and practice. *Language Policy*, 15, 27-47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9347-6>

Markham, P. L. (1999). Stressors and coping strategies of ESL teachers. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 26(4), 268-279.

Markham, P., Green, S. B., & Ross, M. E. (1996). Identification of stressors and coping strategies of ESL/Bilingual, special education, and regular education teachers. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80(2) 141-150. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/328632>

Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education. (2018). *LOOK Act: Overview of new law supporting English learners*. <http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/look-act.html>

Mathews, H. M., Rodgers, J. D. & Youngs, P. Y. (2017). Sense-making for beginning special educators: A systematic mixed studies review, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67 23-36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.05.007>

Mavrogordato, M. & White, R. S. (2020). Leveraging policy implementation for social justice: How school leaders shape educational opportunity when implementing policy for English learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(1), 3-45. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013161X18821364>

Menken, K. (2006). Teaching to the test: How No Child Left Behind impacts language policy, curriculum, and instruction for English learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(2), 521-546. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2006.10162888>

Morita-Mullaney, T. (2017). Borrowing legitimacy as English learner (EL) leaders: Indiana's 14-year history with English language proficiency standards. *Language Testing* 34(2), 241-270. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0265532216653430>

*Motha, S. (2005). Trapped in the realm of the body: Normative bodily practices in ESOL pedagogy. *TESL Canada Journal*, 22(2), 17-33. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v22i2.85>

- *Motha, S. (2006a). Decolonizing ESOL: Negotiating linguistic power in U.S. public school classrooms. *Critical Inquiry In Language Studies*, 3(2&3), 75-100.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2006.9650841>
- *Motha, S. (2006b). Racializing ESOL teacher identities in U.S. K-12 public schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 495-518. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40264541>
- *Musanti, S. I. (2017). A novice bilingual teacher's journey: Teacher's noticing as a pathway to negotiate contradictory teaching discourses. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 19(2), 146-161. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18251/ijme.v19i2.1305>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). *Preparing and credentialing the nation's teachers: The secretary's 10th report on teacher quality* (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education). <https://title2.ed.gov/Public/TitleIIReport16.pdf>
- Nemer, S. L., Sutherland, K. S., Chow, J. C., & Kunemund, R. L. (2019). A systematic literature review identifying dimensions of teacher attributions for challenging student behavior. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 42(4), 557-578. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/735088>
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Pub. L. No. 107-110 (2001).
- Office of English Language Acquisition. (2018a). *Fast facts: profiles of English learners (ELs)*. U.S. Department of Education.
https://ncela.ed.gov/files/fast_facts/Profiles_of_ELs_4.12.18_MM_Final_Edit.pdf
- Office of English Language Acquisition. (2018b). *Fast facts: National and state level high school graduation rates for English learners*.
https://ncela.ed.gov/files/fast_facts/GraduationRatesFactSheet.pdf
- Office of English Language Acquisition. (2019). *The top languages spoken by English learners (ELs) in the United States*. https://ncela.ed.gov/files/fast_facts/olea-top-languages-fact-sheet-20191021-508.pdf
- Olsen, R. L. (2019). Better planning for newcomer students. *Educational Leadership*, 77(4), 74-76.
<http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/dec19/vol77/num04/Better-Planning-for-Newcomer-Students.aspx>

- Osterling, J. P. & Webb, W. (2009). On becoming a bilingual teacher: A transformative process for preservice and novice teachers. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 7(4), 267-293.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1541344610386470>
- *Ovando, M. N. & Casey, P. (2010). Instructional leadership to enhance alternatively certified novice bilingual teachers' capacity. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 4(2), 144-168.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ942513.pdf>
- Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(1), 1-17.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2003.10162589>
- *Rodríguez, M. V. (2007). From paraeducator to teacher: Perceptions of the 1st year of teaching. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 20(1), 51-66. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ833535>
- Ronfeldt, M. & McQueen, K. (2017). Does new teacher induction really improve retention? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 68(4), 394-410. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487117702583>
- Schmidt, R., Young, V., Cassidy, L., Wang, H., & Laguarda, K. (2017). *Impact of the new teacher center's new teacher induction model on teachers and students*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. <https://www.sri.com/work/publications/impact-new-teacher-centers-new-teacher-induction-model-teachers-and-students>
- Solano-Campos, A., Hopkins, M., Quaynor, L. (2020). Linguistically responsive teaching in preservice teacher education: A review of the literature through the lens of cultural-historical activity theory. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 71(2), 203-217.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487118808785>
- Sugarman, J. (2018). *A matter of design: English learner program models in K-12 Education*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
<https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/english-learner-program-models-k-12-education>
- Torres-Guzmán, M. E. & Goodwin, A. L. (1995). Urban bilingual teachers and mentoring for the future. *Education and Urban Society*, 28(1), 48-66.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013124595028001005>

- Trickett, E. J., Rukhotskiy, E., Jeong, A., Genkova, A., Oberoi, A., Weistein, T., & Delgado, Y. (2012). "The kids are terrific: It's the job that's tough": The ELL teacher role in an urban context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 283-292.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.10.005>
- Umansky, I. M., & Reardon, S. F. (2014). Reclassification patterns among Latino English learner students in bilingual, dual immersion, and English immersion classrooms. *American Education Research Journal*, 51(5), 879-912. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0002831214545110>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *Non-regulatory guidance: English learners and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)*. <https://title2.ed.gov/Public/TitleIIReport16.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2020). *Teacher shortage areas*. <https://tsa.ed.gov/#/reports>
- *Varghese, M. M. (2006). Bilingual teachers-in-the-making in urbantown. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27(3), 211-224.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630608668776>
- *Varghese, M. M. (2008). Using cultural models to unravel how bilingual teachers enact language policies. *Language and Education*, 22(5), 289-306.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780802152671>
- *Varghese, M. M., & Stritikus, T. (2005). "Nadie me dijo (nobody told me)": Language policy negotiation and implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(1), 73-87. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487104272709>
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143-178. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00346543054002143>
- Warhol, L., & Mayer, A. (2012). Misinterpreting school reform: The dissolution of a dual-immersion bilingual program in an urban New England elementary school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 35(2), 145-163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2012.703636>
- Weinstein, T. L. & Trickett, E. J. (2016). The development of an instrument to measure English

language learner (ELL) teacher stress. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 55, 24-32.

<https://www.learntechlib.org/p/202964/>

*Wong, J. W., Athanases, S.Z., & Banes, L.C. (2020). Developing as an agentive bilingual teachers: self-reflexive and student-learning inquiry as teacher education resources. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(2), 153-169.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/author/Athanases%2C+Steven+Z>

*Yeh, C. (2017). Math is more than numbers: Beginning bilingual teachers' mathematics teaching practices and their opportunities to learn. *Journal of Urban Mathematics Education*, 10(2), 106-139. <https://doi.org/10.21423/jume-v10i2a328>

Youngs, P., Jones, N., & Low, M. (2011). How beginning special and general education elementary teachers negotiate role expectations and access professional resources. *Teachers College Record*, 113(7), 1506-1540. <https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=16097>

*Reviewed study

Chapter 3

New ESL and Bilingual Teachers' Induction Experiences in U.S. Schools

To date, there is relatively little research and no national level studies about the induction of new English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual teachers. Most research regarding their induction experiences are qualitative and representative of specific settings and are therefore not representative of this teacher group nationally (Raab & Billingsley, in review). Qualitative studies suggest that some new ESL/bilingual teachers struggle with what, how, why, and where to teach (e.g., Liggett, 2010; Ricento & Hornberger, 1996; Varghese & Stritikus, 2005). These teachers also struggle in other ways. For example, they may work in contested socio-political environments with restrictive language policies (e.g., Heineke, 2018), lack appropriate teaching resources (e.g., bilingual materials; Amos, 2016), and feel unprepared to collaborate with general educators (e.g., Baecher, 2012). Some teachers struggle to form collegial relationships with general educators (e.g., Amos, 2016, 2020; George, 2010) while others feel isolated, segregated, and/or marginalized in their schools (e.g., Liggett, 2010; Raab & Billingsley, in review).

Given the shortages of ESL/bilingual teachers (U.S. Department of Education, 2020) and high attrition rates among these teachers (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017), induction should be considered as an approach to support their entry into teaching. Well-designed induction may help new ESL/bilingual teachers with their work problems, facilitate ongoing learning, promote effective instruction, and their retention. The purpose of this study is to provide a profile of new ESL/bilingual teachers' induction in the U.S. and compare it to the general population of teachers.

Although little is known about ESL/bilingual teacher induction, other teaching fields have extensively documented new teachers' early career challenges (e.g., curriculum development, student behavior, lack of resources, knowing how to teach diverse learners, assessment) and high attrition rates (Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; Griffin et al., 2009; Mathews et al., 2017; Veenman, 1984). It is known that 30%-50% of new teachers leave or move positions

during the first five years of their careers (Guarino et al., 2006; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011), and certain fields within education (e.g., science, mathematics, and special education) consistently struggle to fill positions (U.S. Department of Education, 2020).

To address attrition and shortages, researchers and policymakers have asserted that new teacher induction can both improve retention (e.g., Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; Ronfeldt & McQueen, 2017) and increase effectiveness (e.g., Schmidt et al., 2017). Given the lack of generalizable research on the early career experiences of new ESL/bilingual teachers, this study investigates their induction in U.S. schools and provides a profile of their demographic characteristics (e.g., race/ethnicity).

Defining Induction and Review of the Literature

New Teacher Induction

Induction has many definitions as it is a concept that “has been defined in different ways by researchers and practitioners and has evolved over time” (Billingsley et al., 2009, p. 4). Some researchers define induction as a stage of development in a new teachers’ career (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011) while others define it as a process of socializing new teachers into school cultures and the profession (Billingsley et al., 2009). Induction is also defined as the formalized programs or supports (e.g., mentoring) provided to new teachers in their first years of teaching (Ronfeldt & McQueen, 2017). For this study, I define induction primarily in relation to the induction supports provided to new teachers in their first year. Specifically, induction for this study is defined as supports provided to new teachers which are “distinct from both preservice and in-service teacher professional development programs... [and which serve] as a ‘bridge’ from student of teaching to teacher of students” (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011, p. 203). Induction is frequently associated with mentoring, but it may also include orientation workshops, new teacher seminars, principal support, and release time, among others (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Moreover, these teachers first-year experiences are influenced by their preparation for teaching, which likely influences the types of induction support they need.

Induction Supports

Induction supports can take many forms with mentoring being the most common (Bullough, 2012; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011; DeCesare et al., 2016). By using the Beginning Teacher Longitudinal Study's nationally weighted sample of 155,600 new teachers, Raue and Gray (2015) found that 76% of new teachers participated in an induction program and 80% had a mentor during their first year of teaching. Gray and Taie (2015) found that retention rates for new teachers with mentors in their first year exceeded that of unmentored teachers over four consecutive years. Additionally, researchers have also found that new teachers benefit more (i.e., less likely to move schools or leave teaching) from being mentored by same-subject/field mentors (e.g., DeAngelis et al., 2013; Kapadia et al., 2007) than other mentors. Additionally, it has been found that mentees with more frequent mentoring indicate that they find their mentors more helpful (DeAngelis et al., 2013) and that they made greater gains in student achievement (Fletcher et al., 2008; Rockoff, 2008). Beyond mentoring, other induction supports can include resources such as classes/seminars, opportunities to observe other teachers, communication and feedback from administrators, and reduced teaching demands (Billingsley, et al., 2009; New Teacher Center, 2016). Researchers have found that a combination of induction supports, (i.e., not just mentoring) over time are the most effective at improving instruction, retention, and student achievement (e.g., Glazerman et al., 2010; Schmidt et al., 2017; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

What is known about new ESL/bilingual induction support comes mostly from qualitative studies (Raab and Billingsley, in review). In these studies, some new ESL/bilingual teachers were assigned mentors who proved to be an important source of support (e.g., Arce, 2004; Ovando & Casey, 2010;). Other studies, however, indicate that new ESL/bilingual teachers were either assigned mentors who proved unhelpful (e.g., Amos, 2016) or not assigned mentors at all (e.g., Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011). There is even less research about specific mentoring activities (i.e., frequency of mentoring, same-subject pairings) or other induction supports (i.e., beginning teacher seminars, administrator feedback/collaboration; Raab & Billingsley, in

review). The limited research that has been done makes it difficult to generalize induction experiences and makes it challenging to advance research efforts or provide recommendations on how to best support new ESL/bilingual teachers.

Preparation and First-Year Experiences

The extent to which new teachers are prepared for their roles may influence their initial experiences in schools, and teachers with less preparation may need more induction. For example, having less coursework or student teaching experiences, could affect new teachers' ability to differentiate instruction for a variety of learners or have confidence in classroom management. Induction supports, such as mentoring and common planning with colleagues, could provide new teachers with the guidance, ideas, and resources they need to feel successful (Kardos & Johnson, 2007, 2010).

Findings from general education studies suggest that new teachers' perceptions of preparedness are related to pedagogical preparation (i.e., student teaching and methods coursework; Ingersoll et al., 2012; Ronfeldt et al., 2014). Specifically, Ronfeldt et al. (2014) used Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) data and found that "teachers who completed more practice teaching and more methods-related coursework felt better instructionally prepared and were more likely to persist in teaching" (p. 3). Researchers have also found that the length of student teaching affects new teachers' perceived preparedness as well as instructional practices and retention. In a meta-analysis of preservice preparation, Dunst et al. (2020) found that "extended student teaching (10+ weeks) ... was associated with better classroom quality and better teaching practices" (p. 34). Other researchers have found that more weeks of student teaching increased teachers' feelings of preparedness and retention (Ronfeldt & Reininger, 2012; Ronfeldt et al., 2014).

Though limited to small studies, prior research on new ESL/bilingual teachers early career experiences provides evidence that teachers vary in their perceptions of preparedness for their positions. For example, some new ESL/bilingual teachers indicated feeling prepared for key aspects of their first jobs (e.g., advocating for multilingual learners (MLLs); teaching culturally

and linguistically responsive methods; Athanases & de Oliveria, 2007; Wong et al., 2020). Others reported not feeling prepared for working with MLLs with diverse needs (e.g., Casey et al., 2013), complying with state testing and accountability (e.g., Baecher, 2012), or teaching academic content (i.e., math; Tigert & Percy, 2018; Varghese & Synder, 2018).

