Brief Report

SECONDARY CONTENT-AREA TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ENGLISH LEARNER ACCOMMODATIONS IN CLASSROOM ASSESSMENTS

Seonhee Cho*
College of Mount Saint Vincent, New York City

Measuring content knowledge of English learners (ELs) whose English skills are still developing has generated questions of test validity, particularly those surrounding large-scale, high-stakes standardized tests. Though using special accommodations is one way to increase the validity of tests, little is known about the ways in which content-area teachers accommodate ELs in classroom-based assessments. In order to address this gap, this study investigated a group of secondary content-area teachers' (n = 52) sense of fairness on the subject of accommodations in classroom assessments. Drawing from the survey data, this study found that secondary content-area teachers viewed some accommodation decisions as fairer than others, and subgroup variances, such as the teaching level and the content areas they teach, appeared to have an influence on their perceptions of fair accommodation to some degree. These findings imply that there is a great need for discipline-specific guidelines that are combined with teacher training to help motivate establishing fair classroom assessment accommodation strategies for ELs.

Keywords: classroom assessments, English learners in inclusive settings, ESL assessment, teachers' perceptions and practices in assessments, test accommodations

The benefits of early mainstreaming and content instruction in inclusive settings, while ELs are developing English language skills, have been well argued and documented (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2016; Reiss, 2005; Richard-Amato, 2005). As such, ELs' education in inclusive settings has been a general rule of practice in recent years. Most research on the assessment of ELs' learning outcomes and test accommodation strategies, however, has centered on large-scale, high-stakes standardized tests. Thus, unlike the abundance of instructional strategies for ELs, the classroom assessments of ELs by content-area teachers in inclusive settings are less known. In order to reduce the research gap, this study examined how a group of secondary content-area teachers (n = 52) perceive various test accommodation strategies for ELs in their classroom assessments, and offers suggestions, based on survey results, for increasing teacher commitment to accommodating the needs of ELs in classroom assessments.

Testing Accommodations

A general consensus among researchers is that ELs' limited proficiency has a negative influence on their performance on most standardized tests, thus limiting the capacity of assessments to serve as accurate measures of achievement and raising a question of the validity of test scores (Abedi, Hofstetter, & Lord, 2004; Martiniello, 2008; Pappamihiel & Mihai, 2006; Solano-Flores, 2008, 2014; Winke, 2011). One way to raise test validity is to measure what is intended by making special accommodations. As Abedi et al. (2004) emphasize, "[R]educing the impact of language factors on content-based assessments can

improve the validity and reliability of such assessments for English learners, resulting in fairer assessments" (p. 6). Thus, a variety of test accommodation strategies for ELs were suggested and adopted for large-scale, high-stakes standardized testing.

Rivera and Collum (2006) documented EL assessment accommodation types across different states and then placed them into two categories: *direct linguistic support* and *indirect linguistic support*. The direct linguistic support includes students' first language (L1) translation, oral translation, response in L1, modified and simplified English versions, use of a bilingual dictionary, and provision of content-irrelevant glossaries. The indirect linguistic support involves the test schedule (e.g., extended time and more breaks during the test) and the test environment. In regard to the effectiveness of such test accommodations, Durán's (2008) meta-analysis provides comprehensive, instrumental information. Specifically, it indicates that modifying a test language through simplified sentence structures and wording improved the ELs' test performance; a math test accompanying visual images explaining the conceptual relationships also yielded increased test scores. An interesting result, however, was that translated tests in the students' L1 proved to be less effective than dual-language translated tests. Poorly constructed and/or translated tests might be one reason (see MacSwan & Rolstad, 2006). A mismatch between the instructional language (English in this case) and the assessment language (L1) might be another reason that causes confusion among test takers, yielding less valid test scores. On the other hand, though Abedi et al. (2004) claimed that a particular strategy is "one of the most promising test accommodations—modifying the language but not the content of the test item (p. 17)," this strategy was reportedly rarely used.

Classroom Assessments of ELs

Research in relation to the ELs' classroom assessments suggests a host of strategies to measure what they know in regard to content while reducing the negative impact of their limited English language proficiency in classroom assessments. Such alternative assessments often involve authentic and performance-based methods—for example, portfolios, conferencing, observations, self-assessment, and performance-oriented tasks have been suggested to classroom teachers of ELs (Gottlieb, 2006; Law & Eckes, 2007; O'Malley & Pierce, 1996). These alternative assessments focus on how to accurately measure what ELs know in terms of content while not compromising them for their limited English skills.

