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SUMMARY

The United States is emerging as a nation of increased diversity, with the projection that “minority” groups will contribute to nearly 50% of the U.S. population by the year 2050 (U.S. Census). This increasing diversity of our nation’s population reflects an increase in immigrant and refugee students coming into our public schools. Understanding sources of ELL teacher stress allows us to be better informed about the school experiences of teachers who work with immigrant and refugee students, and, as a result, provides a potential roadmap for how the school setting affects their work. As part of this goal, it was important to understand stress as a psychological concept, and to understand how it has been defined in past research. The purpose of the current study was to develop a measure of ELL teacher stress that highlights multiple aspects of ELL teachers’ work settings that impact their work stress. Ninety-eight ELL teachers, representing a national U.S. sample, took part in the study. Teachers completed an online questionnaire, which included the current measure in development, as well as a demographic survey, the Teacher Stress Inventory, and the Maslach Burnout Inventory. The development of the final 40-item measure is described in detail. Findings revealed that the current measure captures stress events unique to ELL teachers, and has both discriminant and predictive validity. The measure developed for this study, the ELL Teacher Stress Measure (ETSM), addresses a significant gap in the field—a limited understanding of ELL teacher stress—and presents a tool that is useful in a variety of school settings.

Keywords: English Language Learners, teacher stress, measure development
I. INTRODUCTION

“It’s almost like tutoring. I can’t teach the class as a class. Like when you have all 60 eyes looking at me on the blackboard and taking notes. I can’t even do it as a group, or a table. I have to go around and explain it to every single one of them. As long as I can—unfortunately, I only have 50 minutes. The first 20-25 minutes, you almost lose it. Everybody gets started with their work in the last 10 minutes. Of course, that’s when you have everybody getting to work and then the warning bell rings, and it’s like ‘AAAGH.’” (Katz, 1999, p. 832).

The United States is emerging as a nation of increased diversity, with the projection that “minority” groups will contribute to nearly 50% of the U.S. population by the year 2050 (U.S. Census). This increasing diversity of our nation’s population reflects an increase in immigrant and refugee students coming into our public schools. Furthermore, our system of public education is characterized by academic achievement as a function of ethnicity, primary language use, and socioeconomic status (Hilliard, 1992).

Thus, immigrant students face multiple obstacles to academic achievement. For the purpose of this paper, the term “immigrant” refers to persons from an immigrant background, including persons born either outside of or in the U.S. (including 1st, 1.5 and 2nd generation populations). Students from an immigrant background and the educational programs that serve them may be labeled in various ways, especially in published literature. These terms include: English Language Learners (ELL), Limited English Proficient (LEP), Language Minority Defined (LMD), Culturally and Linguistically Different (CLD), English as a New Language (ENL), English as a Second Language (ESL), and Bilingual Education. English Language Learner (ELL) will be the term used in this paper to describe the varied programs that serve
students from immigrant backgrounds, as well as the job variations that their teachers may experience.

English Language Learner (ELL) teachers have perhaps the most important role in school for immigrant and refugee students. ELL teachers are the staff whom immigrant and refugee students most encounter in their school experiences, whether it is the first time they are entering school or they are entering a new school for the first time. Furthermore, ELL teachers are often the school adults with whom newly arrived students spend the majority of their day. Their distinctive significance in the lives of immigrant and refugee students makes the work experiences of ELL teachers of particular interest to understand, as little research attention has been paid to the ELL setting.

1.1.1 Purpose of the Current Study

The purpose of the current study is to develop a measure of ELL teacher stress that highlights multiple aspects of ELL teachers’ work settings that impact their work stress. Understanding sources of ELL teacher stress allows us to be better informed about the school experiences of teachers who work with immigrant and refugee students and, as a result, provides a potential roadmap for how the school setting affects their work. The limited understanding of ELL teacher stress presents a significant gap in the field. Understanding the stress on teachers can help to minimize its negative impacts. With nearly 50% of all teachers leaving their position within their first 5 years (NCES, 2011; Pennington & Ho, 1992), approximately 45% of ELL teachers not having ELL certification (Esch et al., 2005), and estimates of dropout for ELL students reaching as high as 40% (NCES, 2011), the current examination of sources of stress in the work lives of ELL teachers is imperative.
1.2 An Ecological Framework

Examinations of teacher stress can benefit from the use of an ecological framework to look at a broad group of factors that impact stress, including the influences of other teachers, school staff, school administrators, parents, and students. The notion of capturing the processes that influence teachers’ environment that result in work stress is essential to the current examination. While past research on schools has attempted to capture various aspects of the school environment, it does not typically present an ecological picture of the school, including the experiences of teachers within the school and stressors that evolve from their school environment.

The reason for developing the current stress measure is to capture ELL teacher stress events that evolve from a multitude of ecological areas, such as: the nature of the job for teachers; interactions with other school staff, students, and parents; the nature of the school atmosphere; the absence of social support; and even federal and systemic influences. The Trickett, Kelly, and Vincent (1985) ecological model addresses how the ecology of teachers’ lives are reflected in the issues that are brought both to the school and to the classroom by administrators, other teachers and school staff, parents and students. Using this model, ELL teacher stress may evolve from multiple ecological levels and multiple ecological domains. Stress may come from systemic impacts, school climate, and both formal and informal job requirements, as described above. At the same time, stress may be impacted by administrators, other school staff, parents, and students. Furthermore, interactions of potential stress factors for ELL teachers in any given environment may be cohesive, or a source of conflict that results in experiences of stress.
Therefore, the various components that are present within the school environment contain rich information about what influences teacher experiences of stress, including potential stressors that come from students, teachers, other school staff, administrators, and parents. An ecological model such as this highlights the need for an assessment of how the school context impacts the stress that ELL teachers experience. An ecological framework helps to highlight specific aspects of ELL teachers’ work stress that are impacted by different components of their school’s ecology. Thus, the ecological perspective will be used to organize the existing literature and will be reflected in the proposed measure.

1.3 A Review of Stress

As is evident from the opening quote, teaching is not a stress-free occupation. It is important to review stress as a psychological concept and to understand how it has been defined in research. In this model, stress is defined as a distinctly different concept from burnout, a concept that will be discussed further below. Specifically, it is important to note here that burnout is defined as an outcome, or result, of stressful events.

Stress has been defined broadly as “a particular relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her resources and endangering his or her well-being” (Dalton, Elias, & Wandersman, 2007; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, p. 19). Hoover-Dempsey (1982) provides a stress framework specific to teachers that is grounded in ecological theory. Perceptions of work stress involve the combination of three elements—a change (or event) in one’s environment, a consequential perception of threat, and some form of response to the initial change. In this model, stress is understood as problems, challenges, difficulties, and/or mitigating work circumstances that teachers experience on a regular basis that all may lead to work stress. How stressful these experiences are appraised to
be by the teacher depends upon all of the components that are present in their environment and how these components interact with each other. For ELL teachers more specifically, stress may evolve from various sources, such as the work roles (formal and informal) that ELL teachers must assume to get their jobs done, their ability to address constantly changing student issues, and the ever-changing task of responding to diverse student learning needs.

1.3.1 Research on Teacher Stress

Research on teacher stress has gained momentum over the past 30 years or so, with a history of research in this area outlined by Kyriacou (2001). This history is important, as the stress involved in teaching was not identified as a substantial area of research until the late 1990’s. At that time, teaching was first identified as one of the highest stress occupations.

While important, much of the research on teacher stress has focused on teacher characteristics, such as affect and self-efficacy (Yoon, 2002), coping (Lambert, McCarthy, O’Donnell, & Wang, 2009), and mental health (Wang & Guo, 2007). Some broader problem areas identified as stressful for teachers include: training, preparation and ongoing professional development; role ambiguity, conflict, and overload; and negative work environment and lack of ongoing support (Billingsley 2004; Kyriacou, 2001). It has been further reported that the experiences of beginning teachers is characterized by “shock and survival” (Billingsley, 2004, p. 371), especially as teachers realize the multiple roles and diverse daily tasks they must manage. Various sources estimate that nearly 50% of new teachers leave their position within their first 5 years of teaching. Billingsley (2004) notes that, consequently, most teacher stress research has focused solely on how to best support incoming teachers.

It is commonly understood that teacher stress and teacher attrition are related; thus, much of the existing literature on teacher stress relates stress to burnout (i.e., Kyriacou, 2001; Olson &
Matuskey, 1982; Singer, 1992). What the limited data does tell us is that teaching in specialized settings is not typically a life-long career for most teachers and that teachers outside of the mainstream setting experience higher teacher attrition (Billingsley, 2004; Edgar & Pair, 2005; Pennington & Ho, 1992). To date, much of the research is still focused on the experiences of pre-service teachers or those newly in the field, with few supports found to truly exist in the schools. Historically, the specific work experiences of teachers represents a relatively ignored area of research in the larger context of education and teacher stress (Boe, Bobbitt, & Cook, 1993; Singer, 1992). Until recently, there was no national data tracking of factors pertinent to public school teaching, such as year-to-year teaching changes, reasons for leaving teaching positions, and differences in employment patterns between mainstream teachers and those who teach in specialized settings like ELL programs (Yeager, 2003; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). Little research examines stress for ELL teachers, especially those who have been teaching long-term.

1.3.2 A Critical Review of Teacher Stress Measures

In order to better understand ELL teacher stress, and to develop a measure of ELL teacher stress, it is important to review prior measures of teacher stress for their relevance to ELL teachers. In reviewing these measures, several criteria that have evolved over time in the measurement of stress will be applied to existing teacher stress measures. Thus, the development of the current measure of ELL teacher stress is intended to address the problems of other teacher stress measures. First, stress measures for use with teachers need to differentiate stressful events from outcomes of stress, such as burnout and teacher retention. Second, stress measures need to differentiate the occurrence of events from its perceived stressfulness (Vinokurov, Trickett, & Birman, 2002). This distinction is important because whether the stressor occurs in the first
place, or how often it occurs, is different from teachers’ phenomenological experiences of the
event as stressful. Third, the items on existing stress measures need to cover the domains of
stress important to the experiences of ELL teachers. These three criteria form the basis for
reviewing teacher stress measures.

Four measures of teacher stress were identified in the process of research conducted for
the current study, with two out of the four having been cited in less than 15 published articles.
These measures of teacher stress reviewed in detail below, the Teacher Stress Inventory (TSI;
Fimian, 1984), the Index of Teaching Stress (ITS; Greene, Abidin, & Kmetz, 1997), the Teacher
Occupational Stress Factor Questionnaire (TOSFQ; Moracco, Danford, & D’Arienzo, 1982), and
the Teaching Events Stress Inventory (Cichon & Koff, 1980), represent the most recent and
comprehensive research in the measurement of teacher stress.

1.3.2.1 Teacher Stress Inventory. Fimian (1984) developed the Teacher Stress
Inventory (TSI). Six of the ten subscales (2, 4 and 7-10) are problematic because they represent
outcomes of stress, rather than examples of stressors themselves. For example, items from each
of these subscales, such as “Using alcohol,” “Feeling depressed,” “Stomach cramps,”
“Rapid/Shallow breath,” “Physical exhaustion,” and “Need more status/respect,” do not capture
specific stressors but rather the results of teacher stress. With respect to differentiating the
occurrence of a stressful event from how stressful it is, the response scale is important. The
commonly accepted response scale used with the TSI assesses relevance of the items to the
teacher, from 1 (not relevant) to 4 (very relevant). This response scale does not differentiate
between the occurrence of the stressor and its perceived stressfulness. Finally, with respect to
capturing the experiences of ELL teachers, the items on the TSI almost solely represent one
domain related to teacher stress—formal job characteristics. This leads to a problem of content
in the measure, such that the measure does not adequately represent various domains of teachers’ work lives in which stressors occur. Thus, teacher stress is not conceptualized according to an ecological framework.

**1.3.2.2 Index of Teaching Stress.** The developers of the Index of Teaching Stress (ITS) define “interactional problems with students” as the main category of teaching stressors to be captured by this measure (Greene et al., 1997, p. 240). With respect to differentiating the occurrence of a stressful event from how stressful it is, the response scale to these items is a 5-point Likert scale, in which teachers rate the degree to which the items are stressful. Thus, only the strength of the stressor is assessed in this measure. With respect to the need to differentiate events of stress from outcomes of stress, the ITS has similar weaknesses to the TSI. Part B of the ITS, Teacher Characteristics, includes outcome measures of stress rather than stress itself. The entire second half of this measure does not capture stressors, but rather the result of stress. Finally, with respect to capturing the experiences of ELL teachers, the Student Characteristics scale (Part A) focuses entirely on student behaviors. This narrow conception of stress limits the conceptual portrait of how stress might occur from other sources.

**1.3.2.3 Teacher Occupational Stress Factor Questionnaire.** Based on an instrument that was developed for an unpublished doctoral dissertation in 1980, Moracco et al. (1982) acknowledged that previous efforts to separate stress from its effects in measurement of teacher stress have been “confounded” (p. 276). The result of efforts to rectify this problem is the Teacher Occupational Stress Factor Questionnaire (TOSFQ). However, this 30-item measure has not been used enough in research to validate its validity and reliability. Furthermore, like the ITS, only the strength of the stressor is assessed. With respect to the need to differentiate events of stress from outcomes of stress, several items on this measure capture reactions to stressors
rather than measuring specific stressors themselves. The items on this measure do not
distinguish between the occurrence of a stressor and an appraisal of how stressful it is (i.e., does
it happen vs. how stressful is it).

1.3.2.4 Teaching Events Stress Inventory. The final stress measure is a 37-item index
that was developed by Cichon and Koff (1980). What distinguishes this measure from the others
is its final item, which is a qualitative “other” response that allows the participant to identify
additional stressors that are not captured by the other items. This item has been adapted for the
current measure. With respect to differentiating the occurrence of a stressful event from how
stressful it is in the Teaching Events Stress Inventory (TESI), there is no distinction. The
response system for this particular measure is an item ranking of each of the 36 items by order of
perceived stressfulness (the qualitative “other” represents item 37). The TESI does have similar
problems as the other measures, with some items representing outcomes of stress rather than
stressful events.

