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**Abstract**

The current interest in student performance and evaluation often neglects the impact instruction has in the academic achievement of English Learners. Similarly, recent literature focuses on educators’ specific set of qualities and abilities without considering the implications of self-perception and professional development as instrumental parts of teacher effectiveness. The purpose of this article is to understand the pedagogical experiences of ESL teachers in an urban high school. Through interviews and observations, this article provides an overview of the instructional realities ESL educators face in today’s classrooms. Furthermore, findings reveal the relationship between self-perception and instructional performance in the ESL classroom.
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**Introduction**

 The education field and the literature surrounding teaching and learning often focus on understanding what it takes to make students achieve higher. Recent publications make reference to the impact teachers have in student achievement and the qualities educators need to have to be considered good teachers (Chin-Yin, Indiatsi, & Wong, 2016; McGlynn-Stewart, 2015; Stronge, Ward & Grant, 2011). Some of the most common identified strengths for good and qualified teachers describe the educators’ abilities to be academically flexible and address the individual, personal and instructional needs of all their students (Chin-Yin, Indiatsi, & Wong, 2016; McGlynn-Stewart, 2015; Stronge, Ward & Grant, 2011). While much of the literature focuses on identifying the teachers’ qualities and strengths as educators, not much attention has been paid to how English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers perceive their individual instructional strengths and the effect these self-perceived strengths have in their daily practices as ESL educators.

 Similarly, extensive research shows that ESL teachers face many instructional challenges in the classroom associated to the diverse learning needs and styles of their students (Baecher, 2012; Batt, 2008; Crandall, 1996; CSTP, 2009; Light, 2006). Throughout the years, experts in the field have developed different manuals to meet the needs of diverse learners and to support the instructional practices of ESL teachers (de Oliveira & Yough, 2015; Hill & Björk, 2008; Rutherford, 2010). However, the applicability of many of these resources is limited to specific circumstances and not all learning needs, styles and educational realities are addressed. For this reason, ESL educators are left to decipher and struggle with the best approach to take in supporting their ESL students’ personal, literacy-related, language-based, social and emotional needs without guidance.

 As such, this case study seeks to contribute to the current body of research about the impact of ESL teachers’ perception of self-efficacy and their instructional practices. In addition, this case study seeks to understand the instructional experiences of high school ESL teachers at an urban high school. The vision of this article is to encapsulate ESL teachers’ realities in today’s classrooms. Also, this study seeks to provide a space in the literature where urban schools are addressed as a positive learning environment where educators support one another and reinvent their instructional practices to support their students. Furthermore, this article offers real-life instructional strengths, challenges, and action plans that can serve as a guide and reference for ESL teachers educating Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) students.

**Purpose of Study**

 The purpose of this qualitative case study is to understand the instructional experiences of ESL teachers in an urban high school. The instructional practices of ESL teachers are defined as didactic experiences ESL educators have in their classrooms when teaching diverse population of students with diverse academic, linguistic, and educational backgrounds. Furthermore, the purpose of this study is three-fold: (1) to understand the self-perceived instructional strengths of ESL teachers in an urban public school, (2) to understand the self-perceived instructional challenges of high school ESL teachers in an urban public school, and (3) to create a plan of action to overcome the identified self-perceived instructional challenges. As such, opening a dialogue with ESL educators about their pedagogical reality in the ESL classroom is necessary to further the literature about effective teaching approaches in the ESL field. In addition, this article seeks to share self-identified strengths of ESL teachers as an opportunity to open a department-wide dialogue about how ESL teachers can support one another based on their identified strengths and instructional challenges.

*Figure 1. Purpose of Study*

**Research Questions**

 This section includes questions that were used to guide this study.

Central Question: What are the self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges of ESL educators in an urban public high school?

Sub-questions:

1) What are urban ESL public high school educators’ experiences regarding their instructional practices?

2) How do the self-perceived instructional strengths of ESL educators in an urban high school compare to the strengths and challenges identified in the observations?

3) How are the participants’ self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges present in their daily practices?

4) How do participants overcome their self-perceived instructional challenges? Was the action plan successful?