New ESL/bilingual teachers' reasons for feeling unprepared tended to focus on preparation program components (i.e., coursework and student teaching). For example, some new teachers report coursework that is too theoretical or detached from the reality of today's classrooms (Baecher, 2012; TESOL International Association [TESOL], 2016; Varghese, 2006; Varghese & Synder, 2018). Additionally, graduates of one specific teacher preparation program believed there needed to be "greater structure and rigor in selecting and supervising the school placements" (Baecher, 2012, p. 584). A teacher in this same study stated, "I was paired with average teachers at best and didn't gain nearly what I could have, had [the program] taken more extraordinary efforts to pair me with extraordinary teachers" (Baecher 2012, p. 585). Other new ESL/bilingual teachers reported being taught differently by cooperating teachers and teacher educators in their programs which led to confusion about how and what to teach (Baecher, 2012; Nuñez and Espinoza, 2019). Understanding new ESL/bilingual teachers' preparedness for their positions could potentially provide more effective and relevant induction support and preservice preparation.

Despite these findings, ESL/bilingual teacher educators and other leaders in the field (i.e., TESOL International Association) recommend extensive field-based experiences and "deep and extended learning" (Hood, 2020; TESOL, 2016; Tigert & Percy, 2018; Wong et al., 2020, p.166). Even so, little is known about new ESL/bilingual teachers' perceptions of preparedness for the first year of teaching or their experiences with preparation components (i.e., student teaching, methods coursework) across the U.S.

Purpose and Research Questions

Given the limited knowledge base about new ESL/bilingual teachers' early career experiences, the purpose of this study is to examine induction supports and perceptions of first-

year preparedness in order to see how these teachers were supported and prepared for their positions. I use a national representative sample of teachers from the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) 2011-2012 SASS Teacher Questionnaire dataset to provide a national profile of new ESL/bilingual teachers' induction supports and perceptions of first-year preparedness. This profile includes specific preparation components (i.e., student teaching and coursework). I compare new ESL/bilingual teacher findings to new general educators to determine if these teacher groups have similar experiences. The following questions guided this secondary descriptive analysis of the 2011-12 SASS:

Research Question 1: What induction supports do new ESL/bilingual teachers and general educators report receiving in their first year of teaching?

Research Question 2: What are new ESL/Bilingual teachers' and general educators' perceptions of first year preparedness, and what specific preparation characteristics (i.e., student teaching and coursework) did they receive?

Methods

Instrumentation

The NCES created the SASS to obtain a nationally representative sample of the characteristics and working conditions of U.S. teachers in both public and private schools (Tourkin et al., 2010). The NCES, with assistance from the U.S. Census Bureau, has administered the SASS from 1987-2011—with slight modifications—and has collected responses through mail-based, internet and phone surveys as well as through in-person follow-ups (NCES, n.d.). This instrument is a reliable survey for obtaining and reporting information about elementary and secondary education (Cox et al., 2017; Tourkin et al., 2010). The SASS sample is weighted to “produce national, regional, and state estimates” with a unit response rate of 79.6% for public school teachers on the 2011-2012 iteration of the survey (NCES, n.d.)

The 2011-12 SASS was utilized to perform a secondary, descriptive analysis of new ESL/bilingual teachers and general educators' demographic characteristics, preparation, and induction support experiences. I completed the annual licensee training from the Institute of

Education Statistics (IES) for restricted-used data security and was approved to work with the 2011-2012 SASS. Dr. Thomas O. Williams, co-chair of this dissertation, served as the IES approved single-site user with permission to run the data. Terminology used throughout this manuscript and in all tables reflects the language of the SASS.

Respondents

All respondents were full-time, part-time, or itinerant (i.e., taught at more than one school) public school ESL/bilingual teachers and/or general educators with 3 or less years of experience in K-12 or comparable ungraded levels. In defining ESL/bilingual teachers, the SASS item 0090 was analyzed regarding teachers' main teaching assignment. Teachers who selected subject codes 160-162 were classified as ESL/bilingual teachers. New general educators included elementary (codes 101-102), English and language arts (codes 151-159), mathematics and computer science (codes 191-201), natural science (codes 210-217), and social sciences (220-234) teachers. I excluded arts and music, physical education, foreign languages, special education, career or technical education, and a variety of other areas as I was interested in comparing ESL/bilingual teachers to general educators as these professionals work closely with each other in schools.

Procedure and Variables Analyzed

AM Statistical Software Beta Version 0.06.04 (American Institutes for Research) and SPSS 23.0 were used to run descriptive statistics using the Teacher Final Sampling Weight (TFNLWGT) and the 88 replicate data weights using a Balance Repeated Replication procedure. Cross tabulations between ESL/bilingual and general educators were used to provide a comparison of the variables between the two groups. To answer the research questions, I examined and compared the following variables: induction supports (research question 1) and both perceptions of first-year preparedness and specific preparation characteristics (research question 2). For a full description of each variable, including item numbers and response options, please see Table 1. Means and standard deviations were reported when available, and per NCES/IES reporting standards for anonymity, all *n*'s were rounded to the nearest 10.

Table 1

Variables Used in Study

Variable	SASS Questionnaire Items	SASS Response Options
Main Teaching Assignment	This school year, what is your MAIN teaching assignment field at THIS school? (0090)	ESL = codes 160-162 General educators = 101-102, 151-159, 191-234
Demographic Characteristics		
Gender	Are you male or female? (0525)	Teachers indicate: 1 for <i>Male</i> 2 for <i>Female</i>
Race/ Ethnicity	NCES/IES Variable (RACETH-T) Combines the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin? (0527; yes/no) • What is your race? (0528-0532; White, Black or African-American, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaska Native) 	White; Black/African-American; Hispanic/Latino; Asian; American India/Alaska Native; Other Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian; Two or more races
Age	What is your year of birth? (0534)	Teachers indicate year of birth
Degree attainment	NCES/IES created variable (HIDEGR)	Recorded: 1 for bachelor's degree or lower; 2 for master's or higher
Certification	Which of the following describes the teaching certificate you currently hold that certified you to teach in THIS state? (0250)	Recorded: 1 for Full Cert (SASS option 1 or 2); 2 for No Full Cert (SASS option 3-5)
Years of Experience	NCES/IES Variable (NEWTCH)	Indicates 3 or fewer years of teaching
Induction Experiences		
First Year Supports	In your FIRST year of teaching, did you participate in a teacher induction program? (0220) Did you receive the following kinds of support during your FIRST year of teaching? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced teaching schedule or number of preparations (0221) 	Teachers indicate: 1 for Yes 2 for No

- Common planning time with teachers in your subject (0222)
- Seminars or classes for beginning teachers (0223)
- Extra classroom assistance (e.g., teacher aides) (0224)
- Regular supportive communication with your principal, other administrators, or department chair (0225)

In your FIRST year of teaching, did you work closely with a master or mentor teacher who was assigned by your school or district? (0230)

Frequency of mentoring in the first year (0231)

Teachers indicate:

- 1 = Once or more per week
- 2 = Once or twice a month
- 3 = Free times a year
- 4 = Never

Overall, to what extent did your assigned mentor or mentor teacher improve your teaching in your first year of teaching? (0233)

Teachers indicate:

- 1 = Not at all
- 2 = Small extent
- 3 = Moderate extent
- 4 = Great extent

Perceived First-Year Preparedness

In your FIRST year of teaching, how well prepared were you to:

- a. Handle a range of classroom management or discipline situations? (0211)
- b. Use a variety of instructional methods? (0212)
- c. Teach your subject matter? (0213)
- d. Use computers in classroom instruction? (0214)
- e. Assess students? (0215)
- f. Differentiate instruction in the classroom? (0216)
- g. Use data from student assessments to inform instruction (0217)
- h. Meet state content standards? (0218)

Teachers indicate:

- 1 for Yes
- 2 for No

Student teaching

Did you have any practice or student teaching? (0208)

Teachers indicate:

- 1 for Yes
- 2 for No

How long did your practice or student teaching last? (0209)

Teachers indicate:

- 1 = 4 weeks or less
- 2 = 5-7 weeks

Coursework	Have you ever taken any graduate or undergraduate courses that focused solely on teaching methods or teaching strategies? (0206)	3 = 8-11 weeks 4 = 12 weeks or more Teachers indicate: 1 for Yes 2 for No
	How many courses? (0207)	Teachers indicate: 1 = 1 or 2 courses 2 = 3 or 4 courses 3 = 5 to 9 courses 4 = 10 or more

Note: NCES = National Center for Education Statistics; IES = Institute for Education Statistics

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), 2011-2012.

Findings

In this section, I begin by providing a demographic profile of both teacher groups. I then reveal descriptive findings for both research questions.

Demographic Profile

Table 2 includes the demographic profile of new teachers in this study. Overall, from the weighted sample of teachers in the 2011-2012 school year, 70,430 were ESL/bilingual teachers of which 6,990 (i.e. slightly under 10%) had three years or less teaching experience (i.e., new teachers). This is in comparison to the weighted sample of 2,178,920 general educators of which 232,940 (slightly over 10%) were new teachers. A higher percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers were female (92.0%) than general educators (77.7%), and although the average age of ESL/bilingual and general educators were similar (30.28 and 29.51, respectively), the age range of ESL/bilingual teachers (i.e., 22-53) and general educators (i.e., 20-72) indicated a wider spread for new general educators.

Other demographic characteristics highlighted differences between ESL/bilingual teachers and general educators regarding degrees and certification. For example, a higher percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers had a master's degree or higher when compared to general

educators (37.1% and 25.2%, respectfully) while a higher percentage of general educators (73.8%) had full certification when compared to ESL/bilingual teachers (69.6%).

Table 2

Teacher Demographic and Characteristics

	New ESL/Bilingual % Weighted N=6,990	New General Education % Weighted N = 232,940
Female	92.0	77.7
Male	8.0	22.3
Bachelor's degree or less	62.9	74.8
Master's degree or higher	37.1	25.2
Full teaching certification	69.6	73.8
Age	M=30.28 SD=7.62 Range=22-53 Median=27.00	M= 29.51 SD=7.66 Range= 20-72 Median=26.00

Note. Weighted percentages of teachers responding to SASS items.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), "Public School Teacher Data File," 2011-2012.

Table 3 includes the race/ethnicity of new teachers. To examine race/ethnicity, two IES created variables, NEWTCH and RACETH_T, were cross-tabulated. This revealed that a higher percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers (61.4%) were teachers of color than general educators (21.8%). Moreover, 51.7% of ESL/bilingual teachers identified as Hispanic compared to only 8.6% of general educators. A lower percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers were black compared to general educators (3.8% vs 8.4%, respectfully) while a higher percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers identified as Asian when compared to general educators (4.8% vs 1.6%, respectively).

Table 3

Race/ethnicity of New Teachers

	New ESL/Bilingual % Weighted N=6,990	New General Education % Weighted N = 232,940
American Indian/Alaskan	–	0.4
Asian	4.8	1.6
Black	3.8	8.4
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	–	0.2
Hispanic	51.7	8.6
White	38.6	78.2
Two or more	1.1	3.2

Note. All racial categories determined by the National Center for Education Statistics variable RACETH-T.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), “Public School Teacher Data File,” 2011-2012.

Research Question 1: Induction Supports

The SASS has several questions related to new teachers’ experiences with induction supports (see Tables 4-6). As Table 4 shows, a higher percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers (92.3%) reported participating in a teacher induction program than general educators (83.7%). Additionally, a higher percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers (73.5%) participated in new teacher seminars than general educators (64.5%) while a higher percentage of general educators (62.8%) than ESL/bilingual teachers (57.5%) had common planning time with colleagues in their field. The most pronounced difference was in the percentages of new teachers with regular administrator communication. Specifically, only 60.0% of ESL/bilingual teachers indicated having regular supportive communication with administrators compared to 75.9% of new general educators. Lastly, lower percentages of both groups reported extra classroom assistance (i.e.,

ESL/bilingual 16.7%; general educators 25.2%) and reduced schedules/preps (i.e., ESL/bilingual 8.5%; general educators 8.4%).

Table 4

Induction Supports Received in the First Year

	New ESL/bilingual % Yes Weighted N = 6660	New General Education % Yes Weighted N = 226,650
Teacher induction program (0220)	92.3	83.7
Close work with an assigned a mentor (0230)	75.8	73.5
Seminars/classes for beginning teachers (0223)	73.5	64.5
Regular supportive communication with administrators (0225)	60.0	75.9
Common planning time with teachers in your subject (0222)	57.5	62.8
Extra classroom assistance (e.g., teacher aides; 0224)	16.7	25.2
Reduced teaching schedule/ preparations (0221)	8.5	8.4

Note. Weighted percentages of teachers responding to SASS survey questions (item numbers in parentheses).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), "Public School Teacher Data File," 2011-2012.

The SASS also includes several items about new teachers' mentoring experiences. A slightly higher percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers (75.8%) reported working closely with a mentor than general educators (73.5%; see Table 4). Conversely, only 68.0% of new ESL/bilingual teachers had mentors who had experience instructing students in the same subject

area compared to 83.0% of new general educators which indicates that a higher percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers' mentors were outside of the ESL/bilingual field. A higher percentage of new ESL/bilingual teachers, moreover, indicated fewer opportunities to meet with their mentors as 39.2% reported working with their mentors *once or more a week* compared to 61.9% of general educators (see Table 5). Specifically, 6.1% of new ESL/bilingual teachers said they never met with their mentor compared to 0.9% of general educators.

Table 5

Frequency of Mentoring in the First Year

	New ESL/bilingual % Weighted N = 5,050	New General Education % Weighted N = 166,580
Once or more a week	39.2	61.9
Once or twice a month	33.7	24.5
Few times a year	21.0	12.7
Never	6.1	0.9

Note. Weighted percentages of teachers responding to SASS item 0231—"How frequently did you work with your master or mentor teacher during your first year of teaching?"

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), "Public School Teacher Data File," 2011-2012.

New teachers were asked to respond to the question "to what extent did your assigned master or mentor teacher improve your teaching in your first year of teaching" (SASS, 2011, p. 21). As Table 6 shows, a higher percentage of general educators (70.8%) than ESL/bilingual teachers (60.3%) indicated that their mentors helped improve their teaching to a *great or moderate extent*. Additionally, a higher percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers indicated that their mentors helped improve their teaching to a small extent (33.6%) compared to general educators (23.8%). It is interesting to note that both selected *not at all* at similar percentages (6.1% ESL/bilingual; 5.3% general educators). Working with a mentor was thus perceived by a larger percentage of general educators to improve their teaching to a *great or moderate extent* while a

higher percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers attributed mentors for improving their teaching to a *small* extent.