1.3.2.5 Conclusions. With the weaknesses that exist in these four measures, both
individually and combined, the need to develop the current measure of ELL teacher stress
becomes clear. The current measure, the ELL Teacher Stress Measure (ETSM), is designed to
represent the criteria that are highlighted in the previous section as absent from existing measures
but necessary for an adequate measure of ELL teacher stress. These criteria include: (1) the
distinction between the occurrence and severity of stressors; (2) a focus on events; and (3) a
more complete ecological portrait of stress that is relevant to the work lives of ELL teachers.
1.4 Existing Research with ELL Teachers

Limited past research has focused specifically on ELL teachers. It is important to understand how the settings in which ELL teachers work distinguish their experiences from their mainstream counterparts. One study found that the nature of the ELL teaching position at the middle school level is much more stressful than that of the mainstream teacher’s role due to increased isolation from the mainstream, more diversity in student backgrounds than in mainstream settings, and the consequential challenges to adapt curriculum based on the diversity of student learning needs (Katz, 1999). Many ELL teachers across grade levels report other school staff treating them as “different” in some way, including feeling that other staff deem them to be less important than mainstream teachers. Even teachers who report specific training in working with ELL students may not feel equipped to deal with all of the diverse roles they must fulfill in their daily work lives (Loh, 1995; Markham, Green, & Ross, 1996).

It is important to note, at this point, that ELL programs are quite diverse and vary greatly by school. Yet ELL teachers at both the elementary- and secondary-levels have reported an increased sense of responsibility for their students, even at times during the school day when their students are not assigned to them (Markham, 1999). Increased paperwork demands attached to this position are frequently cited as stressful, as is an increased need for parental contact / involvement, especially when compared to teachers who work in the mainstream setting. In addition, the role diffusion that ELL teachers are likely to experience, based on the multiple roles within the classroom that these teachers assume (teacher, mentor, counselor, etc...), is an increased source of frustration, stress, and burnout for these teachers across K-12 grade levels (Boe, Bobbitt, & Cook, 1997; Markham, 1999). Finally, by their nature, programs

1 Unless otherwise noted, these studies use a mixture of teachers at all grade levels, with no distinction of results by grade.
outside of the mainstream setting are likely to be inherently and structurally isolating for teachers with regards to their regular interaction with coworkers in the mainstream setting, acting as an additional stressor for ELL teachers.

Quite recently, there has been increasing focus in the literature on the work lives of teachers who work with ELL students. Much of this work is specific to the classroom and looks at ELL student needs across multiple academic subjects, rather than focusing solely on English Language courses. For example, Cho and McDonnough (2009) examined the needs of ELL students from the perspectives of mainstream science teachers. The researchers found that the primary work challenges facing U.S. science high school teachers involved such issues as appropriate instructional materials and lack of relevant pedagogical training. Furthermore, in a longitudinal study of teachers working with ELL students in a “sheltered” grade 7 social studies class, Haneda (2009) documented the dual agendas of teachers as not only delivering curriculum content, but also helping their ELL students to learn how to become competent members of the school community.

The cultural, linguistic, and educational diversity of students in the same classroom has been viewed as a particular pedagogical challenge for teachers of ELL students (Haneda, 2009; Lucas, 1997; Olsen, 1997). Classrooms may include students from multiple cultural and linguistic backgrounds whose prior education may range from those with little or no prior schooling literacy to those with adequate or occasionally exceptional educational backgrounds. The impact of this student diversity is exacerbated by a relative lack of well-developed curricular materials (Haneda, 2009; Lucas, 1997), necessitating what Glisson (2002) calls a reliance on “soft” rather than “hard” technology. Soft technology is involved when lack of existing standardized procedures or materials forces the practitioner to modify existing resources or
develop new ones to accommodate the work task. The softer the technology, the less teachers can rely on prior knowledge and the more they must rely on improvisation and creative use of existing materials. This suggests that ELL teachers spend considerable time improvising class-related materials and using trial-and-error pedagogical processes.

Additional studies have focused on stressors in the work lives of ELL teachers, both inside the classroom and in the broader school. In a combined ELL/Bilingual teacher sample, Markham, Green, and Ross (1996) reported a series of out-of-class stressors for ELL teachers, including time spent preparing students to perform well in non-ELL/Bilingual classes and helping them adjust to the school culture. These findings are similar to the dual agendas of the teachers in the Haneda (2009) study described above. However, Markham et al. (1996) found that ELL/Bilingual teachers reported that out-of-class related stressors were more stressful than in-class ones, a different pattern than found among their sample of mainstream teachers. In addition, the relationship of ELL teachers to content area teachers has also been cited as a source of teacher stress (Bunch, 2010). Multiple reports suggest that ELL teachers experience marginalization in the broader school context, reflected in level of access to needed educational resources, quality and predictability of teaching space, exclusion from educational decision-making, and lack of feedback and support from colleagues (Lucas, 1997; Olsen, 1997). These areas represent additional sources of stress for ELL teachers.

Together, these studies represent efforts to describe specific aspects of the work lives of ELL teachers inside the classroom and in the broader school context such as curriculum, perceived marginalization, and relations with other school adults. As such, they provide important contours of work life more so than addressing an overall ecological picture. What this literature does not do, however, is provide a holistic ecological picture. Rather, each study
presents different aspects of ELL teachers work lives. Therefore, the purpose of the current ELL teacher stress measure is to present a more complete portrait of ELL teacher work stress.
II. PRELIMINARY STUDY

Various steps were taken in the development of the current instrument to measure ELL teacher stress. First, items and domains of stress emerged from a qualitative study of ELL high school teachers in the Chicagoland area (Trickett et al., 2012). This study depicted an ecological portrait of the work lives of 16 ELL high school teachers in an urban context in the United States. A structured interview methodology was used to explore multiple aspects of the ecology of the work lives of these teachers. It included both open-ended questions and more structured questions about specific job-related topics derived from existing literature and an ecological perspective on ELL work lives. The interview began with a series of background questions, followed by the “grand tour” question asking the teachers to describe what it was like to be an ELL teacher in their particular school (e.g. “How would you define your job?” or “Are there aspects of your work that are particularly stressful?”), followed by more specific probes for examples). Topics surfacing in this question were followed up in an effort to understand the initial way that teachers described their jobs.

The coding process yielded five meta-codes, each of which contained multiple conditions, such as (1) preparing curriculum and teaching to diverse students under the meta-code of “Job Characteristics,” (2) job-related and system-related stressors under the meta-code of “Stressors/Uplifts,” (3) various sources of “Social Support,” (4) responses of “Mainstream/School Response to ELL Students,” and (5) the impact students’ prior and post-immigration experiences on “Teacher Perspectives on the Lives of ELL Students.” These initial codes served as the basis for a subsequent review of literature to assess their usefulness and relevance to currently published literature on ELL teachers (Weinstein & Trickett, in preparation). It is important to note that the initial meta-codes were reviewed for potential areas
of stress that they captured regarding ELL teachers’ work lives. Thus, meta-codes from the interview study were used to identify potential areas of stressors for ELL teachers.

A thorough review of the literature was next conducted as part of this author’s preliminary examination (Weinstein & Trickett, in preparation). Here, rather than focusing on the broader work lives of teachers, the focus was on ELL teacher stress. This focus emerged from the findings of this review of literature, specifically that ELL teacher work stress was the most commonly cited experience within the currently existing research on ELL teachers. Out of this review, the following four domains were identified in this project, which then served as a basis for developing the current ELL teacher stress measure.

**2.1.1 Domains of Stress**

The four domains of teacher stress emerging from the process above include: Systemic Impacts, Social Climate and Support, Formal Job Characteristics, and Informal Job Duties. These domains form the ecological framework for the development of the proposed measure of ELL teacher stress and reflect differing levels of the ecological context. The domains incorporate the stressors that were discussed in the review of literature above.

**2.1.1.1 Systemic Impacts.** Systemic impacts include federal, state, and local school policies or practices that contribute to the work stress of ELL teachers. Federal-level pressures experienced by teachers, such as No Child Left Behind and mandated language testing, are included in this category. Examples of these types of stressors include testing administration and a lack of necessary supplies and materials for teachers to do their job (Abraham & Chumley, 2000; Davidson, 1981; Hunt, Hirose-Hatae, Doering, Karasoff, & Goetz, 2000; Varghese & Jenkins, 2005). For example, ELL teachers described contradictory messages within the school about ELL services that resulted in increased daily stress for ELL teachers, evolving from
regular practices in the school that excluded them (Artiles, Barreto, Peña, & McClafferty 1998; York-Barr et al., 2007). One study described actual barriers to attempts at ELL policy unification at one school over time, including specific financial constraints, lack of time and structure for ELL and mainstream teachers to communicate and plan together, and divergent visions for the ELL program at the school and district levels (Hunt et al., 2000).

2.1.1.2 Social Support/Climate. Social support and climate refers to the overall social climate of the school, as well as the nature of social interactions between ELL teachers and other school staff. The organizational culture of the school, as perceived by ELL teachers, is one main component of this domain. Negative school climate was indicated by teachers as a stressor throughout much of the published research literature (Abraham & Chumley, 2000; Markham, 1999; York-Barr et al., 2007). Specific interactions and experiences with principal support are also captured in this domain. In previous research, lack of principal support resulted in various teacher stressors, such as a lack of developed protocol to discipline students effectively and an inability by teachers to implement needed changes in their classrooms (Artiles, Barreto, Peña, & McClafferty, 1998; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). One study found that teachers characterized principals as having little expertise in ELL, which was demonstrated by unequal distribution of school resources and an overall school environment that was insensitive to the needs of both ELL teachers and students (Brownell, Smith, & McNellis, 1994). Furthermore, discussions of negative school climate revealed that teachers felt that ELL services held a negative connotation in their school, often due to physical separation of teachers and students from the rest of the school. Some ELL teachers at lower grade levels found themselves working in basements, hallways, stairwells, or temporary trailers (Abraham & Chumley, 2000; Katz, 1999; York-Barr et al., 2007), while others across grade levels are itinerant and move around
from classroom-to-classroom or-school-to-school, without a regular space of their own (i.e., Trickett et al., 2012). These classroom settings not only contributed to teachers’ feelings of being less valued within the school than their mainstream counterparts, but also resulted in physical isolation that limited their daily interactions with other school staff. Thus, ELL teachers identified stressors regarding social climate and support that emanate from their regular and ongoing interactions with all aspects of the school environment, as well as all aspects of the school staff, including: lower-level staff or volunteers, other ELL teachers, mainstream teachers, and school administrators or higher-level personnel.

2.1.1.3 Formal Job Characteristics. There are both formal and informal work responsibilities performed by ELL teachers that are viewed as part of their job. Formal job responsibilities include explicitly outlined roles of the job, such as teaching classes, managing students, and paperwork. Some broad factors that have been identified as pertinent to formal job characteristics include teaching and student load, lack of adequate curriculum and materials, and ongoing paperwork and meetings (Abraham & Chumley, 2000; Davidson, 1981; Markham, 1999). In addition, job duties that ELL teachers reported specifically as stressors included excessive paperwork (Loh, 1995); preparing curriculum for multiple grade levels (York-Barr et al., 2007); and disciplinary issues of students (Artiles et al., 1998). In the Loh (1995) study, the multiple formal tasks that ELL teachers were expected to fulfill was the most common reason provided for thoughts about quitting, in addition to “exhaustion,” “stress,” and being “tired of the job” (Loh, 1995, p. 28).

2.1.1.4 Informal Job Duties. The notion of needing to fulfill multiple roles includes informal work responsibilities. Informal aspects of the teacher role include providing emotional support for students and advocating for students with other school personnel. Additional duties
these teachers take on outside of their teaching activities include maintaining relationships with parents (Loh, 1995), attending to the mental health needs of students (Markham, 1999), providing students and families with daily living essentials, and home visits (Clarke, Davis, Rhodes, & Baker, 1996). In one study, ELL teachers identified the extent of trauma their students had experienced in immigrating to the U.S. as an ongoing stressor that they were not prepared for (Markham, 1999). This was not only an immediate stressor for ELL teachers, but also a long-term stressor, as it impacted their role in preparing students to eventually enter the mainstream setting. In another study, ELL teachers described issues of diversity and multiculturalism as arising in her class unexpectedly and her consequential need to address these issues spontaneously as such opportunities arose in the course of classroom interactions (Artiles et al., 1998). Thus, dealing with mounting (and ever-changing) informal job responsibilities was a frequent stressor that was discussed in the published literature.

In sum, the purpose of the current study is to develop a measure of ELL teacher stress that addresses the weaknesses of other stress measures in the field while also capturing the stress events unique to ELL teachers. The four domains presented above have been analyzed for factor validity of the current ELL teacher stress measure. In addition, the Teacher Stress Index (TSI) was used to assess the discriminant validity of the current ELL teacher stress measure. Predictive validity was examined as well using the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), as described in detail below.
III. METHODS

3.1.1 Development of the Current Measure

From all of the projects described above, a list of possible items was developed for the current measure through ongoing meetings between this author and Dr. Edison J. Trickett. After developing and reviewing the items over several months, the working measure was presented at a Research Team Meeting (RTM). Feedback was provided about the nature and clarity of the items at this meeting. Next, an informal meeting was held with two ELL teachers from Chicago Public Schools. In this meeting, we received feedback about the items based on their experiences as ELL teachers, including the applicability, wording, and clarity of meaning of the items. Additional feedback came from a pilot of the measure with two ELL teachers from Chicago Public Schools, as well as a conference with a primary member of the current dissertation committee who has experience as an ELL classroom teacher and as a researcher of ELL-related topics. Final edits were made to the measure, which can be viewed in full in Appendix B.

Measure items were developed using the ecological framework above to reflect various aspects of a teacher’s work setting that reflect ecological stressors. The response scale includes two prompts for each item: (1) whether the teacher experiences the specific event (stressor: yes/no) and (2) how stressful the event is on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not at all stressful to 5 = extremely stressful). This response scale was chosen because of its common use in the field of teacher stress measurement, as well as its use in the measure of acculturation stress (Vinokurov, Trickett, & Birman, 2002).

Items were then placed into four ecological domains described above, to reflect the main challenges that teachers face. The four domains that were identified from the previous research
that are applied to this instrument include: Systemic Impacts, Social Support/Climate, Informal Job Duties, and Formal Job Characteristics. The domain of “Systemic Impacts” describes the federal, state, and local school policies or practices that contribute to the work stress of ELL teachers. Sample items include: “Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for federally (NCLB) mandated testing,” “Integrating mainstream content standards into my teaching,” and “Not having supplies necessary to do my job.” The “Social Support/Climate” domain represents teacher interactions with: lower-level staff or volunteers, with other ELL teachers, with mainstream teachers, and with school administrators or higher-level personnel. The organizational culture of the school, as perceived by teachers, is also included in this domain. Items include “Administrators did not satisfactorily resolve a work problem that I brought to their attention,” “I had to explain to a mainstream teacher about the circumstances of English Language Learner (ELL) students,” and “Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by other students.” The third domain, “Job Characteristics,” involves explicitly outlined responsibilities of the job, such as teaching classes. Items include: “Students entering and leaving my classes throughout the school year,” “Teaching in an improvised or isolated space, such as hallways, stairwells, basements, or trailers,” and “Differentiating instruction, preparing curriculum for a class of students who have a diverse range of learning abilities and needs.” The final domain, “Informal Job Duties” includes informal aspects of ELL teachers’ work role (such as advocating for students with other teachers) that they regard as their responsibility. Sample items include: “Students pulled from the classroom for non-academic matters (such as for mental health counseling, acculturation groups, etc…”), “I used my own money to buy classroom supplies,” and “I spent time outside of the classroom organizing drives or collections for clothing, food, and other daily necessities for my
students.” A final write-in option allowed surveyed teachers to identify areas of stress that are not captured by the developed measure. A copy of the full measure, including all of the domains and items, is found in Appendix B.