The reality of classroom assessments in inclusive settings, however, may present difficulties of implementing those alternative assessments for various reasons. For example, more teachers adopted standardized test formats and content coverage in their classroom-assessment practices (Abrams, Pedulla, & Madaus, 2003; Mertler, 2009). Other accommodations associated with grading, such as allowing partial scores, grading content only, or applying different grading scales in classroom assessments, may further challenge a content-area teacher's beliefs about what fair assessment is. Milnes and Cheng's (2008) study, drawn upon interviews with a group of high school teachers regarding assessment practices of ELs, sheds light on such issues. While most teachers in their study considered the ELs' efforts and progress in their grading, one of the teachers interviewed reported that she strictly adhered to the rubrics that applied to all the other students; it is important to note that grading is central to this teacher's ethical decisions in relation to the assessment. According to Pope, Green, Johnson, and Mitchell's (2008) study, which investigated the teachers' (n = 103) ethical dilemmas in classroom-based assessments, the majority of teachers (62%) expressed their concerns about test score pollution related to grading practices, standardized testing issues, and special populations, including ELs. McMillan (2007), however, described fair assessment as "*unbiased* and *nondiscriminatory* [author emphasis], uninfluenced by irrelevant or subjective factors" (p. 76). He further contended that accommodating special needs of special learners in assessments reduces test bias while increasing fairness. Thus, it is clear from this body of research that classroom assessments of ELs and their accommodations involve a highly complex decision-making process influenced by teachers' beliefs, institutional requirements, and teachers' knowledge of second

language development and learners (Clark-Gareca, 2016; Milnes & Cheng, 2008)—components not usually part of large-scale, standardized testing.

Method

The purpose of this study was to examine content-teacher perceptions of fairness in regard to their classroom accommodations for ELs. The specific research questions were: (a) How do content-area teachers perceive different accommodation strategies for ELs in classroom assessments? and (b) Are there subgroup variations in the teachers' responses in relation to the teaching level (middle vs. high school), content area (e.g., math, science, English, social studies), work experiences with ELs, and prior ESL training experiences?

Research Context and Participants

A group of secondary content-area teachers (n = 54) who were voluntarily attending a 30-hour inservice teacher training program designed to develop pedagogical skills specific to EL instruction in a school district in central Virginia was invited to participate in this survey.

The teachers who returned the survey (n = 52) displayed different demographic characteristics. As Table 1 indicates, 30 were middle school (57.7%) and 22 were high school (42.3%) teachers. They taught mathematics (n = 16; 30.8%), English (n = 14; 26.9%), science (n = 13; 25%), and social studies (n = 9; 17.3%). Most teachers (n = 48; 92.3%) had prior experience in working with ELs. Nineteen teachers (36.5%) reported that they had received some type of ESL training prior to the current training in central Virginia during which the survey was administered, while 33 teachers (63.5%) did not have any ESL training experiences.

Table 1

Demographical Information of Participating Teachers

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	GRADE LEVEL		DISCIPLINE				WORK EXPERIENCE WITH ELS		ESL-RELATED TRAINING EXPERIENCE	
	Middle School	High School	Math	English	Science	Social Studies	Yes	No	Yes	No
Number	30	22	16	14	13	9	48	4	19	33
Percentage	57.7	42.3	30.8	26.9	25	17.3	92.3	7.7	36.5	63.5

Instrument and Data Analysis

The nature of the study was exploring perceptions and attitudes as opposed to testing hypotheses, and therefore described relationships and patterns (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). The survey questionnaire contained 12 questions asking teachers' opinions on a 5-point Likert scale, from "Very fair" to "Very unfair" in applying various accommodations in EL assessments (see Appendix A, Part II). The 12 questions were constructed based on the types of testing accommodations presented in previously published studies (see Durán, 2008; Reiss, 2005; Rivera & Collum, 2006; Solano-Flores, 2008). The questions covered a range of testing accommodations in administering tests/tasks (e.g., extra time, allowance of dictionary use), modification of tests and tasks, and grading test items. The returned surveys (n = 52) were analyzed using descriptive statistics to examine how teachers perceive different accommodation types, a t-test to compare middle and high school teachers, and one-way ANOVA to compare four different subgroups by discipline, such as English, social studies, math, and science.