**Literature Review**

ESL programs—also known as English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) programs in some states—have experienced a continuous growth throughout the years and enrollment of English Learners (ELs) has risen to an all-time high (NCES, 2016). Although bilingual education and ESL education programs are often grouped in the literature, they are two different entities on their own and only ESL support is required by law. “ESL programs often take a whole language approach where they try to integrate English with other academic subjects” (Williams, 1997, p. 10). Hence, many ESL programs offer classes such as language of science and language of history where content knowledge is presented while focusing on the acquisition of the English language.

 The main purpose of ESL classes, and ESL programs, is to develop English literacy, not to promote the use of other languages in the classroom. As a result, students in the ESL classroom “are oftentimes immersed into the mainstream culture in an attempt to accelerate the process of language acquisition” (Pentón Herrera, 2015, p. 114). ESL programs are designed to be culturally relevant and Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL) programs at universities are expected to prepare ESL educators to overcome all challenges associated with teaching such a diverse population of students. However, teaching extremely diverse heterogeneous populations with different cultures, languages, academic experiences and expectations, among many other factors, make instruction a challenging task for ESL educators (Pentón Herrera, 2015).

Recent researchers reflect about the many instructional challenges ESL educators face in the classroom (e.g., Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly & Driscoll, 2005; Protacio & Jang, 2016; Senom, Zakaria, & Ahmad Shah, 2013; Toledo-López & Pentón Herrera, 2015). Some of the most common challenges presented in the current literature make reference to the little control ESL educators have over these situations. Senom, Zakaria, & Ahmad Shah (2013) explain that one common challenge for ESL educators is the reality shock of transitioning from their idealistic concept of teaching to the reality inside their classrooms. In addition to the reality shock of today’s teaching environment, ESL educators are faced with educating diverse academic levels of proficiency in their classrooms (Toledo-López & Pentón Herrera, 2015), lack of effective instructional resources (Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly & Driscoll, 2005) and finding a balance between curriculum and student motivation (Protacio & Jang, 2016), which makes teaching an even more challenging task for novice educators. The reality is that ESL teachers face challenges on a daily basis that require flexible and innovative thinking because every ESL student is different and their instructional, social, and linguistic needs do not fit in a one-size-fits-all approach.

 On the other hand, there is also a growing literature focusing on the qualities and skills that ESL educators need to have to be considered effective (Chin-Yin, Indiatsi, & Wong, 2016; McGlynn-Stewart, 2015; Stronge, Ward & Grant, 2011). It is important to note that the concepts of *effective* or *good* teacher are elusive considering the complex tasks of teaching, particularly teaching CLD students. Lewis, Parsad, Carey, Bartfai, Farris, & Smerdon (1999) aptly stated that “teacher quality is a complex phenomenon, and there is little consensus on what it is or how to measure it” (p. 1). In fact, there is considerable debate surrounding how educators’ effectiveness is evaluated based on their inputs (e.g., qualifications), teaching processes (e.g., instructional practices), and the product of teaching (e.g., effects on student learning and achievement) (Stronge, Ward & Grant, 2011). The current focus on the ESL teachers’ quality and effectiveness considers only statistical data and leaves little room to individual teacher strengths outside of what is considered acceptable. Furthermore, the goal of measuring ESL teachers’ quality and strengths based on set standards obviates the educators self-perceived strengths as valid and important (Stronge, Ward & Grant, 2011).

The amount of literature on the relationship between teachers’ self-perceived strengths and their pedagogical practices was small 30 years ago (Gilman, 1984) and it continues to be today, especially for ESL educators. ESL teachers’ sense on self-efficacy and self-perceived strengths are relevant because they can potentially influence “both the kind of environment that they create as well as the various instructional practices introduced in the classroom” (Eslami & Fatahi, 2008, p. 2). On the basis of the social cognitive theory of Albert Bandura, self-efficacy is the “individuals’ perceptions of their capabilities to plan and execute specific behavior” (Scherer, Jansen, Nilsen, Areepattamannil, & Marsh, 2016, p. 3). As such, educators’ self-perceived strengths reflect their vision of what effective instruction should look like and their disposition of creating a learning environment conducive of those pedagogical practices. ESL teachers’ self-perceived instructional strengths affect their actions and how they instruct in the classroom (Scherer et al., 2016). Thus, the topic of self-efficacy, as it pertains to ESL educators, has a need for expansion in the future ESL literature as well as its impact on educator instruction and student achievement.