3.2.1 Sampling

ELL teachers were recruited nationally. The first effort of recruitment occurred at the Annual TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) Convention in March 2011. Thousands of teachers from around the world attended this conference. Recruitment procedures were developed at the convention, with follow-up recruitment taking place through the various listservs utilized by the organization. More specifically, introductions to the project were made with all of the leaders of the international TESOL organization, as well as local TESOL group members. Next, contact was made (see Appendix F) with all of the 21 TESOL listserv managers (see Appendix H). The goal of this work was to recruit participants from various TESOL affiliations, including the Refugee Concerns Interest Section, of which I chaired from 2011-2013. The remaining source of participants included a snowballing technique that recruited ELL teachers from across the country, including contact with the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE). The national organization for NABE published information about the study in their quarterly newsletter, with several state-level NABE affiliates disseminating information about the study via email and/or Facebook pages (see Appendix H). Additional snowballing techniques involved sending information about the study (see Appendix G) to personal/professional contacts working in schools across the country, including contacts of the primary author, dissertation committee members, and other colleagues from the University of Illinois’ (UIC) College of Education. The primary author used the “sponsor” option on Facebook to pay for information about the study to stay at the top of the newsfeed of all
“friended” contacts. Friended contacts also disseminated information about the study on their Facebook and Twitter feeds. Finally, information about the study was also posted to the primary author’s website.

Participants were limited to teachers who: (1) work in U.S. public schools, (2) specifically identified as either an ESL, ELL, or Bilingual ESL/ELL teacher and (3) spent part of their day outside of the mainstream setting. Compensation for participation included a drawing of four $25 Amazon gift cards, coming from funds procured through the UIC Department of Psychology.

3.3.1 Procedure

Participants were given a Qualtrics link to fill out the packet of measures. Qualtrics is a web-based site that allows participants to easily access on-line surveys while data remains secure on the Qualtrics server. Instructions explained that it was expected to take less than 45 minutes to fill out the survey. No identifying information was collected with the survey data in order to keep responses anonymous. The optional email addresses submitted for the drawing were kept separate from the survey data. In order to ensure that participants met the inclusion criteria, sequential questions were asked about their teaching roles (see Appendix A). If respondents did not meet the inclusion criteria, they were automatically exited from the survey and thanked for their time. The measures that made up the survey are described next in more detail.

3.4.1 Measures

3.4.1.1 Demographics. A review of previous research with ELL teachers identified specific demographic data that is useful to collect when working with this population (See Appendix A). Such data included the grade level the teacher is teaching at, their area of certification and degree, number of years they’ve been teaching, and their job title. Additional
demographic data that was collected included age, gender, and multiple questions about participants’ teaching roles.

3.4.1.2 ELL Teacher Stress Measure. As presented earlier, the ELL Teacher Stress Measure (ETSM) uses four domains to identify ELL teacher stress: Systemic Impacts, Social Support/Climate, Informal Job Duties, and Job Characteristics (see Appendix B). Fifty-six items represent the number of items on the measure. The domain of “Systemic Impacts” is comprised of 12 items. The “Social Support/Climate” domain is comprised of 10 items. The third domain, “Informal Job Duties” is comprised of 14 items. The final domain, “Job Characteristics,” is comprised of 20 items. One final item is an open-response item, in which participants could identify the occurrence and severity of additional stressors. The order of ETSM items presented in the survey was randomized, using the random number table presented in Appendix E.

3.4.1.3 Teacher Stress Inventory. To assess the discriminant validity of the current ELL teacher stress measure, in comparison to more generic teacher stress measures, the TSI was selected for comparison analyses. With over 80 publications referencing the Teacher Stress Inventory (TSI), this measure is the most established of the teacher stress inventories (Fimian, 1984). Because Scales 4-6 are problematic, as they represent outcomes of stress rather than events of stress, only three subscales of this inventory were used in the current study (see Appendix C). Items from scales 1-3 that represent Personal/Professional Stressors (e.g., “Lack of preparation time”), Professional Distress (e.g., “Lack of control over school-related matters”) and Discipline and Motivation (e.g., “Authority rejected by students or staff”) were used to see how well they compared to Job Characteristics, Informal Job Duties, Social Support/Climate, and Systemic Impacts on the ELL Teacher Stress Measure. The internal reliability for the TSI
was .90. This internal reliability coefficient is identical to previous research (Fimian & Fastenau, 1990).

3.4.1.4 Maslach Burnout Inventory. To assess predictive validity, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI-ES) was included in the survey packet. Unlike the ELL Teacher Stress Measure and Teacher Stress Inventory, the MBI was constructed to measure a specific outcome of stress—burnout (Maslach, Jackson, Leiter, Schaufeli, & Schwab, 1986). There is much literature to suggest that stress and burnout are related, especially for teachers (Boe, Bobbitt, & Cook, 1993; Gersten, Keating, Yovanoff, & Harniss, 2001; Singer, 1992). The MBI captures three dimensions of work burnout for teachers: emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment, and depersonalization (see Appendix D). The order of the MBI items was presented according to the authors’ instructions (see Appendix D). The internal reliability for the MBI in the current study was .89. This internal reliability coefficient for the MBI in the current study is consistent with past research (Worley, Vassar, Wheeler, & Barnes, 2008).
IV. RESULTS

First, a demographic analysis of the sample is presented, followed by descriptive statistics and correlations for the original measure. Next, an in-depth description of the development of the final ETSM is presented, including an analysis of the original ETSM items by frequency and mean severity, and exclusion criteria. Final measure development is presented in detail, with all subsequent analyses using the final version of the ETSM. For all analyses, both the whole measure and specific domains for each of the three measures were analyzed separately. First, whole-measure analyses were calculated to represent overall ratings of stress and burnout. Separate subscale scores were then calculated in order to describe individual domains of each measure. In addition, all analyses were conducted for both frequency and mean severity ratings for the ETSM. SPSS software was used to conduct all analyses unless otherwise noted.

4.1 Demographics

A total of 231 participants logged into the online survey system. Two participants did not agree to the IRB consent process. An additional 27 participants did not teach in grades K-12, and were excluded on that basis. Of the remaining participants, 132 providing partial data (57%) and 98 completed the full questionnaire (42%). The final sample for analysis included only those 98 participants who had complete data.

In the final sample, forty participants (41%) endorsed the “ESL Teacher” label, 11 (11%) endorsed the “Bilingual Teacher” label, and 47 (48%) endorsed the “ELL Teacher” label. A majority of the teachers were between the ages of 30 – 59 years of age (see Figure 1). More specifically, 36% (n = 35) chose 30-39; 20% (n = 20) chose 40-49; and 21% (n = 21) chose 50-59. An additional 9% (n = 6) were between 18-29 years of age and 16% (n = 16) were over the age of 60. Eighty-five percent of the sample reported being female (n = 83 female, n = 14 male).
Participants taught across a full range of grade levels (see Figure 2), with approximately 48% teaching at the elementary level, 17% at the middle school level, and 25% at the high school level. An additional 4% taught kindergarten only and 7% taught across all grade levels. Regarding number of years in teaching (see Figure 3), twelve percent of participants were within their first 3 years of teaching (n = 12), with the rest having taught 4-9 years (26%, n = 25), 10-14 years (21%, n = 21), 15-19 years (16%, n = 16), 20-24 years (12%, n = 12), and 25-29 years and 30+ years each at 6%. (n = 6 each) The majority of the sample held either a Master’s Degree (67%, n = 66) or Bachelor’s Degree (21%, n = 20), with almost all of the remaining at the Doctoral level (10%, n = 10). Ninety-one percent of the sample held state licensure for teaching ELL students.

With regards to location, twenty-nine states were represented by the sample, with the most representation coming from: Illinois (14%, n = 14), Virginia (13%, n = 13), California (11%, n = 11), and Oklahoma (10%, n = 10). The majority of the sample were those teaching in urban settings (46%, n = 45) and suburban settings (40%, n = 39), with an additional 14% (n = 14) describing their school setting as rural. Only 5% of participants (n = 5) identified their school as a charter school.

Academic subjects taught by participants had some variation, with 40% teaching English Language Arts only and 56% teaching multiple subjects across the curriculum (see Figure 4). Participants spent the majority of their day (75% or more of their day) with English Language Learners, with only 10 participants reporting less. Finally, there was a range for number of language groups taught by participants in their classrooms: one language group (9%, n = 9), 2-3 language groups (10%, n = 10), 4-9 language groups (19%, n = 19), and 10+ language groups (14%, n = 14).
4.1.1 Analysis of Demographics by Measure.

Analysis of demographic influences was also conducted. First, correlations among demographics and the whole-measure ETSM were conducted (see Table 5). The whole-measure ETSM did not correlate with any demographics, with one exception. The whole-measure ETSM frequency was correlated with grade \( (r = -.22, p = .04) \), indicating that those in higher grades endorsed more events. Next, ANOVA’s were conducted for demographic factors that could not be analyzed using correlations. These include: job title, categorical grade level groupings, degree, licensure, geographical location (state), and setting (urban, suburban, rural). No significant differences emerged within any of these groups. However, the largest difference in means was noted between suburban teachers, who reported the highest level of stress \((M = 3.31, SD = .63)\), and rural teachers, who reported the lowest level of stress \((M = 2.97, SD = .66)\). Therefore, a separate ANOVA was run to analyze the difference in means between these two groups specifically, with the difference trending towards significance for mean severity \((F(1,51) = 2.88, p = .10)\) and frequency \((F(1,51) = 3.49, p = .07)\).

Next, correlations between the ETSM domains and demographics were conducted. By domain, only mean severity ratings for the ETSM had significant results. The ETSM Social Support/Climate domain was positively correlated with grade level \((r = .25, p = .02)\), indicating that stressors around social support/climate increased with grade level. The ETSM Formal Job Characteristics domain was positively correlated with level of education \((r = .25, p = .01)\), indicating that those with higher-level degrees rated formal job characteristic items as more stressful. Finally, the ETSM Informal Job Characteristics domain was positively correlated with working in a charter school \((r = .22, p = .03)\), indicating that informal job characteristics were rated as more stressful by those working in charter schools.
Additional correlations among demographics and the TSI and MBI were conducted (see Table 5). The whole-scale TSI did not correlate with any demographics. The whole-scale MBI was significantly correlated with age ($r = -.26, p = .01$) only. This is a common finding in research, specifically that younger employees experience higher burnout (Worley, Vassar, Wheeler, & Barnes, 2008).

4.2 The Development of the Final Measure

As a reminder, in this section, the descriptive statistics and correlations for the original ETSM measure will be reported. Next will come a detailed analysis of the original ETSM items by frequency and mean severity. Item exclusion criteria will then be described, using the information presented up to that point. Lastly, the final version measure is presented in detail. All subsequent analyses will use the final version of the ETSM.

4.2.1 Descriptive Statistics

First, to describe the measures, the means and standard deviations for the whole measures were computed, as well as the means and standard deviations for the domains relevant to each measure (see Table 1). Descriptive statistics for items on the ETSM represent only those items that were endorsed by each participant. For example, the mean for severity was calculated by taking only the items endorsed by a single participant, then dividing the sum of the severity scores by the number of items endorsed. These analyses were first computed in Excel, then in SPSS, to ensure the values calculated in SPSS were correct.

For the original ETSM, 56 items were included in the analyses (see Table 1). The mean for the ETSM frequency ratings across 98 participants on a dichotomous scale (0 = yes, 1 = no, “Did this happen?”) was $M = .39$ ($SD = .17$). The mean for the ETSM severity ratings on a 5-point Likert-scale was $M = 3.24$ ($SD = .57$). By domain, twelve items were included in Systemic
Impacts, with a mean of $M = .43 \ (SD = .21)$ for frequency and $M = 3.29 \ (SD = .77)$ for severity. Ten items were included in Social Support/Climate, with a mean of $M = .46 \ (SD = .29)$ for frequency and $M = 3.55 \ (SD = .78)$ for severity. Fourteen items were included in Formal Job Characteristics, with a mean of $M = .38 \ (SD = .19)$ for frequency and $M = 3.46 \ (SD = .56)$ for severity. Twenty items were included in Informal Job Duties, with a mean of $M = .34 \ (SD = .18)$ for frequency and $M = 2.93 \ (SD = .59)$ for severity.

Descriptives for the TSI and MBI were also computed (see Table 1). Twenty-one items were included in the analyses for the TSI. The mean for the TSI on a 5-point Likert scale was $M = 2.79 \ (SD = .77)$. For the MBI, 22 items were included in the analyses. The mean for the MBI on a 6-point Likert scale was $M = 2.71 \ (SD = .81)$.

4.2.2 Correlations

Correlations were conducted for the whole measure and by domains within the measure (see Table 5). Looking at correlations across the 56 items of the ETSM, all significant correlations were below a .80 correlation coefficient. Of those items that were significantly correlated within the mid- to high-range (i.e., .50 to .80), none were similar in nature. Further correlations within the ETSM revealed that overall frequency was significantly correlated with overall mean severity ($r = -.82, p = .000$). As noted above, severity was calculated using a mean score, not a sum. The whole measure ETSM also had a significant correlation with both the TSI (f: $r = -.28, p = .006; \ s: r = .44, p = .000$) and the MBI (s: $r = .27, p = .009$; frequency, ns). The TSI and MBI were also correlated ($r = .57, p = .000$).