Results

Research Question 1

The first research question, *How do teachers perceive different types of EL accommodations in classroom assessments?*, concerned teachers' perceptions of fairness on different types of EL accommodations in this setting. The survey results by descriptive statistics showed that the teachers' views of fairness are dissimilar in each accommodation type (see Table 2). Their sense of fairness turned out to be contingent upon the types of accommodations available or proposed. Most teachers, however, marked as either "Very fair" or "Somewhat fair" in providing extended time to ELs—specifically, what teachers perceived as most fair was "Providing more time in tasks" (M = 4. 58) and "Providing more time on tests" (M = 4.53). Furthermore, low standard deviation (SD) scores (.85 and .89, respectively) indicate that most teachers viewed the provision of more time as a fair practice. The second highest support was "Grading with a focus on content rather than grammar and spelling" (M = 4.44, SD = .78), suggesting that teachers weigh content higher than linguistic accuracy in assessing ELs' work.

In contrast, teachers rated "applying different grading scales in grading ELs' work" as least fair (M = 3.14, SD = 1.40), suggesting that they would not adopt this practice. "Allowing only ELs to use graphic organizers or illustrations instead of written responses" was rated second to last in fairness (M = 3.31, SD = 1.26); in particular, English teachers showed the least support for this accommodation. "Providing fewer questions on tests" was also not much supported by teachers (M = 3.5, SD = 1.29), though math teachers showed more support for this accommodation compared with the support of teachers of other subjects. The large standard deviation in these areas revealed a considerable range of teacher opinions.

Table 2

Fairness of EL Accommodations in Classroom Assessments

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	*N*	MEAN	SD	VERY FAIR/ SOMEWHAT FAIR	NEITHER FAIR NOR FAIR	SOMEWHAT UNFAIR/ VERY UNFAIR
Counting effort	52	3.60	1.19	67.4%	11.5%	21.2%
Providing more time in tasks	52	4.58	.85	94.3%	0%	5.7%
Providing more time on tests	49	4.53	.89	91.8%	2.0%	6.1%
Providing fewer questions on tests	52	3.50	1.29	61.5%	9.6%	28.9%
Providing dictionaries and glossaries	52	4.37	1.03	84.7%	5.8%	9.6%
Allowing visual images explaining concepts and relationships	52	3.62	1.51	61.5%	5.8%	32.7%
Grading with a focus on content rather than grammar and spelling	52	4.44	.78	86.5%	11.5%	1.9%
Allowing graphic organizers or illustrations rather than written responses	52	3.31	1.26	55.8%	15.4%	28.8%
Applying different grading scales	51	3.14	1.40	49.0%	11.8%	39.2%
Creating modified tests	50	4.04	1.09	76.0%	14.0%	10.0%
Giving more second chances	48	3.94	1.14	79.1%	10.4%	10.4%
Allowing oral responses	46	3.98	1.09	76.1%	13.0%	10.8%

Very fair—5, Somewhat fair—4, Neither fair nor unfair—3, Somewhat unfair—2, Very unfair—1. Due to space limitations, item descriptions have been modified from Part II of Appendix A.

Research Question 2

The second research question, *Are there subgroup variations in teachers' responses?*, involved the role of subgroup variations in teachers' responses to different accommodation types. The independent

variables for these subgroup comparisons included (a) teaching level (middle versus high school); (b) content areas (English, social studies, science, and math); (c) experience of working with ELs; and (d) prior training experience related to ESL instruction.

First, a *t*-test was conducted to compare the responses of middle school versus high school teachers' perceptions. The result showed that the average mean scores of middle school teachers' perceptions in each accommodation type were consistently higher than those of high school teachers (see Table 3). In particular, "Creating modified tests" (p = .008) and "Applying different grading scales" (p = .043) turned out to be statistically significant at the level of p <.05. In other words, middle school teachers believed that creating modified tests and applying different grading scales are fairer than high school teachers did.