**Theoretical Foundation**

 There is an assumption that drives the analysis of this study, the *self-efficacy hypothesis*. The self-efficacy hypothesis is a psychological and behavioral theory introduced by Albert Bandura. According to Hayden (2014), the theory “introduces the idea that perception of efficacy is influenced by four factors: mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and somatic and emotional state” (p. 16). Furthermore, this doctrine holds that there is a relationship between expectancy and performance; in other words, when individuals perceive they have strengths in some areas, they will generally perform better (Bandura, 1977). Similarly, when individuals perceive that they have difficulties in a specific area, their performance is hampered by their own perceptions (Bandura, 1977). This case study seeks to understand ESL teachers’ instructional experiences as it pertains to their individual perception of self-efficacy. Furthermore, this study identifies the self-efficacy hypothesis as a behavior that ESL teachers reproduce based on their self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges.

**Data Collection Methods**

 Four ESL teachers were asked to participate in this study. Because I am working with teachers on developing their ESL pedagogical practices, convenience sampling was used of the teachers available at that school (Collins, Onwuegbuzie, & Jiao, 2007). There was a total of four ESL teachers participating in this study, three females and one male who are all bilinguals. Out of the four teachers, three were born in a country outside the United States. The names used in this study to identify participants are pseudonyms to protect their personal identity and information.

 Andrea is the Department Chair for the ESL department at that high school. She is a veteran educator and currently teaches advance ESL classes. She was born and raised in the United States and speaks English as a first language and also speaks Spanish as a second language. Beatrice is a veteran educator and currently teaches intermediate ESL classes and pre-algebra classes for ELs, also known as AIA. She was born in Korea and speaks Korean as a first language and English as a second language. She was the department chair at another high school for many years but moved a few years ago to this new school.

 Claudia is also an experienced and veteran educator and currently teaches ESL beginner classes and Language of History classes. She was born and raised in Puerto Rico and she speaks Spanish as a first language and English as a second language. In the case of Claudia, she moved to New York at an early age, thus she could be considered a simultaneous bilingual. Lastly, Daniel is an educator who has been teaching for 5 years, but still considers himself a new teacher. He currently teaches ESL newcomer classes and Language of Science classes at this high school. He was born and raised in Cuba and speaks Spanish as a first language and English as a second language.

 For this research, face-to-face interviews and observations were collected from all four participants. The interviews and observations took place throughout the length of the study—15 weeks—and there was also weekly communication through e-mails and conversations. The interviews were divided into three interview sessions for each participant: (1) at the beginning, (2) in the middle, and (3) at the end of the study. The action plan had as a main purpose to assist ESL teachers in overcoming their instructional challenges and to conduct interviews to gather feedback on the success of those action plans. In addition, random observations were conducted throughout the study to reflect upon the educators’ self-perceived instructional strengths.

**Data Collection**

 The data was collected through three face-to-face interviews (30-45 minutes) and observations (15-20 minutes) at the high school. The ESL teachers were asked a series of questions (Appendix B) throughout the three interviews to learn about their experiences with teaching ESL at an urban high school and the effectiveness of the identified action plan to overcome their instructional challenge. The interviews were recorded for transcribing and analysis purposes. The observation guide/tool that was used during the observations was provided by the school district and it is used for all observations within that school district (Appendix A). All information regarding contact—interviews and otherwise—and observations were saved in the researcher’s personal records and kept in a safe place.