Within domains, the frequency and mean severity ratings for each of the four ETSM domains were also significantly correlated: Systemic Impacts ($r = -.84, p = .000$), Social Support/Climate ($r = -.94, p = .000$), Formal Job Characteristics ($r = -.82, p = .000$), and
Informal Job Duties ($r = -.69$, $p = .000$) (see Table 6). Furthermore, results show that each of the ETSM domains were significantly correlated with each other. Systemic Impacts was correlated with Social Support/Climate ($f: r = .62$, $p = .000$; $s: r = .72$, $p = .000$), with Formal Job Characteristics ($f: r = .64$, $p = .000$; $s: r = .67$, $p = .000$), and Informal Job Duties ($f: r = .59$, $p = .000$; $s: r = .59$, $p = .000$). Social Support/Climate was also correlated with Formal Job Characteristics ($f: r = .59$, $p = .000$; $s: r = .65$, $p = .000$) and Informal Job Duties ($f: r = .57$, $p = .000$; $s: r = .60$, $p = .000$). Lastly, Formal Job Characteristics was correlated with Informal Job Duties ($f: r = .68$, $p = .000$; $s: r = -.47$, $p = .000$). These findings reveal that events on the ETSM, by domain, are related to each other, by both frequency and mean severity. This is important, because it indicates that the domains overlap, but are not interchangeable.

### 4.2.3 Frequency and Severity Scoring

Analyses of original ETSM items by frequency and mean severity were next conducted (see Table 2). First, all 56 frequency items were analyzed and ranked in order of highest endorsed to lowest endorsed. Then, all 56 severity items were analyzed and ranked in order of mean score for most stressful to least stressful. Finally, further analysis of the 56 ETSM items by frequency versus mean severity was then conducted. All of these analyses are described in detail next.

Ratings of all 56 items on the ETSM by frequency\(^2\) were calculated. For frequency, items were ranked according to the number of times they were endorsed (see Table 3). The most frequently endorsed item included:

1. Working after school and at home to get all of my job responsibilities done ($n = 95$);

\(^2\) Note: To avoid redundancy, given that the total sample size is 98 (i.e., 2 points away from 100), the number of times an item is endorsed is also indicative of the percentage that ranking represents. For example, the most frequently endorsed item, $n = 95$, represents a 95% endorsement rate.
2. I had to spend time differentiating instruction for a class of students who have a
diverse range of learning abilities, language proficiencies, and needs (n = 93);
3. Doing administrative paperwork that mainstream teachers didn’t have to do (n = 91);
4. I was asked by a mainstream teacher to discuss an English Language Learner
(ELL) student issue with them (n = 91);
5. Not having adequate time for curriculum planning, paperwork, and meetings (n = 90);
6. Integrating mainstream content standards (or common core material) into my
teaching (n = 90);
7. I used my own money to buy classroom supplies (n = 89);
8. I had to explain to a mainstream teacher about the circumstances of English
Language Learner (ELL) students (n = 85);
9. Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for federal and state (i.e.,
NCLB) mandated testing (n = 83);
10. Dealing with students with learning disabilities that placed in my English
Language Learner (ELL) classes (n = 82);
11. Spending time meeting the targeted Annual Yearly Progress (AYP or smart goals)
of my students (n = 81);
12. Advocating for my students outside of my classroom with other school personnel
(n = 81);
13. Explaining to students classroom expectations (leaving seat, raising hand, going
to the bathroom, etc…) (n = 81);
14. Scheduling and holding parent-teacher conferences (n = 79);
15. I had to deal with student reactions to mandated testing (n = 78); and
16. Getting parents to sign necessary school paperwork (n = 78)

For severity ratings, the means and standard deviations for each of the endorsed ETSM
items were calculated, then ordered from highest to lowest mean score for stressfulness of the
item (“If so, how stressful was it,” 1-5 scale) (see Table 4). The items ranking as the most
stressful by participants included the following:

1. Not having adequate time for curriculum planning, paperwork, and meetings (M =
4.33, SD = 0.75);
2. I had a conversation with a mainstream teacher who was not at all supportive of
English Language Learner (ELL) students (M = 4.07, SD = 1.06);
3. Working after school and at home to get all of my job responsibilities done (M =
3.99, SD = 0.98);
4. Not having information about my job next year (M = 3.98, SD = 1.16);
5. A school decision was made without my input that affected my classes ($M = 3.98$, $SD = 1.07$);
6. Not having supplies necessary to do my job ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 1.03$);
7. Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by school adults ($M = 3.91$, $SD = 1.21$);
8. Administrators did not satisfactorily resolve a work problem that I brought to their attention ($M = 3.87$, $SD = 1.29$);
9. I made a recommendation to the administration that they didn’t follow through on ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 1.18$);
10. I made suggestions in a recent meeting that were disregarded ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.14$);
11. Teaching in an improvised or isolated space, such as hallways, stairwells, basements, or trailers ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 1.33$);
12. Dealing with mental health issues in class ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 1.07$);
13. I was not invited to a meeting where decisions impacting my job as an English Language Learner (ELL) teacher were made ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 1.36$);
14. I was not able to communicate with a student about a school or personal matter ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 1.10$);
15. No availability of, or poor quality of, ongoing training and/or professional development ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.25$); and
16. Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by other students ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.07$)

The relationship of frequency to mean severity differed across items on the ETSM items.

Two items, “Not having adequate time for curriculum planning, paperwork, and meetings” and “Working after school and at home to get all of my job responsibilities done” were ranked by participants as among the most frequently occurring items and the most stressful items. None of the other items on the ETSM were rated by participants as both frequently occurring and among the most stressful. When looking at the highly stressful items by frequency, most of the items were endorsed by more than 50% of participants (or, $n = 50$). One exception is two similar items, “Teaching in an improvised or isolated space, such as hallways, stairwells, basements, or trailers” and “Not having a regularly assigned classroom space throughout the day.” These two
items were rated as stressful ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 1.33$ and $M = 3.54$, $SD = 1.43$, respectively), but were not endorsed as frequently occurring ($n = 36$ and $n = 28$, respectively).

When looking at how the least stressful items were ranked by frequency, several of the items rated as least stressful are among those that were endorsed as frequently occurring. “I was asked by a mainstream teacher to discuss an English Language Learner (ELL) student issue with them” was endorsed by 91 participants, but was not rated as particularly stressful ($M = 2.34$, $SD = 1.20$). Similarly, “I had to explain to a mainstream teacher about the circumstances of English Language Learner (ELL) students” and “Explaining to students classroom expectations (leaving seat, raising hand, going to the bathroom, etc…)” were endorsed by 85 and 81 participants, respectively, but were not rated as highly stressful overall ($M = 2.82$, $SD = 1.00$ and $M = 2.53$, $SD = 1.11$, respectively).

Finally, items that were rated as the least stressful and also rated as not frequently occurring were analyzed. No clear conclusions emerged from this analysis, as no items were rated low for both mean severity and frequency.

**4.2.3.1 Frequency and Severity by Domain.** For frequency, of the top-endorsed items, seven items were from the Informal Job Duties domain (44%), four were from the Formal Job Characteristics domain (25%), and four were from the Systemic Impacts domain (25%). Only one of these top-endorsed items came from the Social Support/Climate domain (6%). The two least frequently endorsed items were “Being identified as a ‘not highly qualified’ or ‘low performing’ teacher by NCLB (No Child Left Behind)” and “Not having a regularly assigned classroom space throughout the day,” with each of these items endorsed by 28 participants. Thus, the least endorsed items by frequency came from the Systemic Impacts and Formal Job Characteristics domains, respectively.
A different domain pattern was found for mean severity. More specifically, for mean severity, seven of the most stressful rated items came from the Social Support/Climate domain (44%), with the rest coming from the Informal Job Duties, Formal Job Characteristics, and Systemic Impacts domains at the same rate (n = 3 each, 19% each). The items rated as the least stressful by participants came from the Informal Job Duties domain, including: “Taking class time to discuss acculturative issues (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…) (M = 2.26, SD = 1.00)” and “Explaining to students school safety concerns, such as around heating elements, fire alarms, etc…(M = 2.23, SD = 0.94).”

4.2.4 Exclusion of Items

By nature of the development of a stress event measure, not all current items in the measure were expected to remain in the final measure. Thus, the next step was to determine which of the 56 items to cut from the final measure3. The task included developing a structured method for removing items. Using modern test theory (such as in the vein of Item Response Theory), the decision was made to retain items that represented a range of stress severity and frequency, including a representative sample of items on both the low-end and high-end of the rankings presented above. The next step was to calibrate the items, ranking them by (1) lowest mean severity to highest mean severity and (2) lowest frequency to highest frequency, then identifying items with similar scale positions (see Figure 6 and Figure 7). Standard error and a 95% confidence interval were also analyzed to help determine the level of overlap among items on the linear model (see Table 7). Those items that overlapped on the scale were considered for exclusion, especially those that fell in the middle of the model.

---

3 The primary author and Edison J. Trickett met to analyze the items for exclusion, based on the analyses presented in this manuscript.
Additional criteria that were used for excluding items included: (1) analyzing correlations among all 56 items, (2) removing items with no variability, (3) looking at items that potentially did not represent meaningful stressors unique to ELL teachers, and (4) looking at items by domain, especially for those domains that had a high number of items. These four steps are described next.

First, correlations among all 56 items on the ETSM were analyzed to see if any of the items were highly correlated, possibly indicating that items were too similar. For example, if two “problem with administrator” items were highly correlated, that could be a sign that the items were too similar. Findings revealed that none of the original 56 items on the ETSM were highly correlated with each other. As noted above, further analysis of the item correlations did not reveal that any two items were too similar.

Second, items were analyzed for low frequency by low mean severity ratings. Items that had both low frequency and low mean severity would represent items that were not meaningful for teachers. None of the items were identified for removal in this manner, as no items were rated by participants as low severity and low frequency.

Next, items were analyzed by how unique they are to the experiences of ELL teachers specifically (e.g., in comparison to other groupings of teachers, such as mainstream teachers). This method identified the most items for removal—13 items (numbers 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, 22, 23, 27, 31, 35, 38, 43, 45, 48). Some examples of these items include, “Not having supplies necessary to do my job,” “A school decision was made without my input that affected my classes,” “Having discipline problems in my classroom,” “Not having adequate time for curriculum planning, paperwork, and meetings,” and “I used my own money to buy classroom supplies.”
Finally, the frequency and mean severity of items by domain were analyzed for the remaining items. First, the range (frequency by mean severity) was examined for remaining items within the domains. Then, the content of items that fell close to each other was further analyzed. Two additional items were removed using this method (numbers 53 and 56). For example, “Explaining to students school safety concerns, such as around heating elements, fire alarms etc…” was an item that fell close to the others in both frequency and mean severity, but was assessed to be not frequently occurring, not very stressful for teachers, and also somewhat related to another item that was retained for the final measure.

4.2.5 The Final Measure

Thus, taken together, the exclusion criteria were used to identify 16 items for removal, with 40 items remaining on the final measure. By domain, eight items remained in both the Systemic Impacts and Social Support/Climate domains each, 10 in the Formal Job Characteristics domain, and 14 in the Informal Job Duties domain (see Appendix I and Table 15).

A comparison of the descriptive statistics for the original and final version of the ETSM, by mean severity and frequency, can be found in Figure 8 and Figure 9, as well as a comparison with descriptives for the TSI and MBI in Figure 5. The descriptive statistics for the final measure were similar to those for the original measure. For the final version of the ETSM, 40 items were included in the analyses (see Table 8). The whole measure mean for the ETSM frequency ratings across 98 participants on a dichotomous scale (0 = yes, 1 = no, “Did this happen?”) was $M = .37$ ($SD = .19$). The mean for the ETSM severity ratings on a 5-point Likert-scale was $M = 3.18$ ($SD = .58$). By domain, for the 8 items retained for Systemic Impacts, the frequency mean was $M = .35$ ($SD = .23$) and the severity mean was $M = 3.29$ (.77). Eight items retained for the
Social Support/Climate domain had a frequency mean of $M = .44$ ($SD = .29$) and severity mean of $M = 3.42$ ($SD = .81$). Ten items retained for the Formal Job Characteristics domain had a frequency mean of $M = .35$ ($SD = .21$) and severity mean of $M = 3.36$ ($SD = .60$). Lastly, the 14 items retained for the Informal Job Duties domain had a frequency mean of $M = .37$ ($SD = .21$) and severity mean of $M = 2.83$ ($SD = .65$).

4.3 Psychometrics

4.3.1 Discriminant and Predictive Validity

Discriminant and predictive validity analyses for the final version of the ETSM were next conducted. Discriminant validity was used to determine whether the final version of the ETSM captured stress that is particularly relevant to ELL teachers. Predictive validity was used to determine whether the ETSM predicts teacher burnout. Discriminant validity was first assessed by looking at the correlations among whole measures. For mean severity, the final version of the ETSM was correlated with both the TSI ($r = .48, p = .000$) and with the MBI ($r = .45, p = .000$). For frequency, the final version of the ETSM was correlated only with the TSI ($r = -.26, p = .01$). Thus, these correlations show that these three measures are related. When looking specifically at the correlations between the ETSM and TSI, findings do show that the ETSM and TSI are not interchangeable—they are each distinct measures.

To further test discriminant and predictive validity, it was initially proposed that the ETSM would be entered into a regression model with the TSI, with the outcome variable being burnout. If the ETSM was a significant predictor of burnout when the TSI was in the regression model, this finding would suggest that the ETSM accounts for unique variance, over and above the variance accounted for by the TSI. Furthermore, if this finding was supported, then two main tenets of discriminant validity would be argued: (1) the ETSM is a distinctly different measure
than the TSI and (2) the ETSM adds a unique contribution for capturing ELL teacher stress than the TSI.

Multiple hierarchical regression analyses were used to test this initial proposal. The prediction model included an examination of the importance of (i) demographic variables in step one, (ii) the TSI in step two, and (iii) the final version of the whole measure ETSM in step three. For these regression equations, both age and gender were controlled for, as much past research shows that both of these factors impact burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001).

4.3.1.1 Severity. Findings support the proposal of discriminant and predictive validity. The regression model included (i) demographic variables (age and gender) entered in step one, (ii) the TSI entered into step two, and (iii) the final ETSM severity mean entered into step three, with the MBI entered as the outcome variable. For the final version of the ETSM, the overall model was significant \(F(4,91) = 15.62, p = .000\) and contributed 41% of the variance in the prediction of burnout (see Table 9). In step one, age was a significant predictor of burnout \((\beta = -.29, p = .006)\) but gender nonsignificant \((\beta = -.13, ns)\), with 9% of the variance accounted for in this step. For step two, the TSI was a significant predictor of burnout \((\beta = .54, p = .000)\), with 28% of the variance accounted for in this step. Finally, for step three, the final version of the ETSM (severity) was also a significant predictor of burnout \((\beta = .23, p = .02)\), with 4% of the variance accounted for this step.