Table 3

Teachers' Perceptions of EL Accommodations by School Level

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM	SCHOOL TYPE	*N*	MEAN	SD	SIG. (*p* VALUE)
Counting effort	Middle	30	3.63	1.22	
	High	22	3.55	1.18	.796
Providing more time in tasks	Middle	30	4.63	.93	
	High	22	4.50	.74	.581
Providing more time on tests	Middle	28	4.57	1.07	
	High	21	4.48	.60	.716
Providing fewer questions on tests	Middle	30	3.73	1.20	
	High	22	3.18	1.37	.129
Providing dictionaries and glossaries	Middle	30	4.60	.81	
	High	22	4.05	1.21	.054
Allowing visual images explaining concepts and relationships	Middle	30	3.77	1.46	
	High	22	3.41	1.59	.404
Grading with a focus on content rather than grammar and spelling	Middle	30	4.60	.77	
	High	22	4.23	.75	.088
Allowing graphic organizers or illustrations instead of written responses	Middle	30	3.50	1.28	
	High	22	3.05	1.21	.202
Applying different grading scales	Middle	30	3.47	1.43	
	High	21	2.67	1.24	*.043
Creating modified tests	Middle	29	4.38	.90	
	High	21	3.57	1.17	*.008
Giving more second chances	Middle	28	4.04	1.23	
	High	20	3.80	1.00	.485
Allowing oral responses	Middle	27	4.22	1.09	
	High	19	3.63	1.01	.069

*Denotes p < .05. Due to space limitations, item descriptions have been modified from Part II of Appendix A.

Second, in comparing subgroup differences by discipline—social studies, math, science, English (see Table 4)—one-way ANOVA with post hoc tests was utilized to accommodate unequal subgroup sizes. Accordingly, harmonic mean sample sizes ranging from 11 to 12 were used to identify statistical significances. While at p <.05 none of the cross-group comparisons were significant, four types of accommodations showed marginal statistical significance of group variances at p <0.10—"Providing more

time on tests," "Applying different grading scales," "Allowing oral responses," and "Counting effort"—displaying differences across the content areas. Teachers of English and social studies, however, showed more reluctance in "Creating modified tests" than did their counterparts in math and science. Furthermore, English teachers viewed "Grading with a focus on content rather than grammar and spelling" and "Allowing graphic organizers or illustrations instead of written responses" to be the least fair.

Math teachers in general were supportive of certain accommodations in a number of areas. On the other hand, social studies teachers noted overall low scores in most of the accommodations, with the exception of " Providing more time," "Giving more second chances," "Providing dictionaries and glossaries," and "Grading with a focus on content." Although the results lack statistical significance, different responses by content-area teachers imply that the nature of the subject matter affects content teachers' sense of fairness in accommodating ELs in classroom-based assessments.

Table 4

*Teachers' Perceptions of EL Accommodations by Discipline (*N *= 52)*

DESCRIPTION OF ITEM		MATH (*N* = 16)	SCIENCE (*N* =13)	ENGLISH (*N* = 17)	SOCIAL STUDIES (*N* = 9)	SIG. (*p* VALUE)
Counting effort	M	4.13	3.23	3.64	3.11	.074
	SD	.72	1.48	1.28	1.05	
Providing more time in tasks	M	4.44	4.62	4.86	4.33	.169
	SD	.81	.87	.36	1.32	
Providing more time on tests	M	4.53	4.67	4.77	4.00	.056
	SD	.83	.65	.44	1.50	
Providing fewer questions on tests	M	4.00	3.54	3.14	3.11	.118
	SD	.82	1.45	1.46	1.36	
Providing dictionaries and glossaries	M	4.50	4.15	4.36	4.44	.462
	SD	.82	1.35	1.01	1.01	
Allowing visual images explaining concepts and relationships	M	3.88	3.54	3.57	3.33	.433
	SD	1.41	1.81	1.51	1.41	
Grading with a focus on content rather than grammar and spelling	M	4.56	4.46	4.21	4.56	.323
	SD	.81	.66	.89	.73	
Allowing graphic organizers or illustrations rather than written responses	M	3.25	3.46	3.00	3.67	.243
	SD	1.18	1.27	1.47	1.12	
Applying different grading scales	M	3.94	2.92	2.86	2.44	.061
	SD	.85	1.73	1.35	1.33	
Creating modified tests	M	4.38	4.08	3.83	3.67	.153
	SD	.62	1.44	1.19	1.00	
Giving more second chances	M	3.94	3.92	3.91	4.00	.868
	SD	.85	.90	1.22	1.23	
Allowing oral responses	M	4.43	3.58	4.27	3.44	.073
	SD	.65	1.38	.65	1.33	

Note. Due to space limitations, item descriptions have been slightly modified from Part II of Appendix A.