**Interviews**

Interviews are a staple approach in qualitative research used to collect some and occasionally all of the data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). There are various types of interviews that researchers can use to gather qualitative information, namely: (1) structured interviews, (2) unstructured interviews, online interviews, telephone interviews, and in-person interviews (also known as face-to-face interviews), to name a few. Interviews are “seen as negotiated accomplishments of both interviewers and respondents that are shaped by the *contexts* and situations in which they take place” (Oltmann, 2016, p. 2). For this research, face-to-face interviews were chosen with the objective of capturing nonverbal elements that could not be captured in any other type of interview (Oltmann, 2016). Furthermore, face-to-face interviews were more convenient for the participants because they did not have to make additional arrangements to answer the interview questions.

 There was a total of three in-person interviews per participant, each lasting of approximately 30-45 minutes. All of the interviews were conducted in the high school; either in the teachers’ classrooms or in common areas inside the high school. The first interview was conducted within the first four weeks of the study and participants were asked to identify their instructional strengths and challenges (questions 1 and 2 from Appendix B). The purpose of the first interview was to retrieve information to create an action plan to overcome the instructional challenges. The second interview was conducted in the middle of the study and sought to understand the teachers’ personal experience about their teaching practices (questions 3 to 7 from Appendix B). The last interview was conducted at the end of the study and its purpose was to gather data about the success of the action plan and the study as a whole for all teachers and the ESL department in the school (questions 8 to 10 from Appendix B).

**Observations**

Observations are a qualitative method whose main objective is to help researchers learn and gather data using multiple perspectives. “Conducting observations is a systematic process, not a casual occurrence” (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 18). Observations are usually framed in theories, guidelines, or objectives that help researchers anticipate and make sense of the events. For this study, each participant was observed once for approximately 15-20 minutes in regular instruction. There was only on observation conducted in this study due to time constraints and schedule conflicts with the school and participants’ classes. The observations were conducted towards the end of the study and their main purpose was to compare and contrast the ESL teachers’ self-perceived strengths and challenges with the researcher’s observations. The observations were guided by an observation form provided by the high school’s school district (Appendix A). Furthermore, participants received a courtesy notice about the observations but the specific time and day were not provided because the researcher sought to gather data from unplanned everyday instructions.

**Data Analysis**

 The data was analyzed using a deductive logic. Studies following the deductive logic begin with one or more premises that are acknowledged as true (Leedy & Ormrod, 2015). As such, this research used deductive coding to analyze data because the study started with pre-set themes and codes. The data retrieved from ESL teachers and observations was analyzed to uncover instructional self-perceived strengths and challenges. Observations were primarily used to reflect on the teachers’ self-perceived strengths and identify additional strengths they may not have noticed in their teaching practices. Furthermore, for the self-perceived challenges, the researcher proposed action plans that were implemented to overcome those challenges. The final interviews gathered data about whether the action plan to overcome the teachers’ instructional challenges proved effective.

**Self-Perceived Instructional Strengths, Challenges, and Action Plans**

 The chart below shows the instructional strengths and challenges identified by each participant during the interviews. In addition, the chart also shows the action plan created specifically for each ESL teacher in order to overcome their instructional challenge. It is important to note that the ESL teachers had a voice in the action plan chosen. There were many potential action plans proposed for each participant and each chose the best approach for their challenge based on individual experiences and conversations with the author of this research.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Andrea** | **Beatrice** | **Claudia** | **Daniel** |
| **Instructional Challenges** | Teaching Advanced ESL students to write original text summaries and commentaries, rather than plagiarize them. | Individualizing instruction for minority language students within aSpanish-dominant ESL classroom. | Incorporating technology in the ESL classes and lesson plans. | Accommodating interrupted education and illiterate ESL students.  |
| **Action Plans** | Read texts to students and have them write a summary of the story using their own words and memory (develop auditory proficiency and written skills). | Incorporating instructional support (teacher aid) to work specifically with the minority language students. | Google Classroom workshop for all ESL teachers in the department.  | Incorporating peer-tutoring and individualized small-group instruction to support the learning development of this vulnerable student population.  |
| **Instructional Strengths**  | Scaffolding instruction to facilitate language acquisition.  | Utilizing visuals to facilitate learning. | Using different techniques to successfullymanage the classroom. | Modifying instruction as needed to facilitate English language acquisition. |

*Table 1. Instructional strengths, challenges and action plans*

**Research Findings**

 Findings have been divided into different sections to provide a clear and easier understanding of the data gathered. This first section—divided by names—presents the findings of each participant’s action plan and their effectiveness for real life instruction in the ESL classroom. Furthermore, the first section also reflects on the observations conducted for each participant with a particular focus on the participants’ self-identified instructional challenges. In addition, the second section offers in-depth information about five (5) themes that were prevalent in all the participants’ responses during the interviews.