4.3.1.2 Frequency. A separate regression model was run for frequency. The regression model included (i) demographic variables (age and gender) entered in step one, (ii) the TSI entered into step two, and (iii) the final ETSM frequency mean entered into step three, with the

---

4 A predictive validity model with the ETSM (severity) alone (i.e., minus the TSI) can be found in Table 11.
5 Tables referred to here show results for both the original version of the ETSM and the final version.
6 A predictive validity model with the ETSM (frequency) alone (i.e., minus the TSI) can be found in Table 12.
MBI entered as the outcome variable. For the final version of the ETSM, the overall model was significant \((F(4,91) = 13.62, p = .000)\) and contributed 37% of the variance in the prediction of burnout (see Table 10). For step two, the TSI was a significant predictor of burnout \((\beta = .54, p = .000)\), with 28% of the variance accounted for in this step. For step three, the final version of the ETSM (frequency) was not a significant predictor of burnout \((\beta = .08, ns)\).

4.3.2 Predictive Validity by Domain

Separate multiple hierarchical regression analyses were used to assess the predictive validity of the ETSM domains. The prediction model included an examination of the importance of (i) demographic variables in step one, and (ii) the ETSM domains entered together in step two. For these regression equations, both age and gender were controlled for, as past research shows that both factors impact burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001).

4.3.2.1 Severity by Domain. Individual domains of the ETSM were entered in the regression models in the place of the whole measure. Thus, the next prediction model included (i) demographic variables in step one, and (ii) four ETSM (mean severity) domains entered together in step two. For the final version of the ETSM domain model, the overall model was significant \((F(6,83) = 6.93, p = .000)\) and contributed 33% of the variance in the prediction of burnout (see Table 13). In step one, both age \((\beta = -.39, p = .000)\) and gender \((\beta = -.27, p = .007)\) were significant predictors of burnout. For step two, only the final domain of Formal Job Characteristics was a significant predictor of burnout \((\beta = .29, p = .03)\). The final versions of the Systemic Impacts \((\beta = .09, ns)\), Social Support/Climate \((\beta = -.11, ns)\), and Informal Job Duties \((\beta = .14, ns)\) domains did not significantly contribute to the prediction of burnout.

---

7 Because items on the TSI were so similar to items on the MBI, the TSI contributed much of the variance to the regression model when entered. Therefore, the TSI was dropped from the model for these analyses.
4.3.2.2 Frequency by Domain. For frequency ratings, the prediction model included (i) demographic variables in step one, and (ii) four ETSM (frequency) domains entered together in step two. For the final version of the ETSM domain model, the overall model only trended towards significance ($F(6,89) = 1.93, p = .08$) and contributed 6% of the variance in the prediction of burnout (see Table 14). In step one, age was a significant predictor of burnout ($\beta = -.29, p = .006$) and gender nonsignificant ($\beta = -.13, ns$). For step two, none of the final ETSM frequency domains were significant in the prediction of burnout: Systemic Impacts ($\beta = .12, ns$), Social Support/Climate ($\beta = -.08, ns$), Formal Job Characteristics ($\beta = -.20, ns$), and Informal Job Duties ($\beta = .09, ns$).

Additional psychometrics, including reliability analyses, split-half reliability analyses, and confirmatory factor analysis are reported in Tables 17-19.

---

8 Because the current instrument being developed is a life events measure, additional psychometric analyses were not recommended. From a theoretical perspective, life events measures are not expected to “hold up” to reliability analyses or factor analysis, as individual items are not necessarily related (as demonstrated above). Thus, although additional psychometric analyses were conducted, the decision was made not to report them in text.
V. DISCUSSION

From previous research, we know that ELL teachers are stressed. One participant in the current sample described this stress, “I have never been more stressed than I am this year, so close to retirement. This used to be a great job when it was just about the students. Now, there are too many masters, too many fights to battle, too many public distractions. I cannot give to my students now without burning myself out. Eventually I will choose self-preservation, and burnout will begin.” Another participant described their own history, “I’ve been the only ELL teacher in my district for 15 years. I spent personal time in the summer to move into a new room where I would have enough space. After teaching for a month and holding 25 support plan meetings w/ parents, teachers and admin, I got moved to a school w/ no classroom. I was told to train the new part-time teacher who is now in my old space because she has no ELL background so now I continue to travel to 8 schools and store my files at home. I may resign soon.”

Thus, the purpose of the current study was to develop an instrument to measure ELL teacher work stress that captures the unique experiences of this understudied group of teachers. As noted before, English Language Learner (ELL) teachers have one of the most important roles in school for immigrant and refugee students (e.g., Trickett et al., 2012). ELL teachers are the staff whom immigrant and refugee students first encounter in their school experiences and are typically the school adults with whom newly arrived students spend the majority of their day.

Currently, there are few teacher stress measures that exist, and there is no existing measure that captures the unique stressors of ELL teachers. Of the existing teacher stress measures, there are methodological and conceptual problems that the current study is intended to address. First, items on the existing teacher stress measures include a mixture of stress events and outcomes of stress (e.g., Fimian, 1984; Greene et al., 1997; Moracco et al., 1982). These
outcome events include burnout items, as well as the use of drugs, alcohol, and prescription medications, for example. One important task for the development of the current ETSM was to take care to only include potentially stressful events, not items that reflect the outcomes of stress.

Furthermore, existing stress measures do not distinguish between the occurrence of the stress event (frequency) and the stressfulness (mean severity) of the items. One major problem with this practice is that it does not accurately capture stress (e.g., Vinokurov, Trickett, & Birman, 2002). More specifically, on measures that don’t differentiate between frequency and severity, participants have no choice but to rate non-frequent items low on a stress response scale. In other words, when an event doesn’t occur frequently for most of the participant sample, the responses from participants who do encounter these items are not identifiable from the rest of the responses. Thus, the level of stress for the few participants who encounter such events gets “lost” when the mean and/or sum of stressfulness is tallied for the whole sample. Furthermore, this practice of not separating out frequency and severity confounds the occurrence of the event with the appraisal of its stressfulness. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) remind us in their stress model that this practice does not accurately reflect how we react to stress. In their stress model, first an event has to occur (frequency), then an individual has to appraise whether or not it represents a stress for them (severity). In fact, findings from the current study support what Lazarus and Folkman (1984) proposed to be true. With a separate response scale for frequency and mean severity on the ETSM, we find that there is wide variability in both the frequency and severity scores provided by the ELL teachers in the current sample when looking at individual events presented to them on the ETSM. This finding tells us that frequency and severity are not the same, and should not be treated as the same. Thus, the importance of separating frequency
and severity on the response scale of the ESTM is supported both by previous research and the current study, and represents a strength of the ETSM.

Furthermore, distinguishing between frequency and severity allows potential users of the ETSM to capture much more rich data. For example, the data collected using the ETSM allows users to identify and analyze each item on the measure by a range of frequency and mean severity, for example between high to low frequency and high to low severity. Thus, items that are rated as highly stressful are important, but how frequent they occur can also be assessed using data collected from ETSM. This is important for future users of the measure, because knowing that specific events occur frequently, but don’t act as a stressor for teachers, is useful data. Conversely, knowing that an event is stressful, but doesn’t occur frequently is also useful data. This data can be used to better determine what kind of intervention is needed for any given event on the ETSM.

Another necessary task in the development of the ETSM was to make sure that it captures a more complete ecological portrait of stress than currently existing teacher stress measures. Existing teacher stress measures focus solely on classroom-level stressors, such as having discipline problems in the classroom, having to differentiate curriculum for specific groups of students, and lack of motivation of students (e.g., Fimian, 1984). What is missing from existing teacher stress measures are stress events beyond the classroom-level. The ETSM responds to this problem, by including broader events of stress, such as those that evolve at the systemic and school climate level, as well as those that represent more “informal” job characteristics (such as spending time outside of the school day to set up drives for food, clothing, and other necessities, and developing supports for parents). Thus, the ETSM captures a much broader range of
stressors than currently existing teacher stress measures, and, consequently, captures a more realistic and detailed portrait of ELL teacher stress.

Capturing a broad ecological portrait of ELL teacher stress brings into focus for discussion the domain structure of the ETSM, since the domains on the ETSM represent different ecological levels. Systemic Impacts include federal, state, and local school policies or practices that contribute to the work stress of ELL teachers. Stress events at this level have been shown to be important in the lives of ELL teachers in past research (Abraham & Chumley, 2000; Hunt et al., 2000). Social Climate/Support refers to the overall social climate of the school, as well as the nature of social interactions between ELL teachers and other school staff. Stress events at this level occurred frequently for teachers in the current study, but have also been shown to be frequent in past research as well (Abraham & Chumley, 2000; Markham, 1999; York-Barr et al., 2007). Because existing teacher stress measures focus solely on Formal Job Characteristics, this was an important ecological domain to include in the current ETSM (Fimian, 1984; Greene et al., 1997; Moracco et al., 1982). Finally, Informal Job Characteristics, the need of ELL teachers to fulfill multiple roles outside of their formal job roles, has been well-document in previous research (Clarke et al., 1996; Loh, 1995; Markham, 1999). The uniqueness of this domain structure of the ETSM, in comparison to other existing teacher stress measures, is important when thinking about how the measure may be used in the future. For system use (school systems or individual schools or departments), future users are able to identify the ecological levels at which the majority of stress for ELL teachers is occurring, if applicable. It is likely that ELL teachers in a given system may experience stressors from multiple ecological levels that are captured by the ETSM. However, it may also be the case that stressors for ELL teachers in a given system are more concentrated around a specific domain. For example, if a
particular system finds that the most frequent or severe stressors for their ELL teachers occur
within a specific domain, this allows for the system to focus intervention at a targeted area. In
the present study, the highest levels of stress occurred in the Social Support/Climate domain.
Several teachers clarified why this area, specifically, is so stressful. “Other teachers think I’m
not a real teacher, not certified, not informed (like I have limited English, rather than my PhD in
English). I have no forum for delivering staff in-service [training].” Additionally, “I am
somewhat isolated from other staff because I’m not on a team as every other teacher in the
school is. In addition, I am constantly transferred from school to school as caseloads fluctuate
and the program changes (nine different schools in 6 years). I get split between schools and have
to eat in the car and never attend a faculty activity at some schools where I work.” Thus, if this
data represented a specific school system, intervention efforts would be recommended at
building social support for ELL teachers in this school system.

Furthermore, what is also of importance is how frequency and severity scores can be
separated out by domain. While the Social Support/Climate domain had the highest level of
stress in the current study, it had the lowest frequency ratings when compared to the other three
domains. Thus, while social support may be identified as a problem area for intervention, other
specific events may also be identified for a much smaller level intervention. For example,
“Doing administrative paperwork that mainstream teachers didn’t have to do” and “I had to
spend time differentiating instruction for a class of students who have a diverse range of learning
abilities, language proficiencies, and needs” are two events that were frequently endorsed, but
also stressful in the current study. These events come from the Formal Job Characteristics
domain. One teacher describes this stressor, “As a bilingual science teacher, the most stressful
part of my job is not having adequate materials for my students’ success. I spent many hours
translating/modifying materials to better assist my students. I have had to spend entire summers locating materials, such as textbooks, that fit my students’ needs. I had a very difficult time locating an appropriate chemistry textbook. I ended having to have a local book store purchase directly from Mexico and paying twice as much for the book even though the publisher is a US-based company.” So a much simpler intervention plan may target this more specific area for ELL teachers in a particular school or system.

Another reason why the domain structure of the ETSM is important is reflected in the analyses presented in the results section above. For example, low correlations for the Systemic Impacts and Social Support/Climate domains with the TSI and MBI show that events at these ecological levels are not captured at all by the TSI and MBI. Furthermore, when put into regression models, Systemic Impacts, Social Support/Climate, and Informal Job Duties do not predict the MBI. This is further support that current measures, even those like the MBI that capture burnout rather than stress, do not capture events at these ecological levels, because at its essence, the regression model is reflecting how representative these items are of items on the MBI itself. The finding that only the Formal Job Characteristics domain remains a significant predictor of the MBI in a regression model further strengthens this argument, as items on the Formal Job Characteristic domains are the ones that are most similar in ecological level to items on the MBI. In fact, items on the Formal Job Characteristics domain, as discussed above, are the ones that are most similar to items on other teacher stress measures. Thus, the domain structure of the ETSM is important, because items represented in the other three domains specifically (Systemic Impacts, Social Support/Climate, and Informal Job Duties) are unique in comparison to items on other existing measures of teacher stress and burnout. Furthermore, when entered
into the regression models, the domains capture more variance in the prediction of burnout. This is yet another argument for the usefulness of the domain structure of the ETSM.

In developing the final measure, item exclusion was a theoretical process, not a psychometric one. This is an important distinction and topic for discussion. The method of item reduction as described in the results section above increased the variability of the items in the final measure, by both frequency and mean severity. This process removed some high scoring items, by both frequency and severity, and retained some low scoring items, by both frequency and severity. Thus, this process highlights the importance of having separate responses for frequency and severity. When examining items for removal, the items may have fallen anywhere on the frequency scale or the mean severity scale. Therefore, when analyzing the content of the item being considered for removal, it was helpful to see the response pattern for both frequency and severity. In fact, by removing items for the final measure in this way, this represents a strength of the ETSM, in that such variability of events across participants captures a broad range of stressful events among teachers, across schools, school systems, and locations. Thus, in thinking about future uses of the ETSM, the measure can be used at both system and school levels to distinguish teacher stress across teachers. In other words, the more variability in events, the more useful the measure is in identifying different stressors among different ELL teachers. This characteristic will be especially useful when comparing different schools within a school system, for example, because interventions plans are likely to be different for different teachers in different schools.

The present discussion underscores an important analytic topic in how life event measures should be analyzed, especially when compared to traditional psychometrics developed for scales measuring specific constructs (e.g., Dohrenwend, 2006; Gray, Litz, Hsu, & Lombardo,
2004). Given that each item on the ETSM represents a life event that is not necessarily related to each other, traditional psychometrics that include reliability, split-half reliability, and confirmatory factor analysis are not recommended in modern measure development theory. While it can be expected that some items on the Social Support/Climate domain, for example, might be related for some teachers, they are not expected to be related to each other for all teachers. So findings from traditional psychometric analyses are an area of caution for the current study. In the current study, this problem was dealt with by not reporting specific psychometric analyses in the text, because they are not useful in analyzing the ETSM, nor do they reflect the purpose of the development of a life events measure like the ETSM.