Table 6

Extent of Mentor Improving First Year Teaching

	New ESL/bilingual % Weighted N = 5,050	New General Education % Weighted N = 166,580
Great extent	30.0	33.7
Moderate extent	30.3	37.1
Small extent	33.6	23.8
Not at all	6.1	5.3
Total	100.0	100.0

Note. Weighted percentages of teachers responding to SASS Question 38d item 0223—"Overall, to what extent did your assigned master or mentor teacher improve your teaching in your first year of teaching?"

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), "Public School Teacher Data File," 2011-2012.

Research Question 2: First-Year Preparedness

I investigated new teachers' perceived preparation for teaching (see Table 7) through analyzing question 33 on the 2011-2012 SASS. Question 33 asks new teachers to indicate their preparedness for eight critical teaching tasks by selecting one of four choices (i.e., *not at all prepared*, *somewhat prepared*, *well prepared*, or *very well prepared*). For all eight perceived preparedness variables, general educators reported higher percentages of being *very well prepared* while ESL/bilingual teachers reported higher percentages of being *somewhat prepared*. Moreover, the overall and individual means for each item were lower for new ESL/bilingual teachers than general educators.

The teaching tasks for which new ESL/bilingual teachers indicated the highest percentages of preparedness (i.e., over 50% selecting *very well* or *well prepared*) included teaching their subject matter (71.8%), meeting state content standards (70.5%), using computers

in instruction (67.5%), and using a variety of resources (59.2%). For the remaining items, less than 50% of new ESL/bilingual teachers indicated they were *very well* or *well* prepared (see Table 7). For the item, use student assessment data to inform instruction, only 5.1% and 24.1% of new ESL/bilingual teachers selected feeling *very well* or *well* prepared, respectively, and 29.3% felt that they were *not at all* prepared for this task. In contrast, general educators felt *very well* (19.0%) and *well* (38.8%) prepared to use student assessments data to inform instruction, with only 6.5 reporting *not at all* prepared. New ESL/bilingual teachers also indicated a lower percentage of perceived preparedness for assessing students as only 2.2% and 39.1% selected they were *very well* or *well* prepared for this task, respectively. Conversely, 21.3% and 49.1% of new general educators indicated that they were *very well* or *well* prepared to assess students, respectively.

Although not as pronounced as the differences discussed above, a higher percentage of general educators (56.4%) selected that they were *very well* or *well* prepared for differentiating instruction compared to new ESL/bilingual teachers (44.8%). Both new ESL/bilingual teachers and general educators indicated lower perceived preparedness for classroom management and discipline although a higher percentage of general educators indicated feeling *very well* or *well* prepared (58.6% general educators; 41.1% ESL/bilingual) while a higher percentage of ESL/bilingual teachers than general educators indicated being *somewhat* prepared (57.1% v. 35.9%, respectfully).

Table 7

New Teachers' Perceptions of First Year Preparedness

	New ESL/bilingual % Yes Weighted N = 6,660					New General Education % Yes Weighted N =226,650				
	Mean SD	Very Well	Well	Somewhat	Not at all	Mean SD	Very Well	Well	Somewhat	Not at all
Teach your subject matter (0213)	2.93 0.73	22.6	49.2	27.1	1.1	3.21 0.73	38.6	45.2	15.0	1.2
Meet state content standards (0218)	3.03 0.79	32.3	38.2	29.5	0.0	3.11 0.78	33.6	45.8	18.3	2.4

Use computers in classroom instruction (0214)	2.95 0.83	29.8	37.7	30.2	2.3	3.03 0.90	37.1	33.6	24.2	5.1
Use a variety of instructional methods (0212)	2.71 0.67	12.2	47.0	40.8	0.0	2.95 0.80	26.7	44.0	26.8	2.5
Differentiate instruction in the classroom (0216)	2.44 0.92	14.5	30.3	39.9	15.3	2.68 0.83	17.3	39.1	37.4	6.2
Assess students (0215)	2.35 0.66	2.2	39.1	50.5	8.2	2.90 0.76	21.3	49.1	27.0	2.5
Handle a range of classroom management or discipline situations (0211)	2.57 0.79	17.3	23.8	57.1	1.8	2.75 0.85	21.6	37.0	35.9	5.5
Use data from student assessments to inform instruction (2017)	2.05 0.86	5.1	24.1	41.6	29.3	2.70 0.85	19.0	38.8	35.8	6.5
<i>Overall preparation means</i>	21.04 4.19					23.31 4.73				

Note. Weighted percentages of teachers indicating “In your first year of teaching, how prepared were you to—” (SASS Question 33). Data displayed from highest to lowest based on combined percentages of ESL/bilingual teachers who selected *very well* or *well* prepared. Item numbers included in parentheses.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), “Public School Teacher Data File,” 2011-2012.

Since perceptions of first-year preparedness among general educators have been linked to increased methods classes and weeks in student teaching (Ronfeldt et al., 2014), I also explored new teachers’ engagement with these preparation components (see Table 8). Overall, a lower percentage of new ESL/bilingual teachers than general educators (70.5% and 86.6%,

respectively) took methods courses, and a slightly higher percentage of general educators had student teaching than ESL/bilingual teachers (89.2% and 86.6%, respectively). Additionally, 82.4% of general educators reported having 8 weeks or more weeks of preparation compared to 75.3% of ESL/bilingual teachers. Combining ESL/bilingual teachers who reported 4 weeks or less of student teaching (i.e., 8.7%) with the 13.4% who had no student teaching indicates that 22.1% of ESL/bilingual teachers reported minimal to no student teaching. In contrast, combining new general educators who reported 4 weeks or less (i.e., 3.3%) or no student teaching (i.e., 10.8%) indicates that only 14.1% had minimal to no student teaching.

Table 8

New Teacher Preparation Components

	New ESL/Bilingual % Yes Weighted N = 6,990	New General Education % Yes Weighted N =232,940
Had methods courses	70.5	86.6
Had practice or student teaching	86.6	89.2
Student teaching length		
None	13.4	10.8
4 weeks or less	8.7	3.3
5-7 weeks	2.5	3.5
8-11 weeks	13.5	12.2
12 weeks or more	61.8	70.2

Note. Weighted percentages of teachers responding to SASS questions (item numbers in parentheses).

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), "Public School Teacher Data File," 2011-2012.

Discussion

This is the first study providing a national profile of new ESL/bilingual teachers' perceptions of their preparation for teaching and the induction supports they received. After a discussion of the findings, I outline implications for researchers, teacher educators, and school leaders.

As the teacher group with the highest attrition rate (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017), new ESL/bilingual teachers lacked crucial induction supports. This was specifically observed in the areas of same-subject mentors, frequent mentoring, and opportunities for social supports (i.e., administrator communication and co-planning with subject area colleagues). New ESL/bilingual teachers were less prepared for their first year of teaching than general educators on eight teaching tasks. These teachers also had less methods coursework and fewer weeks of student teaching than new general educators which may have contributed to their lack of initial preparedness and suggests the need for greater induction support of this teacher group.

Although the majority of new ESL/bilingual teachers had mentors, fewer had same-subject mentors and they reported less frequent interactions with their mentors than general educators. This may have contributed to some new ESL/bilingual teachers' perception that their mentors had little effect on their first-year instructional improvement. Other researchers have found "matching new teachers with mentors from the same subject area provides more benefit than mentoring by teachers from different subject areas or no mentoring at all" (DeAngelis et al., 2013, p. 351). Mentoring frequency is considered a sign of quality and granted importance because researchers find it is associated with mentees' perceiving the mentor as helpful (DeAngelis et al., 2013). Meeting regularly often leads to mentees improving instructionally which becomes evident by an increase in student achievement (Fletcher et al., 2008; Rockoff, 2008). Not having same-subject mentors with whom they can frequently meet could therefore lead new ESL/bilingual teachers to perceive mentors as less effective in helping them develop.

Given that some schools/districts may not employ other ESL/bilingual teachers, new teachers may not have access to experienced mentors or colleagues (Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995), which may limit their development. This could affect the quality of their mentoring as the mentor may be from another field (i.e. history, science) which means they may not be able to meet the instructional needs of an ESL/bilingual mentee. Limited access to other ESL/bilingual colleagues could affect new teachers' opportunities for common planning with a

an in-field mentor, sharing of ESL/bilingual instructional resources, and engaging in informal conversations specific to ESL/bilingual teachers' work. Other research has shown that new teachers need guidance, support, and resources from experienced colleagues (Kardos & Johnson, 2007, 2010). Districts and state leaders need to prioritize methods to provide new ESL/bilingual teachers with same-subject mentors/colleagues through alternative channels (i.e., virtually, neighboring districts, connections with universities).

In addition to limited collegial interactions with same-subject colleagues, some new ESL/bilingual teachers may not have administrator support. Support from administrators is predictive of new teachers' job satisfaction and intent to stay at a school (Hong & Matsko, 2019; Kapadia et al., 2007; Pogodzinski et al., 2012). Thus, the fact that fewer new ESL/bilingual teachers reported positive communication with administrators than general educators indicates that they may not have access to or develop strong relationships with principals and other leaders. Previous findings suggest that some new ESL/bilingual teachers struggled to establish relationships with both principals and other teachers (Raab & Billingsley, 2020), thus new ESL/bilingual teachers would therefore benefit from coaching on how to connect and form relationships with others in their school, and, school leaders should make efforts to connect with all teachers in their schools.

The need for induction supports is even more pronounced given that many new ESL/bilingual teachers also reported not feeling prepared for crucial teaching tasks. Same-subject colleagues and mentors could provide guidance and assistance in those areas that new ESL/bilingual teachers feel least prepared. For example, same-subject mentors and/or colleagues could support new teachers learning to assess MLLs, use student data to make instructional decisions, differentiate content and language instruction, and effectively manage classroom behavior. Moreover, administrators could help by providing opportunities for new ESL/bilingual teachers to attend professional development related to their needs or release time to observe experienced colleagues teach. Thus, PD supports through induction, could help new ESL/bilingual teachers bridge gaps between their preparation and their new positions.

New ESL/bilingual teachers' readiness to teach is likely influenced by the strength of their preparation programs. Research on new general educators suggests that a strong combination of methods coursework and student teaching predicts instructional effectiveness as well as retention (Ingersoll et al., 2012). Researchers have also found that the more weeks of student teaching a teacher candidate has, the more prepared they feel for their positions (Ronfeldt et al., 2014; Ronfeldt & Reininger, 2012). Future research needs to consider why new ESL/bilingual teachers report less time in student teaching and methods courses. Are these related to the design of preservice programs, or to the hiring of teachers who have not completed an ESL/bilingual preparation programs?

Lastly, new ESL/bilingual teachers had a different demographic profile than general educators which may have influenced how they access induction supports or feel prepared for their first year. Researchers and school leaders should prioritize examining the links between female ESL/bilingual teachers' of color and their first-year experiences as other researchers have found that Latina bilingual teachers have both specific induction needs (i.e., bilingual resources, social supports; Varghese, 2006, 2008) and different experiences with induction supports than new White teachers (Amos, 2016, 2020). Specifically, Amos (2013) found that preservice Latina bilingual teachers experienced microaggressions in their preparation programs which could affect their perceptions of first-year preparedness.

Limitations

Although the SASS database provides a national sample of teachers, it has limitations. First, the questions on the 2011-2012 SASS are general and may not capture nuances of ESL/bilingual teachers' work (i.e., working across grade levels, teaching in multiple languages and content areas, advocating for students and families, collaborating and co-teaching; Raab & Billingsley, in review). Second, ESL/bilingual teachers may interpret survey questions and item choices differently than general educators. For example, an ESL/bilingual teacher may perceive differentiation as more complex since they do not simply differentiate content, they also differentiate language tasks (i.e., reading, writing, listening, and speaking) depending on MLLs'

language proficiency levels. Third, although we know that ESL/bilingual teachers felt unprepared in some important areas of teaching, we do not know what aspects of assessment and differentiation were challenging. Additional research is needed for a more in depth understanding of their induction needs.

Implications for Future Research

Induction Supports and Mentoring

Researchers should continue to use national datasets like the SASS and NTPS as well as state databases to explore relationships between induction variables and specific outcomes (i.e., extent to which working with a mentor improved first-year teaching, retention, intent to stay). Moreover, qualitative explorations involving new teachers, school leaders, and mentors should provide first-hand accounts of what combinations of supports matter to new ESL/bilingual teachers.

Researchers and school leaders need to critically examine new ESL/bilingual teachers who report not receiving induction supports as these teachers may be the most likely to leave (Kelly et al., 2018). Kelly et al. (2018) examined unsupported new teachers in Australia and found that unsupported new teachers tended to be more dissatisfied with their careers and collegial relationships which increased their likelihood of considering leaving the profession. It is thus vital that school leaders explore who is not receiving supports in their schools/districts and find out why the supports are not being provided. These leaders should consider collaborating with other schools/districts or teacher educators to ensure that new ESL/bilingual teachers have access to the supports they need (Farrell, 2019).

School leaders also need to examine new ESL/bilingual teachers' opportunities to regularly communicate with their principals and collaborate with same-subject colleagues. Specifically, school leaders should reflect on their own communication and consider whether they engage similarly with different types of teachers. They should create opportunities for ESL/bilingual teachers to engage in co-planning and collaboration with same-subject colleagues and consider providing scheduled time for collegial connections. Since new ESL/bilingual

teachers may find themselves teaching in schools with few same-subject colleagues or leaders who understand the field, teacher educators should consider coaching teacher candidates on how to establish relationships with school leaders and general educators (Bunaiyan & McWilliams, 2019; Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995). Additionally, teacher educators should consider exposing new ESL/bilingual teachers to collegial networks outside of their schools/districts (i.e., professional organizations, university alumni) as it would be helpful for the teachers to know how to locate additional sources of support.