**Andrea**

Andrea identified her instructional challenge to be *teaching Advanced ESOL students to write original text summaries and commentaries, rather than plagiarize them*. The action plan selected to overcome this instructional challenge was to *read texts to students and have them write a summary of the story using their own words and memory (develop auditory proficiency and written skills)*. This action plan partially worked for Andrea’s class because although some students had the opportunity to show their higher-level skills, “students with lower skills wrote incoherent and confused summaries that were borderline emergent ESL level”. This action plan proved effective for higher-level students but lower students did not have the necessary skills to create their own summaries from just listening to the stories without visual support. Andrea explains “[the action plan] showed me their true reading and writing abilities, which will enable me to guide students toward accessible texts and appropriate guided writing formats”. In a sense, this action plan unintentionally served as an opportunity to assess the students’ listening, reading, and writing proficiencies when analyzing texts.

 Andrea identified as her instructional strength *scaffolding instruction to facilitate language acquisition*. During the observation, the classroom alone showed the many scaffolds Andrea offers to her students during her classes. The walls were filled with instructional support explaining concepts, numbering steps, and offering rubrics for the writing process, specifically for writing literary texts. During the class, Andrea used these resources to help her students achieve a goal that was beyond their reach without assisted support. Similarly, when students were ready to work on their own, Andrea would encourage them to complete the tasks independently. The observation showed that Andrea felt very comfortable using scaffolding in her class to the extent that using scaffolds felt as an inherent extension of her instruction.

**Beatrice**

Beatrice chose *individualizing instruction for minority language students within a**Spanish-dominant ESL classroom* as her instructional challenge. The action plan tailored to overcome this challenge was *incorporating instructional support (teacher aid) to work specifically with the minority language students.* This action plan proved effective for Beatrice’s class and was modified from its original action plan. Beatrice stated “my class is just too big (47 students in her classroom) and although a teacher aid is helpful, there are just too many students in my classroom”. As such, she decided to divide her class into two smaller classes, one led by the teacher aid in another classroom and one led by her in her classroom. Beatrice divided the students into two groups: (1) academically advantaged students and (2) students who needed additional support. The teacher aid took the second group, a smaller group that needed more individualized instruction, and Beatrice took the bigger group that was more independent and grasped content at a much faster pace. This type of grouping is known as academic ability grouping and Beatrice stated that “dividing my class into these two groups really helped me teach and manage my classroom better”.

 Beatrice chose *utilizing visuals to facilitate learning* as her instructional strength. During the classroom observation, Beatrice used diverse visual resources to promote language and content learning as noted in her instructional strength. In particular, Beatrice used the overhead projector to work simultaneously with her students in answering the questions and checking the answers for each exercise. The class was fast-paced and students were actively working, answering questions and checking the answers for all their exercises. Beatrice practices a teacher-led classroom environment that works well with advanced students and keeps them focused on learning and interacting. During the observation, it was apparent that academic ability grouping proved successful and that Beatrice uses visuals to facilitate learning, as well as to maintain effective classroom management and keep her advanced students on task.

**Claudia**

Claudia selected*incorporating technology in the ESL classes and lesson plans* as her instructional challenge. The proposed action plan, which was partially designed by Claudia, was to implement a *Google Classroom workshop for all ESL teachers in the department*. The action plan proved successful for Claudia and her students. “I have started a Google classroom in which I can place activities to go about during class, which is a motivational resource, and students can return to the assignment after school hours as well”. Although incorporating technology in Claudia’s classroom has been successful, she also states that “I just wish there was something easier that I could use and that would take less pre-planning time”. These statements show Claudia’s positive attitude towards incorporating Google classroom, but it also reflects the challenges she faces with technology.