Recommended psychometric analyses do show that the whole measure ETSM is valid. First, looking at the descriptive statistics, the mean of the whole-measure ETSM was higher than the TSI. This finding, along with a low correlation among the ETSM and TSI, indicates that the ETSM is different from the TSI and captures different events of stress. Thus, the ETSM has good discriminant validity. To further test for discriminant validity, severity scoring for the whole measure ETSM was found to capture both shared and unique variance when entered with the TSI in a regression model predicting burnout. Similarly, the whole measure ETSM also has good predictive validity of burnout, but for severity scoring alone. These findings have several implications. First, these findings show that the events of stress captured on the ETSM are good predictors of burnout. This should be expected if the ETSM truly captures stress, as much previous research shows that stress leads to burnout (Maslach et al. 1986; Worley et al., 2008). However, frequency scoring was not a significant predictor of burnout in either the discriminant validity or predictive validity models. This finding makes sense. The stress model presented by Lazarus and Folkman (1984) tells us that what is important is not the number of stressors a
person experiences, but how stressful they appraise an event to be. Thus, the number of items endorsed on the ETSM does not (and should not) reflect how stressful the items endorsed were for each participant. For example, a participant may have endorsed many items as occurring (frequent), but several items as not stressful. Thus, when predicting burnout, the number of stressors a person experiences is not indicative of future burnout, but rather how stressful the events are appraised to be (mean severity). This is consistent with previous research (Maslach et al. 1986; Worley et al., 2008), and is supported in the current study with ETSM severity scoring significantly predicting burnout.

Further analysis of severity scoring provides additional information. The ranking of mean severity by domain is as follows: (1) Social Support/Climate, (2) Formal Job Characteristics, (3) Systemic Impacts, and (4) Informal Job Duties. The severity means for the first three domains were not far apart from each other. This finding suggests that the first three domains contain events that are appraised similarly for stress by ELL teachers. In contrast, the mean for Informal Job Characteristics was a bit lower than the others, indicating that ELL teachers are not as stressed by these events than the others. The reason for this finding could be that these teachers are “resigned” to the extra duties they need to take on in their job role. As one participant noted, “I consider many of these ‘extra’ duties just part of my job.” It is also possible that that they embrace these duties as satisfying a need to feel valuable or helpful to their students and families. Thus, rather than being stressful, events in the Informal Job Duties domain may serve as protective factors against stress. For example, “I was asked by a mainstream teacher to discuss an English Language Learner (ELL) student issue with them” was among the most frequently endorsed items in the Informal Job Duties domain, but was one of the lowest severity items. Thus, this particular event may make ELL teachers feel useful to their
students, peers, and schools, protecting against other stressors. Future use of the measure will help to determine if, in fact, the events on the Informal Job Duties domain cause the least stress for ELL teachers, or if this finding is unique to the current sample.

What is clear from the findings of the current study is that work stress events are unique for ELL teachers. Looking at each of the following examples, stress events are quite distinct from the experiences of those understood to affect most mainstream teachers. For example, unique systemic stressors do exist for ELL teachers. “Not having information about my job next year” was the highest stressor for ELL teachers in the current sample in the Systemic Impacts domain. Furthermore, “Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for federal and state (i.e., NCLB) mandated testing” and “Spending time meeting the targeted Annual Yearly Progress (AYP or smart goals) of my students” were both frequently endorsed and stressful systemic events. For Social Support/Climate events, “I had a conversation with a mainstream teacher who was not at all supportive of English Language Learner (ELL) students” was the most stressful item for ELL teachers. While not rated as highly stressful, “I had to explain to a mainstream teacher about the circumstances of English Language Learner (ELL) students” was a frequently endorsed social climate item. The most stressful Formal Job Characteristics events all revolved around experiences unique to ELL teachers, including “Dealing with inappropriate placement of students in my classes, regarding English Language Learner (ELL) level” and “Doing administrative paperwork that mainstream teachers didn’t have to do.” Finally, regarding Informal Job Duties, as noted above, events on this domain were among the least stressful of all events on the ETSM. However, “Arranging for translation services/liaisons to facilitate communication with parents and/or family members” and “Advocating for my students outside of the classroom with other school personnel” are examples of frequent and stressful
events of ELL teachers. Taken together, these examples show that stress events for ELL teachers are unique from other groups of teachers.

Finally, it’s important to discuss the final sample in the current study. The final sample had a range of demographics, including across age, grade level, years teaching, subjects taught, and geographical location. Some demographic findings were consistent with past research. Age was negatively correlated with burnout, indicating that younger teachers experienced more burnout. This is a common finding in the burnout literature (Worley et al., 2008). Other demographic findings within the sample are more unique. In previous research, urban teachers typically report more work stress. In fact, it is a common practice to group suburban and rural teachers together for analysis, because they typically report similar low levels of stress (Worley et al., 2008). However, in the current study, suburban teachers reported more stress than teachers in other settings, and their stress was significantly higher than rural teachers, who reported the lowest level of stress. There are many possible reasons for this finding. First, there may be more support for ELL teachers in urban schools than suburban schools, simply because there may be other ELL teachers in urban schools for teachers to connect with. Furthermore, urban schools likely have larger populations of ELL students, so more teachers share the stressors of educating these students. Urban teachers may be less stressed because they are more used to the challenges of educating ELL students and have more support in the existing ELL structures present in their schools. In suburban schools, newer populations of ELL students may be coming in to these schools. In addition, these schools may not have a Bilingual/ELL structure for these students to be folded into, with the possibility that there are more “ad hoc” ELL teachers in suburban settings. As one teacher in the sample noted, “Our school is extremely small (K-12 is 412 students). I am the first ESL teacher ever brought into the school because 2 years ago was the
first time our school as EVER had ELL students. Because of this, our school relies on me to educate mainstream teachers about Second Language Acquisition. I am more than happy to share research and best practices with staff, but because of the school's unique situation, I feel the burden of advocacy falls directly on me.” Finally, suburban teachers are more likely to be the ones traveling to multiple schools during the school day, adding to the number of stress events they encounter. Without more information, it is difficult to know for sure what contextual factors impact suburban teachers in the current sample having reporting more stress, so this is another area for future research to explore. It is possible that this finding is unique to the current sample, but still an interesting finding for further exploration.

Additional demographic findings indicate that teachers in higher grade levels endorsed more stress events and stressors around social support/climate increased with grade level. There are many possible reasons for this finding. First, the nature of the job for teachers at higher grade levels tends to be structured differently than for those at lower grade levels and older students learning new languages present unique challenges. One participant noted, “The DOE needs to do a reality check on what [high school] students actually are learning in the classroom and what they are being tested on and make an effort to align these two things. Right now, the students are being tested on material that isn't usually given to students until they reach college. I would know this because I also teach at a university in the area, so I have a pretty good handle on what is being taught in both places and what students are being tested on as well. The students are very stressed out about their test grades and it seems that they are testing nearly every week. So, of course, I feel stressed for them and have to help them put these tests in perspective.” Furthermore, teachers at higher grade levels tend to be more mobile, moving around to different classes during the day and working with a larger group of students.
Consequently, they may have less time for social interaction or time to meet with other teachers to discuss problems or stressors. In addition, there is more of a division across departments in higher grades. So this finding may be reflective of ELL teachers feeling less tied to a specific department or to a connected group of teachers in their schools. If the teachers are traveling among schools at higher grade levels, this is another reason for reporting more stress around social support. Another demographic finding was that older teachers reported more stress around formal job characteristics. It is difficult to determine what specific factors may contribute to this finding. Perhaps this is a teacher training issue, with older teachers having been given less formal training around new methods for differentiating instruction or how to teach oneself about newly arriving immigrants. It is also possible that older teachers are also those who have worked in the field longer, exposing them to more classroom consistency. Thus, new stressors (like losing a classroom space and/or having to teaching in an improvised space, or orienting new students who have never had formal schooling) may be more stressful for these teachers. Lastly, informal job characteristics were rated as more stressful by those working in charter schools. There is little prior research that compares the work experiences of teachers in charter schools to those in public schools. It is also important to note that the sample of teachers working in charter schools in the current study was small. However, for these particular teachers, this finding raises important questions for the field, as it indicates that informal duties in charter schools may be less structured and/or defined, and consequently are more demanding for teachers working in these schools.

Finally, there was large variability in the sample for the current study. This is important to note, because since there is no federal system for ELL programming, there is no one job description for any one ELL teacher. The national sample in the current study captures the
incredible variability in what it means to be an ELL teacher, how their job is defined, and what each of them is assigned to do. First, almost every participant provided a unique job title. Also, many teachers taught across varied grade levels, for example, any possible combination of kindergarten, elementary, middle school, and high school grades. The same was true for subjects taught, percentage of their school day spent outside of the mainstream classroom, and number of languages represented by their students. “People have no idea what we do and what the job entails. It is not only teaching. Teaching the student is the fun part. Having too many people asking for too many things while being split between buildings makes it very difficult to do the job as well as we want to.” Thus, what this sample shows is that there is no clear definition of what an ELL teacher is or does.

5.1.1 Limitations

The most obvious limitation to the current study is the sample size, with a minimum of 300 participants as the initial goal for recruitment. It’s important to note that while 231 participants logged in to view the survey, only 98 completed it in full. That 42% response rate is not unusual in comparison to traditional paper mailings, but may also be indicative of other factors. The small response rate may be attributed to the length of the survey overall, which took participants about 28 minutes to complete, on average. Without face-to-face contact with participants, it is difficult to get “buy in” for them to complete such a long survey without any form of compensation. In addition, those who did complete the survey were likely different from the general population of ELL teachers in some way—either by being more stressed (and therefore wanting to share that experience) or feeling that the research was important in some way. Because of the small sample size, other problems persisted, including not enough power to run some analyses. For example, the confirmatory factor analysis of the domain structure of the
ETSM using Item Response Theory (IRT) parameterization could not be conducted as proposed because of the small sample size.

Finally, a problem arose with the TSI as used in the current study, in that it was found to have similar items to the MBI, with many of the items representing burnout. In fact, the entire Discipline and Motivation domain of the TSI is comprised of burnout items. Thus, planned analyses using the TSI were problematic. In discriminant validity regression models predicting the MBI, the TSI consumed a large part of the variance, which is assumed to be due to the fact that it has so many similar items to the MBI. However, despite this problem, mean severity scoring for the whole measure ETSM was still a significant predictor of burnout above and beyond that contributed by the TSI. What this means is that the test was a very conservative one and that the ETSM may be even stronger as a measure of ELL teacher stress than this test indicates.

5.2.1 Future Directions

This study represents the next step in measure development for ELL teachers, using an ecological framework that highlights the unique experiences of a unique category of teachers. By allowing teachers to indicate the strength of individual stressors, we gain new knowledge about how stress is perceived. Overall, findings from this study show that stress is variable for ELL teachers. Work stress events are clearly unique for ELL teachers and stress does occur across different ecological levels. Many of the stressors that ELL teachers deal with are different from their mainstream counterparts. These events include having to go “above and beyond” to prepare their students for mainstream curriculum and testing, explaining to school staff the circumstances of the students they work with, and participating in “extracurricular” activities, such as parent support activities and running drives for daily life necessities for their students.
The next step in the development of this measure is to increase the current sample size of ELL teachers across K-12 grade levels. As part of this effort, the final 40-item version of the ETSM needs to be tested. The purpose for expanding samples is to ensure both the reliability and validity of the current measure using diverse populations. By sampling greater numbers of ELL teachers, power issues in the current study will be resolved. Including some of the excluded items from the original measure could be used as a strategy to confirm that removed items are less unique to ELL teachers than the items that were retained. In addition, further sampling of the ETSM will help to identify how the domain structure of the measure holds up. This is important because the findings discussed above are unique to the current sample, and the current sample does not represent one school system or geographical location. Therefore, testing the ETSM within school systems will allow for us to see how well the ETSM “describes” a specific system and differentiates ELL teachers within the system.

Given the finding that the ETSM does in fact capture stressors that are unique to ELL teachers, it is important to think about how this measure could be used as a training tool for teachers, as it is an indicator of what ELL teachers need to know at the teacher training level. As one participant noted, “I’m not sure why there isn’t better training and why we use textbooks that are basically easier literature anthologies—they don’t teach the structure of language in a systematic way. The tail seems to be wagging the dog, at least here. This is what stresses me out—I hate wasting time!!” One possibility for future sampling would be to include pre-service teachers, to see if the measure can be used for predicting what events might occur when they are in the field. This would be useful for teacher training, as the measure could be used with pre-service teachers in training them how to respond to stress events they may encounter. In addition, this same training program could also be used to train mainstream teachers, since the
majority will end up working with ELL students in their classrooms, or even within the school in some specific way (i.e., mandated testing). In fact, clinical training programs regularly include components that teach students about how to process feelings—this be translated to teacher training programs around anticipated work stress events.

Further to this cause, strengthening the demographic questionnaire is necessary. This task will include omitting items that were not useful for analysis (such as the large variation in job titles offered by participants), and adding questions that capture better descriptions of the context these teachers are working in. For example, asking teachers whether or not there are other ELL, ESL, or bilingual teachers in their schools would provide information about how isolated they are. This is one possible reason that contributes to suburban ELL teachers reporting more stress than teachers in urban or rural settings. Another possibility for future research will be to use population census data to categorize school setting, rather than allowing participants to self-report. This would better standardize the definitions of “urban,” “suburban,” and “rural” for national samples.

One demographic item that was not captured in the current sample was indicated as clearly important by one participant—the unique experiences of teachers who speak other languages themselves. “Our elementary school ELL population is approximately 65% of almost 600 students (100% of the 65% are Hispanic), but we have no one on staff who speaks Spanish except me (well, other than the custodian). As you can imagine, there are NUMEROUS occasions when a translator is needed. I’m definitely not a native Spanish speaker, though I do have a Bachelor’s degree in Spanish and have become fairly fluent. Last year at least the full-time Parent Facilitator spoke Spanish about as well as me, but we have a different P.A. this year who is starting a program to teach English to the parents (which is a very good thing, but
doesn’t help me in the short run). I’m happy for the chance to improve my Spanish, but this is a huge responsibility and stressor (time-wise and responsibility-wise).” Thus, whether bilingual teachers experience stress events differently from monolingual teachers is an important area for future investigation. This could be one factor that impacted the current sample and the higher level of stress among suburban teachers. For example, if teachers in the sample were bilingual, this may have led them to have either more or less stress in interacting with the students they were working with.

Finally, over the long-term, further development of this measure will include sampling mainstream teachers who work with ELL students. Future samples for consideration may also include those of other grade levels, such as college, as well as recruiting international ELL teacher samples. A final direction for this measure is to see how it relates to Special Education teachers, or perhaps developing a similar measure for use with this subset of teachers.