As shown in Table 1, another subgroup comparison by the independent variable "Related ESL training experience," neither a statistical significance nor consistent results in the teachers' responses was found. In addition, only 36.5% of teachers reported that they had received some type of ESL-relevant training, though it is unknown what the quality and the quantity of education they were exposed to was. The result of another independent variable, "Work experience with ELs," was not valid either, as the subgroup sample sizes were way too skewed: only 4 teachers (8%) had not worked with ELs.

Limitations

This study has limitations in both the methodological approach and the interpretation of the study, which warrants further research in this area. First, the sample size is small and the sample was selected conveniently rather than randomly. As a result, the generalization of the findings is arguable. In addition, a relatively small sample size (n = 52) reduces the study's statistical power. As mentioned above, the teachers who participated in the survey were already attending an ESL inservice teacher training program. For this reason, the average mean scores were higher than 3 on all items. This preexisting preference may partially affect the results, as these teachers were already disposed to support EL students. Second, the survey instrument—the two-part questionnaire—was not tested elsewhere, and further research is necessary to refine this instrument. Third, the teachers' beliefs of "fairness" with little to no understanding of second language development and test validity, and the influence of their beliefs on their assessment practices, should be further explored. Fourth, the length of teaching experience and types of ESL training, which might also influence teachers' perceptions of EL accommodation strategies in classroom assessments, needs further study and analysis. Finally, although there might be a discrepancy between what teachers perceive to be fair and what they actually practice, they are more likely to be receptive when they feel the practice is fair to begin with. Without teacher buy-in, the well-researched accommodation strategies will not work in any case if they are not used.

Discussions and Conclusion

This study explored secondary content-area teachers' views of fairness on EL accommodations in classroom assessments. While a fairly large number of studies advocate for the importance of EL accommodations—whether classroom-based or in large-scale standardized tests—the results of this study indicate that the teachers' perceptions of fairness can vary depending on the types of accommodations and content area, as well as the grade level they are teaching. First, teachers most supported extra time, dictionary use, and grading focusing on content, while they showed the least support for applying different grading criteria. This finding is in strong agreement with the results of other studies, which found that the provision of extra time to ELs was most frequently and consistently implemented in classroom-based assessments (Clark-Gareca, 2016; Rivera & Collum, 2006). It is speculated that the provision of extra time or dictionaries does not require much in additional teacher time and attention, and therefore either is relatively easy to implement.

In contrast, teachers' least support for applying different grading criteria may suggest their ethical conflicts regarding test score pollution. In Pope et al.'s (2008) study, 62% of teachers expressed their concern about score pollution, and one of their concerns included ELs. In relation to grading ELs' work, Law and Ecks (2007) provided a framework that included grading selectively, grading what is important, grading both process and product, defining and communicating to students clearly using rubrics, and involving students in the grading process using guided self-assessments. These suggestions, however, may not be accepted by teachers as long as they believe that different grading practices to accommodate ELs would remain inherently unfair.

Second, middle school teachers turned out to be more accepting of accommodating ELs than high school teachers. It is notable that high school curriculum requires not only depth in subject matter knowledge but also advanced and sophisticated language skills, and therefore ELs are more likely to be struggling with the English language—yet high school teachers demonstrated less flexibility in their sense of fairness about EL accommodations. Similarly, Milnes and Cheng (2008) reported that teachers tended to hold higher expectations for Grades 11 and up, in alignment with academic standards and external exams that would influence their students' high school graduation.