Investigating Teachers' Perceived Preparedness

Researchers should investigate the effects of specific preparation characteristics on new ESL/bilingual teachers' perceptions of first-year preparedness. Using the multiple iterations of SASS and NTPS, researchers could explore the effects of student teaching and coursework on new ESL/bilingual teachers' perceived preparedness and intent to continue teaching (see Ronfeldt et al., 2014). Qualitative researchers and school leaders could elaborate on the findings from this study by gauging first-year preparedness of new ESL/bilingual teachers' through exploring their knowledge and skills regarding field specific practices (i.e., advocating for MLLs, co-teaching and collaborating with general educators, differentiating language and content instruction). They could also investigate how these field specific practices might be scaffolded during induction through various supports (i.e., same-subject mentors).

Teacher educators should also examine the experiences that their teacher candidates have and how these opportunities prepare them for their first ESL/bilingual positions, using follow-up surveys or interviews. ESL/bilingual teacher candidates need to have as many experiences as possible with a variety of MLLs, grade levels, and content areas since they need to know a substantial amount of information (e.g., knowledge in history, math, social studies, and science for potentially 14 grade levels; second language learning theory and pedagogy; and socio-emotional skills). School leaders also need to carefully consider where they place new ESL/bilingual teachers by closely examining their preservice preparation and assigning them to classrooms where they have some prior experience. If new ESL/bilingual teachers have little to

no experience with the grade and/or content area they are assigned, school leaders, mentors, and teacher educators will need to collaborate to provide additional induction supports to bridge potential knowledge gaps.

Teacher educators should evaluate preparation programs as educators in the ESL/bilingual field have found program evaluations helpful in understanding what new teachers need to feel prepared in their first positions (e.g., Baecher, 2012; Fradd & Lee, 1999). Specifically, teacher educators should consider (1) what program components best prepare ESL/bilingual teachers while considering input from new teachers, principals, and mentors; (2) preparation factors related to their observed effectiveness; and (3) documentation of model induction programs and their effects.

Connecting Race/Ethnicity in Induction Research

Researchers need to investigate the intersection of race/ethnicity on new ESL/bilingual teachers' induction specifically with relation to their access to induction supports and retention. Researchers have found that both teacher candidates and new Latinx ESL/bilingual teachers experience racism and microaggressions in their preparation programs (e.g., Amos, 2013) and schools (Amos, 2016, 2020; Varghese, 2006, 2008). Researchers, teacher educators, and school leaders should therefore consider the effects of race/ethnicity on new teachers' induction experiences.

Conclusion

Retaining effective ESL/bilingual teachers who want to persist in their field should be a national priority as almost five million MLLs in the U.S. need their expertise and support (Office of English Language Acquisition, 2018). Nonetheless, this study of new ESL/bilingual teachers suggests they do not receive the same level of induction support and do not begin their first year of teaching feeling as prepared as new general educators. Therefore, the ESL/bilingual field and school leaders need to prioritize both the preparation of teacher candidates as well as the induction support provided to new teachers—MLLs' academic success and new ESL/bilingual teachers' job satisfaction and retention are dependent on it.

References

- Achinstein, B. & Ogawa, R. T. (2011). Change(d) agents: School contexts and the cultural/professional roles of new teachers of Mexican descent. *Teachers College Record*, 113(11), 2503-2551. <https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=16109>
- Amos, Y. T. (2013). Becoming a teacher of color: Mexican bilingual paraprofessionals' journey to teach. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 40(3), 51-73. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43684701>
- Amos, Y. T. (2016). Wanted and used: Latina bilingual education teachers at public schools. *Equity & Excellence In education*, 49(1), 41-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2015.1122557>
- Amos, Y. T. (2020). "Are you going to take my job away?": Latina bilingual education teachers' relationships with white colleagues in a white racial frame. *Urban Education*, 55(4), 640-666. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916656900>
- Arce, J. (2004). Latino bilingual teachers: The struggle to sustain an emancipatory pedagogy in public schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 17(2), 227-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390310001653880>
- Baeher, L. (2012). Feedback from the field: What novice preK-12 ESL teachers want to tell TESOL teacher educators. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(3), 578-588. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.43>
- Billingsley, B., Griffin, C., Smith, S.J., Kamman, M., & Israel, M. (2009). *A review of teacher induction in special education: Research, practice, and technology solutions*. University of Florida, National Center to Inform Policy and Practice in Special Education Development (NCIPP Doc. No. RS-1ES). http://ncipp.org/reports/rs_1es.pdf
- Boyd, D., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., Ronfeldt, M., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). The role of teacher quality in retention and hiring: Using applications to transfer to uncover preference of teachers and schools. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 30(1), 88-110. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20545>
- Bullough, R. V. (2012). Mentoring and new teacher induction in the United States: A review and analysis of current practices. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 20(1), 57-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2012.645600>

- Bunaiyan, W., & McWilliams, K. (2019). Case study on school leaders' impact on English language acquisition programs. *International Journal of Education, Learning, and Development*, 7(3), 15-30. <http://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/Case-Study-on-School-Leaders'-Impact-on-English-Language-Acquisition-Programs.pdf>
- Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/teacher-turnover-report>
- Casey, P., Dunlap, K., Brister, H., Davidson, M., & Starrett, T. M. (2013). Sink or swim? Throw us a life jacket! Novice alternatively certified bilingual and special education teachers deserve options. *Education and Urban Society*, 45(3), 287-306. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013124511408075>
- Cox, S., Parmer, R., Strizek, G., Thomas, T. & Spiegelman, M. (2017). *Documentation of the 2011-2012 Schools and Staffing Survey*. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2016/2016817.pdf>
- DeAngelis, K. J., Wall, A. F., & Che, J. (2013). The impact of preservice preparation and early career support on novice teachers' career intentions and decisions. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(4), 338-355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487113488945>
- DeCesare, D., Workman, S., & McClelland, A. (2016). *How do school districts mentor new teachers? (REL 2016–125)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Central. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
- Dunst, C. J., Hamby, D. W., Howse, R. B., Wilkie, H., & Annas, K. (2020). Research synthesis of meta-analyses of preservice teacher preparation practices in higher education. *Higher Education Studies*, 10(1), 29-47. <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v10n1p29>
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2019). 'My training has failed me': Inconvenient truths about second language teacher education (SLTE). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 22(4), 1-16. <http://tesl-ej.org/pdf/ej88/a1.pdf>

- Fletcher, S., Strong, M., & Villar, A. (2008). An investigation of the effects of variations in mentor-based induction on the performance of students in California. *Teachers College Record*, 110(10), 2271-2289. <https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentID=14719>
- Fradd, S. H., & Lee, O. (1997). Teachers' voices in program evaluation and improvement: A case of a TESOL program. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(6), 563-577. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(97\)80001-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(97)80001-7)
- George, C. (2009). Marginalization or collaboration: First year ESL teachers & the middle school context. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, 4(1), 25-52.
- Glazerman, S., E. Isenberg, S. Dolfen, M. Bleeker, A. Johnson, M. Grider, and M. Jacobus. (2010). *Impacts of comprehensive teacher induction: Final results from a randomized controlled study (NCEE 2010-4027)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED565837.pdf>
- Goldrick, L. (2016). *Support from the start: A 50-state review of policies on new educator induction and mentoring*. New Teacher Center. <https://newteachercenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2016CompleteReportStatePolicies.pdf>
- Gray, L., and Taie, S. (2015). *Public school teacher attrition and mobility in the first five years: Results from the first through fifth waves of the 2007–08 beginning teacher longitudinal study (NCES 2015-337)*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015337.pdf>
- Guarino, C. M., Santibañez, L., & Daley, G.A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 76, 173-208. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00346543076002173>
- Heineke, A. J. (2018). The invisible revolving door: The issue of teacher attrition in English language development classrooms in Arizona. *Language Policy*, 17, 77-98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-016-9428-9>

- Hong, Y., & Matsko, K. K. (2019). Looking inside and outside of mentoring: Effect on new teachers' organizational commitment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 56(6), 2368-2407. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219843657>
- Hood, S. J. (2020). Two-way immersion teacher preparation. *Foreign Language Annals*, 53(1), 128-148. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12441>
- Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & May, H. (2012). Retaining teachers: How preparation matters. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 30-34. <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/may12/vol69/num08/Retaining-Teachers.aspx>
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0034654311403323>
- Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a "sense of success": New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 581-617. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00028312040003581>
- Kapadia, K., Coca, V., Easton, J. (2007). *Keeping new teachers: A first look at the influences of induction in the Chicago Public Schools*. Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago. https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/2018-10/keeping_new_teachers012407.pdf
- Kardos, S. M., & Johnson, S.M. (2007). On their own and presumed expert: New teachers' experience with their colleagues. *Teachers College Record*, 109(9). 2083-2106. <https://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=12812>
- Kardos, S. M., Johnson, S. M., Peske, H. G., Kauffman, D., Liu, E. (2001). Counting on colleagues: New teachers encounter the professional cultures of their schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(2), 250-290. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F00131610121969316>
- Kauffman, D., Johnson, S. M., Kardos, S. M., Liu, E., & Peske, H.G. (2002). "Lost at Sea": New teachers' experiences with curriculum and assessment. *Teachers College Record*, 104(2), 273-300. <https://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=10822>

- Kelly, N., Sim, C., & Ireland, M. (2018). Slipping through the cracks: Teachers who miss out on early career support. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(3), 292-316.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2018.1441366>
- Liggett, T. (2010). 'A little bit marginalized': The structural marginalization of English language teachers in urban and rural public schools. *Teacher Education*, 21(3), 217-232.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10476211003695514>
- Malsbary, C. B., & Appelgate, M. H. (2016). Working downstream: A beginning EL teacher negotiating policy and practice. *Language Policy*, 15, 27-47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9347-6>
- Mathews, H. M., Rodgers, J. D., & Youngs, P. Y. (2017). Sense-making for beginning special educators: A systematic mixed studies review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 23-36.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.05.007>
- Musanti, S. I. (2017). A novice bilingual teacher's journey: Teacher's noticing as a pathway to negotiate contradictory teaching discourses. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 19(2), 146-161. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18251/ijme.v19i2.1305>
- National Center for Education Statistics (2011). *Schools and Staffing Survey Teacher Questionnaire*.
<https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/pdf/1112/SASS4A.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *2011-12 SASS Methods and procedures*.
<https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/methods1112.asp>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *SASS sample design, weights, variance, and missing data module*. https://nces.ed.gov/training/datauser/SASS_04/assets/SASS_04.pdf
- New Teacher Center. (2016). *High quality mentoring and induction practices*.
https://newteachercenter.org/wp-content/uploads/BRF-HQM-US-1708-EN_final.pdf
- Núñez, I., & Espinoza, K. (2019). Bilingual pre-service teachers' initial experiences: Language ideologies in practice. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 18(3), 228-242.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2017.1386105>
- Office of English Language Acquisition. (2018). *Fast facts: profiles of English learners (ELs)*.

https://ncela.ed.gov/files/fast_facts/Profiles_of_ELs_4.12.18_MM_Final_Edit.pdf

Ovando, M. N., & Casey, P. (2010). Instructional leadership to enhance alternatively certified novice bilingual teachers' capacity. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 4(2), 144-168.

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ942513.pdf>

Pogodzinski, B., Youngs, P., Frank, K. A., & Belman, D. (2012). Administrative climate and novices' intent to remain teaching. *Elementary School Journal*, 113(2), 252-275.

<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/667725>

Raab, R. R. (2018). A statistic's five years: A story of Teacher Attrition. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24(8), 583-591. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417729849>

Raab, R. R. & Billingsley, B. (in review). *The experience of new bilingual and ESL teachers: A review of the literature*.

Raue, K., & Gray, L. (2015). *Career paths of beginning public school teachers: Results from the first through fifth waves of the 2007-2008 beginning teacher longitudinal study*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

<https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015196.pdf>

Reitman, G. C., & Karge, B. D. (2019). Investing in teacher support leads to teacher retention: Six supports administrators should consider for new teachers. *Multicultural Education*, 27(1), 7-18. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1250205.pdf>

Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 401-428. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587691>

Rockoff, J. (2008). *Does mentoring reduce turnover and improve skills of new employees? Evidence from teachers in New York City*. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 13868. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w13868>

Ronfeldt, M., & McQueen, K. (2017). Does new teacher induction really improve retention? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 68(4), 394-410. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117702583>

Ronfeldt, M., & Reininger, M. (2012). More or better student teaching? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28 (8), 1091-1106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.06.003>

- Ronfeldt, M., Schwartz, N., Jacob, B. A. (2014). Does preservice preparation matter? Examining an old question in new ways. *Teachers College Record*, 116, 1-46.
<https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=17604>
- Schmidt, R., Young, V., Cassidy, L., Wang, H., & Laguarda, K. (2017). *Impact of the new teacher center's new teacher induction model on teachers and students*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. <https://www.sri.com/publication/impact-of-the-new-teacher-centers-new-teacher-induction-model-on-teachers-and-students/>
- Smith, T.M. and Ingersoll, R.M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 681-714.
<https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00028312041003681>
- TESOL International Association (February, 2016). *The preparation of the ESL educator in the era of college and career readiness standards: A summary of the TESOL International Association convening*. https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/advocacy/ccr-standards-convening_final2.pdf?sfvrsn=2&sfvrsn=2
- Tigert, J. M., & Percy, M. M. (2018). Preparing to teach both content and language: Four ESOL teacher candidates' experiences. *TESOL Journal*, 9(3), 542-556.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.358>
- Torres-Guzmán, M. E., & Goodwin, A. L. (1995). Urban bilingual teachers and mentoring for the future. *Education and Urban Society*, 28(1), 48-66.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013124595028001005>
- Tourkin, S., Thomas, T., Swaim, N., Cox, S., Parmer, R., Jackson, B., . . . Zhang, B. (2010). *Documentation for the 2007–08 Schools and Staffing Survey* (NCES 2010-332). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.
<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2020). *Teacher shortage areas*.
<https://tsa.ed.gov/#/reports>
- Varghese, M. M. (2006). Bilingual teachers-in-the-making in urbantown. *Journal of Multilingual*

and *Multicultural Development*, 27(3), 211-224.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630608668776>

Varghese, M. M. (2008). Using cultural models to unravel how bilingual teachers enact language policies. *Language and Education*, 22(5), 289-306.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780802152671>

Varghese, M. M., & Stritikus, T. (2005). “Nadie me dijo (nobody told me”): Language policy negotiation and implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(1), 73-87. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487104272709>

Varghese, M. M., & Synder, R. (2018). Critically examining the agency and professional identity development of novice dual language teachers through figured worlds. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 12(3), 145-159.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2018.1474060>

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143-178. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00346543054002143>

Wong, J. W., Athanases, S. Z., & Banes, L. C. (2020). Developing as an agentic bilingual teacher: self-reflexive and student-learning inquiry as teacher education resources. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(2), 153-169.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/author/Athanases%2C+Steven+Z>

Yeh, C. (2017). Math is more than numbers: Beginning bilingual teachers’ mathematics teaching practices and their opportunities to learn. *Journal of Urban Mathematics Education*, 10(2), 106-139. <https://doi.org/10.21423/jume-v10i2a328>

Youngs, P., Jones, N., & Low, M. (2011). How beginning special and general education elementary teachers negotiate role expectations and access professional resources. *Teachers College Record*, 113(7), 1506-1540. <https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=16097>

Chapter 4

What Predicts ESL/Bilingual Teachers' Perceptions of Mentors Improving First-Year Teaching?

