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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida. Using Ginsberg and Wlodkowski’s Motivational Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching, an online survey of 17 teaching practices was developed and validated. In the survey, participants assessed how frequently they used each practice and how important they believed each practice was to their teaching on 5-point frequency scales. The sampling frame consisted of teachers from 15 colleges, 2 universities, 8 school districts, and Bay Area Regional TESOL (BART) and resulted in 134 responses.

Results indicated that the most frequently used practice was “provide rubrics and progress reports to students” (M = 4.26), followed closely by “elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities” (M = 4.24). The least frequently used practice was “include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias” (M = 2.51), followed by “students work independently, selecting their own learning activities” (M = 2.76).

Also, results indicated that the two most important practices were “provide rubrics and progress reports to students” (M = 4.13) and “elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities” (M = 4.13). Five culturally responsive teaching practices were perceived to be the least important. They were “include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias” (M = 2.58), “learn words in students’ native
languages” (M = 2.89), “ask for student input when planning lessons and activities” (M = 2.90), “students work independently, selecting their own learning activities” (M = 2.91), and “encourage students to speak their native language with their children” (M = 2.96).

This study revealed a trend of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers’ regular use of culturally responsive teaching practices. These findings add to the limited knowledge of how teachers in ethnically and linguistically heterogeneous classrooms create and support a learning environment for all learners.
Chapter 1

Introduction

According to the U.S. Current Population Survey, over 13 million immigrants arrived in the U.S. in the 1990s, comprising 31 million people, or 11% of the total population. By March, 2002, this number had increased by 1.5 million, resulting in a foreign-born population of 32.5 million people (Capps, Passel, Perez-Lopez, & Fix, 2003). Upon arrival, these immigrants commence the acculturation process. They examine American culture and compare it with their native culture, a process which entails evaluation of their own and the surrounding groups’ cultural identities. For many of these immigrants, the adult education English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) or English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classroom is a primary source of information about the American culture, as well as the culture of other immigrants (Alfred, 2009a). These classrooms are multicultural environments in which students from different language, ethnic, and racial backgrounds study lifeskills and academic English to improve their general communication skills (National Center for Family Literacy and Center for Applied Linguistics, 2008).

Amidst this diversity of cultures, ESOL and EAP teachers face many obstacles in the creation of a learning environment that addresses the needs and learning styles of learners from diverse backgrounds (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). According to multicultural education scholars, the most effective learning environment is one which most closely
reflects the students’ learning preferences and ways of knowing (Archie-Booker, Cervero, & Langone, 1999; Collard & Stalker, 1991; Gay, 2000; Guy, 2009, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1995). This presents a challenge as learners from increasingly diverse backgrounds enter the classroom, resulting in cultural mismatches between the educator and learner (Collard & Stalker, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1995).

While the field of adult education has emphasized the importance of the individual in the learning process, it has been criticized for its lack of focus on socio-cultural aspects of individual learners, largely ignoring the importance of cultural identity to the learning process (Alfred, 2009a, 2009b; Brookfield, 1995; Guy, 2009, 1999; Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 1998). This emphasis on the individual in adult learning theory has been criticized for its disconnection of the learner from his or her identity and surrounding environment, creating a “generic” self-directed adult learner (Alfred, 2009a, 2009b; Brookfield, 1995; Guy, 2009, 1999; Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 1998). In Providing Culturally Relevant Adult Education: A Challenge for the Twenty-First Century, Guy (1999) noted the need to incorporate culture into adult education, calling upon adult educators to reflect upon aspects of their own culture, learn about their learners’ cultures, critically examine curriculum and materials for stereotypical misrepresentations, and develop inclusive strategies and instructional methods that represent not only the educator’s, but the learners’ backgrounds and preferences as well. Other adult education scholars have investigated the effects of cultural differences in the classroom, concurring with the need to increase awareness of the characteristics

According to authors such as Bornau (1999), Gnida (1991), Goldstein (2004), Petruskevich (1997), Phinney (2003), and Shaw (2001), the inclusion of culture has major importance in the adult ESOL classroom. ESOL students are diverse in native culture, language, and educational background, among other factors. Their immigration status is also varied, including “permanent residents, naturalized citizens, legal immigrants, and undocumented immigrants” (National Center for Family Literacy and Center for Applied Linguistics, 2008, p. xi). However, ESOL students all experience the acculturation process, the “process of cultural and psychological change that follows intercultural contact” (Berry, 2003, p. 34). All undergo the complex process of maintaining ties to their native cultural group, while exploring and developing relationships within the new “American” cultural group (Berry, 2003; Rai, 2001). Thus, the multi-culturally competent adult ESOL or EAP educator should be cognizant of this process and incorporate the learners’ native cultures into the classroom environment (National Center for Family Literacy and Center for Applied Linguistics, 2008).

Culturally responsive teaching is one approach to addressing such diversity. In contrast to traditional pedagogies, the culturally responsive framework places students’ cultures at the core of the learning process and utilizes the “cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students” (Gay, 2000, p. 29). Culturally responsive educators are proficient at discerning subtle and overt differences and developing culturally-sensitive and appropriate learning
environments (Guy, 1999). Culturally responsive teaching is one approach to address the needs of today’s diverse classroom, yet there are few studies of this approach in a culturally and linguistically diverse classroom of adult learners.

Statement of the Problem

A growing body of literature has focused on the teaching practices which create culturally responsive learning environments for specific cultural groups such as African-Americans (Archie-Booker, Cervero, & Langone, 1999; Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 1996; Sealey-Ruiz, 2007; Sheared, 1999) or Latinos (Gault, 2003; Heaney, Sanabria, & Tisdell, 2001). However, there have been limited studies of the teaching practices used to create a culturally responsive environment when ethnic and linguistic heterogeneity are the norm, such as the adult ESOL classroom (Rai, 2001). There has been limited research describing the strategies used to incorporate adult students’ cultures and cultural identities in a second language learning environment. This void has presented a challenge to various stakeholders who want to assess and guide programs and practitioners toward the use of a culturally responsive approach with adult English language learners.

Statement of Purpose

In the adult education ESOL or EAP class, there is a compelling need for educators to use culturally responsive teaching practices (Bornau, 1999; Gnida, 1991; Goldstein, 2004; Petruskevich, 1997; Phinney, 2003; Shaw, 2001); however, there were no documented studies of the ways educators incorporate students’ cultures when multiple linguistic and ethnic minority cultures are present in the adult classroom. The
purpose of this study was to describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida.

Research Objectives and Questions

The following research objectives guided this study:

1. To develop and validate a survey of culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers.
2. To describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of a representative sample of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. To what extent do adult education ESOL and EAP teachers use culturally responsive teaching practices?
2. How do adult education ESOL and EAP teachers rank the importance of using specific culturally responsive teaching practices?

Theoretical Framework

Culturally responsive teaching served as the theoretical framework of this study. Culturally responsive teaching positions learner culture at the core of the learning process and uses the “cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students” (Gay, 2000, p. 29). This equity pedagogy (Banks, 2006) encompasses a variety of approaches such as culturally relevant, culturally sensitive, culturally congruent, and culturally contextualized pedagogies (Gay, 2000). Culturally responsive teaching “simultaneously develops, along with academic achievement, social consciousness and critique, cultural affirmation,
competence, and exchange; community building and personal connections; individual self-worth and abilities; and an ethic of caring” (Gay, 2000, p. 43). A central assumption of this approach is that learners from minority cultures experience a cultural mismatch resulting from differences between their home culture and the culture of school, which becomes problematic due to the dominance of majority group cultures and the stigmatization of minority group norms and values (Lee & Sheared, 2002). Culturally responsive teaching, therefore, addresses this mismatch by placing student culture at the center of the learning process, utilizing student values, beliefs, and experiences in the learning process.

Culturally responsive teaching is distinguished by its emphasis on validating, facilitating, liberating, and empowering minority students by “cultivating their cultural integrity, individual abilities, and academic success” (Gay, 2000, p. 44) and based on the four pillars of “teacher attitude and expectations, cultural communication in the classroom, culturally diverse context in the curriculum, and culturally congruent instructional strategies” (Gay, 2000, p. 44). Culturally responsive teaching can be identified by the following common characteristics:

- It acknowledges the legitimacy of the cultural heritages of different ethnic groups, both as legacies that affect students’ dispositions, attitudes, and approaches to learning and as worthy content to be taught in the formal curriculum.
- It builds meaningfulness between home and school experience as well as between academic abstractions and lived sociocultural realities.
- It uses a wide variety of instructional strategies that are connected to different learning styles.
- It teaches students to know and praise their own and each other’s cultural heritages.
- It incorporates multicultural information, resources, and materials in all the subjects and skills routinely taught in schools. (Gay, 2000, p. 29)
The Motivational Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009; Wlodkowski, 2004) is a model of culturally responsive teaching that was designed for the higher education classroom and does not specify practices and beliefs related to the ethnic and linguistic diversity of the adult education ESOL and EAP classrooms. It is based on the assumption that culturally responsive teaching enhances the motivation of students from minority cultures. However, it can be adapted to the unique aspects of this learning environment.

The framework entails these four elements: *establishing inclusion*, *developing attitude*, *enhancing meaning*, and *engendering competence*. Teaching practices that create an environment of respect and connectedness and that use cooperation and equitable treatment of all learners reflect the element of *establishing inclusion*. The element, *developing attitude*, includes norms and practices that help students develop a positive attitude toward the learning process by building on students’ personal experiences and knowledge and by allowing learners to make choices throughout the learning process. The third element, *enhancing meaning*, includes norms and practices that encourage students to engage in deep reflection and critical inquiry, such as role-plays and simulations. The final element, *engendering competence*, are practices that show the learner evidence of his or her learning and proficiency and the use of assessments that are contextualized in the learners’ experiences (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009; Wlodkowski, 2004). This four-element model served as the theoretical foundation for culturally responsive teaching practices applicable to the adult education ESOL and EAP classrooms.
Significance of the Study

Adult education ESOL and EAP teachers deal with students from a variety of cultural and language groups, ethnicities, and races. In a multicultural and diverse learning environment, there will be cultural mismatches among the students and between the teacher and students (Collard & Stalker, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Rai, 2001). Compounding the challenge of handling these differences is the psychological phenomenon of acculturation, a process in which individuals in a new culture undergo changes to their cultural identity. However, little is known about how ESOL and EAP educators incorporate students’ cultures in their teaching practices. This study aims to add to the body of knowledge about culturally responsive teaching practices in a multicultural second language learning environment for adults.

Delimitations of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida. Participation was limited to those educators working in non-credit adult ESOL and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) programs administered by district school boards or colleges. Programs administered by community or faith-based organizations were excluded from this study. Additionally, participation was limited to paid, non-volunteer teachers in order to establish a more homogeneous sampling frame in terms of teacher educational level.
Limitations of the Study

Data were collected from adult education ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida. Therefore, findings are not generalizable to adult education ESOL and EAP teachers outside of this state.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were provided for relevant terms.

*Adult Education Programs:* Adult education programs serve both native and non-native English speakers who need to improve their literacy through adult basic education (ABE), adult secondary education (ASE), or English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), also known as English as a Second Language (ESL), classes. Instruction also helps learners achieve additional goals related to job, family, or further education (TESOL, 2003).

*Adult Education ESOL Programs:* Adult Education ESOL programs serve non-native English speaking adults who desire to improve their communicative competence. Classes are non-credit bearing and focus on the acquisition of listening, speaking, reading, and writing in English. Instruction also helps learners achieve additional goals related to job, family, or further education (TESOL, 2003).

*Culturally Responsive Teaching:* Culturally responsive teaching positions student culture at the core of the learning process in recognition of the all-encompassing nature of culture and cultural identity. Relevant strategies utilize
the experiences and backgrounds of students to create a culturally compatible environment in order to empower learners from non-dominant cultural groups.

*Cultural identity*: Cultural identity is a “complex, multidimensional, and socially significant construct that all persons possess” (Guy, 2009, p. 14) and refers to a combination of “religion, culture, ethnicity, and national identities” (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006, p. 138).

*Culture*: Culture is defined as the “webs of significance” (Geertz, 1973, p. 15) through which individuals perceive and make meaning of their world (Guy, 2009), including “language, symbols, and artifacts; customs, practices, and patterns of interaction; and shared values, norms, beliefs, and expectations” (Guy, 2009, p. 14).

EAP: EAP is an acronym for English for Academic Purposes, a term used to designate classes to help non-native speakers of English effectively participate in an academic, post-secondary learning environment.

ESOL: ESOL is an acronym for English for Speakers of Other Languages, a term used to designate literacy classes for non-native speakers of English and is synonymous with ESL, or English as a Second Language.

*Teaching Practices*: Teaching practices are the methods or strategies teachers use to create a learning environment and are reflective of assumptions and beliefs associated with the learning process.
Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 describes the statements of the problem and purpose, research questions, theoretical framework, significance, limitations and delimitations, and definitions of terms used in this study. Chapter 2 includes a review of literature concerning the importance of culture, cultural identity and English language learners, culturally responsive teaching, examinations of culturally responsive teaching in adult and higher education, examinations of culturally responsive teaching in adult education ESOL, measuring culturally responsive teaching, and survey research. Chapter 3 presents the research questions, survey development, survey administration, data collection, data analysis, and descriptive statistics. Chapter 4 presents the findings of this study including the study participants, instrumentation, an analysis of questions, and summary. Chapter 5 includes the summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research of this study.
Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

The purpose of this study was to describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida. This chapter outlines the literature related to culture and the culturally responsive teaching approach. The first section is a summary of literature about the importance of culture. The following section contains a summary of the overall framework of culturally responsive teaching. Additionally, there are summaries of research conducted from a culturally responsive framework in adult and higher education, as well as adult education ESOL or EAP. Finally, this chapter concludes with measuring culturally responsive teaching and survey research.

The Importance of Culture

Culture is defined differently by academic field (Banks, 2006). Within multicultural education, many utilize Geertz’s definition of culture as the “webs of significance” (1973, p. 15) through which individuals perceive and make meaning of their world (Guy, 2009). These webs include layers of “language, symbols, and artifacts; customs, practices, and patterns of interaction; and shared values, norms, beliefs, and expectations” (Guy, 2009, p. 14). As described by Gay, “culture determines how we
think, believe, and these, in turn, affect how we teach and learn” (2000, p. 9). Thus, culture is multidimensional and dynamic, changing as a result of numerous factors (Gay, 2000).

Banks identified six key variables of culture: values and behavioral styles, languages and dialects, nonverbal communication, cultural cognitiveness, worldviews, and identification (Banks, 2006). Thus, cultural group members collectively share worldviews, or ways of meaning-making, which may be different from those in the learning environment. Furthermore, culture has superficial and profound aspects, yet is often invisible and overlooked, leading to misunderstandings between individuals from different cultural groups (Guy, 2009).

Hofstede (1986) developed the 4-D Model of Cultural Differences to help intercultural trainers understand differences associated with social role patterns across cultures. He hypothesized four areas of difference related to ethnic or national cultural identity. These elements, individualism versus collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity versus femininity, are used to explain cross-cultural varieties of behavior in family, school, job, and community roles.

**Cultural Identity and English Language Learners**

Cultural identity refers to a combination of “religion, culture, ethnicity, and national identities” (Berry et al., 2006, p. 138). These core cultural characteristics are not shared or experienced equally by all members (Gay, 2000), as aspects of membership in a cultural group vary by individual; therefore, one’s cultural identity is a
“complex, multidimensional, and socially significant construct that all persons possess” (Guy, 2009, p. 14) and cannot be generalized throughout the cultural group.

Cultural identity has major significance for students in an ESOL or EAP adult classroom (Peirce, 1995; Phinney, 2003). While these learners are highly diverse in age, country of origin, and language, among other characteristics (National Center for Family Literacy and Center for Applied Linguistics, 2008), they all experience the acculturation process, simultaneously maintaining ties to their native cultural group and developing relationships within the new, American cultural group (Berry, 1980).

**Acculturation.** Acculturation is the socio-cultural or psychological process that occurs when two distinct individuals or cultures come into prolonged contact (Berry, 1980). It is a multi-faceted process which varies according to cultural group, environment, and individual and has both positive and negative effects on individuals and societies (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006). The socio-cultural perspective was developed by anthropologists and sociologists who examined changes which occur at the societal level to different cultures after prolonged contact (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936). The Social Science Research Council (1954) incorporated the psychological perspective to acculturation to examine the changes which occur to individuals undergoing intercultural contact. This process may affect the individual’s attitude toward the process of acculturation itself, cultural identities, and social relations to native and host groups (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006). These psychological changes affect “language use, cognitive style, personality, identity, attitudes, and acculturative stress” (Berry, 1980, p. 18).
Initial acculturation models were linear and uni-dimensional, describing individuals as exhibiting either traditional cultural traits or adopting those of the new culture. According to this model, when an individual gained new traits, he simultaneously lost the corresponding native traits. It was posited that the cultural newcomer continued through this process, eventually arriving at total assimilation. Berry (1980) modified that theory to create his bi-dimensional model of four typologies or psychological responses to the acculturation process: *assimilation* (adoption of host culture behaviors and loss of native culture behaviors), *integration* (addition of host culture to native culture behaviors), *separation* (maintenance of native culture behaviors and rejection of host culture behaviors), and *marginalization* (loss of native culture and lack of identification with host culture) (Berry, 1980). An underlying assumption of this model is that individuals have a choice, rather than assimilation being a predetermined outcome. Further, Berry’s model of the process is not linear and irreversible; it is multi-faceted and variable. An individual is not perceived to have lost his native culture when displaying traits or behaviors of the new culture. Rather, he has added traits or behaviors to his cultural repertoire.