 Claudia identified her instructional strength to be *using different techniques to successfully**manage the classroom*. Throughout the observation, it became clear that classroom management was not an issue for Claudia. She uses traditional classroom management techniques such as body language and direct teaching methods. Some of the most prevalent body language practices used by Claudia during the observation were direct eye contact to convey a message, body proximity as a tool to promote students’ self-control, facial expressions to indicate acceptable or unacceptable behavior instead of calling out students’ names, and body posture to engender confidence and classroom control. Furthermore, the direct teaching methods used were lectures and guided activities where students followed specific guidelines and instructions. Although traditional classroom management techniques are considered obsolete nowadays, the observation showed that these techniques worked effectively in Claudia’s classroom and contributed to students’ good behavior and focus.

**Daniel**

 Daniel identified *accommodating interrupted education and illiterate ESL students in the ESL classroom* as his instructional challenge. The proposed action plan was to *incorporate peer-tutoring and to individualize small-group instruction to support the learning development of illiterate and interrupted education ESL students*. The action plan proved beneficial for Daniel’s classroom because “it is easier to have students who understand each other explain to their peers from their own perspective”. Daniel explained that at the beginning of the study his classes were smaller but by the end of the study his English classes had grown about 10 students per class. “I initially thought that peer-tutoring would only help me in teaching my illiterate students or those with interrupted education. But, when my classes started to expand in numbers I found peer-tutoring to be a lifesaver as well”. Peer tutoring proved successful for Daniel and helped him support the language and literacy needs of his illiterate students and those with interrupted education. In addition, it also proved beneficial in managing and supporting the academic needs of new ELs arriving in his classroom throughout this study.

 Daniel identified his instructional strength to be *modifying instruction as needed to facilitate English language acquisition*. During the observation, it was evident that Daniel effectively accommodated instruction to support his students’ needs. The class was divided into five groups and each group had a responsible student, or group captain, explaining and modeling the activity. Daniel went around the classroom explaining the information as needed and providing specific support to individual students who were not understanding the concepts. At one point, Daniel created a new group with three students who were struggling to understand the concept and used word builders to explain the conjugation of the verb “*to be*”. Although accommodating and differentiating instruction are Daniel’s instructional strengths, classroom management and active learning were also identified as part of his instructional strengths.

 **Common Themes**

In addition to the findings identified from the observation and interviews, as it pertained to the participants’ self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges, the study also revealed five common themes that the participants experience in their daily practices. The five themes are expanded below.

1. **Professional Development –** The need for professional development opportunities and the incorporation of quality professional development sessions was a common trend among the participants’ responses. As Daniel stated, “this study has been beneficial to me personally because I rarely have the opportunity to receive professional feedback on how to improve my daily teaching practices; most of the professional development sessions offered to us by the county focus on testing”. In addition to this, Claudia explained that “when the school administrators conduct observations, we [ESL teachers] are evaluated using a standard rubric that is not appropriate for ESL and the feedback we [ESL teachers] get to improve instruction is just not realistic”. Participants agreed that there is a need for meaningful workshops that offer techniques and tips they can realistically use in their ESL classrooms.
2. **Opportunity to reflect –** Participants stated that this project gave them the opportunity to reflect about their individual teaching practices and the department’s teaching practices as a whole. Andrea, the department chair stated, “we [ESL teachers] rarely have time to exchange tips and ideas due to the urgency of deadlines and student emergencies. However, this project pushed us to stop for a second and reflect about what we are doing in our classrooms and how we see ourselves as ESL teachers”.
3. **Making classes relevant to students –** Participants implemented action plans with the purpose of overcoming self-perceived instructional challenges that were keeping them from incorporating meaningful activities in their classrooms. During the interviews, all participants stated that instruction needs to be relatable and should promote a sense of responsibility in their students. Andrea explained that this project made a positive impact in the ESL department’s vision of inculcating social responsibility through instruction because it offered real-life solutions to specific instructional challenges they were having. “I regularly prepare lessons of substance, provide students with feedback and remind students of school policies, class conventions and social expectations. But, sometimes I feel like I need to learn more so I can use other approaches to teach those things. In this project, I learned how to use a new tool to continue making my classes relevant”.
4. **Using diverse tools to teach language and literacy –** The use of diverse activities to teach language and literacy was identified as essential in the ESL classrooms. Participants shared different didactic tools they use regularly, to include multi-sensory presentations, using students’ background knowledge, story diagrams, collaborative work, and vocabulary development charts. Although participants have had little opportunity to collaborate in the past, the tools they use in their classroom to teach language and literacy are similar and they were surprised to learn how their peers also use them.
5. **Technology as an opportunity and a challenge –** The use of technology in the classroom was identified as both an opportunity and a challenge. Claudia stated, “using Google classroom in my class was great and my students loved using the Chromebooks to answer questions”. In this sense, technology was identified as an opportunity to engage students and keep them motivated towards learning. Technology is a tool that attracts students because they are surrounded by technology and they can relate to computers and cellphones the most.