New teachers who experience “a sense of success” in their early careers are more confident and satisfied in their career choice (Johnson & Birkland, 2003, p. 609). This sense of success comes seeing students learn and grow. Many new teachers, however, struggle and do not feel this “sense of success” (Johnson & Birkland, 2003, p. 609). In response to the challenges new teachers experience, many schools and districts provide mentors to guide and support their transition into the profession. Mentoring is one of the most common induction supports provided to new K-12 teachers in U.S. public schools (Goldrick, 2016; Raue & Gray, 2015; Ronfeldt & McQueen, 2017), and some states require that new teachers be assigned mentors (e.g., California, Hawaii, Ohio; Goldrick, 2016).

Mentoring’s popularity is based at least in part on the correlations between mentoring and improved teacher retention (e.g., Raue & Gray, 2015; Ronfeldt & McQueen, 2017). Other studies have found correlations between mentoring and instructional effectiveness (e.g., Schmidt et al., 2017). Therefore, researchers, policymakers, and school leaders generally view mentoring as a support that helps “mitigate the well documented... ‘reality shock’ of new teachers” (Hobson et al., 2009, p. 208) while facilitating instructional growth (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011).

It is concerning that few researchers study the mentoring experiences of new English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual teachers (e.g., Sosa & Gonzales, 1993; Kissau & King, 2015). Not only are there shortages of these teachers (Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995; U.S. Department of Education, 2020), this group of educators has the highest rate of attrition in the field of education (Carver-Thomas & Darling Hammond, 2017). Moreover, the students these teachers work with, multilingual learners (MLLs), have low graduation rates which indicate a need for effective ESL/bilingual teachers to help improve their educational outcomes (Office of English Language Acquisition, 2018).

For this study, mentoring is defined as,

the one-to-one support of a novice or less experienced practitioner (mentee) by a more experienced practitioner (mentor), designed primarily to assist the development of the mentee's expertise and to facilitate their induction into the culture of the profession...and into the specific local context. (Hobson et al., 2009 p. 207)

Mentoring is also a part of induction, a system of broader supports that include orientations, new teacher meetings, professional development, and evaluation (Billingsley et al., 2009; Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). This study focuses on mentoring for new ESL/bilingual teachers as it has the potential to mitigate early career challenges, improve instructional effectiveness, and reduce attrition (Goldrick, 2016).

Conceptual Framework & Review of the Literature

Mentoring is part of the continuum of teacher development. According to Ingersoll and Strong (2011), the process of teacher development includes “preservice preparation, induction, improved classroom teaching practices and teacher retention, and improved student learning and growth” (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011, p. 203). The induction phase, which includes mentoring, should focus on the instructional aspects of new teachers’ work since a major goal of mentoring is “improving a teacher’s practice” (Matsko, et al., 2020, p. 42). Mentoring is thus a support that “*when done right* [emphasis added] can stabilize the shifting ground on which new teachers try to stand” (Kardos & Johnson, 2010, p. 24).

New ESL/bilingual teachers often find themselves on “shifting ground” as their first years can be pedagogically challenging, physically isolating, and socially marginalizing (Kardos & Johnson, 2010, p. 24; Raab & Billingsley, in review). These teachers must provide language and content-area instruction to an extremely diverse group of MLLs with varied academic and socio-emotional needs (Solis, 2004). Additionally, they must learn to co-teach and collaborate with general educators and administrators some of whom hold deficit-based thoughts or ideas about MLLs’ academic and language abilities (e.g., Motha, 2014). ESL/bilingual teachers must furthermore navigate complex socio-political contexts where state and district level beliefs about MLLs’ education dictate instruction (i.e. English-only policies which prohibit the use of

bilingual programs; Alfaro, 2018; Heineke, 2017, 2018). Moreover, many of these educators lack resources and supports that other new teachers find helpful (i.e., strong colleague and administrative support, curricular resources; Raab & Billingsley, in review). When combined, these conditions can create stressful job situations as well as isolation and marginalization for both new ESL/bilingual teachers and their students (Raab & Billingsley, in review). As in general and special education (e.g., Billingsley, et al., 2009; Kardos & Johnson, 2010), ESL/bilingual researchers and leaders have emphasized that mentoring can help new teachers transition and thrive in the field (Torres-Guzmán, 1996; Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995; Kissau & King, 2015; Raab & Billingsley, in review; Sosa & Gonzales, 1993).

Mentoring “Done Right”

What aspects of mentoring improve instruction and how do we know they are helping new teachers? General education researchers have studied specific components of mentoring including same-subject mentor pairings, the frequency of mentoring, and specific mentoring activities (e.g., co-planning, help with student assessment; DeAngelis et al., 2013; Kardos & Johnson, 2010; Ronfeldt & McQueen, 2017). Even so, few studies addressing these aspects of mentoring among ESL/bilingual teachers have been done. What is known about new ESL/bilingual mentoring comes from qualitative and mixed methods studies (see Raab & Billingsley, in review) and reports of different mentoring programs in the field (Solis, 2004; Sosa & Gonzales, 1993; TESOL, 2016). Below, I discuss these aspects of mentoring and highlight findings from general, special, and ESL/bilingual education research.

Same-Subject Mentors

Researchers recommend that mentors and mentees share the same subject area (i.e., ESL, science, special education) or at least grade level (i.e., 6th grade; Billingsley et al., 2009; DeAngelis, et al., 2013; Kardos & Johnson, 2010). This is because mentors and mentees should share resources, co-plan, discuss instructional decisions and strategies, create and reflect on assessments, and engage in meaningful conversations regarding students (Bullough, 2012; Huling & Resta, 2007). In their study of new teachers ($n = 1,159$), DeAngelis et al., (2013),

found that “matching new teachers with mentors from the same subject area provides more benefit than mentoring by teachers from different subject areas or no mentoring at all” (DeAngelis, et al., 2013, p. 351). Smith and Ingersoll (2004) used Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) data and found that having a same-subject mentor decreased the likelihood of teachers leaving their current school and the profession.

Scholars in the ESL/bilingual field have acknowledged the benefits of same-subject mentor/mentee pairings (e.g., sharing resources, co-planning, engaging in conversations about language and academic learning (Kissau & King, 2015; Torres-Guzmán, 1996; Torres-Guzman & Goodwin, 1995), and some qualitative researchers indicate that when same-subject pairings occur, mentoring is focused on ESL/bilingual education (Arce, 2004; Kissua & King, 2015; Sosa & Gonzales, 1993; Yeh, 2017). Leaders in the field are cognizant of the potential challenge of finding experienced mentors since schools/districts may not employ many experienced ESL/bilingual teachers (Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995). Recent research using SASS data indicates that approximately two-thirds of new ESL/bilingual teachers have same-subject mentors nationwide (Raab, 2020).

Frequency of Mentoring

Mentoring should occur frequently. The New Teacher Center (NTC), a nonprofit that works with school districts across the U.S. to improve new teachers’ experiences, provides a specific recommendation which suggests that “mentors and beginning teachers should have 1.25-2.5 hours per week to allow for the most rigorous mentoring activities” (2016, p. 1). Researchers have found that more frequent mentoring increases organizational commitment (e.g., Hong & Matsko, 2019), strengthens perceptions that mentors are helpful (e.g. DeAngelis, et al., 2013), and improves student achievement (e.g., Fletcher et al., 2008; Rockoff, 2008).

Allocated time for mentees and mentors to meet with each other is key to frequent mentoring (NTC, 2016) and research has suggested that schools provide release time and coverage for teachers to engage in mentoring activities (DeCesare et al., 2016; Hobson et al., 2009). It appears, however, that mentors continue to teach full-time with no release time for

mentoring in many states (DeCesare et al., 2016; Goldrick, 2016) which likely reduces opportunities for mentoring.

Few researchers have explored new ESL/bilingual teachers' frequency of mentoring (Raab & Billingsley, in review). In one of the studies that did address frequent mentoring, Arce (2004) described a relationship between a bilingual mentor and mentee that resulted in daily instructional interactions. Examples like this, however, are few and far between. Raab (2020) found that that of the 5,050 new ESL/bilingual teachers who had mentors in the 2011-2012 SASS, only 39.2% met with their mentors at least once a week compared to 61.9% of general educators (i.e., math, science, social studies, and English/language arts). This shows a major disparity between teacher groups.

Mentoring Activities

Professional groups and researchers suggest that mentoring activities should focus more on instruction rather than simply being geared towards acclimating teachers to their new schools or providing emotional support (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Israel et al., 2014; NTC, 2016; Wexler, 2020). The NTC further explains,

In the past, and still in many places, a mentor assumed the role of “buddy,” lending an empathetic ear and offering a kind and supportive role. While emotional support is important to building trust, to accelerate beginning teacher growth, mentors must do much more. (2016, p.1)

Thus, instructionally focused mentoring activities should help new teachers critically reflect on lesson planning and delivery as well as student learning and growth. This can involve mentors/mentees co-planning lessons, co-developing assessment tools, and/or demonstrating lessons (Young et al., 2017). Additionally, mentoring activities can include assisting new teachers with routine paperwork/record keeping. This is especially important for some new teachers (e.g., special educators) who have intensive compliance responsibilities involving sensitive paperwork/records (e.g., IEPs; Billingsley et al., 2009).

Researchers have found that instructionally focused mentoring has positive effects on both student achievement (Schmidt et al., 2017; Young et al., 2017) and new teachers' intent to remain teaching in their current schools (Kapadia et al., 2007). A recent study evaluating the NTC's mentoring model (which included mentoring focused on lesson planning and assessment) found that after two years of NTC mentoring, teachers who participated had students who showed statistically significant gains in math and English/language arts scores (Young et al., 2017). Additionally, Kapadia et al. (2007) found new elementary and high school teachers with mentors in Chicago Public Schools were more likely to intend to stay in their schools when they had instructionally focused mentoring activities, specifically "analyzing student work" (p. 27).

Although the mentoring activities of new ESL/bilingual teachers have received limited attention, a few qualitative studies provide evidence that mentors plan with and assist new teachers with instructional tasks (e.g., Arce, 2004; Sosa & Gonzales, 1993). In one of the few studies to address mentoring activities, researchers examined the logs of 25 bilingual mentors in Texas and found that they addressed the following:

instructional assistance and planning; classroom management; campus and district procedures; instructional materials; Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS) observations or evaluations; discipline management decisions; assessing, testing, or grading issues; parent conferences or parent involvement; new teacher anxiety; professional advice and assistance; instructional aides; TEA [Texas Education Agency] audit/compliance, and miscellaneous. (Sosa & Gonzales, 1993, p. 18)

This list highlights mentoring activities with an instructional focus. It also suggests that new ESL/bilingual teachers may need help with compliance tasks such as paperwork/record keeping as some find these tasks challenging during the first year (Raab & Billingsley, in review).

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to investigate which mentoring components predicted the extent to which new ESL/bilingual teachers perceived that their mentors improved their first-year teaching. I used a nationally representative weighted sample of new ESL/bilingual teachers from

the 2015-2016 National Teacher and Principals Survey (NTPS), providing the field with generalizable results about what components of mentoring predicted new ESL/bilingual teachers' perceptions that their mentors improved their teaching in the first year. The following questions guide this study:

Research Question 1: How many new ESL/bilingual teachers were assigned a mentor in their first year, and of those assigned a mentor, what were their experiences with their mentors?

Research Question 2: What components of mentoring predict the extent to which new ESL/bilingual teachers perceived their mentors as improving their teaching in the first year?

Method

Instrumentation

The NTPS is a redesign of the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS). SASS was administered seven times from 1987-1988 to 2011-2012, and the NTPS administered the survey every two years with the first time being in the 2015-2016 school year (Goldring et al., 2017). The 2015-2016 NTPS only collected data on public and charter schools with the overall goal to “collect information that can provide a detailed picture of U.S. elementary and secondary schools and their staff” (Goldring et al., 2017, p. 2). The current study uses data from the restricted-use data file from the NTPS Teacher Questionnaire. To collect data from public school teachers during the 2015-2016 school year, “NTPS employed a combined mail-based and internet survey approach, with subsequent telephone and in person field follow-up” and had a weighed overall response rate of 57.2% (Goldring et al., 2017, p. 6).

Data in the NTPS was weighted with the Public School teacher sampling weight variables because “using final interview weights whenever computing population estimates or doing analyses helps ensure unbiased population estimates” (Goldring et al., 2017, p. 14). The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and Institute of Education Statistics (IES)

specify that to maintain respondent anonymity, researchers must round all n 's to the nearest 10. Due to rounding, data presented in tables and findings may not equal the total N when added.

Sample

The sample consists of all regular and itinerant full-and part-time ESL/bilingual teachers with 3 or less years of consecutive teaching experience in any grades (i.e., K-12 or comparable ungraded levels) who selected that they had mentors. New teachers were selected using the NCES/IES variable (NEWTCH). ESL/bilingual teachers were disaggregated from the full sample through their responses to NTPS Question 2-4, "this school year, what is your MAIN teaching assignment field at THIS school, that is, the subject matter in which you teach the most classes?" (NCES, 2015, p.7). Only new teachers who selected the codes under the subject-matter specific category of English as Second Language (ESL) were included (i.e., 160-ESL or bilingual education: general; 161-ESL or bilingual education: Spanish; 162-ESL or bilingual education: other languages). Only new ESL/bilingual teachers who selected "yes" to having a mentor assigned to them by their school/district (i.e., NTPS Question 5-7a, item 1523) were included in the sample. Table 1 includes the sample characteristics including a full sample mean and weighted n for the measures in the study.