*Acculturation and second language acquisition.* Environmental second language acquisition theory examines the relationship between the second language learner and the social context in which learning occurs (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). The role of an individual’s acculturation into the host culture is the foundation of Schumann’s Acculturation Model for Second Language Acquisition (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). Its hypothesis is that second language proficiency influences the
individual’s acculturation “and the degree to which a learner acculturates to the target language (TL) group will control the degree to which he acquires the second language” (Schumann, 1986, p. 384). This model further differentiates between the acculturation process of individuals who are “socially integrated” and “psychologically open” (Schumann, 1986, p. 379) and those of individuals who want to adopt the cultural values and behaviors of the target culture. Based on the concept of social distance between the second language learner and the target language group, Schuman identified eight social and psychological variables in the Acculturation Model. The social variables affecting second language acquisition are: the power relations between the target language group (TLG) and the second language learner group (SLLG), the SLLG’s integration pattern, the relative amount of enclosure and cohesiveness, and size of the SLLG, the cultural congruence between the TLG and the SLLG, the attitudes of both groups, and the SLLG’s intended duration of residence in the target language culture. The psychological variables affecting second language acquisition are: language shock, culture shock, motivation, and ego permeability of the second language learner (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). These social and psychological variables combine to create a “major causal variable” (Schumann, 1986, p. 379) of social and psychological distance or proximity with the TLG. Thus, individuals who are socially integrated and psychologically open to the target language group will experience higher levels of second language acquisition. In summary, while Schumann’s Acculturation Model for Second Language Acquisition occupies a limited role in second language acquisition
theory, it provides a framework to better understand the role of acculturation on the acquisition of a second language.

**Culturally Responsive Teaching**

The influence of culture on the classroom is a foundation of multicultural education (Banks, 2006; Bennett, 2001) and is exemplified by the assumption that both students and teachers bring their cultural identities into the classroom. As described by Guy (2009):

> Adult learners bring to the learning environment a range of experiences grounded in communicative and interaction strategies. Given the cultural basis of these strategies, they may or may not serve learners well depending on the way in which the educational activity itself is framed. (p. 10)

In *Culturally Responsive Teaching*, Gay (2000) elaborates on this tenet and asserts that culture is “at the heart of all we do in the name of education, whether that is curriculum, instruction, administration, or performance assessment” (p. 8).

Culturally responsive pedagogy is an equity pedagogy with roots in the multicultural education movement (Banks, 2006). Multicultural education is the interdisciplinary field which addresses the needs of learners from non-dominant ethnic and racial groups (Bennett, 2001). An outgrowth of the U.S. Civil Rights Movement, multicultural education advocates for historically underrepresented or marginalized minority groups. The multicultural education framework is based on the four principles of cultural pluralism, social justice, primacy of culture in education, and equity and excellence for all learners (Bennett, 2001).

Culturally responsive pedagogy is a framework that positions learner culture at the core of the learning process and uses the “cultural knowledge, prior experiences,
frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students” (Gay, 2000, p. 29). Furthermore, it “simultaneously develops, along with academic achievement, social consciousness and critique, cultural affirmation, competence, and exchange; community building and personal connections; individual self-worth and abilities; and an ethic of caring” (Gay, 2000, p. 43). A central assumption is that learners from minority cultures experience a cultural mismatch resulting from differences between their home culture and the culture of school, which becomes problematic due to the dominance of majority group cultures and the stigmatization of minority group norms and values (Lee & Sheared, 2002). Culturally responsive pedagogy, therefore, addresses this mismatch by placing student culture at the center of the learning process, utilizing student values, beliefs, and experiences in the learning process.

Culturally responsive teaching is an umbrella term which encompasses a variety of approaches, such as culturally relevant, culturally sensitive, culturally congruent, and culturally contextualized pedagogies (Gay, 2000). It is believed to be more appealing and meaningful to learners from non-dominant backgrounds than traditional pedagogies. An additional tenet is that culturally responsive teaching helps minority students learn more easily and deeply than traditional, non-culturally-situated learning environments (Gay, 2000; 2002; Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009). According to Gay (2000), there are five major premises underlying all culturally responsive approaches:

1. Culture is at the basis of all human interaction, including the learning process.
2. Traditional school reform has not produced results for students of Color and therefore is inadequate.

3. Good intentions and awareness of cultural diversity must be accompanied by pedagogical awareness and skills.

4. Cultural diversity is a strength for both individuals and the greater society.

5. Test scores and grades are indicators of the magnitude of the disparity in education, not its cause.

In reference to an adult learning environment, Guy (2009) posited additional assumptions of the culturally responsive approach:

1. Learning occurs as a result of interaction and communication.

2. Unwritten rules of interaction and communication are learned through the socialization process at the family and community level.

3. Classrooms reflect the various rules of interaction and communication of all individuals in the learning environment.

4. Classroom interactions and communication can be understood from the foundations of “sociocultural differences and modes of cultural socialization” (p. 10).

Thus, culturally responsive teaching:

validates, facilitates, liberates, and empowers ethnically diverse students by simultaneously cultivating their cultural integrity, individual abilities, and academic success. It is anchored on four foundational pillars of practice – teacher attitudes and expectations, cultural communication in the classroom, culturally diverse context in the curriculum, and culturally congruent instructional strategies. (Gay, 2000, p. 44)
Within the multiplicity of approaches classified as culturally responsive, Gay (2000) noted the following common characteristics:

- It acknowledges the legitimacy of the cultural heritages of different ethnic groups, both as legacies that affect students’ dispositions, attitudes, and approaches to learning and as worthy content to be taught in the formal curriculum.
- It builds meaningfulness between home and school experience as well as between academic abstractions and lived sociocultural realities.
- It uses a wide variety of instructional strategies that are connected to different learning styles.
- It teaches students to know and praise their own and each other’s cultural heritages.
- It incorporates multicultural information, resources, and materials in all the subjects and skills routinely taught in schools. (Gay, 2000, p. 29)

**Motivational framework for culturally responsive teaching.** Ginsberg and Wlodkowski developed the Motivational Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching (2009) to describe culturally responsive teaching in adult learning environments. They posited that culturally responsive teaching increases the intrinsic motivation of students of non-dominant cultural groups. Furthermore, they theorized that a learner feels more intrinsic motivation to learn when experiencing emotional well-being, and consequently experiences a loss of intrinsic motivation to learn when experiencing conflicting or uncomfortable emotions in the learning environment. This can be summarized in the following manner:

> Because motivation plays such a key role in learning, teaching methods and educational environments that motivationally favor particular learners to the exclusion of others are unfair and diminish the success for those learners discounted or denied in this situation. (p. 32)

The Motivational Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching is designed to create an environment in which “inquiry, respect, and the opportunity for full
participation by diverse adults is the norm” (Wlodkowski, 2004, p. 161) and is based on
the integrated use of four elements: establishing inclusion, developing attitude,
enhancing meaning, and engendering competence (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009;
Wlodkowski, 2004). Each element, or criteria, has corresponding norms and practices
that adult educators can use in creating or evaluating lesson plans.

 Establishing inclusion. According to Ginsberg and Wlodkowski, adult educators
establish inclusion through using “norms and practices that are woven together to
create a learning environment in which learners and teachers feel respected and
connected to one another” (2009, p. 34), and reflect respect and connectedness. One
norm associated with this element is the co-construction of knowledge that is reflective
of the “ideas, perspectives, and experiences” (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009, p. 43) of
all students. Culturally responsive teachers strive to establish positive interdependence
among students by using collaborative and cooperative learning activities such as jigsaw
readings or peer teaching. An additional norm associated with creating an environment
of respect and connectedness is ensuring that all students are treated equitably and are
comfortable voicing their opinions about discriminatory actions and classroom policies.
Teaching practices such as the use of focus groups and reframing activities to explore
non-dominant perspectives and to elicit opinions are recommended. A complete list of
the norms identified by Ginsberg and Wlodkowski (2009) that are associated with
establishing inclusion in the adult classroom is summarized in Table 1.

The importance of establishing an inclusive learning environment is a common theme
throughout culturally responsive teaching literature.
Table 1

Norms Related to Elements of Motivational Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishing Inclusion&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Developing Attitude&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Enhancing Meaning&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Engendering Competence&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course work emphasizes the human purpose of what is being learned and its relationship to the learners’ personal experiences and contemporary situations.</td>
<td>Teaching and learning activities are contextualized in the learners’ experience and knowledge and are accessible through their current thinking and ways of knowing.</td>
<td>Learners participate in challenging learning experiences involving deep reflection and critical inquiry that address relevant, real-world issues in an action-oriented manner.</td>
<td>The assessment process is connected to the learner’s world, frames of reference, and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers co-construct knowledge that is inclusive of the ideas, perspectives, and experiences of learners.</td>
<td>The entire academic process of learning, from content selection to accomplishment and assessment of competencies, encourages learners to make choices based on their experiences, values, needs, and strengths.</td>
<td>Learner expression and language are joined with teacher expression and language to form a “third idiom” that enables the perspectives of all learners to be readily shared and included in the process of learning.</td>
<td>Demonstration of learning includes multiple ways to represent knowledge and skill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration and cooperation are the expected ways of proceeding and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-assessment is essential to the overall assessment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course perspectives assume a nonblameful and realistically hopeful view of people and their capacity to change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is equitable treatment of all learners with an invitation to point out behaviors, practices, and policies that discriminate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ginsberg, M., & Wlodkowski, R., 2009, <sup>a</sup> p. 43; <sup>b</sup> p. 44-45; <sup>c</sup> p. 46; <sup>d</sup> p. 47-48
For example, a culturally responsive teacher demonstrates a connectedness and is validating and affirming to all students (Gay, 2000, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2001, 1995). Furthermore, a culturally responsive teacher acknowledges the importance of student culture by learning about and acknowledging students’ cultural heritages and differences (Gay, 2000, 2002), as well as providing opportunities for self-expression of cultural backgrounds (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

**Developing attitude.** The second element of this framework, developing attitude, includes “norms and practices that create a favorable disposition toward the learning experience through personal relevance and volition” (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009, p. 35). Central to these are addressing the *relevance* and *creation of student volition* in the learning environment. The first norm associated with this element is the contextualization of learning activities in the learners’ background experiences and knowledge base. Additionally, culturally responsive teachers strive to use the learners’ ways of knowing and thinking. In a culturally diverse classroom, the use of commonly accepted terminology and labels can create a negative attitude for students of non-dominant backgrounds (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009). Therefore, culturally responsive teachers recognize the importance of language and allow the learners to determine classroom norms for problematic terms. Additionally, teachers reinforce student volition when encouraging students to formulate their own course goals and desired outcomes. Class assessment should include problem-solving activities that can result in a variety of acceptable solutions. Thus, culturally responsive teachers instill a positive connection to course objectives and activities. A complete list of the norms
identified by Ginsberg and Wlodkowski (2009) that are associated with the second norm of developing attitude in the adult classroom is presented in Table 1.

Additional literature indicates that a culturally responsive teacher utilizes a constructivist approach to learning, using students’ prior knowledge and beliefs as the basis of new learning, building on their personal and cultural strengths (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Furthermore, teaching practices such as creating a physically and psychologically comfortable class environment (Amstutz, 1999) which encourages communication (Varian, 2008), in addition to incorporating multicultural resources and materials (Gay, 2000, 2002) are central to developing a positive attitude toward the learning process.

**Enhancing meaning.** The third element of this framework, enhancing meaning, relates to making the learning process pleasant and meaningful, not solely as the accomplishment of a set of academic objectives. This is described as “norms and practices that create challenging and engaging learning experiences that include learners’ perspectives and values” (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009, p. 35). Teachers will encourage “deep reflection and critical inquiry that address relevant, real-world issues in an action-oriented manner” (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009, p. 46). Culturally responsive practices include the use of simulations, role-playing, and games in order to approximate authentic use of the academic objectives. Problem posing is another culturally responsive strategy that adds a challenging and critical element to classroom discussions, in addition to enhancing learner engagement. A complete list of the norms identified by Ginsberg and Wlodkowski (2009) that are associated with developing attitude in the adult classroom is presented in Table 1.
Various authors also describe the value of enhancing the meaning of the learning process to the students in a culturally responsive learning environment. Central to this element is helping students develop a critical perspective, which can be accomplished by helping students question theory relative to their own and others’ cultural experiences (Amstutz, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002), as well as helping the make connections between their community, national, and global identities (Ladson-Billings, 2001, 1995). To ensure that students are challenged by the learning process, a culturally responsive teacher should also use a variety of instructional practices (Amstutz, 1999; Gay, 2000, 2002; Varian, 2008; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) and incorporate practical applications into academic lessons (Varian, 2008).

**Engendering competence.** Engendering competence, the final element of this framework, deals with the *authenticity* and *effectiveness* of assessment and is described as “norms and practices that help learners understand how they are effectively learning something they value and is of authentic value to their community” (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009, p. 35). There are three norms associated with this element, including the use of assessments that relate to the students’ backgrounds and allow them to demonstrate mastery in a variety of ways. Practices associated with this include performance-based or portfolio assessments. According to Ginsberg and Wlodkowski (2009), utilizing authentic and reflective student self-assessments is essential to engendering competence and is associated with using student-invented dialogues, focused reflections, and journals. A complete list of the norms identified by
Ginsberg and Wlodkowski (2009) that are associated with engendering competence in the adult classroom is presented in Table 1.

Additional information regarding culturally responsive teaching practices related to engendering competence has been limited. However, Amstutz (1999) found that culturally responsive teachers continually reviewed educational goals with their students, while Varian (2008) found that these teachers encouraged students to be self-directed and take ownership of their own learning process. In short, the culturally responsive teacher takes student diversity into account when assessing learning.

**Culturally responsive teaching of English language learners.** There is a growing body of knowledge about creating a culturally responsive environment for English language learners. Prominent educational theorists such as Nieto (2002) and Cummins (1986) have chronicled the unique aspects of using culturally responsive teaching practices with English language learners; limited descriptive studies have been conducted in primary and secondary classrooms with English language learners, providing additional findings specific to working with this group. The principal theme throughout the literature has been the importance of incorporating and facilitating the development of students’ native languages in order to promote academic success in American schools (Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejeda, 1999; Henze & Lucas, 1993; Irizarry, 2007; Lee, 2010; Nieto, 2002; Osborne, 1996; Reyes, 1992).

In his early writings, Cummins (1986) proposed examining the interactions of English language learners and the school system to explain persistent lower academic achievement. His evaluative framework was based on the tenet that English language
learners are either empowered or disabled through these interactions. He described the following characteristics as influential:

1. Minority students’ language and culture are incorporated into the school program;
2. Minority community participation is encouraged as an integral component of children’s education;
3. The pedagogy promotes intrinsic motivation on the part of students to use language actively in order to generate their own knowledge;
4. Professionals involved in assessment become advocates for minority students rather than legitimizing the location of the problem in the students. (Cummins, 1986, p. 21)

Cummins’s framework operates from a critical standpoint and is often referred to as the springboard for further theorization of the culturally responsive approach with English language learners. Its influence is clear in Nieto’s (2002) work on how to prepare teachers to work with English language learners.

Nieto (2002) called on multicultural educators to broaden their focus to include the needs of English language learners. Furthermore, she proposed changing how schools conceptualize the teaching of English language learners, calling for a “reconceptualization of language diversity” (Nieto, 2002, p. 81). The first tenet involved changing the deficit view of language diversity to that of bilingualism being seen as an addition or resource to the student and school community. Secondly, she strongly advocated schools’ participation in developing students’ native languages in addition to educating teachers about the discriminatory nature of English-only language policies. Thus, teachers of English language learners should be educated and knowledgeable about second and first language acquisition theories and linguistics. Moreover, they should hold additive, not deficit beliefs about language diversity, and actively foster
students’ native language literacy. She noted that teachers can do so by “providing them (the students) the time and space to work with all their peers, or with tutors or mentors, who speak the same language” (Nieto, 2002, p. 95).

The limited studies of culturally responsive teaching practices of English language learners support the importance of native language literacy and the positive relationship between fostering these native languages and academic achievement to English language learners (Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejeda, 1999; Henze & Lucas, 1993; Lee, 2010; Osborne, 1996; Reyes, 1992). Additionally, in a case study of a culturally responsive teacher of Hispanic secondary students, Irizarry (2007) reported a positive reaction of these English language learners to the informal English presented in hip-hop music, leading the author to suggest that a variety of styles and levels of English be presented in class.