Third, teachers' different perceptions of various accommodation strategies by discipline are worthy of further discussion. For example, although dictionary use and grading that focused on content were rated by most subject-area teachers as fair, English teachers perceived these two accommodations the least fair, and they also did not much support graphic organizers or illustrations over essays—perhaps because writing skills and linguistic accuracy are often the intended focus of English classes and assessments. Similar to this finding, the work of Milnes and Cheng (2008) also revealed that English teachers held higher expectations for the written work submitted by ELs. Notable is that social studies teachers did not agree with teachers in other content areas on the fairness of accommodations to ELs. Though the expectation might have been that social studies teachers would have a perspective promoting minority students' equity issues, the results implied that the social studies teachers might have misinterpreted fairness as equal treatment. In fact, however, according to McMillan (2007) accommodating special needs increases fairness. Regarding creating linguistically modified tests, English and social studies teachers were opposed to this type of accommodation. It is difficult to understand why, however, because English and social studies require more advanced literacy skills, thus challenging ELs further.

It is undeniably complex to decide what accommodation strategies are appropriate for ELs. According to Koran and Kopriva (2017), assessment accommodations should match individual students' needs for the accommodations to be effective. They explained that such factors as "individual English language proficiency, first language literacy, the language of instruction, and skill in using bilingual dictionaries and translation aids" should be considered in choosing the appropriate accommodations (p. 72). Furthermore, when developing accommodation guidelines, the characteristics of each content area should be taken into consideration. For example, such accommodations as "Grading with a focus on content rather than grammar and spelling" and "Allowing graphic organizers or illustrations rather than written responses" in math assessments may not be well received in English assessments (see Table 4).

Another issue to be addressed is the inconsistency between high-stakes test accommodations and classroom assessment accommodations. Based on her study, which surveyed elementary school teachers (n = 213) of math and science, Clark-Gareca (2016) asserted that many accommodations in high-stakes standardized tests were not implemented in classroom-based assessments. This finding suggests that the classroom-assessment guidelines in these subjects should ensure consistency between these two types of assessments. Furthermore, if teachers have very little understanding of second language acquisition processes, it is very likely that they rely on their basic general sense regarding what is fair. Thus, education programs for pre- and inservice teachers need to integrate classroom assessment accommodation strategies that are well supported by second language acquisition research to help teachers make informed yet fair decisions in assessing ELs in the classroom. (see Mertler, 2009, 2011).

General classroom assessments, unlike standardized tests, may include effort, behaviors, participation, projects, and assignments in addition to quizzes and unit or benchmark tests. While it is beyond the scope of this paper to make specific suggestions in terms of assessment accommodations, the survey questionnaire in Appendix A was created based on the recommendations by previous studies, as noted earlier. In addition, in order to establish coherent accommodations between large-scale standardized tests and classroom assessments, the accommodations that needed to be made for classroom-based assessments of ELs are extra time; frequent breaks; separate location; content-irrelevant glossaries; and L1

translated, orally translated, or linguistically modified English tests. All these accommodations involve considering ELs' English proficiency, their L1 literacy skills, and their preferred response mode to measure what they know most effectively and accurately. The findings of this study should contribute to the body of literature by including the nature of each content area in recommending assessment accommodation strategies.

References

Abedi, J. Hofstetter, C. H., & Lord, C. (2004). Assessment accommodations for English language learners: Implications for policy-based empirical research. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1) 1–28.

Abrams, L. M., Pedulla, J. J., & Madaus, G. F. (2003). Views from the classroom: Teachers' opinions of statewide testing programs. *Theory into Practice, 42*(1), 18–29.

Clark-Gareca, B. (2016). Classroom assessment and English language learners: Teachers' accommodations implementation on routine math and science tests. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 54,* 139–148.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Durán, P. R. (2008). Assessing English language learners' achievement. *Review of Research in Education, 32,* 292–327.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, J. S. (2016). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson.

Gottlieb, M. (2006). *Assessing English language learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Koran, J., Kopriva, R. J. (2017). Framing appropriate accommodations in terms of individual need: Examining the fit of four approaches to selecting test accommodations of English language learners. *Applied Measurement in Education, 30*(2), 71–80. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10/1080/08957347.2016.1243539

Law, B., & Eckes, M. (2007). *Assessment and ESL: An alternative approach* (2nd ed.). Winnipeg, Canada: Portage & Main Press.

Martiniello, M. (2008). Language and the performance of English-language learners in math word problems. *Harvard Educational Review, 78*(2), 333–368.