Table 1

Sample Characteristics of New ESL/Bilingual Teachers with Mentors (n = 9110)

	New ESL/Bilingual Teachers		
	Mean	SD	Range
Mentor Frequency	1.59	0.77	1-3
Same-Subject Mentor	0.67	0.47	0-1
Helped with Paperwork	0.55	0.50	0-1
Demonstrated Lessons	0.56	0.50	0-1
Helped prepare lessons	0.68	0.47	0-1
Developed Assessment Tools	0.50	0.50	0-1

Mentor Improved Teaching	2.77	1.0	1-4
--------------------------	------	-----	-----

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey, “Public School Teacher Data File,” 2015-2016.

Variables Analyzed

The following variables were analyzed with descriptive statistics and linear regression. Table 2 includes a comprehensive variable specification chart with a description of each variable, NTPS item numbers, and survey response options.

Teacher Assignment

New teachers were categorized as new ESL/bilingual teachers if they selected ESL as the main teaching assignment (see Table 2).

Assigned a Mentor/Master Teacher

To determine the number of new ESL/bilingual teachers with mentors, teachers who selected “yes” to NTPS question 5-7a—“In your FIRST year of teaching, were you assigned a master or mentor teacher by your school or district,”—were selected (NCES, 2015, p. 25). Those who selected “no”, skipped the remaining questions on mentoring and were not included in the sample for this study.

Frequency of Mentoring

All new ESL/bilingual teachers with mentors indicated the frequency of their mentoring activities. Teachers selected from four choices: *at least once a week*, *once or twice a month*, *a few times a year*, or *never*. For the regression, this variable was recoded so that 1 indicated having weekly mentoring and 0 indicated the remaining three options.

Same-Subject Mentor

New ESL/bilingual teachers with mentors also responded to whether their mentor had same-subject area experience. New teachers responded “yes” or “no”. Responses were dummy coded with a 1 representing “yes” and a 0 representing “no”.

Mentor Provided Supports

New teachers with mentors also answered a series of questions about specific mentor provided supports. NTPS 5-8 asks, “Did your assigned master or mentor teacher provide the following types of support during your FIRST year of teaching?” (NCES, 2015, p. 25). Teachers responded “yes” or “no” to four mentor-provided supports (see Table 2). Responses were dummy coded with a 1 representing teachers who responded “yes” and a 0 representing “no”.

Extent of Mentor Improving First-Year Teaching

The outcome variable of this study was NTPS question 5-9: “Overall, to what extent did your assigned master or mentor teacher improve your teaching in your first year of teaching?” (NCES, 2015, p. 25). New teachers responded by assigning one of four values to their perception of the extent to which their mentors improved their teaching: *not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, and to a great extent*. High scores indicate teachers’ perceptions that mentors improved their teaching to a greater extent.

Table 2

Variable Specification Chart

Measure	Questionnaire Items	Response Options
Main Teaching Assignment	This school year, in what subject is your MAIN teaching assignment at THIS school, that is, the subject matter in which you teach the most classes? (0217)	ESL is indicated by codes (160-162)
Experience	NCES/IES created variable (NEWTCH) 3 or fewer years of teaching experience	Indicates 3 or fewer years of teaching
Gender	Are you male or female? (0924)	0 Male; 1 Female
Age	What is your year of birth? (0934)	Teachers indicate year of birth.
School Level	NCES/IES created variable (SHCLEVEL)	0 = elementary; 1 = secondary
Race/Ethnicity	NCES/IES created variable (RACETH-T) Combines the following:	White; Black/African-American; Hispanic/Latino; Asian; American India/Alaska Native; Other Pacific

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin? (0928; yes/no) • What is your race? (0929-0933; White, Black or African-American, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaska Native) 	Islander/Native Hawaiian; Two or more races
Degree Attainment	NCES/IES created variable (HIDEGR)	Recorded: 1 for masters or higher; 0 for bachelors or lower
Certification	Which of the following describe the teaching certificate you currently hold that certified you to teach in this state? (0401)	Recorded: 1 for Full Cert (response options 1-2); 0 for Not Full Cert (response options 3-5)
Alternative certification	Did you enter teaching through an alternative route to certification program? (0400)	1 Yes; 0 No
Participate in mentor program	In your FIRST year of teaching, were you assigned a master or mentor teacher by your school or district? (1523)	1 Yes; 0 No
Mentor frequency	How frequently did you work with your master or mentor teacher during your first year of teaching? (1524)	Recorded: 1 for At least once a week; 0 for Once or twice a month, a few times a year, never
Mentor-same subject area	Had your mentor teacher ever instructed students in the same subject area(s) as yours? (1525)	1 Yes; 0 No
Paperwork/record keeping	Helped with paperwork or record keeping (1526)	1 Yes; 0 No
Demonstrate Lessons	Demonstrated lessons (1527)	1 Yes; 0 No
Prepare lessons	Helped you prepare lessons that address learning standards (1528)	1 Yes; 0 No
Student assessment tools	Helped you develop student assessment tools (1529)	1 Yes; 0 No
Mentor improved first year teaching	Overall, to what extent did your assigned master or mentor teacher improve your teaching in your first year of teaching? (1530)	1 Not at all; 2 To a small extent; 3 To a moderate extent; 4 To a great extent

Note. NCES = National Center for Education Statistics; IES = Institute for Education Statistics

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey, “Public School Teacher Data File,” 2015-2016.

Procedures

This secondary analysis of the 2015-16 NTPS restricted-use data used AM Statistical Software Beta Version 0.06.04 (American Institutes for Research) and SPSS 23.0. A linear regression model was built to predict the number of new teachers reporting that their mentors improved their first-year teaching as a function of mentor frequency, same-subject mentor/mentee matching, and mentor activities (i.e., helped with paperwork/record keeping, demonstrated lessons, helped teachers plan standards-based lessons, and helped in developing student assessment tools). The model was run using AM Statistical Software Beta Version 0.06.04 (American Institutes for Research), and the data in the NTPS was weighted to generate a nationally representative sample. The NTPS files utilized the Jackknife 2 methodology and used the final teacher sampling weight and the 200 replicate weights (Goldring et al., 2017).

To answer research question 1, descriptive statistics were analyzed and provided the percentage of new ESL/bilingual teachers assigned mentors. Teachers not receiving mentoring were excluded from the analysis. From teachers assigned a mentor, I examined the descriptive statistics of each type of mentoring component including the frequency of mentoring, same-subject mentor pairings, specific mentor activities, and the extent to which teachers perceived mentors as improving their first-year of teaching. I report results in percentages (see Tables 5-7).

For research question 2, a linear regression model was employed (Keith, 2019; Table 8). The outcome (i.e. dependent) variable was *teachers’ perception of the extent to which their mentor improved their teaching in their first year*. Predictor (i.e., independent) variables included the following: frequency of mentoring, same-subject mentor/mentee pairings, and the four mentor activities described above and in Table 2.

Results

I begin my discussion of the results by providing demographic and preparation characteristics of new ESL/bilingual teachers with mentors. I then provide findings for both research questions which reveal new teachers' experiences with specific mentoring components and the influence of these components on predicting the extent to which new teachers perceived that their mentors improved their teaching in the first year.

Demographic and Preparation Characteristics

Of the weighted sample of new ESL/bilingual teachers in the 2015-16 NTPS dataset, 68.2% were assigned mentors. Table 3 provides the demographic characteristics of these new teachers with mentors. A higher percentage taught in elementary (68.3%) than secondary schools (31.7%). Regarding gender, which the NTPS only categorizes as male or female, a higher percentage were female than male (81.8% and 18.2%, respectively). New teachers' average age was 30.74 years, and their average experience was 1.97 years. Ninety percent were fully certified, 26.4% entered teaching through an alternative certification program, and 40.5% held a master's degree or higher.

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of New ESL/Bilingual Teachers with Mentors

New ESL/Bilingual Teachers		
Weighted n = 9,110		
School Level	Elementary 68.3%	Secondary 31.7%
Gender	Male 18.2%	Female 81.8%
Age	M=30.74 SD=7.72 Range=22-60 Median=29.0	

Years of Experience	M=1.97 SD=0.80 Range=1-3 Median=2.0
---------------------	--

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey, “Public School Teacher Data File,” 2015-2016.

Table 4 provides the race/ethnicity of new teachers with mentors. The racial/ethnic categories/terminology mirror the language of the NTPS survey. Overall, approximately 57% of new teachers were White and 43% were teachers of color. Of the teachers of color, approximately 24.9% identified as Hispanic, 6.9% Black, 5.8% Asian, 2.1% American Indian/Alaskan, 1.9% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and 1.5% two or more race/ethnicities.

Table 4

Race/ethnicity of New ESL/Bilingual Teachers with Mentors

New ESL/Bilingual Teachers	
Weighted N = 9110	
American Indian/Alaskan	2.1%
Asian	5.8%
Black	6.9%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1.9%
Hispanic	24.9%
White	56.9%
Two or more	1.5%

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey, “Public School Teacher Data File,” 2015-2016.

ESL/Bilingual Teachers’ Experiences with Mentoring

I next looked at specific components of mentoring to determine the extent to which they were provided (see Table 5). Almost 60% of teachers indicated that they met with their mentors *once or more a week* while 23.9% met their mentor *once or twice a month*, and 17.6% met a *few times a year*.

Table 5

Frequency of Mentoring

New ESL/Bilingual Teachers with Mentors Weighted N = 9110	
Once or more a week	58.5%
Once or twice a month	23.9%
Few times a year	17.6%
Total	100%

SOURCE U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey, "Public School Teacher Data File," 2015-2016.

Table 6 provides a summary of the mentoring components provided to new ESL/bilingual teachers. Teachers were asked to indicate if their mentor had same-subject experience, and whether mentors demonstrated lessons and helped with paperwork, standards-based lesson preparation, and developing student assessment tools. As Table 6 shows, the two most frequently provided mentoring components were having a same-subject mentor (67.7%) and receiving mentor help with preparing standards-based lessons (i.e., 67.5%). A smaller percentage received lesson demonstrations (i.e., 55.6%) and help with paperwork (i.e., 54.9%). The component least likely to be provided was help with developing student assessment tools (i.e., only half reported receiving this support). In summary, about a third of new ESL/bilingual teachers did not have access to a mentor in their subject area, and a third to a half of ESL/bilingual teachers did not participate in key mentoring activities.

Table 6

Mentoring Components of New ESL/Bilingual Teachers with Mentors

	New ESL/Bilingual Teachers Weighted N = 9,110	
	Yes	No
Assigned mentor with experience in the same subject area	67.7%	33.3%

Mentor helped prepare standards-based lessons	67.5%	32.5%
Mentor demonstrated lessons	55.6%	44.4%
Mentor helped with paperwork/record keeping	54.9%	45.1%
Mentor helped develop student assessment tools	50.2%	49.8%

Source: Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey, “Public School Teacher Data File,” 2015-2016

As Table 7 shows, over half (i.e., 60.5%) responded that working with their mentor improved their teaching in the first year to a moderate or great extent. However, almost 40% indicated that their mentors had a small (i.e., 27.2%) or no effect at all (i.e., 12.4%) on improving their first-year teaching.

Table 7

Extent of Mentor Improving First Year Teaching

New ESL/Bilingual Teachers	
Weighted N = 9,110	
Not at all	12.4%
Small extent	27.2%
Moderate extent	31.8%
Great extent	28.7%
Total	100%

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey, “Public School Teacher Data File,” 2015-2016.

Predicting the Extent of Mentors Improving First-Year Teaching

To explore which components of mentoring predicted the extent to which new ESL/bilingual teachers perceived their mentors as improving their first year of teaching, a simultaneous multiple regression was conducted (Keith, 2019; see Table 8). The six predictor variables (i.e., frequency, same-subject, helped with paperwork, demonstrated lessons, helped prepare standards-based lessons, and helped develop student assessment tools) explained 53.5% of the variance in new teachers’ perceptions of the extent to which their mentors improved their

teaching in the first year ($R^2 = .535$). Moreover, the overall regression equation was statistically significant; $F(6, 195) = 12.696, p < .001$. Not all six variables were important in the regression. Frequency of mentoring had a statistically significant effect on the outcome variable ($p < .05$) as did mentors who helped with paperwork ($p < .05$) and helped develop student assessment tools ($p < .01$). Conversely, the effect of having a mentor in the same-subject area who demonstrated lessons and helped prepare standards-based lessons were not statistically significant predictors.

Table 8

Regression Results for Extent to which Mentor Improved First-Year Teaching

Constant	1.683*** (0.17)
Frequency of mentoring	0.40* (0.17)
Same-Subject Mentor	-0.19 (0.17)
Assisted with paperwork	0.40* (0.19)
Demonstrated lessons	0.30 (0.18)
Helped prepare standards-based lessons	0.42 (0.28)
Helped develop student assessment tools	0.68** (0.27)
R-squared	0.535

Note. Standard errors are in parentheses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .0001$

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Teacher and Principal Survey, "Public School Teacher Data File," 2015-2016.

Discussion

For the first time, this study provides findings about the specific mentoring components that predict the extent to which new ESL/bilingual teachers perceive their mentors as improving their first year of teaching using nationally representative data. In this discussion, I summarize key findings, discuss this study's contributions, suggest directions for future research, and outline implications for school leaders and policymakers.

I found that between 30-50% new ESL/bilingual teachers did not have same-subject mentors who met with them weekly to engage in key mentoring activities (i.e., help with paperwork/ record keeping, demonstrating lessons, help planning lessons, and help developing student assessment tools). Moreover, I discovered that frequent weekly mentoring, help with paperwork/record keeping, and help developing student assessment tools were positively correlated and statistically significant predictors of the extent to which new ESL/bilingual teachers perceived their mentors as having improved their first-year teaching.

Mentors and mentees should regularly engage in mentoring activities that focus on improving instruction (i.e., lesson planning; Kardos & Johnson, 2010; Wexler, 2020), and mentors should also provide assistance with other work-related needs (i.e., paperwork). Evidence from this study, however, indicates that a number of new ESL/bilingual teachers did not engage in mentoring activities that addressed instruction (i.e., helped prepare standards-based lessons and develop student assessments) or other work related needs (i.e., paperwork/recorded keeping). This is disconcerting as qualitative and mixed methods studies indicate that some new ESL/bilingual teachers struggle with lesson planning (e.g., Casey et al., 2013; Malsbary & Appelgate, 2016), assessing students (e.g., Achinstein & Ogawa, 2011; Musanti, 2017), and paperwork/ record keeping (e.g., Ovando & Casey, 2010, Rodríguez, 2007). Moreover, two of these mentoring activities (i.e., help with paperwork/record keeping and developing student assessment tools) were statistically significant predictors of the extent to which new ESL/bilingual teachers perceived their mentors as improving their first-year teaching. However, only around half of the new teachers in this sample received these two supports.