In addition, studies of culturally responsive teachers of English language learners revealed findings which duplicate studies conducted with other minority group students. In terms of teacher characteristics, a teacher’s personal affirmative beliefs about diversity were found to be more important than the teacher’s ethnicity or race (Irizarry, 2010; Osborne, 1996; Reyes, 1992). Similarly, culturally responsive teachers of English language learners were found to share a practice of holding high academic expectations of students (Lee, 2010; Osborne, 1996). Culturally responsive teachers of English language learners situated instruction in the students’ cultural contexts (Lee, 2010; Osborne, 1996) and utilized a variety of activities, specifically, group work (Henze & Lucas, 1993; Lee, 2010; Osborne, 1996). One final characteristic shared by many
culturally responsive teachers of English language learners was the valuing of the students’ native cultures and a tendency to create strong ties with parents and the ethnic community (Osborne, 1996).

In summary, culturally responsive teaching of English language learners shares many beliefs and practices with culturally responsive teaching of students from other minority groups. However, the importance of utilizing and nurturing the students’ native languages and cultures was distinctive and must be added to the overall culturally responsive teaching framework.

**Sociocultural approach to culturally responsive teaching.** Alfred’s (2009a, 2009b) advocacy of a sociocultural approach to culturally responsive teaching is based on the changing demographics of the foreign-born population in U.S. classrooms. Today’s immigrants are less likely to be White Europeans, with the majority originating from nonwestern countries. Furthermore, today’s immigrants are often transnational and maintain contact with their native communities, commonly resisting the previous model of assimilation for bi-culturalism to American culture. Based on the needs of this new immigrant learner, Alfred (2009b) proposes incorporating the sociocultural framework of “a) personal, b) socio-historical, and c) community or institutional/organizational dimensions that influence learning” (p. 141) into adult and higher education.

She calls on adult educators to critically examine the ways in which their own histories have influenced their existing epistemological beliefs through “continuous reflexive engagement” (Alfred, 2009b, p. 141). Practices include reflective thinking and
writing, acknowledgement of group memberships, and visiting immigrant students’ communities (Richards et al., 2006).

Additionally, there are five recommendations that address instructional design:

1. Integrate nonwestern knowledge into the curricula to lessen the cultural divide between students and the western-dominated classroom.
2. Acknowledge cultural differences among immigrant groups.
3. Foster inclusive learning communities through use of learning partners or teams.
4. De-emphasize assimilation in curricula and teaching practices.
5. Consider the early schooling and work socialization of immigrant groups. (Alfred, 2009b, pp. 143-144)

In summary, the sociocultural approach to culturally responsive teaching presses adult educators to utilize students’ “cultures, histories, and identities to plan and deliver instruction” (Alfred, 2009b, p. 143). Its acknowledgement of the transnational identity and change in immigrant student characteristics broadens the traditional framework of culturally responsive teaching, serving as a useful model for adult education ESOL teaching practices.

Examination of Culturally Responsive Teaching in Adult and Higher Education

While much of the research into culturally responsive teaching has been conducted in primary and secondary classrooms, there is a growing body of research examining culturally responsive teaching practices within adult and higher education. These qualitative studies generally examine one of the following elements of a culturally relevant learning environment for adults: instructor cultural self-awareness, learner culture, inclusive curricula, or instructional methods and processes (Marchisani & Adams, 1992).
**Instructor cultural self-awareness.** A growing number of studies have examined the role of the adult educator’s cultural identity. In *Making Space: Merging Theory and Practice in Adult Education* (Sheared & Sissel, 2001), adult educators explored how their cultural identities have affected and informed their teaching. All identified the multidimensionality of cultural identity, asserting that in addition to other aspects of identity, their race, ethnicity, class, and gender intersect and interact. For example, Lopez-Marcano described how being a Hispanic woman/Latina influenced her experiences in higher education as both a non-traditional student and a minority faculty member. She strongly recommended that other educators use their cultural identity to change those structures that create obstacles to minorities in higher education.

Similar themes emerged in *The Leaning Ivory Tower: Latino Professors in American Universities* (Padilla & Chavez, 1993), a series of autobiographical accounts of Latino professors in higher education. These men and women noted instances of institutional racism such as being asked to participate solely on faculty searches of other minority candidates and being viewed as a role model or spokesperson of the Latino community. This collection of accounts further illustrates the need to create a more culturally relevant environment for Latino/Hispanic faculty.

The importance of the adult educator’s racial identity has been documented in many U.S.-based studies (Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 1996; Lee & Johnson-Bailey, 2004; Manglitz, Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 2005). In their examination of higher education, Johnson-Bailey and Cervero (1996) found race to be an unspoken, yet dominant feature of the classroom. Students and professors who were not White were subtly treated as
“less than” their White colleagues. Similar findings resulted from Lee and Johnson-Bailey’s (2004) autobiographical analyses. They recommended that adult educators examine issues of power in the classroom, while also taking advantage of technology to create new forums for discussions of these issues. Furthermore, they stressed that professors of Color need to be more authoritative in the classroom in order to overcome assumptions of inferiority to their White colleagues.

Learner cultural identity. There are limited studies that have examined the role of the adult learner’s cultural identity (Alfred, 2003; Johnson-Bailey, & Cervero, 1996; Wan, 2001). Johnson-Bailey and Cervero (1996) found that the previously unexamined experiences of Black women who had entered post-secondary education at a non-traditional age were markedly different from the experiences of White women who were also non-traditional, reentry students. Aspects of racial, gender, color, and class identities were all identified as playing a pivotal role in these women’s experiences as students. Throughout the study, participants consistently identified themselves as Black women, never separating their race from their gender. They also noted that overcoming racism and sexism was a major issue throughout the learning experience, in stark contrast to the experiences of their White counterparts.

Two studies of foreign-born adult learners’ experiences in higher education revealed similarities between participants from disparate native cultures. Language was an obstacle in both Wan’s (2001) case study of a Chinese graduate student and wife and Alfred’s (2003) study of Anglophone Caribbean women. Furthermore, both groups expressed difficulties adapting to the classroom environments due to a conflict in their
native cultural values and those manifested in the U.S. classroom. However challenging these differences in culture are, the adaptability of these foreign-born adult learners is exemplified in the following quotation from Rita: “Our Caribbean way gave us the discipline to learn, to master the content, and to take control of our lives; and the American way has taught us to be more critical, more vocal, and even more political” (Alfred, 2003, p. 255).

Curricula and instruction. There are limited studies that have examined the cultural relevance of curricula and instruction used in adult and higher education (Archie-Booker, Cervero, & Langone, 1999; Sealey-Ruiz, 2007; Sheared, 1999). Sheared (1999) examined the cultural relevance to African American students of adult basic education curriculum materials, determining that in addition to including relevant materials which focused on the unique experiences of African American learners, an overt acknowledgement of African Americans’ different way of knowing was needed. She described this as polyrhythmic realities, in reference to the unique way in which culture, race, gender, and class intersect to influence this group of learners. She advocated various methods to encourage these learners to develop their own voices in the classroom, such as call and response and the sharing of authority with learners.

Another study of African American adult female learners yielded similar findings in regard to the importance of student expression. In her role as teacher-researcher, Sealey-Ruiz (2007) examined the significance of an undergraduate English composition course in which the learners’ positionality of race, class, age, and gender were at the core of curriculum and materials selection. All learners reacted positively to the
inclusion of African American Vernacular English in discussion and writing, and noted the resulting positive affirmation of their cultural identity. Furthermore, participants related how the course encouraged critical thinking through activities designed to deconstruct negative images of African Americans, while simultaneously affirming their individual academic goals.

Similar positive results were noted by participants in an experimental Master’s in Adult Education that was based on the concept of *educacion popular* and works of Latin American scholars (Heaney, Sanabria, & Tisdell, 2001). The Latino participants described a great sense of connection between adult education theory and practice, in addition to the liberatory and transformative nature of the learning process. Additionally, participants felt encouraged to conduct research and publish articles about their community. The significance of utilizing a culturally relevant curriculum can be understood in the words of L. Lugo, “I have always and everywhere been clear about being Puerto Rican, but until now, I did not understand how my Puerto Rican identity meant that I learned differently from others” (Heaney, Sanabria, & Tisdell, 2001, p. 6).

Archie-Booker, Cervero, and Langone (1999) examined the cultural relevance to African American women of the curriculum of an AIDS prevention program. The programmatic and organizational focus of this study yielded findings that offer insight into the challenges of meeting the needs of various minority groups within one program or organization. The authors found persistent and systemic reluctance to address the needs of African American women, yet high-quality and culturally relevant materials and workshops for White homosexual men. Therefore, despite the organization’s
understanding of the importance of culturally relevant instruction, program directors chose to emphasize one group’s needs over those of another group. As noted by the authors, decisions regarding culturally relevant instruction are political and can be understood as manifestations of the existing organizational power structures.

**Examination of Culturally Responsive Teaching in Adult Education ESOL**

There are limited studies of culturally responsive pedagogy in the adult education ESOL classroom. This is perhaps reflective of the general lack of research related to the adult education ESOL classroom, in contrast to English language learners at the university level or in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) setting (Mathews-Aydinli, 2008). In a literature review, Mathews-Aydinli (2008) found only 41 research articles on adult education ESOL focusing on three areas: ethnographic studies of adult English language learners, teacher-related studies, and second-language acquisition studies. With the exception of second-language acquisition studies, culture was a recurring theme and basis of many of these studies. Although studies varied in ethnic group participation, all shared findings related to the relationship of acculturation and the acquisition of English. Teacher-related studies included examinations of culture and cultural identity, the results of which characterized the role of the adult education ESOL teacher as “caring, patient, cultural mediators” (p. 207). However, the paucity and lack of academic rigor of research on this growing branch of adult education was noted by the author and remains an obstacle to a comprehensive understanding of the needs of adult English language learners.
The following sections present the few studies of culturally responsive pedagogy in the adult education ESOL learning environment in terms of: instructor cultural self-awareness, learner cultural identity, and curricula and instruction (Marchisani & Adams, 1992).

**Instructor cultural self-awareness.** Studies focusing on the adult ESOL educator are limited and few examine instructor cultural self-awareness or cultural identity. However, there are several studies of the impact of the teacher’s English speaking status (native or non-native), an issue which has been more thoroughly examined in the EFL environment. Maum (2003) found some significant differences between the teaching practices and beliefs of these groups. In a study of 80 teachers, Maum observed that non-native English speaking teachers placed more importance on the cultural background of the teacher, as well as the inclusion of culture in the curriculum. Both groups also felt differently about the challenges faced by native and non-native English speaking teachers. Non-native English speaking teachers expressed confidence in their ability to understand adult ESOL students’ experiences related to being a foreigner, although they felt some insecurity about the level of their English proficiency. Native English-speaking teachers, on the other hand, believed that they had an advantage due to their understanding of the nuances of English, but worried that they may lack cultural awareness or sensitivity of their students. This issue was also explored in a study of five “visibly-minority” (Amin, 1997, p. 580) teachers in Canada. Using a critical race framework, the researcher identified three assumptions held by minority teachers.
They believed that their students assumed that: “(a) Only White people can be native speakers of English; (b) only native speakers know “real,” “proper,” “Canadian” English; and (c) only White people are “real” Canadians” (Amin, 1997, p. 580). These findings were corroborated in a later study (Amin, 1997), leading to the author’s stance that overcoming this persistent discrimination was a pressing issue to the field of ESOL.

**Learner cultural identity.** Studies of learner cultural identity in the adult education ESOL classroom involve a variety of participants, but share the assumption of the important relationship between culture and learning. In a study of seven women refugees from Bosnia, Iran, and Sudan, Warriner (2003) examined the participants’ varied roles and their impact on learning English. Additionally, the author examined the perceived obstacles to learning English and the strategies used to overcome those difficulties. An underlying theme was the disparity between perceptions held by program administrators and the participants, which the author concluded resulted in poor program quality and effectiveness. Another examination of the lived experiences of refugee women was Skilton-Sylvester’s (2002) longitudinal study of four Cambodian women in two urban adult education ESOL programs. Utilizing Peirce’s (1995) framework of *investment* to understand the nature of participation, Skilton-Sylvester found that although culture strongly influenced the identification of work and family roles, participants enacted these roles in different ways. Furthermore, the dynamic nature of the women’s roles resulted in continually changing learner needs which remained unmet. The author noted that the programs operated under misguided
assumptions of these learners that did not fully resemble the women’s complex roles and identities.

Many studies of learner cultural identity focus on Hispanics, the largest group of adult ESOL students in the U.S. One example is Gault’s (2003) examination of the assumptions adult Hispanics made about good language teaching. His findings revealed significant disparities between currently accepted best practices of second language instruction and the preferences of this sample of 136 predominantly Mexican participants. Students demonstrated strong preferences for practices related to direct instruction, such as explicit grammar and vocabulary instruction, rather than more holistic practices related to language acquisition. The author stressed the relevance of these findings to adult education programs which receive funding based on voluntary student attendance, resulting in a conflict between the use of teaching practices that are effective and those that are preferred by a cultural group of students.

Curricula and instruction. The limited studies of culturally responsive curricula and instruction in the adult education ESOL classroom can be classified into two areas: studies of cross-cultural aspects and various teaching strategies and practices. Shaw’s (2001) study of the intersection of culture and gender examined both students’ and teachers’ perceptions of these factors, concluding that culture and diversity played a significant role in the adult education ESOL classroom. Students noted an awareness of cultural differences and a tendency to make positive and negative generalizations of classmates from other backgrounds. They also reacted more positively to teachers from an Anglo/White American background, but paradoxically felt more comfortable if their
teacher was from their cultural background. Teachers also were aware of cultural
differences and made positive and negative generalizations about their students.
Furthermore, they also noted utilization of various teaching strategies as dependent on
the cultural backgrounds of students. In regard to handling cross-cultural conflict,
teachers reported strategies such as giving a lesson on culturally appropriate behaviors
and direct confrontation with the student(s). They also noted their expectation of
students’ conforming to U.S. values and behaviors, at times utilizing lessons that
communicated this mono-cultural perspective. In order to prevent conflict, teachers
used various strategies to create a sense of community such as consensus building and
the exploration of cultural similarities and differences.

Two studies examined intercultural communication and individual participation
in the adult education ESOL class. Students from diverse backgrounds stated that an
inability to understand classmates due to different accents and pronunciation was the
biggest problem in the classroom. Teachers also noted this issue, but felt that students’
acting superior to other students was the most problematic issue in a multicultural
classroom (Bornau, 1999). This challenge of communicating across cultures was also
found in Petruskevich’s (1997) study of various factors influencing participation in an
adult education ESOL class, sometimes resulting in students’ reluctance to work with
classmates of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. However, students generally
viewed diversity in a positive way and expressed an appreciation of the opportunity to
learn about other cultures. Teachers also viewed diversity as a positive aspect of the
classroom and dealt with differences in pronunciation by enforcing intercultural
cooperative activities. These opportunities were described as being invaluable to developing cross-cultural understanding.

Studies of culturally responsive teaching strategies and practices cover a range of issues. Many adult education ESOL educators implement an English only policy in order to encourage communication and language development. However, Auerbach (1993) examined the assumptions and implications of this practice and concluded that this practice resulted in the privileging of students with higher native and English literacy skills, effectively discriminating against certain language and cultural groups. This critical stance was also utilized in Griswold’s (2010) critique of the narratives used in a citizenship preparation class. The predominant and persistent theme of individualism used by the teacher demonstrated cultural insensitivity, creating a direct conflict with the students’ experiences as immigrants and cultural backgrounds.

The use of memoir writing in an adult education ESOL class was found to be highly challenging, resulting in the author’s acknowledgement of how complex the utilization of culturally responsive teaching strategies can be in a multicultural environment (Goldstein, 2004). The participants were resistant and preferred more traditional literacy strategies such as vocabulary and grammar worksheets, creating a conflict between the teacher’s and students’ language learning ideologies. The author recommended that the teacher develop an in-depth understanding of each student’s sociocultural perspectives in order to select appropriate, culturally responsive strategies, resisting the reliance on cultural generalizations.
The final study related to culturally responsive curricula and instruction in the adult education ESOL classroom is an examination of an innovative approach in an ESOL methods course. Throughout the course, pre-service teachers completed a practicum requirement by teaching ESOL in the homes of a Spanish-speaking, largely Mexican community. Although the author noted some reservations about the long-term effectiveness of this approach, the pre-service teachers noted feeling transformed by the experience and being more apt to contextualize and include the students’ native language in lessons (Rymes, 2002).

**Measuring Culturally Responsive Teaching**

While interest in culturally responsive teaching is steadily increasing, multicultural education researchers have not developed a psychometrically sound assessment instrument of this construct. Instead, assessments of teachers’ cultural sensitivity, racial bias or cultural competence comprise the majority of self-report instruments used in multicultural education research (Ponterotto & Pedersen, 2006). The following section describes three instruments: the Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory (CDAI), the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS), and the Munroe Multicultural Attitude Scale Questionnaire (MASQUE).

**Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory (CDAI).** The CDAI was developed by Henry in 1995 and examines the cultural awareness of teachers. This 28-item self-report instrument was originally developed for use with primary and secondary teachers, but has also been used with higher-education students and faculty. Henry (1995) originally identified three underlying factors: curriculum and communication,
identity differences, and discomfort with other culture. Other studies have modified these into four or five sub-scales of general awareness, parent/teacher interaction, classroom environment, cross-cultural communication, and alternative assessment (Brown, 2004). A 5-point Rating (1=Strongly Agree, 5=Strongly Disagree) scale is used to answer items such as *I would be comfortable in settings with people who speak a different English dialect from myself, it is important to identify immediately the ethnic groups of the children I serve, and translating a standardized achievement or intelligence test to the child’s dominant language gives the child an added advantage and does not allow the peer comparison.* The CDAI is a widely-cited instrument in education research, yet relatively little has been reported about its validity and reliability (Brown, 2004).

**Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS).** The M-GUDS was developed by Miville et al. in 1999 and uses Vontress’s framework of universality and multiple cultural identities. The M-GUDS is a uni-dimensional 45-item self-report survey. The construct of universal-diverse orientation (UDO) has been linked to a multicultural personality (Brummett et al., 2007), and was defined as “an attitude toward all other persons that is inclusive yet differentiating in that similarities and differences are both recognized and accepted“ (Miville et al., 1999, p. 292). UDO was originally hypothesized as consisting of the three factors of: relativistic appreciation of oneself and others, diversity of contact, and sense of connection. However, initial factor analysis found high intercorrelations (.65 to .69), leading the authors to support the survey’s uni-dimensionality and the suggested use of a total score, not sub-scale scores. Items such as *I am only at ease with people of my own race and I am interested in*
Knowing people who speak more than one language are assessed on a 6-point Likert scale (1= Strongly Agree, 6=Strongly Disagree).

**Munroe Multicultural Attitude Scale Questionnaire (MASQUE).** The Munroe Multicultural Attitude Scale Questionnaire was developed by Munroe and Pearson (2006) to measure the attitude of pre-service educators toward multiculturalism. The 18-item instrument utilizes Banks’s transformative approach of attitudinal change as its theoretical framework, corresponding to three factors of know, care, and act. The factor of know refers to those “cognitive thoughts, beliefs, perceived facts, and knowledge” (Munroe & Person, 2006, p. 821) about multicultural education, while the factors of care and act refer to “the affective emotion” (Munroe & Person, 2006, p. 821) and “behavioral course of action” (Munroe & Person, 2006, p. 821), toward multicultural education. Items are all positively worded statements such as I realize that racism exists (Know), I am sensitive to differing expressions of ethnicity (Care), and I actively challenge gender inequities (Act). Items are answered on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 6 (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree). While exploratory factor analysis supported the three-factor structure, the authors recommend using only a composite score, due to the low reliability of the Act subscale (.58) and “substantial interfactor correlations” (Munroe & Person, 2006, p. 826) found during the initial validation study. A second validation study of 422 undergraduates resulted in a similar three-factor construct. However, a rewording two of the 18 items resulted in a higher level of internal consistency in the Act factor of .64 (Uttley, 2008).
The CDAI, M-GUDS, and MASQUE are three instruments used to measure multicultural awareness or competence of educators. However, all deal exclusively with attitudes and beliefs toward diversity. This lack of a self-assessment instrument which examines practices inhibits teachers' abilities to assess their teaching in a multicultural classroom.

**Survey Research**

Survey research is a method of obtaining personal information that is not readily observable such as attitudes, trends, and opinions (Creswell, 2005; Rea & Parker, 2005). Survey research is often used when the goal is to generalize findings from the study to the relevant population. In addition to being generalizable, well-designed survey research offer the advantages of quick administration and easy statistical analysis (Rea & Parker, 2005).

**The tailored design method.** Dillman (2000) describes the Tailored Design Method as survey design that enhances response rates through social exchange theory. This theoretical framework focuses survey design on methods to “increase perceived rewards for responding, decrease perceived costs, and promote trust in beneficial outcomes” (Dillman, 2000, p. 5). The Tailored Design Method requires the survey designer to critically analyze the survey environment in order to counteract aspects of potential cost to participants and to develop a sense of trust and perceived benefit to participants. Two assumptions underlying this method are that people must be motivated to respond to survey items and that various attempts to solicit participation are essential to augment response rates. Suggestions to provide rewards to participants
include using terminology and explanations that demonstrate positive regard for the participants and offering tangible compensation. Informing participants of survey sponsorship by a legitimate authority or even offering compensation prior to completing the survey instills a sense of trust, while minimizing requests for personal information and using design features that emphasize the brevity and ease of completing the survey combine to reduce the perceived cost of participation (Dillman, 2000). When writing survey items, Dillman (2000) suggested following these principles:

1. Choose simple over specialized words.
2. Choose as few words as possible to pose the question.
3. Use complete sentences to ask questions.
4. Avoid vague quantifiers when more precise estimates can be obtained.
5. Avoid specificity that exceeds the respondent’s potential for having an accurate, ready-made answer.
6. Use equal numbers of positive and negative categories for scalar questions.
7. Distinguish undecided from neutral by placement at the end of the scale.
8. Avoid bias from unequal comparisons.
9. Eliminate check-all-that-apply question formats to reduce primacy effects.
10. Develop response categories that are mutually exclusive.
11. Use cognitive design techniques to improve recall.
12. Provide appropriate time referents.
13. Be sure each question is technically accurate.
14. Choose question wordings that allow essential comparisons to be made with previously collected data.
15. Avoid asking respondents to say yes in order to mean no.
16. Avoid double-barreled questions.
17. Soften the impact of potentially objectionable questions.
18. Avoid asking respondents to make unnecessary calculations.
(Dillman, 2000, pp. 34-77)

Summary

In summary, this chapter detailed the literature relevant to this study, including the importance of culture, cultural identity, and acculturation to English language learners. Then, a description of culturally responsive teaching theory and the
Motivational Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching were presented, followed by examinations of research related to adult, higher, and English language education settings. Additionally, three multicultural competence assessments were summarized and compared. This chapter concluded with information related to the primary survey design approach, the Tailored Design Method.
Chapter 3

Methods

The purpose of this study was to describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida. This chapter outlines the methods and procedures used to accomplish these goals. Due to the multi-faceted design of this study, this chapter consists of two major sections: survey development and survey administration. The survey development section explains the two-stage process, while the survey administration section chronicles the research design, population and sampling, instrumentation, data collection, and analysis of the study.

Research Objectives and Questions

The following research objectives guided this study:

1. To develop and validate a survey of culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL teachers.

2. To describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of a representative sample of adult education ESOL teachers in the state of Florida.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. To what extent do adult education ESOL teachers use culturally responsive teaching practices?
2. How do adult education ESOL teachers rank the importance of using specific culturally responsive teaching practices?

Survey Development

The first stage of this study was the development of a survey of culturally responsive teaching practices relevant to the adult education ESOL and EAP teachers based on the Motivational Framework of Culturally Responsive Teaching framework (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009). Development of a survey instrument can be accomplished through various methods; however, the process entails the following steps: clear identification of the construct to be measured, item generation, expert review and refinement of item pool, a pilot or development study, and item evaluation and reduction (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006). The development, modification, and validation of the proposed survey consisted of two phases: the generation and validation of an item pool and the validation of the draft survey.

**Item pool development.** The first major phase of this study was the generation of a pool of items which describe culturally responsive teaching practices in the adult education ESOL classroom. The goal of this phase was to yield items that “every potential respondent will interpret in the same way, be able to respond to accurately, and be willing to answer” (Dillman, 2000, p. 32).

A list of culturally responsive teaching characteristics compiled during a literature review served as the theoretical foundation of this process. The researcher conducted a literature review using the key terms “culturally responsive”, “culturally relevant”, and “culturally congruent” teaching in Academic Search Premier, Education
Resources Information Center (ERIC), JSTOR Education, and ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, A & I. This search yielded findings from predominantly qualitative examinations of culturally responsive teachers in a variety of teaching environments. All characteristics were compiled into a master list, categorized by the four elements of the Motivational Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009). The list was then consolidated by eliminating redundant characteristics, resulting in a master list of 23 characteristics of culturally responsive teachers. These characteristics represented general beliefs and experiences of culturally responsive teachers and were used to develop items of specific teaching practices appropriate for an adult education ESOL classroom.

The item pool development process entailed three tasks: item pool development, item pool validation, and item pool verification. After conducting a pilot test, the researcher conducted the item pool development task through an online questionnaire with a panel of Second Language Acquisition and Instructional Technology (SLAiT) graduate students. Following this, a validation panel and verification panel was utilized to establish the content validity of the item pool. The item pool validation task was conducted through an online questionnaire sent to a panel of practitioners with a background in teaching adult education ESOL. The item pool verification task was also conducted through an online questionnaire sent to a panel of adult education professors with a background in culturally responsive teaching theory.

*Pilot test item pool development task.* The researcher reviewed the instructions and materials of the item pool development task for clarity and ease of application with
the pilot test panel. This pilot test panel was comprised of advanced graduate students with a background in measurement, multicultural education, or adult learning and was used to pilot test all tasks in this study. The list of pilot panel members can be found in Appendix A. This panel was conducted online at surveygizmo.com. Feedback served as the basis of the item pool development task revisions.

**Administration of item pool development task.** A sample of 34 Second Language Acquisition and Instructional Technology (SLAIT) graduate students with a background in linguistics, curriculum and instruction, and research design comprised the item pool development panel. A list of the item pool development panel members can be found in Appendix B.

Each panel member received an email explaining the study objectives and a link to version A or B of the online item pool development questionnaire. Each version had 12 of the 23 total characteristics, with one characteristic duplicated in both versions. This process was selected to reduce the amount of time each individual had to spend reviewing the items in an effort to increase response rates (Dillman, 2000). Panel members were randomly selected to receive version A or B of the item pool development questionnaire.

Appendix C contains the email sent to panel members used throughout this study, and versions A and B of the item pool development task can be found in Appendices D and E, respectively. Panel members were asked to write one possible indicator of the application of a culturally responsive teaching characteristic in the adult education ESOL classroom. The compiled list of culturally responsive teaching
characteristics that served as the foundation of item development can be found in Appendix F.

**Consolidate item pool.** The researcher consolidated the generated item pool by eliminating duplicate and ambiguous items, resulting in an item pool of 27 culturally responsive teaching practices. Attention was given to writing simple and concise items, in addition to avoiding the use of double-barreled or potentially offensive questions (Dillman, 2000).

In order to assess the content validity of the item pool, this study utilized the expertise of individuals with extensive academic and practical teaching experience in the field of adult education ESOL and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) to evaluate the item pool for clarity and relevance (Rea & Parker, 2005). The item pool validation was conducted online using the following steps:

**Pilot test item pool validation task.** The researcher reviewed the instructions and materials of the item pool validation task for clarity and ease of application with the pilot test panel.

**Administration of item pool validation task.** Each item pool validation panel member received an email containing a brief explanation of the study and a link to the item pool validation panel activity. A copy of the email correspondence and a screen shot of the online item pool validation task can be found in Appendices G and H. A maximum of two follow-up reminder emails were sent to non-responding individuals. Panel members were asked to rank the clarity of each item from 1-5, as well as ranking its relevance to the adult ESOL classroom (Rea & Parker, 2005). Panel members were
also asked to evaluate the total item pool and add any culturally responsive teaching practices missing from the overall list. Of the 31 potential panel members contacted, 12 completed the item pool validation task. Respondents were not asked to identify themselves; therefore, a list of the entire potential panel member names can be found in Appendix I.

In order to further support the content validity of the survey, the researcher conducted a final verification of the items. This task was completed by the members of the Item Verification Panel and consisted of rating the relevance of each item to the adult learning environment and culturally responsive teaching theory.

**Pilot test item pool verification task.** The researcher reviewed the instructions and materials of the item pool verification task for clarity and ease of application with the pilot test panel.

**Administration of item pool verification task.** The item pool verification task was conducted through surveygizmo.com. A list of item pool verification panel members can be found in Appendix J. Each item pool verification task panel member received an email containing a brief explanation of the study and a link to the item pool verification task. A copy of the email correspondence to the verification panel can be found in Appendix K. A maximum of two reminder emails were sent to non-responding individuals. Each panel member was asked to rank the relevance to the adult learning environment of each item from 1-5, as well as its relevance to culturally responsive teaching theory (Rea & Parker, 2005). A screen shot of the item pool verification task
can be found in Appendix L. Panel members were also asked to evaluate the total item pool and add any culturally responsive teaching practices missing from the overall list.

**Revise draft survey.** Of the 27 culturally responsive teaching practices in the item pool, 8 were deleted with mean scores of 3 or below, while 2 items were reworded or combined. At the conclusion of this stage, the draft survey included 17 culturally responsive teaching practices. In the draft survey, adult ESOL and EAP teachers assessed how frequently they used each teaching practice and how important they perceived each practice to be to their teaching. The frequency of use was assessed through a 5-point frequency scale with levels of: *never, rarely, sometimes, usually,* and *always,* while perception of importance is assessed through a 5-point frequency scale with levels of: *not at all, somewhat, moderately, very,* and *extremely.*

**Draft survey pretest and pilot test.** Although survey developers sometimes use the pretest phase of survey development in different ways, it is generally used to obtain feedback on various aspects such as administration procedures and survey format (Dillman, 2000). Dillman recommends the four-stage process of an expert panel review, cognitive interviews, a small pilot study, and a cumulative review. In this study, the researcher conducted the pretest and pilot test phase in the specific steps followed below.

**Pretest draft survey using cognitive interviewing.** A pretest of the draft survey was administered to adult education ESOL teachers in the Pasco County School District. The researcher used the retrospective technique (Dillman, 2000), during which pretest participants completed the draft survey without interruption and were interviewed.
about problematic issues. Based on participant feedback, no changes were made to the draft survey. A sample of the draft survey can be found in Appendix M.

**Pilot test draft survey.** In the pilot phase of survey development, the researcher administers “the final draft form to a large sample of examinees representative for whom the test is designed” (Crocker & Algina, 1986, p. 83). A proportional sample of 100 adult education ESOL or EAP instructors in Florida (Dillman, 2000) was used to conduct a pilot study of the survey. Between October 19, 2012 and November 14, 2012, each pilot test participant received an email containing a brief explanation of the study, an Informed Consent Form, and a link to the draft survey. Copies of the email correspondence to the pilot test participants can be found in Appendix N (this is the same correspondence that was sent to the survey participants). For a copy of the Informed Consent Form, see appendix O (this is the same form sent to survey participants). Reminder emails were sent to non-respondents on a weekly basis resulting in an overall survey response rate for the pilot study of 29%.

**Analyze data of pilot study.** The data analysis of the pilot study included item analyses of both the items related to frequency of use and perceived importance (DeVaus, 1995). The means of frequency-related items ranged from 4.17 to 2.52. Additionally, the variances of these items ranged from .677 of “How often do you ask students to compare their culture with American culture?” to 2.291 “How often do you ask students to speak their native language with their children?”. Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and variances of all frequency-related items.
The means of items measuring perceived importance ranged from 3.97 to 2.41. The item of perceived importance with the lowest variance at .680 was “How important is it to your teaching to ask students to compare their culture with American culture?” and the item with the greatest variance at .1.852 was “How important is it to your teaching to encourage students to speak their native language with their children?”. Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and variances of all items related to perceived importance.

In order to assess the reliability, or consistency, of the pilot survey, Cronbach’s coefficient alpha values were calculated for both the 17 frequency-related items and the 17 perceived-importance items. Both demonstrated acceptable reliability with Cronbach’s coefficient alpha values of .752 for the frequency-related items and .824 for the perceived-importance items. These values are detailed in Table 4. Based on these data, all 17 items were retained for the administration phase.

**Survey Administration**

The following section describes the steps in the administration phase of the survey. First, the population and sampling steps are detailed, followed by a description of the instrumentation, data collection, and analysis steps.

**Population and sampling.** The target population for this study consisted of teachers in non-credit, adult education ESOL and EAP programs in the state of Florida. There is no available statewide database of adult education ESOL educators.
Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics of Responses to How Frequently Teachers Used Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices from Pilot Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide rubrics and progress reports to students</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use mixed-language and mixed-cultural pairings in group work</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make an effort to get to know students’ families and background</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask students to compare their culture with American culture</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine class materials for culturally appropriate images and themes</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to use cross-cultural comparisons when analyzing material</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn words in students’ native languages</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use peer tutors or student-led discussions</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about the acculturation process</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time outside of class learning about the cultures and languages of students</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement the curriculum with lessons about international current events</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to speak their native language with their children</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use student surveys to learn about students’ classroom preferences</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for student input when planning lessons and activities</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N=29. Var=Variance*
Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Responses to How Important Teachers Rated Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices from Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide rubrics and progress reports to students</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>1.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use peer tutors or student-led discussions</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>1.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use mixed-language and mixed-cultural pairings in group work</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td>1.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine class materials for culturally appropriate images and themes</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>1.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask students to compare their culture with American culture</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make an effort to get to know students’ families and background</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>1.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to use cross-cultural comparisons when analyzing material</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>1.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time outside of class learning about the cultures and languages of students</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>1.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about the acculturation process</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use student surveys to learn about students’ classroom preferences</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement the curriculum with lessons about international current events</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td>1.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to speak their native language with their children</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.361</td>
<td>1.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for student input when planning lessons and activities</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>1.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn words in students’ native languages</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>1.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>1.323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=29. Var=Variance
Table 4

*Reliability of Pilot Study Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items of Frequency</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items of Importance</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, an initial sampling frame was compiled using data from publicly-accessible adult education ESOL and EAP faculty directories from district school board and college websites. Additionally, participants from Sunshine State TESOL (SSTESOL) and local SSTESOL affiliates were recruited through the SSTESOL list-serv and the social media network, Facebook. Local SSTESOL affiliates included: EAP Consortium, Bay Area Regional TESOL, Central Florida TESOL, Emerald Coast TESOL, and Northeast Florida TESOL.