 On the other hand, some participants stated that technology was an up-hill battle in the classroom. Andrea states, “persuading students to use their own words and ideas instead of plagiarizing has become increasingly difficult with the ubiquitous cellphone”. Furthermore, Beatrice shared that “using technology is a challenge for me because I do not know when students are using their cellphones or Chromebooks to work on the activities or for Facebook, I do not know how to manage that”. Appropriate use of technology in the classroom is something new for many educators. In addition, the participants in this study had never received formal training about techniques they can use to successfully manage the use of technology in their classrooms and to keep students on task while using their cellphones of Chromebooks.

**Limitations of Study**

 The purpose of qualitative case studies was to search for meaning and understanding while immersing in a thorough descriptive study of the phenomenon (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). For this study, the author sought to understand the phenomenon of the participants’ self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges in an urban public high school. Thus, the author does not intend to imply that the information gathered in this research, findings, or the conclusions, are representative of all ESL teachers in urban high schools. Furthermore, the action plans implemented in this study should not be considered best practices for similar self-perceived instructional challenges as they were specifically tailored for the participants to fit their schedule, instructional reality, and students’ academic needs.

 Bias is part of the qualitative research methodology and does not pretend to avoid it. “Qualitative researchers are involved in their research, and their experiences inform their research” (Fregeau & Leier, 2016, p. 70). As such, a note is warranted about the author’s background as it pertains to this study. The author, a bilingual speaker (Spanish and English) was a prior ESL student in high school and has worked as an ESL educator for over 5 years. The author’s experiences have influenced the choice to study this topic, and informed both the research approach and interpretation of the data. The research was also informed by the author’s experiences with the impact self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges have in his daily instruction. Although the study could have been expanded to explore additional instructional strengths and challenges of ESL educators in urban high schools, the main purpose was to address the impact self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges have for these particular population of teachers.

 The study was 16 weeks long from the moment participants were selected to the moment data was gathered and findings were shared with the participants. Due to the time constraint, only one observation per teacher was feasible. Hence, the findings on the ESL teachers’ self-perceived instructional strengths, as compared with the observations, have opportunity for expansion. Including more observations in this study could have resulted in identifying more instructional strengths in each educator. However, evaluating self-perceived instructional strengths in daily instruction can be expanded into further research that specifically addresses that topic. Similarly, due to time constraint, teachers did not have the opportunity to reflect and share their thoughts about the real implications and impact this type of study will have in their daily practices. Further research could address the change in instructional behavior educators have after reflecting on their self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

 The purpose of this qualitative case study was to understand the instructional experiences of ESL teachers in an urban high school. As such, the central research question for this study was *What are the self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges of ESL educators in an urban public high school?* The self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges for each participant were identified in the study. Furthermore, action plans were created to overcome self-perceived instructional challenges and observations were conducted to evaluate the participants’ self-perceived instructional strengths. The study showed that self-perception, whether for instructional strengths or challenges, had an impact in the participants’ teaching practices and shaped their classroom environment. This finding aligns with Badura (1977)’s theory regarding the impact self-perception has in the teaching practices and instructional approaches used by educators in the classroom.