VI. CONCLUSION

The purpose of the current study, the development of an instrument to measure ELL teacher stress, is to add new meaning and depth to our understanding of the rich, multifaceted work lives of ELL teachers. As described above, ELL teachers typically have one of the most demanding jobs within the school, yet this fact has been often overlooked in previous examinations of the day-to-day functioning of the complex school setting. Therefore, this examination is intended to highlight the experiences of a select group of staff who are typically underrepresented in studies that focus on educational factors within the school context. Using a quantitative survey method, the development of an instrument to measure teacher stress investigates how ELL teachers define work stress, including the identification of stressors and the measure of how frequent and how stressful they are to teachers. In the end, while it is clear
that ELL teachers are stressed, one teacher notes, “Many of these questions are about the challenges that go into teaching. I have stayed in the profession for over 30 years. It is a great job.”
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APPENDIX A: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Inclusion Criteria

1. Do you teach grades K-12 in a public school?
   a. Yes
   b. No (Selection of this response will be routed to end of survey)

2. How would you characterize your teaching role?
   a. ESL Teacher
   b. Bilingual Teacher
   c. ELL Teacher
   d. Other (Selection of this response will be routed to end of survey)

3. Do you spend part of your day working directly with students outside of the mainstream setting (i.e., push in, pull out, or separate classroom)?
   a. Yes
   b. No (Selection of this response will be routed to end of survey)

Additional Demographics

4. How old are you?
   a. 18-29
   b. 30-39
   c. 40-49
   d. 50-59
   e. 60+

5. What grade level do you teach (choose all that are applicable)?
   a. Kindergarten
   b. 1st grade
   c. 2nd grade
   d. 3rd grade
   e. 4th grade
   f. 5th grade
   g. 6th grade
   h. 7th grade
   i. 8th grade
   j. 9th grade (freshman)
k. 10th grade (sophomore)
l. 11th grade (junior)
m. 12th grade (senior)

6. How many years have you been teaching?
   a. 1-3 years
   b. 4-9 years
   c. 10-14 years
   d. 15-19 years
   e. 20-24 years
   f. 25-29 years
   g. 30+

7. What is your gender?
   a. Female
   b. Male

8. What is your highest level of education?
   a. High School Graduate
   b. Bachelor Degree
   c. Master Degree
   d. Doctoral Candidate
   e. Doctoral Degree

9. Is your school district:
   a. Urban
   b. Suburban
   c. Rural

10. Is your school a charter school?
    a. Yes
    b. No

11. What subjects do you currently teach (choose all that apply)?
    a. English
    b. Math
    c. History
    d. Science
    e. Health/P.E.
    f. Art
12. Do you hold state licensure/endorsement/special credential for teaching English Language Learners (ELL)?
   a. Yes
   b. No

13. What is your current job title?

14. What state do you teach in?

15. Approximately what percentage of your day is spent with English Language Learners (ELL)?

16. Approximately what percentage of your teaching load are English Language Learners (ELL)?

17. Approximately how many language groups other than English are represented in your classes?

18. What subjects do you currently teach?
APPENDIX B: ORIGINAL ELL TEACHER STRESS MEASURE (ETSM)

Instructions: Please think about your experiences within the last 3 months, then respond to the following questions.

Response Scale:

DID THIS HAPPEN IN THE LAST THREE MONTHS?

0 = yes; 1 = no

IF YES, HOW STRESSFUL WAS IT?

1 = not at all stressful, 2 = not very stressful, 3 = mildly stressful, 4 = fairly stressful, 5 = extremely stressful

SYSTEMIC IMPACTS

1. Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for federal and state (i.e., NCLB) mandated testing.
2. Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for mandatory language testing (i.e., ACCESS).
3. Not getting feedback about my students’ performance on mandated tests.
4. Being identified as a “not highly qualified” or “low performing” teacher by NCLB (No Child Left Behind).
5. Integrating mainstream content standards (or common core material) into my teaching.
6. Not having supplies necessary to do my job.
7. Not having information about my job next year.
8. Spending time meeting the targeted Annual Yearly Progress (AYP or smart goals) of my students.
9. No availability of, or poor quality of, ongoing training and/or professional development.
10. I had to deal with student reactions to mandated testing.
11. I had to supervise/manage the home language survey for newly registering students for the Central Office.
12. I had to communicate with the Central Office about the home language survey.

SOCIAL SUPPORT/CLIMATE

13. Administrators did not satisfactorily resolve a work problem that I brought to their attention.
14. I made a recommendation to the administration that they didn’t follow through on.
15. I made suggestions in recent meetings that were disregarded.
16. I had trouble finding other English Language Learner (ELL) teachers to talk to about a school-related issue.
17. I had a conversation with a mainstream teacher who was not at all supportive of English Language Learner (ELL) students.
18. I had to explain to a mainstream teacher about the circumstances of English Language Learner (ELL) students.

19. Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by school adults.

20. Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by other students.

21. Not having an on-site supervisor to consult with around work issues.

22. A school decision was made without my input that affected my classes.

**FORMAL JOB CHARACTERISTICS**

23. Having discipline problems in my classroom.

24. Students entering and leaving my classes throughout the school year.

25. Dealing with inappropriate placement of students in my classes, regarding English Language Learner (ELL) level.

26. Dealing with students with learning disabilities that are placed in my English Language Learner (ELL) classes.

27. Not having a regularly assigned classroom space throughout the day.

28. Teaching in an improvised or isolated space, such as hallways, stairwells, basements, or trailers.

29. Not having in-classroom volunteers or aides.

30. I was not invited to a meeting where decisions impacting my job as an English Language Learner (ELL) teacher were made.

31. Not having adequate time for curriculum planning, paperwork, and meetings.

32. I had to spend time differentiating instruction for a class of students who have a diverse range of learning abilities, language proficiencies, and needs.

33. Doing administrative paperwork that mainstream teachers didn’t have to do.

34. I had to track down a student who was absent.

35. I had to organize service learning/volunteer hours for my students.

36. I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school practices, including holding a pencil, opening a book, writing on paper, etc.

**INFORMAL JOB DUTIES**

37. Students pulled from the classroom for non-academic matters (such as for mental health counseling, acculturation groups, health skills, etc.).

38. I used my own money to buy classroom supplies.

39. I spent time and money outside of the classroom organizing drives or collections for clothing, food, and other daily necessities for my students.

40. I ran a program, or out-of-class activity, to help parents.

41. I attended to activities outside of the classroom to deal with inappropriate student placements.
42. Arranging for translation services/liaisons to facilitate communication with parents and/or family members.
43. Scheduling and holding parent-teacher conferences.
44. Getting parents to sign necessary school paperwork.
45. Student missed class for family reasons.
46. Providing professional development for mainstream staff.
47. I was asked by a mainstream teacher to discuss an English Language Learner (ELL) student issue with them.
48. Working after school and at home to get all of my job responsibilities done.
49. Advocating for my students outside of the classroom with other school personnel.
50. Spending time outside of class to develop acculturative lessons (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…).
51. Taking class time to discuss acculturative issues (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…).
52. Dealing with mental health issues in class.
53. I was not able to communicate with a student about a school or personal matter.
54. I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school policies and practices.
55. Explaining to students classroom expectations (leaving seat, raising hand, going to the bathroom, etc…).
56. Explaining to students school safety concerns, such as around heating elements, fire alarms, etc…

OTHER
57. Other:

Please provide information about any additional things that may have happened in your work as an ELL teacher that you experienced as stressful. Please pay particular attention to anything that this survey might have missed. Your feedback here is extremely valuable!
APPENDIX C: TEACHER STRESS INVENTORY (SHORT)

Instructions: Next, the following are a number of teacher concerns. Please identify those factors which cause you stress in your present position.

Read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. Then indicate how strong the feeling is when you experience it by circling the appropriate rating on the 5-point scale.

If you have not experienced this feeling, or the item is inappropriate for your position, circle number 1 (no strength, not noticeable).

Response Scale:
STRENGTH SCALE
1 = no strength, not noticeable to 5 = major strength, extremely noticeable

FACTOR 1: Personal/Professional Stressors
1. My personal priorities are being shortchanged due to time demands.
2. There is little time to prepare for my lessons/responsibilities.
3. The pace of school day is too fast.
4. My caseload is too big.
5. There is too much administrative paperwork in my job.
6. There is too much work to do.

FACTOR 2: Professional Distress/Professional Investment
7. I lack recognition for the extra work and/or good teaching I do.
8. I lack promotion and/or advancement opportunities.
9. I need more status and respect on my job.
10. I receive an inadequate salary for the work I do.
11. I am not progressing on my job as rapidly as I would like.
12. My personal opinions are not sufficiently aired
13. I lack of control over decisions made about classroom/school matters.
15. I lack opportunities for professional improvement.

FACTOR 3: Discipline and Motivation
16. I feel frustrated having to monitor pupil behavior.
17. I feel frustrated because of inadequate/poorly defined discipline policies.
18. I feel frustrated attempting to teach students who are poorly motivated.
19. I feel frustrated because of discipline problems in the classroom.
20. I feel frustrated when my authority is rejected by pupils/administration.
21. I feel frustrated because some students would do better if they tried.
APPENDIX D: MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY (ES-EDUCATOR SURVEY)

Instructions: Lastly, the following statements are about job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job.

If you have never had this feeling, choose the number “0” (zero = never).

If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by choosing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

Response Scale:
FREQUENCY SCALE
0 = never to 6 = every day

EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION (EE)
1. I feel emotionally drained from my work. (1)
2. I feel used up at the end of the workday. (2)
3. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job. (3)
4. Working with people all day is really a strain for me. (6)
5. I feel burned out from my work. (8)
6. I feel frustrated by my job. (13)
7. I feel I am working too hard on my job. (14)
8. Working with people directly puts too much stress on me. (16)
9. I feel like I’m at the end of my rope. (20)

PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT (PA)
10. I can easily understand how my students feel about things. (4)
11. I deal very effectively with the problems of my students. (7)
12. I feel I’m positively influencing other people’s lives through my work. (9)
13. I feel very energetic. (12)
14. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my students. (17)
15. I feel exhilarated after working closely with my students. (18)
16. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job. (19)
17. In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly. (21)

DEPERSONALIZATION (DP)
18. I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects. (5)
19. I’ve become more callous towards people since I took this job. (10)
20. I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally. (11)
21. I don’t really care what happens to some students. (15)
22. I feel that students blame me for some of their problems. (22)
### APPENDIX E: RANDOM NUMBER TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row #</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hello!

I am a doctoral student at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), in the Department of Psychology. I am interested in researching English Language Learner (ELL) teacher stress.

I have researched ELL teacher stress\(^9\) and developed a measure of ELL teacher stress for my doctoral dissertation. The next step is to recruit ELL teachers to complete this survey. I am interested in capturing the experiences of ELL teachers from diverse backgrounds and work settings.

I hope that you are willing to help me! If you:

1. teach in a public school in the United States,
2. are an ELL, ESL, or Bilingual teacher and
3. spend some portion of your day outside of the mainstream setting,

I would like to learn more about your work experiences! (Note that you must be over the age of 18.)

If you meet these requirements, please click on the following link to take the survey -- it should take approximately 30 minutes to complete. The survey is completely anonymous and has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at UIC. You may also choose to enter your email address into a drawing to win a $25 gift card from Amazon.com. No identifying information will be linked to your survey responses.

http://uicpsych.qualtrics.com/SE/?SId=SV_cHKWJr5vcYTyYQc

We think you will find this process interesting and your participation will be essential in increasing understanding of the unique experiences of ELL teachers. Thank you for your time and consideration!

Please pass this opportunity on widely to your colleagues and friends!

Sincerely,

Traci Weinstein

---

Traci Weinstein, Doctoral Candidate
tweins2@uic.edu
Community & Prevention Research
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois at Chicago
Behavioral Sciences Building #1080
1007 West Harrison Street (M/C 285)
Chicago, IL 60607
http://sites.google.com/site/tracilweinstein
APPENDIX G: SNOWBALLING EMAIL

Dear ___________,

I am working on my dissertation project, which involves asking ELL teachers about their work stress. Could you please disseminate the following email to any interested parties?

Much thanks for your help with this!

Sincerely,

Traci

*******************************************************************************

Hello!

I am a doctoral student at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), in the Department of Psychology. I am interested in researching English Language Learner (ELL) teacher stress.

I have researched ELL teacher stress and developed a measure of ELL teacher stress for my doctoral dissertation. The next step is to recruit ELL teachers to complete this survey. I am interested in capturing the experiences of ELL teachers from diverse backgrounds and work settings.

I hope that you are willing to help me! If you:

  (1) teach in a public school in the United States,
  (2) are an ELL, ESL, or Bilingual teacher and
  (3) spend some portion of your day outside of the mainstream setting,

I would like to learn more about your work experiences! (Note that you must be over the age of 18.)

If you meet these requirements, please click on the following link to take the survey -- it should take approximately 30 minutes to complete. The survey is completely anonymous and has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at UIC. You may also choose to enter your email address into a drawing to win a $25 gift card from Amazon.com. No identifying information will be linked to your survey responses.

[Link to survey]

We think you will find this process interesting and your participation will be essential in increasing understanding of the unique experiences of ELL teachers. Thank you for your time and consideration!

Please pass this opportunity on widely to your colleagues and friends!