There were 430 adult education ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida that comprised the sampling frame of this study. They were drawn from 15 state colleges or community colleges, 2 universities, 8 school districts, and Bay Area Regional TESOL (BART). Between November 18, 2012 and December 7, 2012, participants received an email containing a brief explanation of the study, an Informed Consent Form, and a link to the draft survey. See appendices N and O for the email correspondence and Informed Consent Form for the study participants. Reminder
emails were sent to non-respondents on a weekly basis until no further responses were forthcoming, resulting in an overall survey response rate of 31.2%. There were 46 responses in the first week, followed by 49 responses in the second week, 39 responses in the third week, and no further responses following the fourth reminder email.

To determine if item responses differed according to week of response, separate analyses of variance and follow-up tests were conducted on the two sets of items for frequency of use and perceived importance. There were differences in week of responses to four items.

The ANOVA and Tukey test results found significant differences by response week using a predetermined Type I error rate of .05 in three frequency of use items. These differences were between the responses to the first and second weeks’ responses in addition to the first and third weeks’ responses to “How often do you make an effort to get to know students’ families?” [F (2, 131) = 7.40, p = .001]. Significant differences were found in responses to “How often do you elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities?” [F (2, 131) = 4.61, p = .012] between the first and third weeks’ responses, and between the first and second weeks’ responses to “How often do you ask for student input when planning lessons and activities?” [F (2, 131) = 3.18, p = .045].

The ANOVA and Tukey test results found significant differences between the first and third weeks’ responses to “How important to your teaching is it to elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities?” [F (2, 131) = 4.13, p = .018] and
“How important to your teaching is it to encourage students to use cross-cultural comparisons when analyzing material?” \[F (2, 131) = 3.81, p = .025\].

The survey of culturally responsive teaching practices was accessed through www.surveygizmo. There were no potential risks to participants. Non-response of study participants can result in a reduction of sample size or bias and can be offset by careful planning and the use of a higher initial sample (Sapsford, 1999). Therefore, the researcher offered three raffles for $25 gift cards to all participants who completed either the draft or final survey. The researcher used www.randompicker.com to randomly select the three recipients who were notified via email at the completion of the survey.

**Instrumentation.** Since no instrument existed to describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL educators, a survey was developed for this research through a multi-step process based on an extensive literature review of culturally responsive teaching theory in adult education and ESOL, the professional experience of the researcher, suggestions offered during roundtable discussions at national and state adult education conferences, and feedback from experts in the fields of Adult Education and Second Language Acquisition.

**Web-based surveys.** This study utilized a web-based survey of closed-ended questions. Web-based surveys offer further advantages of convenience, fast data collection, low administration cost, confidentiality and security of participant information, and facilitation of complex questions and visual aids (Rea & Parker, 2005). However, web-based surveys also offer disadvantages, including the limitation of
respondents to individuals who are able to use computers and feel comfortable using the Internet. Also, without personal contact, the interviewer cannot clarify or explain questions, possibly leading to inaccurate responses. The researcher selected this format based on the assumption that adult education ESOL and EAP teachers would be computer-literate and Internet-savvy. Issues of incomprehensibility of items were addressed and corrected from input gathered during the pilot study phase.

**Survey framework.** Many models of culturally responsive teaching refer to teaching one specific cultural group in the K-12 setting. However, the adult education ESOL classroom may be an ethnically heterogeneous classroom of adult learners. As such, there was no conceptual framework which addressed teaching practices appropriate for ethnically diverse learning environments of adult learners of sound psychometric properties. After completing an extensive literature review, the researcher selected Ginsberg and Wlodkowski’s Motivational Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching (2009) as the operational framework of culturally responsive teaching practices. The first rationale for this decision was due to the framework’s original design as “a tool for continual reflection” (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009, p. 39) to help educators examine their teaching in an effort to improve the cultural responsiveness of their practices. Secondly, although this framework was designed for the higher education classroom, it could be adapted to the adult education classroom. Based on these reasons, it was the researcher’s decision to select this theoretically sound and relevant framework of the survey.
**Survey format.** The survey included 34 items related to culturally responsive teaching practices. Participants were presented with 17 culturally responsive teaching practices and assessed *how frequently* they used each teaching practice and *how important* they believed each practice was to their teaching. The frequency of use was assessed through a 5-point frequency scale with levels of: never, rarely, sometimes, usually, and always, while perception of importance was assessed through a 5-point frequency scale with levels of: not at all, somewhat, moderately, very, and extremely.

**Data collection and analysis**

All data were collected through the web-based survey at [www.surveygizmo.com](http://www.surveygizmo.com) and stored in a secure data file. The principal investigator agreed to maintain this secure data file for a minimum of five years as stipulated by USF IRB. After five years from the close of the study by USF IRB, data will be erased using Secure Erase, available through the Center for Magnetic Recording Research, [www.cmrr.ucsd.edu](http://www.cmrr.ucsd.edu). Data were downloaded from [www.surveygizmo.com](http://www.surveygizmo.com) onto a password-protected external hard drive. Access to the data was limited to the principal investigator, co-investigator, and USF IRB personnel if requested. The principal investigator reviewed the data for anomalies to ensure its integrity. Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics through the Statistics Package for Social Services (SPSS) software program.

**Reliability.** When examining latent traits such as culturally relevant teaching practices, the reporting of the reliability of sample scores establishes a level of consistency of these unobservable characteristics (Meyer, 2010). Thus, “reliability
refers to the degree of test score consistency over many replications of a test or performance task” (Meyer, 2010, p. 4).

There are various ways to examine reliability of scores including test-retest, parallel test forms, and internal consistency. Tests of internal consistency such as Cronbach’s alpha coefficient scores are used when there is a single administration of the instrument and reveal a pattern of item responses relative to each other (Crocker & Algina, 1986). In other words, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient scores reveal if participants respond in a similar or consistent manner (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). Therefore, coefficient scores were calculated for the variables of frequency of use and perception of importance to establish the internal consistency of the proposed survey with this sample.

**Validity.** Validity is an additional element to support inferences and interpretations made during the research process (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). Validity is multi-faceted and includes content and construct validity, both of which were examined in this study.

**Content validity.** Content validity is “the extent to which inferences from a test’s scores accurately reflect the concept or conceptual domain that the test is claimed to measure” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 621). The content validation process is generally conducted through feedback from content area experts during the survey development process (Crocker & Algina, 1986). In this study, panels of experts were used at various phases of survey development, including the item pool validation panel and item pool
verification panel. Through various activities they served as judges of clarity, comprehensiveness, and relevance of the items and overall survey (Rea & Parker, 2005).

**Construct validity.** Construct validity is “the extent to which inferences from a test’s scores accurately reflect the construct that the test is claimed to measure” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 621). There are various ways to support construct validity. In this study, exploratory factor analysis was conducted to ascertain if certain items functioned as a group, or factor, of the construct of culturally responsive teaching practices (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006).

**Descriptive statistics**

The initial step of analysis was an examination and representation of the frequency distributions of the frequency of use and perception of importance of each culturally responsive teaching practice. In addition, they were analyzed for central tendency, dispersion, and shape. A cumulative frequency chart was developed in order to examine overall patterns within the sample. Additionally, variance, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis of both the overall and item scores were compiled and examined.

**Summary**

This chapter detailed the various steps of this study to design, validate, and administer a self-report survey of culturally responsive teaching characteristics. First, the alignment, item pool development, and draft survey validation phases needed to develop a draft survey were elaborated. Then, the research design, population and sampling, instrumentation, data collection, and analysis were detailed.
Chapter 4

Findings

The purpose of this study was to describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida. This chapter presents the demographics of the study participants and the results of the statistical data analyses of the items.

The following research objectives guided this study:

1. To develop and validate a survey of culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers.
2. To describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of a representative sample of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. To what extent do adult education ESOL and EAP teachers use culturally responsive teaching practices?
2. How do adult education ESOL and EAP teachers rank the importance of using specific culturally responsive teaching practices?

The first stage of this study was the development of a survey of culturally responsive teaching practices relevant to adult ESOL and EAP classrooms and consisted of two phases: the generation and validation of an item pool and the validation of the draft survey through the administration of a pilot study. In the second stage, 400
potential participants received an email containing a brief explanation of the study (Appendix N), an Informed Consent Form (Appendix O), and a link to the online survey. The survey (Appendix M) was administered to 134 ESOL and EAP teachers from school districts or college programs throughout the state of Florida for an overall survey response rate of 33.5%.

The 34-item survey is divided into two sections focusing on a) current frequency of use of culturally responsive teaching practices and b) perceived importance of those practices to their teaching. In the survey, participants assessed *how frequently* they used each teaching practice and *how important* they believed each practice was to their teaching.

**Study Participants**

There were 430 adult education ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida that comprised the sampling frame of this study. They came from 15 state or community colleges, 2 universities, 8 school districts, and Bay Area Regional TESOL (BART). The following list details the state or community college and the number of teachers included in the sampling frame: Brevard Community College (10), Broward College (64), Central Florida College (1), Daytona State College (7), Edison State College (9), Hillsborough Community College (43), Indian River State College (70), Miami Dade College (52), Northwest Florida State College (3), Palm Beach State College (4), Saint Petersburg College (17), Seminole State College (13), State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota (13), and Valencia College (40). Teachers at Florida colleges comprised the majority of the sampling frame with 346 potential participants, or 80.5%. There were 15
teachers from Florida International University and 21 teachers from the University of South Florida comprising 8.4% of the sampling frame. Teachers from district school boards comprised 7.7% of the frame in the following numbers: Citrus (2), Columbia (1), Hardee (6), Hillsborough (5), Osceola (4), Orange (10), and Pinellas (6) Counties, with Bay Area Region TESOL (BART) rounding out the frame with 15 teachers, 3.4% of the sampling frame.

Between November 18, 2012 and December 7, 2012, participants received an email containing a brief explanation of the study (Appendix N), an Informed Consent Form (Appendix O), and a link to the survey (Appendix M). Reminder emails were sent to non-respondents on a weekly basis until no further responses were forthcoming, resulting in an overall survey response rate of 31.2%. Of the 296 non-respondents, 9 requested to be removed from the distribution list prior to completing the survey. All survey responses were fully completed and none were deemed invalid. Of the 134 respondents, 26 preferred to remain anonymous and did not provide their email address upon completion of the survey; therefore, this demographic information was not available.

The majority of respondents were female (78.38%), while males represented 19.82% of the sample, with 1.8% of unidentified gender. The overwhelming majority of respondents were from community or state colleges (92%), while individuals from school districts were only 6.3% of the respondents. Two respondents were from Bay Area Regional TESOL, representing 1.8% of the respondents. All respondents were teaching adults in ESOL or EAP programs in the state of Florida.
Instrumentation

The following section describes the findings related to the validity and reliability of the survey.

**Validity.** Validity is an additional element to support inferences and interpretations made during the research process (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). Validity is multi-faceted and includes content and construct validity, both of which were analyzed in this study.

**Content validity.** Content validity is “the extent to which inferences from a test’s scores accurately reflect the concept or conceptual domain that the test is claimed to measure” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 621). The content validation process is generally conducted through feedback from content area experts during the survey development process (Crocker & Algina, 1986). In this study, panels of experts were used at various phases of survey development, specifically during the item pool validation and item pool verification stages. In the item pool validation stage, each panel member was asked to rank the clarity of each item from 1-5, in addition to its relevance to the adult ESOL classroom. In the item pool verification stage, each panel member was asked to rank the relevance to the adult learning environment and to culturally responsive teaching theory of each item from 1-5 (Rea & Parker, 2005). Both sets of panel members were also asked to evaluate the total item pool and add any culturally responsive teaching practices missing from the overall list.

Results from the item validation task yielded mean scores of item clarity ranging from 3.36 to 4.64, with no item mean below 3.1. Mean scores of item relevance to the
adult ESOL classroom ranged from 2.45 to 4.64, with four item means below 3.0. These items were the following: “I greet my students in their native languages” (M = 2.55), “I know some words in all of my students’ native languages” (M = 2.82), “Students use native language materials for class assignments” (M = 2.45), and “I encourage students to use bilingual reference tools in class” (M = 1.73). A complete list of item means from the item validation panel can be found in Appendix P.

Results from the item verification task yielded mean scores of relevance to the adult learning environment ranging from 1.38 to 4.63 with the highest number of item means below 3.0. These items were “I greet my students in their native languages” (M = 2.88), “I ask students to compare their culture with American culture” (M = 2.87), “I know some words in all of my students’ native languages” (M = 2.75), “I discourage discussions of politics, religion, or other culturally sensitive areas in class” (M = 1.38), “I use maps, flags, and symbols from my students’ countries in class activities” (M = 2.75), “Students use native language materials for class assignments” (M = 2.88), “I encourage students to use bilingual reference tools in class” (M = 2.88). Mean scores of item relevance to culturally responsive teaching theory ranged from 1.38 to 5, with only two item means scoring below 3.0. Those items were “I discourage discussions of politics, religion, or other culturally sensitive areas in class” (M = 1.38) and “Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities” (M = 2.75). A complete list of item means from the item verification panel can be found in Appendix Q.
Based on these item means, eight items were deleted while two items were reworded or combined. At the conclusion of this stage, the draft survey included 17 culturally responsive teaching practices.

**Construct validity.** Construct validity is “the extent to which inferences from a test’s scores accurately reflect the construct that the test is claimed to measure” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 621). There are various ways to support construct validity. In this study, exploratory factor analysis was conducted to ascertain if certain items function as a group, or factor, of the construct of culturally responsive teaching practices (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006).

**Frequency of use.** To support the factorability of the data, two criteria were examined. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .767, above the recommended value of .6. Additionally, the Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(136) = 473.19, p < .05$).

Principal components analysis was used because the primary purpose was to identify underlying factors of the items related to the frequency of use of the 17 culturally responsive teaching practices. The initial eigen values showed that the first factor explained 25% of the variance, the second factor 9% of the variance, the third factor 8% of the variance, the fourth and fifth factors both contributed 7% of the variance, for a cumulative total variance of 56%. Based on the four-element structure of the theoretical framework and the initial eigen values, four and five factor solutions were examined, using both varimax and oblimin rotations of the factor loading matrix. The five-factor solution using a varimax rotation solution was used for the final solution.
The factor pattern coefficients revealed some similarities to the Motivational Framework of Culturally Responsive Teaching. All three of the items categorized as *enhancing meaning* were related to each other with factor pattern coefficients of .711, .652, and .608, demonstrating a relationship among those items. Those factor pattern coefficients and communalities of these items are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

*Factor Pattern Coefficients and Communalities Based on a Principle Components Analysis for Items Related to Frequency of Use of Survey Items Categorized as Enhancing Meaning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Comm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask students to compare their culture with American culture</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>-.328</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to use cross-cultural comparisons when analyzing material</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement the curriculum with lessons about international current events</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td></td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
<td>.517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Comm=Communality.

Additionally, 3 of the 5 items categorized as *establishing inclusion* demonstrated factor pattern coefficients of .690, .681, and .585 Factor II, while 1 of the remaining items demonstrated a closer relationship to Factor I with a coefficient of .559. A
complete list of the factor pattern coefficients and communalities of this element of the Motivational Framework of Culturally Responsive Teaching is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

*Factor Pattern Coefficients and Communalities Based on a Principle Components Analysis for Items Related to Frequency of Use of Survey Items Categorized as Establishing Inclusion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Comm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use mixed-language and mixed-cultural pairings in group work</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.309</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make an effort to get to know students’ families and background</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn words in students’ native languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about the acculturation process</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time outside of class learning about the cultures and languages of students</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td></td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to speak their native language with their children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Comm=Communality.

Of the 4 items categorized as *engendering competence*, 2 items demonstrated a relationship to Factor IV with pattern coefficients of .689 and .641. A complete list of Factor IV pattern coefficients and communalities are presented in Table 7.
Table 7

*Factor Pattern Coefficients and Communalities Based on a Principle Components Analysis for Items Related to Frequency of Use of Survey Items Categorized as Engendering Competence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Comm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide rubrics and progress reports to students</td>
<td></td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use peer tutors or student-led discussions</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td></td>
<td>.526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for student input when planning lessons and activities</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Comm=Communality.

Of the 3 items categorized as the final element of the Motivational Framework of Culturally Responsive Teaching, *developing attitude*, 2 demonstrated a relationship to Factor III with factor pattern coefficients of .691 and .740, while the third item categorized as *developing attitude* was found to have a stronger relationship to Factor I, with a factor pattern coefficient of .544.

In summary, the findings of this survey administration demonstrated some relationship to its theoretical framework. However, these findings are exploratory and influenced by the small sample size.
Table 8

Factor Pattern Coefficients and Communalities Based on a Principle Components Analysis for Items Related to Frequency of Use of Survey Items Categorized as Developing Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Comm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td></td>
<td>.509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine class materials for culturally appropriate images and themes</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td></td>
<td>.608</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use student surveys to learn about students’ classroom preferences</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Comm=Communality.

Perceived Importance. To support the factorability of the data, two criteria were examined. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .805, above the recommended value of .6. Additionally, the Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (136) = 617.70, p < .05$).