This study's finding that frequent weekly mentoring is statistically significant in predicting the perception of improved first-year teaching is consistent with findings from other teaching fields. For example, researchers have found that frequent mentoring is a factor in increased organizational commitment (Hong & Matsko, 2019) and in improving student achievement scores in math and English/language arts (Schmidt et al., 2017; Young et al., 2017). However, since 40% of new ESL/bilingual teachers did not have weekly mentoring, this may suggest that either the mentoring of these teachers is not a priority for school systems or that there are not sufficient mentors. Given the need for weekly mentoring, school districts may want to share mentors if experienced bilingual/ESL teachers are not available.

The field is aware that there is likely a limited number of experienced ESL/bilingual teachers available to serve as mentors in some schools (Torres-Guzman & Goodwin, 1995). Moreover, some experienced ESL/bilingual teachers who could serve as mentors may be located in different parts of the school or even in other schools within the district. Thus, virtual mentoring should be considered as an alternative to in-person mentoring.

Although previous research suggests that same-subject mentors influence new teachers' career decisions (DeAngelis et al., 2013; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004), they were not a significant predictor of improved first-year teaching for new ESL/bilingual teachers. This factor was instead negatively correlated which means that having a same-subject mentor decreased the extent to which new ESL/bilingual teachers indicated their mentor improved their first-year teaching. It is possible that this question may be interpreted differently by ESL/bilingual teachers. For example, we cannot know how these teachers interpreted "subject" since they may work across multiple content areas and grade levels. Do they view "subject" as what is taught (i.e., mathematics), grade level (i.e., 4th grade), or teacher group (i.e. ESL/bilingual)? If they interpret it as the latter, it may be the lack of experienced ESL/bilingual teachers available to serve as mentors which contributed to same-subject mentoring being negatively correlated with first-year improvement in teaching (Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995).

Lastly, comparing 2011-12 SASS findings (Raab, 2020) with the 2015-16 NTPS results show some similarities and differences across time. Two-thirds of teachers in both studies reported having same-subject mentors and close to the same percentage (60.3% on SASS 2011-12; 60.5% on NTPS 2015-16) reported that their mentors improved their teaching to a great or moderate extent. In 2015-16, 58.5% of new ESL/bilingual teachers had weekly mentoring compared to 39.2% in 2011-12 which was a major improvement (Raab, 2020). Future researchers should examine the extent to which new ESL/bilingual teachers are provided mentoring supports over multiple years of the SASS and NTPS teacher questionnaires.

Future Research

Future research should consider longitudinal investigations, mentor/mentee pairings, and investigations of specific mentoring components that increase ESL/bilingual teachers' instructional effectiveness and retention.

Longitudinal Investigations

Researchers should consider exploring mentoring in states that have multi-year programs (Goldrick, 2016), and should investigate both how bilingual/ESL teachers' experiences change over the first three years of their careers and how mentoring programs evolve over time. Specifically, researchers should examine the mentor/mentee relationship and focus on how mentoring activities are different from the first to second year or second to third year.

Mentor/Mentee Pairings

Researchers should also investigate mentor/mentee pairings to better understand who is mentoring new ESL/bilingual teachers and whether their mentoring is effective. This research should consider (1) the potential challenge of finding field-specific mentors and (2) their selection and professional development needs (Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995). Researchers should also consider how other professionals outside of K-12 settings could serve as mentors. In their literature review on new ESL/bilingual teachers' experiences and support, Raab and Billingsley (in review) found that some researchers served in mentor-like roles for the participants in their studies. Researchers should thus reflect on the role they play (or could play)

in mentoring new ESL/bilingual teachers and consider collaborating with schools/leaders to provide field specific mentoring (Burke & Dauksas, 2020; Farrell, 2019).

Effects of Mentoring Components

The effect of specific mentoring components on new ESL/bilingual teachers' career decisions and instructional effectiveness should be considered as research has shown a correlation between both mentoring and new teacher retention (e.g., Gray & Taie, 2015; Raue & Gray, 2015) and student achievement (e.g., Schmidt et al., 2017; Young et al., 2017). Federal datasets like the NTPS should continue to be used to explore relationships between new teachers' intent to stay or leave the field and mentoring. Researchers should also consider using state-level data to investigate the effects of mentoring across state-specific contexts. Data from states with specific mentoring policies could be disaggregated to see if new ESL/bilingual teachers' experiences differ from other teachers (i.e., general educators) and whether mentoring has an effect on specific outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, retention, and student achievement).

Implications for Policymakers and School Leaders

Since frequent mentoring, help with developing assessment tools, and help with paperwork/record keeping were significant predictors of first-year improvement, policymakers and school leaders should consider incorporating these activities in their mentoring programs. Additional mentoring activities should be considered to meet the needs of new ESL/bilingual teachers as previous literature suggests that they need help finding instructional resources, assistance in learning to teach both language and content to MLLs with varied language proficiencies, guidance on navigating language policies, and advice on learning to collaborate with general educators (Raab & Billingsley, in review; Sosa & Gonzalez, 1993; Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin 2005). School leaders should therefore ensure mentors are able to help mentees with field specific teaching tasks, and policymakers should consider addressing the need to differentiate mentoring for ESL/bilingual teachers in state policies.

School leaders need to carefully consider who is selected and prepared to mentor new ESL/bilingual teachers. Those in charge of mentor selection should consider whether (1) the

mentor has experience working in the field and/or with MLLs and whether (2) the mentor has experience teaching the grade level(s) and content area(s) the new teacher is assigned to teach. For example, while a field specific mentor would be the ideal (DeAngelis et al., 2013), effective mentor/mentee pairings could involve a mentor outside the ESL/bilingual field as long as the mentor has experience teaching the same grade/content along with MLLs. This would help new ESL/bilingual teachers who feel unprepared for content instruction or lack experience with specific grade levels (Tigert & Peercy, 2018; Varghese & Synder, 2018).

Every effort should also be made to ensure mentor/mentee accessibility. School leaders need to consider mentor/mentees' schedules and physical locations within schools/districts. Raab and Billingsley (in review) found that some new ESL/bilingual teachers' classrooms are not easily accessible by others in their schools (i.e., located in basements, modular units outside the main building) or that teachers are itinerant (i.e., they travel between several schools; George, 2009; Liggett, 2010). Both of these conditions could strain the mentor/mentee relationship. These professionals should therefore be in the same building. If they cannot be in the same building, release time for travel between schools should be provided. Moreover, allocated and protected time for e-mentoring may need to be considered as an alternative to in-person meetings (Burke & Dauksas, 2020).

Limitations

Several limitations are worth noting. First, this study is limited to the questions and forced-choice responses in the 2015-16 NTPS Teacher Questionnaire, and many important areas of mentoring were not included on the questionnaire (e.g., advocacy, working with parents, implementing language policy, finding appropriate bilingual resources, co-teaching and collaboration, leading professional development for other teachers; Baecher, 2012a; 2012b; Sosa & Gonzales, 1993; Torres-Guzmán & Goodwin, 1995). Observational and qualitative studies are therefore needed to provide more detailed descriptions of the mentoring of ESL/bilingual teachers. These studies should also look at how mentoring improves practice.

Second, mentoring is relational and contextual. The survey did not provide opportunities for mentees/mentors to comment on the nature of their relationship or how mentors both in and out of the field supported new teachers. Furthermore, this study did not consider contextual factors such as teachers' school level (i.e., elementary or secondary), school poverty (i.e., % of students on free and reduced lunch), or urbanicity (i.e., urban, rural, suburban). All of these are areas for future research.

Finally, I used the extent to which new teachers perceived that their mentor improved their first-year teaching as evidence of what matters to them about mentoring. However, the relationship between specific mentoring components and what is most beneficial for improving instructional practice requires additional research.

Conclusion

Twenty-five years ago, Torres-Guzmán and Goodwin (1995) wrote, “mentoring programs will no doubt become especially significant in terms of recruitment and retention of bilingual [and ESL] teachers because school systems will not be able to afford the loss of even one bilingual [or ESL] teacher” (p. 61). Unfortunately, high attrition and shortages are challenges in the field today (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond; U.S. Department of Education, 2020). This study shows that not all teachers are receiving mentoring they believe will improve their instruction. It is therefore imperative that teacher educators, school leaders, and policymakers commit time and resources to ensure ESL/bilingual mentoring is “done right” (Kardos & Johnson, 2010, p. 24). New ESL/bilingual teacher effectiveness, satisfaction, and retention, as well as the success of MLLs across the U.S., are at stake.

References

- Achinstein, B., & Athanases, S.Z. (Eds.). (2006). *Mentors in the making: Developing new leaders for new teachers*. Teachers College Press.
- Achinstein, B. & Ogawa, R. T. (2011). Change(d) agents: School contexts and the cultural/professional roles of new teachers of Mexican descent. *Teachers College Record*, 113(11), 2503-2551. <https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=16109>
- Achinstein, B. & Ogawa, R. T. (2012). New teachers of color and culturally responsive teaching in an era of educational accountability: Caught in a double bind. *Journal of Educational Change*, 13, 1-39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-011-9165-y>
- Alfaro, C. (2018). The sociopolitical struggle and promise of bilingual teacher education: Past present, and future. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 413-427. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1540367>
- Arce, J. (2004). Latino bilingual teachers: The struggle to sustain an emancipatory pedagogy in public schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 17(2), 227-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390310001653880>
- Baecher, L. (2012a). Feedback from the field: What novice preK-12 ESL teachers want to tell TESOL teacher educators. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(3), 578-588. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.43>
- Baecher, L. (2012b). Pathways to teacher leadership among English-as-a-second-language teachers: professional development by and for emerging teacher leaders. *Professional Development in Education*, 38(2), 317-330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2012.657877>
- Billingsley, B., Griffin, C., Smith, S.J., Kamman, M., & Israel, M. (2009). *A review of teacher induction in special education: Research, practice, and technology solutions*. University of Florida, National Center to Inform Policy and Practice in Special Education Development (NCIPP Doc. No. RS-1ES). http://ncipp.org/reports/rs_1es.pdf
- Bullough, R. V. (2012). Mentoring and new teacher induction in the United States: A review and analysis of current practices. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 20(1), 57-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2012.645600>

- Burke, L., & Dauksas, L. (2020). The old college try: Can't find good mentors for new special education teachers in your area? Look to colleges and universities. *Principal*, 99(3).
<https://www.naesp.org/principal-januaryfebruary-2020-special-education/old-college-try>
- Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from
<https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/teacher-turnover-report>
- Casey, P., Dunlap, K., Brister, H., Davidson, M., & Starrett, T. M. (2013). Sink or swim? Throw us a life jacket! Novice alternatively certified bilingual and special education teachers deserve options. *Education and Urban Society*, 45(3), 287-306.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013124511408075>
- DeAngelis, K. J., Wall, A. F., & Che, J. (2013). The impact of preservice preparation and early career support on novice teachers' career intentions and decisions. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(4), 338-355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487113488945>
- DeCesare, D., Workman, S., & McClelland, A. (2016). *How do school districts mentor new teachers? (REL 2016-125)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Central. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2019). 'My training has failed me': Inconvenient truths about second language teacher education (SLTE). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 22(4), 1-16.
<http://tesl-ej.org/pdf/ej88/a1.pdf>
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). Helping novices learn to teach lessons from an exemplary support teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 17-30.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487101052001003>
- Fletcher, S., Strong, M., & Villar, A. (2008). An investigation of the effects of variations in mentor-based induction on the performance of students in California. *Teachers College Record*, 110(10), 2271-2289. <https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentID=14719>

- Goldrick, L. (2016). *Support from the start: A 50-state review of policies on new educator induction and mentoring*. New Teacher Center. <https://newteachercenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2016CompleteReportStatePolicies.pdf>
- Goldring, R., Taie, S., Rizzo, L., and Riddles, M. (2017). User's manual for the 2015–16 National Teacher and Principal Survey, Volume 1: Overview (NCES 2017–131). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Gray, L., and Taie, S. (2015). *Public school teacher attrition and mobility in the first five years: Results from the first through fifth waves of the 2007–08 beginning teacher longitudinal study* (NCES 2015-337). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015337.pdf>
- Heineke, A.J. (2017). *Restrictive language policy in practice: English learners in Arizona*. Multilingual Matters.
- Heineke, A. J. (2018). The invisible revolving door: The issue of teacher attrition in English language development classrooms in Arizona. *Language Policy*, 17, 77-98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-016-9428-9>
- Hong, Y., & Matsko, K. K. (2019). Looking inside and outside of mentoring: Effect on new teachers' organizational commitment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 56(6), 2368-2407. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219843657>
- Huling, L. & Resta, V. (2007). *CREATE teacher induction study: The relationship of mentor support to novice teacher retention and student achievement. Phase II report*. Center for Research, Evaluation, and Advancement of Teacher Education. <https://uh.edu/education/research/institutes-centers/create/reports-pub/>
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0034654311403323>
- Israel, M., Kamman, M.L., McCray, E.D, & Sindelar, P.T. (2014). Mentoring in action: The interplay among professional assistance, emotional support, and evaluation. *Exceptional*

Children, 81(1), 45-63. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0014402914532231>

Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a “sense of success”: New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 581-617.

<https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00028312040003581>

Kardos, S. M., & Johnson, S. M. (2010). New teachers’ experiences of mentoring: The good, the bad, and the inequity. *Journal of Educational Change*, 11, 23-44.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-008-9096-4>

Kapadia, K., Coca, V., Easton, J. (2007). *Keeping new teachers: A first look at the influences of induction in the Chicago Public Schools*. Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago. [https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/2018-](https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/2018-10/keeping_new_teachers012407.pdf)

[10/keeping_new_teachers012407.pdf](https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/2018-10/keeping_new_teachers012407.pdf)

Keith, T. Z. (2019). *Multiple regression and beyond* (3rd edition). Routledge.