MacSwan, J., & Rolstad, K. (2006). How language proficiency tests misled us about ability: Implications for English language learners placement in special education. *Teachers College Record, 108*(11), 2304–2328.

McMillan, J. H. (2007). *Classroom assessment: Principles and practice for effective standards-based instruction* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.

Mertler, C. A. (2009). Teachers' assessment knowledge and their perceptions of the impact of classroom assessment professional development. *Improving Schools, 12*(2), 101–113.

Mertler, C. A. (2011). Teachers' perceptions of the influence of No Child Left Behind on classroom practices. *Current Issues in Education, 13*(3). Retrieved from http://cie.asu.edu/

Milnes, T., & Cheng, L. (2008). Teachers' assessment of ESL students in mainstream classes: Challenges, strategies, and decision-making. *Canada TESL, 25*(2), 49–65.

O'Malley, M. J., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Pappamihiel, N. E., & Mihai, F. (2006). Assessing English language learners' content knowledge in middle school classrooms. *Middle School Journal, 38(1),* 34–43.

Pope, N., Green, S. K., Johnson, R. L., & Mitchell, M. (2008). Examining teacher ethical dilemmas in classroom assessment. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 778-782. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2008.11.013

Reiss, J. (2005). *Teaching content to English language learners: Strategies for secondary school success*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Richard-Amato, P. A. (Ed.). (2005). *Academic success for English language learners: Strategies for K–12 mainstream teachers.* White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Rivera, C., & Collum, E. (Eds.). (2006). *State assessment policy and practice for English language learners.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Solano-Flores, G. (2008). Who is given tests in what language by whom, when, and where? The need for probabilistic views of language in the testing of English language learners. *Educational Researcher, 37*(4), 189–199.

Solano-Flores, G. (2014). Probabilistic approaches to examining linguistic features of test items and their effect on the performance of English language learners. *Applied Measurement in Education, 27*(4), 236-247. doi:10.1080/08957347.2014.944308

Winke, P. (2011). Evaluating the validity of a high-stakes ESL test: Why teachers' perceptions matter. *TESOL Quarterly, 45*(4), 628–660.

*Corresponding author: seonhee.cho@mountsaintvincent.edu

APPENDIX A—QUESTIONNAIRE REGARDING EL ACCOMMODATIONS IN CLASSROOM ASSESSMENTS

Part I. General Information

1. I am teaching: ☐ Math ☐ Social Studies ☐ English ☐ Science ☐ Other (specify)
2. I am teaching at: ☐ Middle school ☐ High school
3. I have been teaching about _____years.
4. I have worked with ELs. ☐ Yes ☐ No
5. I have received previous training in working with ELs. ☐ Yes ☐ No
6. Are there any grading policies regarding ELs in your school? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If **Yes,** describe them briefly here.

_____

_____

_____

Part II. Fairness of Classroom-Based Assessment for ELs

Please mark an "X" in the box that best represents your opinions about assessment practices for ELs regarding adjustments of ELs' classroom-based assessment.

	Very fair	Somewhat fair	Neither fair nor unfair	Somewhat unfair	Very unfair
1. Counting effort as a part of ELs' grades more than you do for native speakers.					
2. Providing more time to ELs in completing instructional tasks than you provide to native speakers.					
3. Providing more time to ELs in taking quizzes and unit tests than you provide to native speakers.					
4. Providing fewer questions on tests administered to ELs than on tests administered to native speakers.					
5. Providing customized dictionaries or a glossary of terms only to ELs on assessments that do not explicitly test vocabulary.					
6. Allowing visual images that explain concepts and relationships of the content (e.g., maps, graphs, figures, and pictures) only to ELs to help their comprehension of test questions.					
7. Grading ELs' work with a focus more on the content rather than the grammar and spelling.					
8. Allowing only ELs to answer open-ended response questions (e.g., short answer, essay) using graphic organizers or illustrations, rather than a written response.					
9. Applying different grading scales in grading ELs' work than are applied to native speakers' work.					
10. Creating a modified test for ELs that eliminates complex sentences, difficult vocabulary, double negatives, and words like "always" or "never" to minimize language complexity.					
11. Giving ELs more second-chance opportunities (e.g., retaking tests, redoing assignments) than you provide to native speakers.					
12. Allowing ELs to respond to test questions orally.					