Principal components analysis was used to identify underlying factors of the items related to the perceived importance of the 17 culturally responsive teaching practices. The initial eigen values showed that the first factor explained 30% of the variance, the second factor 8% of the variance, the third factor 7% of the variance, the fourth and fifth factors both contributed 6% of the variance, for a cumulative total variance of 58%. Based on the four-element structure of the theoretical framework and
the initial eigen values, four and five factor solutions were examined, using both varimax and oblimin rotations of the factor loading matrix. The five factor solution using a varimax rotation solution was used for the final solution.

The factor pattern coefficients revealed fewer similarities to the Motivational Framework of Culturally Responsive Teaching than the frequency of use items. However, the strongest relationship among items resulted from those classified as *engendering competence*, 3 of which were grouped in Factor III with factor pattern coefficients of .690, .747, and .653. A complete list of the factor pattern coefficients and communalities are presented in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Comm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide rubrics and progress reports to students</td>
<td></td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use peer tutors or student-led discussions</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for student input when planning lessons and activities</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Comm=Communality.
Additionally, 3 of the 7 items categorized as *establishing inclusion* had coefficients of .634, .811, and .528 on Factor IV, while 2 items had coefficients of .771 and .511 on Factor II, and 1 item had a coefficient of .546 on Factor I. The complete list of factor pattern coefficients and communalities of these items are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

*Factor Pattern Coefficients and Communalities Based on a Principle Components Analysis for Items Related to Perceived Importance of Survey Items Categorized as Establishing Inclusion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Comm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use mixed-language and mixed-cultural pairings in group work</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make an effort to get to know students’ families and background</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn words in students’ native languages</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td></td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about the acculturation process</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time outside of class learning about the cultures and languages of students</td>
<td></td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td></td>
<td>.716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to speak native language with children</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.-277</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Comm=Communality.
The items categorized as *enhancing meaning* revealed a pattern for 2 of the 3 items loading on Factor I with coefficients of .715 and .775. A complete list of the factor pattern coefficients and communalities of this element are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

*Factor Pattern Coefficients and Communalities Based on a Principle Components Analysis for Items Related to Perceived Importance of Survey Items Categorized as Enhancing Meaning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Comm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask students to compare their culture with American culture</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to use cross-cultural comparisons when analyzing material</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
<td>.207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement the curriculum with lessons about international current events</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td></td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Comm=Communality.

Items categorized in the final element of the Motivational Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching, *developing attitude*, did not reveal a discernible pattern. Only one item demonstrated a relationship to other survey items, with a coefficient of .731 on Factor II. The complete list of factor pattern coefficients and communalities of items related to *developing attitude* are presented in Table 12.
Table 12

*Factor Pattern Coefficients and Communalities Based on a Principle Components Analysis for Items Related to Perceived Importance of Survey Items Categorized as Developing Attitude*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Comm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>-.497</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine class materials for culturally appropriate images and themes</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td></td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use student surveys to learn about students’ classroom preferences</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Comm=Communality.

**Reliability.** The Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of the two sub-groups of items related to *frequency of use* and *perception of importance* were calculated and high levels of internal reliability of .781 and .848, respectively. See Table 13 for details.

Table 13

*Reliability of Results of Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items of Frequency</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items of Importance</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Research Questions

The following section describes the findings of the survey related to frequency of use and perception of importance of the items.

**Frequency of use.** The first section of the survey contained 17 items requiring respondents to indicate how frequently they use each culturally responsive teaching practice. The frequency of use was assessed through a 5-point frequency scale with levels of: *never, rarely, sometimes, usually, and always* with respective score values ranging from one point to five points. Item means ranged from 2.51 to 4.26 with nine items falling in the moderate range of 3.02 to 3.91 corresponding to the frequency category of *sometimes*. There were four items with high mean scores between 4.0 and 4.5, as well as four items with mean scores ranging from 2.5 to 3.0 corresponding to the frequency level between *rarely* and *sometimes*. The specific items are discussed below under most frequently used practices and least frequently used practices. Mean scores, standard deviations, and variances of all items related to frequency of use are detailed in Table 14.

**Most frequently used practices.** Results indicated that four teaching practices were used most frequently, with mean scores ranging from 4.1 to 4.26, corresponding to the levels of *always* and *usually*. The most frequently used practice was “*provide rubrics and progress reports to students*” (\(M = 4.26; SD = .98\)), followed closely by “*elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities*” (\(M = 4.24; SD = .748\)).
Table 14

Descriptive Statistics of Responses to How Frequently Teachers Used Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide rubrics and progress reports to students</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask students to compare their culture with American culture</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make an effort to get to know students’ families and background</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use mixed-language and mixed-cultural pairings in group work</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine class materials for appropriate images and themes</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>1.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to use cross-cultural comparisons when analyzing material</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time outside of class learning about the cultures and languages of students</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use peer tutors or student-led discussions</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn words in students’ native languages</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>1.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement the curriculum with lessons about international current events</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about the acculturation process</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to speak their native language with their children</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>2.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use student surveys to learn about students’ classroom preferences</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>1.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for student input when planning lessons and activities</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 134; Var$^a$ = Variance
The items, “ask students to compare their culture with American culture” and “make an effort to get to know students’ families and background”, were also noted as being frequently used with means of 4.16 and 4.10, respectively. Based on their means, these practices can be described as being used by most teachers on a highly regular basis, falling between usually and always on the survey scale.

Examination of respondents’ item responses reveals further details about these frequently used teaching practices. While three respondents indicated that they never provide rubrics and progress reports to students, roughly 80% of all surveyed teachers indicated that they did so on a highly regular basis.

A larger percentage of the sample (86.6%) indicated that they usually or always elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities. Adult ESOL or EAP students represent a multitude of linguistic and cultural backgrounds (National Center for Family Literacy and Center for Applied Linguistics, 2008). Thus, it is noteworthy that this practice is perceived to be enacted on such a regular basis. A complete distribution of the item responses by scale value of the four most frequently used teaching practices can be found in Table 15.

**Least frequently used practices.** Results indicated that four teaching practices were used least frequently, with mean scores ranging from 2.51 to 2.94, corresponding to the levels of rarely and sometimes. The least frequently used practice was “include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias” ($M = 2.51; SD = 1.017$), followed by “students work independently, selecting their own learning activities” ($M = 2.76; SD = .860$).
Table 15

Percentage Distribution of Responses to Most Frequently Used Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices by Scale Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide rubrics and progress reports</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask students to compare their culture with American culture</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make an effort to get to know students’ families and backgrounds</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 134

The items, “ask for student input when planning lessons and activities” and “use student surveys to learn about students’ classroom preferences”, were also noted as being less frequently used with means of 2.91 and 2.94, respectively. Based on their means, these practices can be described as being perceived to be used least frequently by most teachers in the adult ESOL or EAP classroom.

Examination of the respondents’ item scores reveals further details about these less frequently used teaching practices. In general, there was greater dispersion of the least frequently used culturally responsive teaching practices than the most frequently used ones. A greater number of teachers indicated the moderate use of these four practices with the frequency level sometimes, in addition to both the levels of rarely and usually. For example, even though 18.7% of the sample indicated they never included
lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias, 15 teachers indicated that they usually or always did so comprising 11.2% of the sample.

Slightly more than one-third of the sample indicated that they *never or rarely* have students work independently or select their own learning activities. When the teachers who *sometimes* engage in this practice are added, an overwhelming majority of the total sample (86%) did not support the use of this culturally responsive teaching practice. The infrequent use of administering student surveys and asking for student input when lesson planning may be related to the high proportion of part-time ESOL and EAP classes which are staffed by part-time teachers. Generally, part-time teachers do not have paid planning time and have limited instructional time with students (Florida Department of Education, 2005). Therefore, teachers may not have the time to develop or administer surveys designed to gauge student preferences. A complete percentage distribution of the item responses by scale value of the four least used teaching practices can be found in Table 16.

**Perception of Importance.** The second section of the survey contained 17 items requiring respondents to indicate how important they perceive each culturally responsive teaching practice to be to their teaching. The perception of importance is assessed through a 5-point frequency scale with levels of: *not at all, somewhat, moderately, very,* and *extremely* with respective score values ranging from one point to five points. Item means ranged from 2.58 to 4.13 with 10 items falling in the moderate range of 3.21 to 3.76 corresponding to the frequency category of *moderately* important.
Table 16

Percentage Distribution of Responses to Least Frequently Used Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices by Scale Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for student input when planning lessons and activities</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use student surveys to learn about students’ classroom preferences</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N= 134

There were two items with high mean scores of 4.13 corresponding to the importance category of very, while there were five items with mean scores ranging from 2.5 to 2.96 indicating a level between somewhat and moderately important. Mean scores, standard deviations, and variances of all items related to perceived importance are detailed in Table 17.

Most important practices. Results indicated that two culturally responsive teaching practices were perceived to be the most important with mean scores of 4.13, corresponding to the level of very important. These practices were “provide rubrics and progress reports to students” \( (M = 4.13; SD = 1.01) \) and “elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities” \( (M = 4.13; SD = .857) \).
Examination of respondents’ item responses reveals further details about these highly important teaching practices. Over 95% of all respondents indicated that it was either very or extremely important to elicit students’ experiences prior to a reading or listening activity, while no respondent deemed it not at all important.

Although both items had a mean score of 4.13, there was a greater variety in responses to providing rubrics and progress reports with only 107 (80%) of the sample indicating that it was very or extremely important and 14 (10.5%) respondents indicating that this practice was somewhat or not at all important to their teaching practices.

A complete percentage distribution of the item responses by scale value of the two most important culturally responsive teaching practices can be found in Table 18.

**Least important practices.** Results indicated that five culturally responsive teaching practices were perceived to be the least important with mean scores ranging from 2.58 to 2.96, corresponding to the higher range of somewhat and moderately important levels.

No practices were perceived to be not at all or in the lower range of somewhat important levels. These practices were the following: “include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias” \((M = 2.58; SD = 1.126)\), “learn words in students’ native languages” \((M = 2.89; SD = 1.148)\), “ask for student input when planning lessons and activities” \((M = 2.90; SD = 1.130)\), “students work independently, selecting their own learning activities” \((M = 2.91; SD = 1.065)\), and “encourage students to speak their native language with their children” \((M = 2.96; SD = 1.461)\).
Table 17

**Descriptive Statistics of Responses to Importance of Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Var^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide rubrics and progress reports to students.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and listening</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask students to compare their culture with American culture</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine class materials for culturally appropriate image and themes</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use mixed-language and mixed-cultural pairings in group work</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make an effort to get to know students’ families and background</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to use cross-cultural comparisons when analyzing material</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use peer tutors or student-led discussions</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about the acculturation process</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement the curriculum with lessons about international current events</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>1.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time outside of class learning about the cultures and languages of students</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use student surveys to learn about students’ classroom preferences</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>1.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to speak native language with children</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>2.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>1.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for student input when planning lessons and activities</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>1.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn words in students’ native languages</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>1.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>1.268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 134; Var^a = Variance
Table 18

Percentage Distribution of Responses to Most Important Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices by Scale Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Some -what</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide rubrics and progress reports</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 134 \)

Examination of respondents’ item responses reveals further details about these less important teaching practices. Based on mean scores, including lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias was the least important practice, yet item responses revealed a great dispersion of responses, with 40 respondents, 52.5% of the sample, indicating it was not at all or somewhat important, and 29 respondents, 34.7 % of the sample, indicating it was very or extremely important. The remaining 35 respondents, 26.1 % of the sample, viewed this item as moderately important.

Encouraging students to speak their native language with their children revealed the greatest dispersion of responses with a variance of 2.133, leading one to conclude that teachers do not strongly agree with the role of this practice to their teaching in an adult ESOL or EAP classroom. Almost equal numbers of respondents found this practice to be not at all or somewhat important (\( N = 56 \) at 41.8%) as those who found this practice to be very or extremely important (\( N = 57 \) at 42.6%), leaving only 21 respondents, or 15.7% of the sample, who found this practice moderately important to their teaching practices. A complete percentage distribution of the item responses by
scale values of the least important culturally responsive teaching practices can be found in Table 19.

Table 19

*Percentage Distribution of Responses to Least Important Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices by Scale Value*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn words in students’ native languages</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for student input when planning lessons and activities</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to speak their native language with their children</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 134*

**Summary**

This study was designed to describe the patterns of frequency of use and perceived importance of 17 culturally responsive teaching practices of a group of ESOL and EAP adult educators in the state of Florida. The most frequently used practice was the use of rubrics and progress reports, while the least frequently used practice was the use of lessons about anti-discrimination or anti-immigrant bias. Teachers also reported
that using rubrics and progress reports and eliciting students’ life experiences in pre-
reading and pre-listening experiences were highly important, while including lessons
about anti-discrimination or anti-immigrant bias was the least important of the 17
culturally responsive teaching practices used in this survey.
Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida. This chapter presents a summary of the study, conclusions based on the research, implications for the field, and recommendations for further research.

Summary

A survey was developed, validated, and administered to 134 ESOL and EAP teachers from school districts or college programs in Florida. In the 34-item survey, participants assessed how frequently they used each culturally responsive teaching practice and how important they believed each practice was to their teaching. The most frequently used practice was the use of rubrics and progress reports, while including lessons about anti-immigrant bias or discrimination was the least used practice. Using rubrics and progress reports and eliciting students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities were perceived to be the most important practices, while including lessons about anti-immigrant bias or discrimination was the least important practice.

Conclusions

This study revealed a trend of adult education ESOL and EAP teachers’ regular use of culturally responsive teaching practices. These findings add to the limited knowledge of how teachers in ethnically and linguistically heterogeneous classrooms...
create and support a learning environment for adult learners. These findings reveal a heightened awareness of the importance of placing students’ cultural identities at the core of the learning process. These teachers respond to the ethnically and linguistically heterogeneous learning environment by reaching out and incorporating students’ learning styles and ways of knowing into their teaching (Villegas & Lucas, 2002), instead of establishing classrooms which represent only mainstream American culture.

This high level of culturally responsiveness may be due to the absence of students from mainstream U.S. culture. All adult education ESOL and EAP students come from a minority cultural group. As a result, the need to position students’ cultures at the forefront of the learning process and utilize their values and experiences may be more compelling and obvious to ESOL and EAP teachers. Thus, the diversity of ESOL and EAP students induces these teachers to identify the cultural mismatches minority students face, resulting in the heightened use of culturally responsive teaching practices.

However, this study also found that there were some culturally responsive teaching practices that are not regularly used, and thus, provide an area of potential growth for adult education ESOL and EAP teachers. Three of the four least frequently used practices related to the teacher’s use of student input into the learning process. These culturally responsive teaching practices shared an emphasis on the individual and learner autonomy and self-directedness. An understanding of why these practices were used less frequently may lie in Hofstede’s 4-D Model of Cultural Differences (1986). Developed as a model to help intercultural training, Hofstede hypothesized that there
are four elements of major differences related to an individual’s culture. One element of difference is an orientation toward individualism vs. collectivism. Students from highly individualistic cultures believe they are responsible for their own learning, while students from highly collectivist cultures place more responsibility for their learning on the teacher. Highly collectivist countries include Mexico, Brazil, and Colombia, while highly individualistic countries include the United States, Canada, and the Netherlands (Hostede, 1986). Thus, it is more likely that ESOL and EAP students come from cultures of a less individualistic nature. These teachers who use student-centered teaching practices less frequently may be responding to their students’ discomfort with learner autonomy and self-direction of the learning process. Examinations of the teachers’ rationale behind these practices may provide a more complete understanding of this phenomenon.

Finally, promoting critical inquiry and addressing real-world issues are tenets of culturally responsive teaching. However, this study found that adult education ESOL and EAP teachers did not believe in or include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias. The second element of Hofstede’s Model of Cultural Differences (1986), power distance, may explain some of the reticence to use critical inquiry in the ESOL or EAP classrooms. Power distance is defined as “the extent to which the less powerful persons in a society accept inequality in power and consider it normal” (Hofstede, 1986, p. 307). Individuals from large power distance cultures tend not to criticize or contradict those in authority in any public manner. Many of the countries described as large power distance include those highly represented in the ESOL and EAP
classrooms. Thus, teachers may believe that they should refrain from asking students to criticize their adopted culture in order to prevent students’ discomfort or unease. Better understanding of why ESOL and EAP teachers do not engage in lessons that examine bias and discrimination toward immigrants is necessary to improve or change this practice.

**Implications**

This section examines the implications of this study for the field of adult education ESOL and EAP. Based on the findings of this study, there is a need for state leadership to offer a program which includes an educational component about the theoretical framework of culturally responsive teaching and a self-evaluation component utilizing the survey developed in this study. State leadership will need to demonstrate their strong commitment to this program and spearhead the movement through a variety of activities.

There is limited discussion of the culturally responsive teaching approach in adult ESOL and EAP journals. Teachers may not be aware of the connection between their teaching practices and the underlying pedagogical theory. Therefore, state Department of Education leadership should be part of a movement to introduce the theoretical foundation of culturally responsive teaching to practitioners statewide. Adult education ESOL and EAP teachers throughout Florida would benefit from a well-rounded understanding of the relationship between their practices and the four elements of Ginsberg and Wlodkowski’s Motivational Framework of Culturally Responsive Teaching, for example. These in-service workshops for adult education ESOL and EAP teachers
should help teachers fully understand this approach in order to facilitate a systematic implementation in the classroom. Imparting teachers with this knowledge of the theory will empower them to tackle those practices which they find challenging, such as using lessons dealing with anti-immigrant bias or discrimination.