 In addition to the central question, this study had three (3) sub-questions. The first sub-question was *What are urban ESL public high school educators’ experiences regarding their instructional/pedagogical practices?* The findings reflect that all participants had different teaching experiences in their classroom although they were teaching the same student population. Andrea, the department chair and a veteran educator, felt confident about her ability to use scaffolding but had a challenge with how students use technology to plagiarize information. Beatrice and Claudia, also veteran educators, had a similar experience with technology in their classroom. All three of these veteran educators understood the importance of including technology but did not know how to manage it. This finding echoes Glowiak (2014)’s article on the challenges veteran teachers encounter to understand and manage technology in the classroom. Thus, it is not enough to promote the use of technology and expect educators to have the necessary skills to incorporate it. School counties and administrators need to offer workshops and professional development opportunities that specifically focus on the effective incorporation and management of technology in the ESL classroom.

 The second sub-question *How do the self-perceived instructional strengths of ESL educators in an urban high school compare to the strengths and challenges identified in the observations?* sought to make a connection between the participants’ self-perceived pedagogical skills and their teaching practices. The findings reflect that the participants’ self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges were accurate. Furthermore, there were some cases where the observations revealed that some participants also had additional instructional strengths that had not been self-identified. Knowing and understanding individual and other co-workers’ instructional strengths and challenges proved beneficial for all participants. All four ESL educators shared that having this opportunity to reflect and learn about each other’s instructional reality motivated them to collaborate in the future and conduct small workshops within the department to address specific instructional challenges.

 Lastly, the third sub-question *How are the participants’ self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges present in their daily practices?* looked into the impact strengths and challenges had in the daily instruction of participants. The findings reflect that the self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges are present in the daily pedagogical practices of participants and have an impact in the overall classroom environment and delivery of information. In addition, many of these findings align with previous studies on these specific self-identified instructional strengths and challenges. For example, Beatrice’s ability to group her classes based on her students’ academic skills impact her daily instruction. This type of grouping is known as academic ability grouping and literature shows the positive academic impact it has for students in ESL and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms (Khazaeenezhad, Barati, & Jafarzade, 2012; Matthews, Ritchotte, & McBee, 2013; Missett, Brunner, Callahan, Moon, & Azano, 2014). Similarly, Daniel’s feedback on the potential of peer-tutoring in the ESL classroom reflects Bowman-Perrott, deMarín, Mahadevan, & Etchells (2016) findings. According to Bowman-Perrott et al. “peer tutoring encourages gains for ELLs [English Language Learners] of varying levels of English proficiency. Further, ELLs appear to gain academic and social benefits from this empirically supported practice” (p. 378).

 The researcher’s suggestions for the educational community, based on the findings and personal experiences while conducting this research, is to expand the current literature on the impact self-perceived instructional strengths and challenges have on ESL teachers’ daily instructional practices. Furthermore, research can also expand the current literature on how action plans to overcome self-perceived instructional challenges promote educators’ resilience and motivation. This study had many limitations, but one of the biggest limitations was the number of participants. As such, it is important for future research studies conducted on this topic to examine a bigger population of participants to compare and contrast findings. Lastly, future research should also focus on how professional development shapes and contributes to the teaching practices of ESL educators in urban school settings.
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**Appendix A: Observation Log**

**Appendix B: Interview Questions**

1) Tell me something you consider to be an instructional strength in your teaching practices.

2) Tell me something you consider to be an instructional challenge in your teaching practices.

3) What three words would you use to describe your teaching practices with English as a second language students?
- great, why \_\_\_\_\_? (repeat with each word)
4) Tell me about a time when a lesson you presented enabled ESL students to learn.
5) Tell me about a time when a lesson you presented caused struggles for ESL students
6) If you had to choose one thing that you do well in working with ESL students, what would that be? Why?

7) If you had to choose one thing that is a challenge for you in working with ESL students, what would that be? Why?

8) How would you explain your experience teaching ESL in an urban high school?

9) Did the action plan to overcome your instructional challenge prove successful? Why or why not?

10) How was this study beneficial for you personally and as a department? What did you learn from this study about you and your colleagues in the ESL department?