Kissau, S. P. & King, E. T. (2015). Peer mentoring second language teachers: A mutually beneficial experience? *Foreign Language Annuals*, 48(1), 143-160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12121>

Malsbary, C. B., & Appelgate, M. H. (2016). Working downstream: A beginning EL teacher negotiating policy and practice. *Language Policy*, 15, 27-47. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9347-6)

[014-9347-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9347-6)

Matsko, K. K., Ronfeldt, M., Nolan, H. G., Klugman, J., Reininger, M., & Brockman, S. L. (2020). Cooperating teacher as model and coach: What leads to student teachers’ perceptions of preparedness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 2020, 71(1), 41-62.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118791992>

National Center for Education Statistics (2015). *National Teacher and Principal Survey*.

https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ntps/pdf/1516/Teacher_Questionnaire_2015-16.pdf

New Teacher Center. (2016). *High quality mentoring and induction practices*.

https://newteachercenter.org/wp-content/uploads/BRF-HQM-US-1708-EN_final.pdf

Office of English Language Acquisition. (2018). *Fast facts: National and state level high school graduation rates for English learners*.

https://ncela.ed.gov/files/fast_facts/GraduationRatesFactSheet.pdf

Ovando, M. N., & Casey, P. (2010). Instructional leadership to enhance alternatively certified novice bilingual teachers' capacity. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 4(2), 144-168.

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ942513.pdf>

Raab, R. R. (2020). *New ESL and bilingual teachers' induction experiences in U.S. Schools*. Unpublished manuscript.

Raab, R. R. & Billingsley, B. (in review). *The experience of new bilingual and ESL teachers: A review of the literature*.

Raue, K., & Gray, L. (2015). *Career paths of beginning public school teachers: Results from the first through fifth waves of the 2007-2008 beginning teacher longitudinal study*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

<https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015196.pdf>

Rockoff, J. (2008). *Does mentoring reduce turnover and improve skills of new employees? Evidence from teachers in New York City*. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 13868. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w13868>

Rodríguez, M. V. (2007). From paraeducator to teacher: Perceptions of the 1st year of teaching. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 20(1), 51-66. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ833535>

Ronfeldt, M., & McQueen, K. (2017). Does new teacher induction really improve retention? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 68(4), 394-410. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022487117702583>

Schmidt, R., Young, V., Cassidy, L., Wang, H., & Laguarda, K. (2017). *Impact of the new teacher center's new teacher induction model on teachers and students*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. <https://www.sri.com/publication/impact-of-the-new-teacher-centers-new-teacher-induction-model-on-teachers-and-students/>

Smith, T.M. and Ingersoll, R.M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 681-714. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00028312041003681>

Solis, A. (2004). *The role of mentoring in teacher quality and retention*. IDRA Newsletter.

<https://www.idra.org/resource-center/the-role-of-mentoring-in-teacher-quality-and-retention/>

- Sosa, A. S. & Gonzales, F. (1993). *Teachers need teachers: An induction program for first year bilingual teachers*. Intercultural Development Research Association. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Bilingual Education (22nd, Houston, TX, February 24-27, 1993): <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED360854.pdf>
- TESOL International Association (February, 2016). *The preparation of the ESL educator in the era of college and career readiness standards: A summary of the TESOL International Association convening*. https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/advocacy/ccr-standards-convening_final2.pdf?sfvrsn=2&sfvrsn=2
- Tigert, J. M., & Percy, M. M. (2018). Preparing to teach both content and language: Four ESOL teacher candidates' experiences. *TESOL Journal*, 9(3), 542-556.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.358>
- Torres-Guzmán, M. E. (1996). Mentoring the bilingual teacher. *NCBE Resource Collection Series*, 7, 1-10. https://www.ncele.ed.gov/files/rcd/BE020683/Mentoring_the_Bilingual_Teache.pdf
- Torres-Guzmán, M. E., & Goodwin, A. L. (1995). Urban bilingual teachers and mentoring for the future. *Education and Urban Society*, 28(1), 48-66.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013124595028001005>
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2020). *Teacher shortage areas*. <https://tsa.ed.gov/#/reports>
- Varghese, M. M., & Synder, R. (2018). Critically examining the agency and professional identity development of novice dual language teachers through figured worlds. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 12(3), 145-159.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2018.1474060>
- Wexler, L. J. (2020). 'I would be a completely different teacher if I had been with a different mentor': Ways in which educative mentoring matters as novices learn to teach. *Professional Development in Education*, 46(2), 211-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2019.1573375>
- Yeh, C. (2017). Math is more than numbers: Beginning bilingual teachers' mathematics teaching

practices and their opportunities to learn. *Journal of Urban Mathematics Education*, 10(2), 106-139. <https://doi.org/10.21423/jume-v10i2a328>

Young, V. M., Schmidt, R., Wang, H., Cassidy, L., & Laguarda, K. (2017). *A comprehensive model of teacher induction: Implementation and impact on teachers and students. Evaluation of the New Teacher Center's i3 Validation grant, final report*. SRI International.

https://www.sri.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/NTC-i3-Validation-Comprehensive-Report-with-App_Final.pdf

Chapter 5

Conclusion to the Dissertation

ESL/bilingual teachers are crucial for our nation's schools as their expertise in working with multilingual learners (MLLs) is invaluable. Even so, with high attrition and teacher shortages (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017; U.S. Department of Education, 2020), the field should be concerned about new ESL/bilingual teachers who enter the profession. Given this concern, this dissertation sought to explore the induction and mentoring experiences of these teachers as literature on their early career challenges, participation in induction programs and supports, and engagement with mentoring were limited. The findings from the three manuscripts that form this dissertation suggest that new ESL/bilingual teachers have (1) significant challenges (e.g., navigating language policies, knowing what/how to teach, performing multiple roles, experiencing marginalization and segregation), (2) lack collegial, administrative, and material supports, (3) do not perceive themselves as well prepared for teaching tasks as new general educators, (4) receive less support in key areas than new general educator (i.e., administrative communication, common planning with same-subject teachers, same-subject mentors, weekly mentoring), and (5) perceive mentors who provide weekly mentoring, help with paperwork/record keeping, and assist with the development of student assessment tools as instrumental in improving their first-year teaching.

Contributions to the Field

The manuscripts in this dissertation provide several important contributions to the literature and are first of their kind in the ESL/bilingual field. The literature review in Chapter 2 is the first synthesis of new ESL/bilingual teachers experiences and supports in U.S. public schools. This literature review synthesized findings from 32 qualitative and mixed method studies over an eighteen-year period. The significance of this work rests in the exposed gaps in the literature later explored in Chapters 3 and 4. Specifically, the lack of generalizable studies indicated a need to investigate new ESL/bilingual teachers using national datasets like the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and the National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS).

Findings also revealed the continued marginalization, physical segregation, and isolation of ESL/bilingual teachers and their students which is something prior literature previously suggested (e.g., Ada, 1986, Basica & Jacka, 2001, Trickett et al., 2012). This review further provided the foundation for Chapters 3 and 4 as gaps in the literature exposed the need to explore new ESL/bilingual teachers' induction and mentoring experiences.

Chapter 3 used a descriptive analysis of new ESL/bilingual teachers' induction experiences. Using the 2011-2012 SASS dataset, this manuscript contributes to the literature by providing the first induction and demographic profile of ESL/bilingual teachers that is generalizable across the U.S. It is also significant that new ESL/bilingual teachers' induction was compared to new general educators as it indicated key differences in specific induction supports received by both teacher groups. Specifically, new ESL/bilingual teachers reported higher percentages of infrequent mentoring, same-subject mentors, and opportunities for social supports (i.e., administrator and same-subject colleagues) than new general educators. Moreover, a higher percentage of new ESL/bilingual teachers perceived themselves to be less prepared for first-year teaching tasks and were more racially/ethnically diverse than general educators. All of these findings were discussed as areas for future research.

Chapter 4 investigated new ESL/bilingual teachers' mentoring experiences using the 2015-16 NTPS as both Chapters 2 and 3 indicated more research on mentoring was needed. Since mentoring is common and well-documented (Goldrick, 2016; Raue & Gray, 2015), I was perplexed that few researchers have explored mentoring components for ESL/bilingual teachers (e.g., Kissau & King, 2015; Sosa & Gonzales, 1993). Thus, this study contributes first of its kind descriptive and inferential findings of specific mentoring components for new ESL/bilingual teachers across the U.S. The major contribution of this study includes the regression results which indicate frequent mentoring, help with paperwork/record-keeping, and assistance with developing student assessment tools were statistically significant predictors of new ESL/bilingual teachers indicating that their mentors improved their first-year teaching. Additionally, like Chapter 3, this study provides a national, generalizable profile of new

ESL/bilingual teachers' experiences with mentoring. Thus, the field now has some evidence of what mentoring components new ESL/bilingual teachers find important in improving their teaching (discussed above) and further data about their overall participation in mentoring programs and activities.

Closing Remarks

I opened this dissertation with a personal account, explaining that I became interested in studying new ESL/bilingual teachers' experiences and supports due to my own story of new teacher attrition (Raab, 2018). I now better understand the conditions that led to my own and other teachers' departures: limited supports and resources during a particularly vulnerable career stage. I have found that the experience of doing research for and writing this dissertation has enriched both my understanding of my own career journey and provided direction for other ESL/bilingual teachers' futures. My sincere hope is that this research can be used by scholars and school leaders to chart a new path for ESL/bilingual teacher induction. This new path must recognize ESL/bilingual teachers' work as "...complex, multifaceted, often improvised, frequently perceived as marginal to the mainstream school, and ever changing" (Trickett et al., 2012, p. 286).

Teacher educators, schools leaders, and policymakers need to provide appropriate supports to new ESL/bilingual teachers for learning to work collaboratively with others, potentially teaching in multiple languages across varied content areas and grade levels, and traversing both contested language policies and socio-political ideologies so that they can effectively instruct and advocate for MLLs. To do this work and to do it well, these teachers must be supported, respected, and trusted to make decisions regarding what is best for our nation's MLLs. Therefore, new ESL/bilingual teachers require and deserve social and material support from intentionally designed induction and mentoring programs.

References

- Ada, A. F. (1986). Creative education for bilingual teachers. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(4), 386-394. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.56.4.1813034v7q651844>
- Bascia, N. & Jacka, N. (2001). Falling in and filling in: ESL teaching careers in changing times. *Journal of Educational Change*, 2(4), 325-346. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014668925172>
- Goldrick, L. (2016). *Support from the start: A 50-state review of policies on new educator induction and mentoring*. New Teacher Center. <https://newteachercenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2016CompleteReportStatePolicies.pdf>
- Kissau, S. P. & King, E. T. (2015). Peer mentoring second language teachers: A mutually beneficial experience? *Foreign Language Annuals*, 48(1), 143-160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12121>
- Raab, R. R. (2018). A statistic's five years: A story of teacher attrition. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24(8), 583-591. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1077800417729849>
- Raue, K., & Gray, L. (2015). *Career paths of beginning public school teachers: Results from the first through fifth waves of the 2007-2008 beginning teacher longitudinal study*. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015196.pdf>
- Sosa, A. S. & Gonzales, F. (1993). *Teachers need teachers: An induction program for first year bilingual teachers*. Intercultural Development Research Association. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Bilingual Education (22nd, Houston, TX, February 24-27, 1993): <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED360854.pdf>
- Trickett, E. J., Rukhotskiy, E., Jeong, A., Genkova, A., Oberoi, A., Weistein, T., & Delgado, Y. (2012). "The kids are terrific: It's the job that's tough": The ELL teacher role in an urban context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 283-292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.10.005>

Appendix A

Institute of Education Statistics (IES) Security Disclosure Risk Reports

IES Data Security Disclosure Risk Review: Chapter 3

Received	Due	Returned	Title	Author(s)	Dataset(s)
6/30/2020	7/7/2020		New ESL and Bilingual Teachers	Thomas Williams	SASS

No necessary changes identified.

OR

Necessary changes identified. Please see below.

IES Data Security Disclosure Risk Review: Chapter 4

Received	Due	Returned	Title	Author(s)	Dataset(s)
8/4/2020	8/11/2020		RAAB Draft	Thomas Williams	NTPS

No necessary changes identified.

OR

Necessary changes identified. Please see below.

Appendix B
IRB Approval Letter



**Division of Scholarly Integrity and
Research Compliance**

Institutional Review Board
North End Center, Suite 4120 (MC 0497)
300 Turner Street NW
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
540/231-3732
irb@vt.edu
<http://www.research.vt.edu/sirc/hrpp>

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 3, 2020
TO: Thomas O Williams Jr, Bonnie S Billingsley, Rebecca Raine Raab
FROM: Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board (FWA00000572, expires October 29, 2024)
PROTOCOL TITLE: Predicting New ESL and Bilingual Teachers's Intent to Continue Teaching
IRB NUMBER: 20-117

Based on the submitted project description and items listed in the Special Instructions section found on Page 2, the Virginia Tech IRB has determined that the proposed activity is not research involving human subjects as defined by HHS and FDA regulations.

Further review and approval by the Virginia Tech HRPP is not required because this is not human research. This determination applies only to the activities described in the submitted project description and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made you must immediately submit an Amendment to the HRPP for a new determination. Your amendment must include a description of the changes and you must upload all revised documents. At that time, the HRPP will review the submission activities to confirm the original "Not Human Subjects Research" decision or to advise if a new application must be made.

If there are additional undisclosed components that you feel merit a change in this initial determination, please contact our office for a consultation.

Please be aware that receiving a "Not Human Subjects Research" Determination is not the same as IRB review and approval of the activity. You are NOT to use IRB consent forms or templates for these activities. If you have any questions, please contact the Virginia Tech HRPP office at 540-231-3732 or irb@vt.edu.

PROTOCOL INFORMATION:

Determined As: **Not Human Subjects Research**
 Protocol Determination Date: **February 3, 2020**

ASSOCIATED FUNDING:

The table on the following page indicates whether grant proposals are related to this protocol, and which of the listed proposals, if any, have been compared to this protocol, if required.

Invent the Future

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:

Based on the additional information provided, it was determined that this is not human subjects research because you will be receiving de-identified data.

Date*	OSP Number	Sponsor	Grant Comparison Conducted?

* Date this proposal number was compared, assessed as not requiring comparison, or comparison information was revised.

If this protocol is to cover any other grant proposals, please contact the HRPP office (irb@vt.edu) immediately.