The second component of this program is the dissemination of the survey of culturally responsive teaching practices developed in this study. Prior to the development of this survey, adult education ESOL and EAP teachers could not easily assess the extent to which they used this teaching approach. The survey developed in this study enables these teachers to evaluate specific teaching practices which are relevant to their classroom. It can serve as an important tool to foster and improve culturally responsive teaching practices in low-proficiency level teachers and to expand culturally responsive teaching practices in average to high-proficiency level teachers.

Through this statewide educational movement, leaders will affirm and demonstrate the value of this approach to adult education. Models of successful culturally responsive adult education programs or classrooms will need to be documented and publicized throughout the community. The model of best practices for the adult education ESOL and EAP classroom must be expanded to include culturally responsive teaching strategies in addition to second language teaching methods and adult learning principles. State leadership could fund and staff workshops designed to train local programs in the evaluation of textbooks and resources in relationship to the culturally responsive teaching approach.
In summary, these findings assert that adult education ESOL and EAP teachers are already utilizing many culturally responsive teaching practices. The next step is for state leadership to ensure that teachers fully understand this approach and feel comfortable addressing areas for individual growth. Additionally, state leadership must set the example by advocating this approach to the adult education ESOL and EAP teaching community.

Recommendations for Further Research

The recommendations included in this section pertain to suggestions for further research into culturally responsive teaching in multi-lingual and multicultural classrooms. These recommendations relate to three areas: improving the survey instrument, expanding the data collection process, and conducting future research.

**Improving the survey.** There are three recommendations to improve the current survey of culturally responsive teaching practices. The first recommendation entails the addition of a demographic section to record variables such as the teacher’s native language, race or ethnicity, and years of teaching experience. These data could then be used to investigate the relationships between those demographic variables and culturally responsive teaching practices and beliefs.

Refining and expanding the item pool is the second recommendation for improving this survey. The survey includes 17 items which were developed and validated through online questionnaires. The use of online questionnaires in the item pool development stage proved challenging and could be improved upon by conducting live focus groups (Edmunds, 1999). For example, during the validation stage, two items
related to the use of native language were deemed not relevant to the adult ESOL or EAP classroom. Additionally, two items of the same nature were combined to create one item. This resulted in the inclusion of only two survey items related to the use of the students’ native language. However, a principal theme of culturally responsive teaching theory is the importance of incorporating and facilitating the development of students’ native languages in order to promote academic success (Gutierrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejeda, 1999; Henze & Lucas, 1993; Irizarry, 2007; Lee, 2010; Nieto, 2002; Osborne, 1996; Reyes, 1992). During a focus group, the researcher could probe participants in order to gain a better understanding of this discrepancy between culturally responsive teaching theory and its practice in adult ESOL and EAP classrooms.

Thirdly, the quantitative study design used in this study could be expanded to include qualitative follow-up questions to gather data of participants’ explanations of their culturally responsive teaching practices and beliefs. Open-ended survey questions could enrich the understanding of patterns of usage and beliefs. For example, in addition to describing how frequently they used these 17 culturally responsive teaching practices, participants could be asked to describe the rationale behind the frequency of usage. This information would greatly add to the understanding of this teaching approach.

**Data collection process.** Access to adult education ESOL teachers presented a challenge while assembling the sampling frame of this study. Attempts to work with adult education program directors were not successful, even after applying for and receiving IRB approval from various local school boards. Future researchers might
benefit from utilizing conferences held by state adult education advocacy groups such as Adult and Community Educators (ACE) of Florida or ESOL advocacy groups such as Sunshine State TESOL. While there is no research to suggest differences of use and belief in culturally responsive teaching practice between adult education ESOL educators and EAP educators, there is still a compelling need to create a more representative picture of all educators of adult English language learners in Florida.

**Future research.** Research for this study was conducted solely among adult education ESOL and EAP educators in the state of Florida. Future studies could expand to include these educators from throughout the United States. Additionally, this study was limited to non-volunteer educators in non-credit ESOL or EAP classes. Future studies could examine the volunteer educators in community and faith-based organizations that administer ESOL classes.

Finally, this survey relies on the self-reporting of teaching practices. This does not allow for verification that the specific culturally responsive teaching practices are being performed at the frequency reported in the survey. Therefore, future studies would benefit from the inclusion of observations to determine if what participants report is what actually occurs in the classrooms.
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List of Pilot Panel Members

Claudia Guerere
Doctoral Candidate, Educational Measurement and Research
University of South Florida
Ethnic Origin: Native of Venezuela
Areas of Expertise: Educational Measurement and Research, Adult Education

Alex Kumi
Doctoral Candidate, Adult, Career, and Higher Education
University of South Florida
Ethnic Origin: Native of Ghana
Areas of Expertise: Adult Education, Educational Research, Curriculum and Instruction

Ray McCrory
Doctoral Student, Adult, Career, and Higher Education
University of South Florida
Ethnic Origin: Native of United States
Areas of Expertise: English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Teaching, Adult Education

Carmeda Stokes
Doctoral Candidate, Adult, Career, and Higher Education
University of South Florida
Ethnic Origin: Native of United States
Areas of Expertise: Adult Education, Educational Research
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## List of Item Pool Development Panel Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro Romero</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Santana</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelica Roa-Perez</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley McKenzie</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Muffy</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Watson</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Martinez</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Murray</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela Pesantes</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genicarmen Noble</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgina Cronin</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayley Sweet</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iman Daadoush</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Diaz</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannine Polk</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kendrick</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juana Aleman</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kameron Riley</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey North</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Brodows</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda McKeighen</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie-Helene Lacascade</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Striby</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred Abreu</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Millard</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Mortellite</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn Rabatin</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Woodfin</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Sifrit</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teikoa Washington</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma Chicas</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonya Kentish</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Razzano</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Espeset</td>
<td>USF SLAIT Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Email Correspondence to Item Pool Development Panel

Dear SLAIT graduate student,

I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Adult, Career and Higher Education at USF. I am writing to ask for your help in developing items for a survey of culturally responsive teaching practices in an adult education English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) classroom. These items will be used to survey the culturally responsive teaching practices of adult ESOL educators throughout the state of Florida.

I am asking for your help because of your expertise and knowledge of second language teaching theory. You do not need to have adult ESOL teaching experience.

This activity will take approximately 10 minutes. You will receive no reward or incentive for completing this activity, nor will you be penalized for not completing it. However, please know that your participation will play a vital role in helping to understand effective teaching practices in a multicultural classroom.

To begin this activity, please go to

http://edu.surveygizmo.com/Item-Pool-Development-Panel

If you have any questions or comments, you can email Christy M. Rhodes.

Thank you again for your invaluable help.

Christy M. Rhodes
Ph.D. Candidate, Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Adult, Career and Higher Education
University of South Florida
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Item Pool Development Task Version A

In this activity, you will help develop items for a survey of culturally responsive teaching practices in an adult education English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) classroom for a dissertation by Christy M. Rhodes from the Department of Adult, Career, and Higher Education at the University of South Florida.

You have been selected to write these items because of your expertise and knowledge of second language teaching theory. You do not need to have adult ESOL teaching experience. Please use your background in second language teaching to create each item.

This activity will take approximately 20 minutes. If you need to stop before submitting your answers, please save your answers and complete them later.

You will receive no reward or incentive for completing this activity, nor will you be penalized for not completing it. Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers, and all of your feedback is greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions or comments, you can email Christy M. Rhodes at cmrhodes@mail.usf.edu.

Thank you again for your invaluable help.

Instructions:
First, read the culturally responsive teaching characteristic.
Then, write a teaching practice or strategy that an adult ESOL teacher might use in the textbox below the statement.
For example,

"A culturally responsive teacher encourages a community of learners. In the adult education ESOL classroom, that teacher might . . . "
Possible answers are: "regularly use small groups" or "ask students to answer a question before the teacher answers himself or herself".

Please write at least one teaching practice or strategy for each characteristic.

1) A culturally responsive teacher is validating and affirming of all students.
In the adult ESOL classroom, that teacher might _______________________

2) A culturally responsive teacher acknowledges culture and the cultural heritage of students.
In the adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _______________________

3) A culturally responsive teacher teaches students to know and praise their own and each other's cultural heritages.
In the adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _______________________

4) A culturally responsive teacher demonstrates a connectedness with all students.
In the adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _______________________

5) A culturally responsive teacher encourages students to learn collaboratively.
In the adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _______________________

6) A culturally responsive teacher knows about students' lives and cultural backgrounds and provides ample opportunities for students to talk about themselves.
In the adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _______________________

7) A culturally responsive teacher assumes a hopeful view of people and their capacity to change.
In the adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _______________________
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8) A culturally responsive teacher *encourages students to point out discriminatory classroom policies.*
   In an adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _________________________

9) A culturally responsive teacher *constructs and maintains a supportive learning environment, both physically and psychologically comfortable.*
   In an adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _________________________

10) A culturally responsive teacher *incorporates multicultural information, resources, and materials.*
    In an adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _________________________

11) A culturally responsive teacher *supports a constructivist view of learning, using students' prior knowledge and beliefs as the basis of new learning.*
    In an adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _________________________

12) A culturally responsive teacher *designs the classroom to encourage communication.*
    In an adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _________________________

Thank you for your participation. If you have any questions or would like to see the findings of this study, please contact Christy M. Rhodes.
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Item Pool Development Task Version B

In this activity, you will help develop items for a survey of culturally responsive teaching practices in an adult education English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) classroom for a dissertation by Christy M. Rhodes from the Department of Adult, Career, and Higher Education at the University of South Florida.

You have been selected to write these items because of your expertise and knowledge of second language teaching theory. You do not need to have adult ESOL teaching experience. Please use your background in second language teaching to create each item.

This activity will take approximately 20 minutes. If you need to stop before submitting your answers, please save your answers and complete them later.

You will receive no reward or incentive for completing this activity, nor will you be penalized for not completing it.

Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers, and all of your feedback is greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions or comments, you can email Christy M. Rhodes at cmrhodes@mail.usf.edu.

Thank you again for your invaluable help.

Instructions:
First, read the culturally responsive teaching characteristic.
Then, write a teaching practice or strategy that an adult ESOL teacher might use in the textbox below the statement.

For example,

“A culturally responsive teacher encourages a community of learners. In the adult education ESOL classroom, that teacher might . . . ”

Possible answers are: "regularly use small groups" or "ask students to answer a question before the teacher answers himself or herself".

Please write at least one teaching practice or strategy for each characteristic.

1) A culturally responsive teacher **involves all students in the construction of knowledge and builds on students’ personal and cultural strengths.**
   In the adult ESOL classroom, that teacher might ________________________

2) A culturally responsive teacher **de-emphasizes assimilation in the curricula and practice.**
   In the adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might ________________________

3) A culturally responsive teacher **helps students question theory relative to their own cultural experiences.**
   In the adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might ________________________

4) A culturally responsive teacher **uses a variety of instructional practices.**
   In the adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might ________________________

5) A culturally responsive teacher **helps students make connections between their community, national, and global identities.**
   In the adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might ________________________

6) A culturally responsive teacher **incorporates practical applications into academic lessons.**
   In the adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might ________________________
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7) A culturally responsive teacher helps students examine the curriculum from multiple perspectives. In the adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _______________________

8) A culturally responsive teacher continually reviews student goals. In an adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _______________________

9) A culturally responsive teacher uses assessments connected to the students' world, frames of reference, and values. In an adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _______________________

10) A culturally responsive teacher sees excellence as a complex standard that takes student diversity and individual differences into account. In an adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _______________________

11) A culturally responsive teacher encourages students to take ownership of the learning process. In an adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _______________________

12) A culturally responsive teacher acknowledges the culture and cultural heritage of students. In an adult ESOL classroom, this teacher might _______________________

Thank you for your participation. If you have any questions or would like to see the findings of this study, please contact Christy M. Rhodes.
### Appendix F

**Compiled List of Culturally Responsive Teaching Characteristics by Elements of the Motivational Framework for Culturally Responsive Teaching**

| Establishing Inclusion | Teacher is validating and affirming of all students.  
Teacher acknowledges culture and the cultural heritage of students  
Teacher demonstrates a connectedness with all students.  
Teacher encourages students to learn collaboratively.  
Teacher knows about students’ lives and cultural backgrounds and provides ample opportunities for students to talk about themselves in the learning environment.  
Teacher encourages students to point out discriminatory classroom policies.  
Teacher teaches students to know and praise their own and each other’s cultural heritages.  
Teacher assumes a hopeful view of people and their capacity to change. |
| --- | --- |
| Developing Attitude | Teacher should construct and maintain supportive learning environments, both physically and psychologically comfortable.  
Teacher incorporates multicultural information, resources and materials.  
Teacher supports a constructivist view of learning, using students’ prior knowledge and beliefs as the basis of new learning.  
Teacher involves all students in the construction of knowledge and builds on students’ personal and cultural strengths.  
Teacher designs classroom to encourage communication. |
| Enhancing Meaning | Teacher de-emphasizes assimilation in the curricula and practice.  
Teacher should help students question theory relative to their own cultural experiences.  
Teacher should use a variety of instructional practices.  
Teacher incorporates practical applications into academic lessons.  
Teacher helps students examine the curriculum from multiple perspectives.  
Teacher helps students make connections between their community, national, and global identities. |
| Engendering Competence | Teacher should continually review educational goals.  
Teacher uses assessments that are connected to the learner’s world, frames of reference, and values.  
Teacher sees excellence as a complex standard that takes student diversity and individual differences into account.  
Teacher encourages students to take ownership of the learning process. |
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Email Correspondence to Validation Panel

Dear _________________,

My name is Christy M. Rhodes, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Adult, Career and Higher Education at the University of South Florida in Tampa, Florida. I am writing to ask for your help in the validation of survey items to be used in my dissertation research study (USF IRB #Pro 7413) Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices of Adult Education ESOL Teachers. Your expertise in the fields of TESOL and adult learning is critical to the creation of this survey. When completed, this instrument will include approximately 25 culturally responsive teaching practices and be administered to adult ESOL and EAP teachers throughout Florida. In this online activity you will evaluate the clarity and relevance of 27 draft items, which may take up to 20 minutes.

I'd like to thank you if you have already completed this validation survey. If you have not, I would invite you to do so by going to the following link prior to July 15:

http://edu.surveygizmo.com/s3/603614/Item-Pool-Validation-Task

If you have any questions or comments, you can email Christy M. Rhodes at __________.

Your help is greatly appreciated and critical to the development of this survey.

Christy M. Rhodes
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Adult, Career and Higher Education
University of South Florida
Appendix H

Screen Shot of Online Item Pool Validation Task

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices of Adult ESOL Teachers

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

Dear Adult Educator

In this activity, you will evaluate the clarity and relevance of draft items for a survey of culturally responsive teaching practices in an adult education ESOL classroom. This survey is being developed as part of a dissertation research study (USF IRB #Pro 7413) by Christy M. Rhodes from the Department of Adult, Career, and Higher Education at the University of South Florida.

You have been selected to evaluate these items because of your expertise and knowledge of both adult learning and ESOL teaching practices.

This activity will take approximately 20 minutes. If you need to stop before submitting your answers, please save your answers and complete them later.

If you have any questions or comments, you can email Christy M. Rhodes at cmrhodes@mail.usf.edu.

Thank you again for your invaluable help.

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

1. Use the drop-down menus to record your answers.*

   When judging **clarity**, ask yourself, “How clear and comprehensible is this question for adult education ESOL teachers?”

   When judging **relevance** to the adult education ESOL classroom, ask yourself, “How relevant is this teaching practice to the adult education ESOL classroom?”

   Each item’s clarity and relevance will be judged on a five-point scale:

   1 = not at all
   2 = somewhat
   3 = moderately
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4 = very
5 = extremely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How clear and comprehensible is this item?</th>
<th>How relevant to the adult ESOL classroom is this item?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I greet my students in their native languages. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I include lessons about the acculturation process and culture shock. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I examine class materials for culturally appropriate images and themes. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask students to compare their culture with American culture *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make an effort to get to know their families and backgrounds. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

________________________

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

3. Use the drop-down menus to record your answer. *
When judging clarity, ask yourself, "How clear and comprehensible is this question for adult education ESOL teachers?" When judging relevance to the adult education ESOL classroom, ask yourself, "How relevant is this teaching practice to the adult education ESOL classroom?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How clear and comprehensible is this item?</th>
<th>How relevant to the adult ESOL classroom is this item?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know some words in all of my students’ native languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use mixed-language and mixed-cultural pairings in group work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use peer tutors or student-led discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use student surveys to learn about my students’ classroom preferences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| I spend time outside of class learning about the cultures and languages of my students. |   |   |

4. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

5. Use the drop-down menus to record your answer. *
   When judging clarity, ask yourself, “How clear and comprehensible is this question for adult education ESOL teachers?”

   When judging relevance to the adult education ESOL classroom, ask yourself, “How relevant is this teaching practice to the adult education ESOL classroom?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How clear and comprehensible is this item?</th>
<th>How relevant to the adult ESOL classroom is this item?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know some words in all of my students’ native languages.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use examples and themes from my students’ native cultures in lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I address students’ prejudices with activities to increase cultural competence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I discourage discussions of politics, religion, or other culturally sensitive areas in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use maps, flags, and symbols from my students’ countries in class activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

7. Use the drop-down menus to record your answer. *
   When judging clarity, ask yourself, “How clear and comprehensible is this question for adult
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education ESOL teachers?" When judging relevance to the adult education ESOL classroom, ask yourself, "How relevant is this teaching practice to the adult education ESOL classroom?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How clear and comprehensible is this item?</th>
<th>How relevant to the adult ESOL classroom is this item?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students use native language materials for class assignments.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage students to use bilingual reference tools in class.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage students to speak their native language with their children.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage students to speak only English with their families.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities.*</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

```

```

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

9. Use the drop-down menus to record your answer.
When judging clarity, ask yourself, "How clear and comprehensible is this question for adult education ESOL teachers?" When judging relevance to the adult education ESOL classroom, ask yourself, "How relevant is this teaching practice to the adult education ESOL classroom?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How clear and comprehensible is this item?</th>
<th>How relevant to the adult ESOL classroom is this item?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I supplement the curriculum with lessons about international current events.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask for student input when planning lessons and activities.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage students to use cross-</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural comparisons when analyzing material.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I provide rubrics and progress reports to students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.


Thank You!

Thank you for your invaluable feedback. If you have any questions or would like an update about this research study (USF IRB # Pro 7413), please email Christy M. Rhodes at cmrhodes@mail.usf.edu.
## Appendix I

### List of Potential Item Pool Validation Panel Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth Larson</td>
<td>Seminole State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Valier</td>
<td>Palm Beach County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Allene Guss Grognet</td>
<td>Retired, TESOL Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Candace Harper</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cynthia Schuemann</td>
<td>Miami Dade College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Edwidge Crevecouer-Bryant</td>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Edwina Hoffman</td>
<td>Miami Dade County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eric S. Dwyer</td>
<td>Florida International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ester DeJong</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jeanna Ojeda</td>
<td>St. Petersburg College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kyle Perkins</td>
<td>Florida International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Maria Coady</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Maria Koonce</td>
<td>Retired, ESOL Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Michelle Thomas</td>
<td>Miami Dade County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Phil Smith</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Rebecca Galeano</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sergei Paromchik</td>
<td>Hillsborough County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steve Osthoff</td>
<td>Polk County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Teresa Lucas</td>
<td>Florida International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Quebbemann</td>
<td>Miami Dade County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Maxwell</td>
<td>Daytona State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Carmona</td>
<td>Hillsborough County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Marlasca</td>
<td>Brevard County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Martin-Hall</td>
<td>Indian River State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Ballard</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Anderson</td>
<td>FL Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Breitband</td>
<td>Collier County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saba Baptiste</td>
<td>Hillsborough County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Thursby</td>
<td>Pinellas County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Winters</td>
<td>Escambia County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd McDonald</td>
<td>Hillsborough County Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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List of Item Pool Task Verification Panel Members

Dr. Lisa Baumgartner  
Associate Professor of Adult and Higher Education  
Northern Illinois University  
Areas of Expertise: Multicultural Adult Education, Social Context of Adult Education

Dr. Elaine Manglitz  
Assistant Vice President, Student Affairs  
Clayton State University  
Areas of Expertise: Multicultural Adult Education, Critical Race Theory

Dr. Larry Martin  
Professor and Department Chair of Administrative Leadership  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee  
Areas of Expertise: Multicultural Adult Education, Urban Education, Adult Literacy

Dr. Raymond Wlodkowski  
Professor Emeritus  
Regis University  
Areas of Expertise: Motivation and Learning, Culturally Responsive Adult Education

Federico Salas  
Doctoral Candidate  
Texas A & M University  
Areas of Expertise: Culturally Responsive Education

Dr. Adam Schwartz  
Assistant Professor  
University of South Florida  
Areas of Expertise: Multicultural Education, Culturally Responsive Education

Dr. Yolanda Sealey-Ruiz  
Assistant Professor of English Education  
Teachers College at Columbia University  
Areas of Expertise: Critical English Education, Culturally Relevant Teaching
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Email Correspondence to Verification Panel

Dear _________________,

My name is Christy M. Rhodes, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Adult, Career and Higher Education at the University of South Florida in Tampa, Florida. I am writing to ask for your help in the validation of survey items to be used in my dissertation research study (USF IRB #Pro 7413) Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices of Adult Education ESOL Teachers. Your expertise in culturally responsive pedagogy and adult learning are critical to the development of this survey.

When completed, this survey will include approximately 25 culturally responsive teaching practices and be administered to adult ESOL and EAP teachers throughout Florida. In this online activity you will evaluate the clarity and relevance of 26 draft items, which may take up to 20 minutes. To begin this activity, please go to: http://edu.surveygizmo.com/s3/913556/df300225b147.

If you have any questions or comments, you can email me at _________________. Your expertise is critical to the successful development of this survey and is greatly appreciated.

Christy M. Rhodes  
Ph.D. Candidate  
Department of Adult, Career and Higher Education  
University of South Florida
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Screen Shot of Item Pool Verification Task

Draft Item Pool Verification Task

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

Dear Adult Educator

In this activity, you will evaluate the relevance of draft items to the adult learning environment and to culturally responsive teaching theory for a survey of culturally responsive teaching practices in an adult education ESOL classroom. This survey is being developed as part of a dissertation research study (USF IRB #Pro 7413) by Christy M. Rhodes from the Department of Adult, Career, and Higher Education at the University of South Florida.

You have been selected to evaluate these items because of your expertise and knowledge of both adult learning and culturally responsive teaching theory.

This activity will take approximately 20 minutes. If you need to stop before submitting your answers, please save your answers and complete them later.

If you have any questions or comments, you can email Christy M. Rhodes at cmrhodes@mail.usf.edu.

Thank you again for your invaluable help.

Copy of Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

1. Use the drop-down menus to record your answers.*

   In the first column, judge the relevance of each item to the adult learning environment.

   In the second column, judge the relevance of each item to culturally responsive teaching theory.

   Relevance will be judged on a five-point scale:
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1 = not at all
2 = somewhat
3 = moderately
4 = very
5 = extremely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How relevant to the adult learning environment is this item?</th>
<th>How relevant to culturally responsive teaching theory is this item?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I greet my students in their native languages. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I include lessons about the acculturation process and culture shock. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I examine class materials for culturally appropriate images and themes. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask students to compare their culture with American culture *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make an effort to get to know their families and backgrounds. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

3. Use the drop-down menus to record your answer.*

In the first column, judge the relevance of each item to the adult learning environment.

In the second column, judge the relevance of each item to culturally responsive teaching theory.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know some words in all of my students' native languages. *</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use mixed-language and mixed-cultural pairings in group work. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use peer tutors or student-led discussions. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use student surveys to learn about my students' classroom preferences. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spend time outside of class learning about the cultures and languages of my students. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

[Textbox]

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

5. Use the drop-down menus to record your answer. *

In the first column, judge the **relevance** of each item to the **adult learning environment**.

In the second column, judge the **relevance** of each item to **culturally responsive teaching theory**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know some words in all of my students' native languages. *</th>
<th>How relevant to the adult learning environment is this item?</th>
<th>How relevant to culturally responsive teaching is this item?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use examples and themes from my students' native cultures in lessons. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I address students' prejudices with activities to increase cultural competence. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I discourage discussions of politics, religion, or other culturally sensitive areas in class. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use maps, flags, and symbols from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.


Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

7. Use the drop-down menus to record your answer.*

In the first column, judge the relevance of each item to the adult learning environment.

In the second column, judge the relevance of each item to culturally responsive teaching theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>How relevant to the adult learning environment is this item?</th>
<th>How relevant to culturally responsive teaching theory is this item?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I elicit students’ experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students use native language materials for class assignments.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage students to use bilingual reference tools in class.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage students to speak their native language with their children.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage students to speak only English with their families.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.
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Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

9. Use the drop-down menus to record your answer.

In the first column, judge the relevance of each item to the adult learning environment.
In the second column, judge the relevance of each item to culturally responsive teaching theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How relevant to the adult learning environment is this item?</th>
<th>How relevant to culturally responsive teaching theory is this item?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I supplement the curriculum with lessons about international current events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask for student input when planning lessons and activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage students to use cross-cultural comparisons when analyzing material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide rubrics and progress reports to students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

Thank You!

Thank you for your invaluable feedback. If you have any questions or would like an update about this research study (USF IRB # Pro 7413), please email Christy M. Rhodes at cmrhodes@mail.usf.edu.
Appendix M

Screen Shot of Online Survey of Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

Survey of Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

Dear Adult ESOL or EAP Teacher,

The purpose of this research study (USF IRB #Pro7413) is to describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of adult ESOL and EAP teachers in the state of Florida. You will need approximately 15-20 minutes to complete this survey.

When answering each question, think about your most recent teaching experience. There are no right or wrong answers, so please relax and click the next page button to start the survey. If you do not want to participate in this study, exit this screen now.

In appreciation of your valuable time and feedback, three $25 Amazon gift cards will be raffled to completed survey participants. To be eligible, please remember to include your email address at the end of this survey.

Thanks for your help!

Christy M. Rhodes

Ph.D. Candidate in Adult, Career and Higher Education

University of South Florida

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

1. Describe how often you use these teaching practices in your adult ESOL class. Possible answers are never, rarely, sometimes, usually, or always. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>How important is this to your teaching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ask students to compare their culture with American culture? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make an effort to get to know students' families and backgrounds? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To answer these questions, describe how important you believe these practices are to your teaching. Possible answers are: *not at all, somewhat, moderately, very, or extremely.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>How important is this to your teaching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I greet my students in their native languages. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I include lessons about the acculturation process and culture shock.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I examine class materials for culturally appropriate images and themes.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask students to compare their culture with American culture *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make an effort to get to know their families and backgrounds.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

3. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

4. To answer these questions, think about how often you use these teaching practices in your adult ESOL class. Possible answers are *never, rarely, sometimes, usually,* or *always.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>How often do you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>learn words in your students' native languages? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use mixed-language and mixed-cultural pairings in group work? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use peer tutors or student-led discussions? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use student surveys to learn about your students' classroom preferences?*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spend time outside of class learning about the cultures and languages of your students? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

---

**Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices**

6. To answer these questions, describe how important you believe these practices are in your teaching. Possible answers are: *not at all, somewhat, moderately, very,* or *extremely.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>How important is this to your teaching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I learn words in my students' native languages. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use examples and themes from my students' native cultures in lessons. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I address students' prejudices with activities to increase cultural competence. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I discourage discussions of politics, religion, or other culturally sensitive areas in class. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use maps, flags, and symbols from my students' countries in class activities. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

---

**Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices**

8. To answer these questions, think about how often you use these teaching practices in your adult ESOL class. Possible answers are: *never, rarely, sometimes, usually,* or *always.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>How often do you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>elicit students' experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourage students to use native language materials for class assignments? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourage students to use bilingual reference tools in class? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices

10. To answer these questions, describe how important you believe these practices are to your teaching. Possible answers are: not at all, somewhat, moderately, very, or extremely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>How important is this to your teaching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I supplement the curriculum with lessons about international current events. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask for student input when planning lessons and activities. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage students to use cross-cultural comparisons when analyzing material. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide rubrics and progress reports to students. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Please write any questions or comments about these items in the textbox below.

Thank You!

Thank you for your invaluable feedback. If you have any questions or would like an update about this research study (USF IRB # Pro 7413), please email Christy M. Rhodes at cmrhodes@mail.usf.edu.
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Email Correspondence to Survey Participants

Dear Adult ESOL or EAP Teacher,

My name is Christy M. Rhodes and I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Adult, Career and Higher Education at the University of South Florida. I am asking adult education ESOL teachers in Florida to complete an online survey about their teaching practices. The online survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes and will help me complete the requirements of my dissertation research study "The Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices of Adult Education ESOL Teachers" (USF IRB #Pro 7413).

If you would like to be removed from the distribution list, please reply to this email.

If you would like to complete this survey, please read the attached Online Informed Consent Form and then click on the link:


In appreciation of your valuable time and feedback, three $25 Amazon gift cards will be raffled to completed survey participants. To be eligible, please remember to include your email address at the end of this survey.

Thanks for your help!

Christy M. Rhodes

Ph.D. Candidate in Adult, Career and Higher Education

University of South Florida
Appendix O

Informed Consent Form

Dear Adult ESOL Teacher,

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Adult, Career and Higher Education at the University of South Florida in Tampa, Florida. I am pursuing my dissertation topic on the culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL teachers. You are invited to participate in this research study, *Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices of Adult Education ESOL Teachers* (USF IRB #Pro 7413) because of your current status as an adult education ESOL teacher at a community college or public school board in the state of Florida. If this does not accurately describe your current status, please do not continue with this survey. If you are an adult education ESOL teacher, please read the following information:

1. The purpose of this study is to describe the culturally responsive teaching practices of adult education ESOL teachers in the state of Florida.

2. The study is expected to last from July 2012 until December 2012.

3. Approximately 230 teachers will be asked to complete this survey.

4. Surveys will take 15-20 minutes to complete.

6. There are no foreseeable risks to participants in this study; you may exit this research study at any time.

7. There are no known direct benefits from participating in this research study.

8. There will be three $25 Amazon gift cards raffled to participants of completed surveys. To be entered into this raffle pool, participants must submit their email address at the end of the survey.

9. Participants will remain anonymous.

10. All records will be kept confidential to the full extent of the law. Authorized research
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personnel, employees of the Department of Health and Human Services, and the USF IRB and its staff, and any other individuals acting on behalf of USF, may inspect the records from this research study. Institutional Review Board and its staff, and any other individuals acting on behalf of USF, may inspect the records from this research project. We may publish what we learn from this study. If we do, we will not include your name. We will not publish anything that would let people know who you are.

11. For questions about the research you may contact me, Christy M. Rhodes.

12. Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Refusal to participate will not affect your relationship with the University of South Florida or your current employment status.

13. There is no cost to you to participate in the study.

14. The University of South Florida Institutional Review Board (IRB) may be contacted at (813) 974-5638. This IRB may request to see my research records of the study.

Any information you provide during this study will be used for educational purposes only and you may withdraw from the study at any time.

If you understand the intent of this study and agree to participate, please click on the survey link below.

Thank you for your assistance!

Christy M. Rhodes
Doctoral Candidate in Adult, Career and Higher Education
University of South Florida
### Appendix P

**Mean Scores of Item Pool by Validation Panel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Item</th>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>Relevance to ESOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I greet my students in their native languages.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I include lessons about the acculturation process and culture shock.</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I examine class materials for culturally appropriate images and themes.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I ask students to compare their culture with American culture</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I make an effort to get to know students' families and backgrounds.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I know some words in all of my students' native languages.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I use mixed-language and mixed cultural pairings in group work.</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I use peer tutors or student-led discussions.</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I use student surveys to learn about my students' classroom preferences.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I spend time outside of class learning about the cultures and languages of my students.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I use examples and themes from my students' native cultures in lessons.</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I address students' prejudices with activities to increase cultural competence.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I discourage discussions of politics, religion, or other culturally sensitive areas in class.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I use maps, flags, and symbols from my students' countries in class activities.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I elicit students' experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Students use native language materials for class assignments.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I encourage students to use bilingual reference tools in class.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I encourage students to speak their native language with their children.</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Item</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Relevance to ESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I supplement the curriculum with lessons about international current events.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I ask for student input when planning lessons and activities.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I encourage students to use crosscultural comparisons when analyzing material.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I provide rubrics and progress reports to students.</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes n = 11
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### Mean Scores of Item Pool by Verification Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Item</th>
<th>Relevance to Adult Learning</th>
<th>Culturally Responsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I greet my students in their native languages.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I include lessons about the acculturation process and culture shock.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I examine class materials for culturally appropriate images and themes.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I ask students to compare their culture with American culture</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I make an effort to get to know students' families and backgrounds.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I know some words in all of my students' native languages.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I use mixed-language and mixed cultural pairings in group work.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I use peer tutors or student-led discussions.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I use student surveys to learn about my students' classroom preferences.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I spend time outside of class learning about the cultures and languages of my students.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I use examples and themes from my students' native cultures in lessons.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I address students' prejudices with activities to increase cultural competence.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I discourage discussions of politics, religion, or other culturally sensitive areas in class.</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I use maps, flags, and symbols from my students' countries in class activities.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I elicit students' experiences in pre-reading and pre-listening activities.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Students use native language materials for class assignments.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I encourage students to use bilingual reference tools in class.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Draft Item | Adult Learn | Culturally Responsive |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. I encourage students to speak their native language with their children.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I encourage students to speak only English with their families.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I include lessons about anti-immigrant discrimination or bias.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I supplement the curriculum with lessons about international current events.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I ask for student input when planning lessons and activities.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I encourage students to use cross-cultural comparisons when analyzing material.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I provide rubrics and progress reports to students.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Students work independently, selecting their own learning activities.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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