Sincerely,

Traci Weinstein

******************************************************************************
Traci Weinstein, Doctoral Candidate
tweins2@uic.edu
Community & Prevention Research
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois at Chicago
Behavioral Sciences Building #1080
1007 West Harrison Street (M/C 285)
Chicago, IL 60607
http://sites.google.com/site/tracilweinstein
APPENDIX H: LISTSERVS USED FOR RECRUITMENT

TESOL:

- Adult Education
- Applied Linguistics
- Bilingual Education
- Computer-Assisted Language Learning
- Elementary Education
- English as a Foreign Language
- English for Specific Purposes
- Higher Education
- Intercultural Communication
- Intensive English Programs
- International Teaching Assistants
- Materials Writers
- Nonnative English Speakers in TESOL
- Program Administration
- Refugee Concerns
- Second Language Writing
- Secondary Schools
- Social Responsibility
- Speech, Pronunciation, and Listening
- Teacher Education
- Video and Digital Media

NABE:

ALASKA ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Phillip Farson, President
Karen Waters, 50600 Claire Drive, #10
Kenai, AK 99611
Tel: (907) 742-6030 or 858-7713
farson_philip@asdk12.org

ARIZONA ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Inactive
Ex-president: Vivian Martinez
vmartinez@azbilingualed.org

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION (CABE)
Gloria Inzunza-Franco, President
16033 E. San Bernardino Road
Covina, CA 91722

Tel: (626) 814-4441
Fax: (626) 814-4640
Gloria.inzunza-franco@csulb.edu
www.bilingualeducation.org

Janet Gustafson, Executive Director CABE
16033 E. San Bernardino Rd
Covina, CA 91722
Tel: (626) 814-4441
Fax: (626) 814-4640
jgcorea@bilingualeducation.org
www.bilingualeducation.org

CAPITAL AREA NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Inactive
Ex-president: Dr. Jorge P. Osterling
josterli@amu.edu
BILINGUAL ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA
Elvia Hernández, President
P.O. Box 440042
Miami, FL 33144
Tel: (305) 318-6411
ehern047@fiu.edu

FLORIDA ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION SUPERVISORS (FABES)
Dr. Margarita Pinkos, President
Palm Beach County Public Schools
ESOL/Multicultural Department
3388 Forest Hill Blvd, Suite A 204
West Palm Beach, FL 33411
Tel: (561) 434-8010;
(561) 644-5942
margarita.pinkos@palmbeachschools.org

IDAHO ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Irene Chavolla, President
6549 E. Lewis Lane
Nampa, ID 83686
Tel: (208) 467-7697
Irenechavolla@aol.com;
ichavoll@sde.state.id.us

KANSAS ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Abdelilah Salim Sehlaoui, President
Emporia University
1200 Commercial Street
Emporia, KS 66801
Tel: (316) 685-2662
sehloua@emporia.edu

LOUISIANA ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Nilda M. Aguirre, President
NABE Conference Coordinator
43110 Holder Lane
Hammond, LA 70403
Tel: (225) 209-0224
nma226@gmail.com
www.labe.us

MARYLAND ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Dr. Millicent I. Kusher, President,
University of Maryland
Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction
Education and Culture
2311 Benjamin Building
College Park, MD 20742
Tel: (301) 405-3324

MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Phyllis Hardy, President
45 Lakeview Terrace
Ashland, MA 01721
Tel: (508) 934-6317
phyllis_hardy@brown.edu;
massmabe@gmail.com
www.massmabe.com

MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Kathy Walcott, President
walcottjk@gmail.com

NJTESOL/NEW JERSEY BILINGUAL EDUCATORS
Cassandra Lawrence, President
Perth Amboy Public Schools
Wyckoff, NJ 07481
clawrence@njtesol-njbe.org
www.njtesol-njbe.org

NEW MEXICO ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION (NMABE)
Florence Acque, President
P.O. Box 5190
Clovis, NM 88102-5190
Tel: (505) 238-6812
Fax: (505) 238-6812
nmabe@suddenlink.net
www.nmabe.net

David Briseño, Executive Director
P.O. Box 5190
Clovis, NM 88102-5190
Tel: (505) 238-6812
Fax: (505) 238-6812
nmabe@suddenlink.net
www.nmabe.net
NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION (NYSABE)
Dr. Awilda Ramos Zagarri, President
NYSABE, New York University-
Metropolitan Center for Urban Education
726 Broadway, 5th Floor
New York, NY 10003
Tel : (716) 677-4234
Fax : (716) 878-5410
sisisall@gmail.com
www.nysabe.net

Nancy Villarreal de Adler, Executive Director
NYSABE, New York University
Metropolitan Center for Urban Education
726 Broadway, 5th Floor
New York, NY 10003
Tel : (212) 998-5104
Fax : (212) 995-4199
nancyvill@aol.com

OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Lynore Carnuccio, President
189 W. 15th Street
Edmond, OK 73013
Tel : (405) 715-1116 ext. 313
doc@thelanguagecompany.com

OREGON ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Liliana Heller-Mafria, President
Portland State University
Graduate School of Education
1399 Boca Ratan Drive
Lake Oswego, OR 97034
Tel : (503) 675-7458
hellermafrica@comcast.net;
lheller@pdx.edu

PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Inactive
Ex-president: Margaret Chin

SOUTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL BICULTURAL EDUCATION
Maurice Twiss, President
P.O. Box 109
Batesland, SD 57716
Tel : (605) 288-1921
Fax : (605) 288-1814
mtwiss@shannon.ws

TEXAS ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Dr. Judith Marquez, President
University of Houston-Clear Lake
2700 Bay Area Blvd.
Houston, TX 77058
Tel : (281) 283-3591
marquez@uhcl.edu
www.tabeb.org

José Hernández, Executive Director
110 Broadway, Suite 480
San Antonio, TX 78205
Tel : (915)747-5572, 1-800-822-3930
jhernan5@earthlink.net;
tabe@sbcglobal.net

UTAH ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Nayibe Garcia, President
nayibe.garcia@slcschools.org

WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
David Irwin, President
11273 Third Street
Mount Vernon, WA 98273
Tel : (360) 903-0131
dave@langdevopps.com
www.wabewa.org

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Antonio Rodriguez, President
P.O. Box 340192
Milwaukee, WI 53234-0192
Tel : (414) 902-1669
rodrigax@milwaukee.k12.wi.us
www.wiabe.org
APPENDIX I: FINAL ELL TEACHER STRESS MEASURE (ETSM)

Instructions: Please think about your experiences within the last 3 months, then respond to the following questions.

Response Scale:
DID THIS HAPPEN IN THE LAST THREE MONTHS?
0 = yes; 1 = no
IF YES, HOW STRESSFUL WAS IT?
1 = not at all stressful, 2 = not very stressful, 3 = mildly stressful, 4 = fairly stressful, 5 = extremely stressful

SYSTEMIC IMPACTS
1. Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for federal and state (i.e., NCLB) mandated testing. (1)
2. Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for mandatory language testing (i.e., ACCESS). (2)
3. Integrating mainstream content standards (or common core material) into my teaching. (5)
4. Not having information about my job next year. (7)
5. Spending time meeting the targeted Annual Yearly Progress (AYP or smart goals) of my students. (8)
6. No availability of, or poor quality of, ongoing training and/or professional development. (9)
7. I had to deal with student reactions to mandated testing. (10)
8. I had to supervise/manage the home language survey for newly registering students for the Central Office. (11)

SOCIAL SUPPORT/CLIMATE
9. I made a recommendation to the administration that they didn’t follow through on. (14)
10. I made suggestions in recent meetings that were disregarded. (15)
11. I had trouble finding other English Language Learner (ELL) teachers to talk to about a school-related issue. (16)
12. I had a conversation with a mainstream teacher who was not at all supportive of English Language Learner (ELL) students. (17)
13. I had to explain to a mainstream teacher about the circumstances of English Language Learner (ELL) students. (18)
14. Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by school adults. (19)
15. Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by other students. (20)
16. Not having an on-site supervisor to consult with around work issues. (21)

FORMAL JOB CHARACTERISTICS
17. Students entering and leaving my classes throughout the school year. (24)
18. Dealing with inappropriate placement of students in my classes, regarding English Language Learner (ELL) level. (25)
19. Dealing with students with learning disabilities that are placed in my English Language Learner (ELL) classes. (26)
20. Teaching in an improvised or isolated space, such as hallways, stairwells, basements, or trailers. (28)
21. Not having in-classroom volunteers or aides. (29)
22. I was not invited to a meeting where decisions impacting my job as an English Language Learner (ELL) teacher were made. (30)
23. I had to spend time differentiating instruction for a class of students who have a diverse range of learning abilities, language proficiencies, and needs. (32)
24. Doing administrative paperwork that mainstream teachers didn’t have to do. (33)
25. I had to track down a student who was absent. (34)
26. I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school practices, including holding a pencil, opening a book, writing on paper, etc…. (36)

INFORMAL JOB DUTIES
27. Students pulled from the classroom for non-academic matters (such as for mental health counseling, acculturation groups, health skills, etc…). (37)
28. I spent time and money outside of the classroom organizing drives or collections for clothing, food, and other daily necessities for my students. (39)
29. I ran a program, or out-of-class activity, to help parents. (40)
30. I attended to activities outside of the classroom to deal with inappropriate student placements. (41)
31. Arranging for translation services/liaisons to facilitate communication with parents and/or family members. (42)
32. Getting parents to sign necessary school paperwork. (44)
33. Providing professional development for mainstream staff. (46)
34. I was asked by a mainstream teacher to discuss an English Language Learner (ELL) student issue with them. (47)
35. Advocating for my students outside of the classroom with other school personnel. (49)
36. Spending time outside of class to develop acculturative lessons (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…). (50)
37. Taking class time to discuss acculturative issues (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…). (51)
38. Dealing with mental health issues in class. (52)
39. I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school policies and practices. (54)
40. Explaining to students classroom expectations (leaving seat, raising hand, going to the bathroom, etc…). (55)

OTHER

41. Other:
Please provide information about any additional things that may have happened in your work as an ELL teacher that you experienced as stressful. Please pay particular attention to anything that this survey might have missed. Your feedback here is extremely valuable!

________________________________________________________
**Figure 1: Participant Age**

*Figure 1.* Participant age
**Figure 2: Grade Levels Taught By Participants**

![Grade Levels Taught](chart.png)

*Figure 2. Participant grade levels taught*
Figure 3: Number of Years Teaching

Figure 3. Participant years teaching
Figure 4: Participant subjects taught
**Figure 5: Descriptive Statistics for Whole Measures**

![Diagram showing descriptive statistics](image)

*Figure 5. Descriptive statistics by measure*
### Figure 6: Linear Model of Original ETSM Items by Severity and Frequency

1-12: Systemic  
13-22: Social  
23-36: Formal  
37-56: Informal  

#### Severity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>56</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Frequency:

| 4 | 28 | 12 | 7 | 41 | 21 | 54 | 45 | 44 | 5 | 47 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| 27 | 53 | 56 | 40 | 19 | 46 | 30 | 51 | 2 | 42 | 10 | 55 | 31 | 33 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 15 | 25 | 8 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
**Figure 7: Linear Model of Final ETSM Items by Severity and Frequency**

1-12: Systemic
13-22: Social
23-36: Formal
37-56: Informal

Items Removed: 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, 22, 23, 27, 31, 35, 38, 43, 45, 48, 53, 56

| Severity | 39 | 50 | 28 | 11 | 16 | 36 | 9 | 4 | 37 | 0 | 17 | 52 | 20 | 29 | 14 | 4 | 42 | 0 | 26 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 32 | 16 | 36 | 9 | 4 | 37 | 0 | 17 | 52 | 20 | 29 | 14 | 4 | 42 | 0 | 26 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 32 | 39 | 50 | 28 | 11 | 16 | 36 | 9 | 4 | 37 | 0 | 17 | 52 | 20 | 29 | 14 | 4 | 42 | 0 | 26 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 32 | 7 | 41 | 21 | 54 | 44 | 47 | 40 | 19 | 46 | 30 | 51 | 2 | 10 | 55 | 33 | 14 | 24 | 49 | 15 | 25 | 8 |

| Frequency | 39 | 50 | 28 | 11 | 16 | 36 | 9 | 4 | 37 | 0 | 17 | 52 | 20 | 29 | 14 | 4 | 42 | 0 | 26 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 32 | 7 | 41 | 21 | 54 | 44 | 47 | 40 | 19 | 46 | 30 | 51 | 2 | 10 | 55 | 33 | 14 | 24 | 49 | 15 | 25 | 8 |
**Figure 8: Descriptive Statistics for Original and Final ETSM (Severity)**

*Figure 8.* Means for original and final ETSM (severity)
Figure 9: Descriptive Statistics for Original and Final ETSM (Frequency)

Figure 9. Means for original and final ETSM (frequency)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETSM</td>
<td>.39 (f); 3.24 (s)</td>
<td>.17 (f); .57 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic Impacts</td>
<td>.43 (f); 3.29 (s)</td>
<td>.21 (f); .77 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support/Climate</td>
<td>.46 (f); 3.55 (s)</td>
<td>.29 (f); .78 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Job Characteristics</td>
<td>.38 (f); 3.46 (s)</td>
<td>.19 (f); .56 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Job Duties</td>
<td>.34 (f); 2.93 (s)</td>
<td>.18 (f); .59 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSI</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Professional Stressors</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Distress/Investment</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline and Motivation</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBI</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 98
## Table 2: Original ETSM Items with Frequency and Severity by Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Occurrence (^{11}) # times endorsed</th>
<th>Severity (mean, SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYSTEMIC IMPACTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for federal and state (i.e., NCLB) mandated testing.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.51 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for mandatory language testing (i.e., ACCESS).</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.27 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not getting feedback about my students’ performance on mandated tests.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.23 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Being identified as a “not highly qualified” or “low performing” teacher by NCLB (No Child Left Behind).</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.64 (1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Integrating mainstream content standards (or common core material) into my teaching.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.96 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Not having supplies necessary to do my job.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.97 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Not having information about my job next year.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.98 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spending time meeting the targeted Annual Yearly Progress (AYP or smart goals) of my students.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.46 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No availability of, or poor quality of, ongoing training and/or professional development.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.60 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I had to deal with student reactions to mandated testing.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.19 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I had to supervise/manage the home language survey for newly registering students for the Central Office.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.76 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I had to communicate with the Central Office about the home language survey.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.55 (1.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL SUPPORT/CLIMATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Administrators did not satisfactorily resolve a work problem that I brought to their attention.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.87 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I made a recommendation to the administration that they didn’t follow through on.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.81 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I made suggestions in recent meetings that were disregarded.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.66 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I had trouble finding other English Language Learner (ELL) teachers to talk to about a school-related issue.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.41 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I had a conversation with a mainstream teacher who was not at all supportive of English Language Learner (ELL) students.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.07 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I had to explain to a mainstream teacher about the circumstances of English Language Learner (ELL) students.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.82 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by school adults.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.91 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by other students.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.59 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Not having an on-site supervisor to consult with around work issues.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.13 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) Note: Given that the total sample size is 98 (i.e, 2 points away from 100), the ranking number (# of times endorsed) is also indicative of the percentage that ranking represents. For example, for item 1, 83 represents both the number of times the items was endorsed, as well as the overall percentage that item represents.
A school decision was made without my input that affected my classes.

### FORMAL JOB CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>A school decision was made without my input that affected my classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Having discipline problems in my classroom.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Students entering and leaving my classes throughout the school year.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Dealing with inappropriate placement of students in my classes, regarding English Language Learner (ELL) level.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Dealing with students with learning disabilities that are placed in my English Language Learner (ELL) classes.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Not having a regularly assigned classroom space throughout the day.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Teaching in an improvised or isolated space, such as hallways, stairwells, basements, or trailers.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Not having in-classroom volunteers or aides.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I was not invited to a meeting where decisions impacting my job as an English Language Learner (ELL) teacher were made.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Not having adequate time for curriculum planning, paperwork, and meetings.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I had to spend time differentiating instruction for a class of students who have a diverse range of learning abilities, language proficiencies, and needs.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Doing administrative paperwork that mainstream teachers didn’t have to do.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I had to track down a student who was absent.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I had to organize service learning/volunteer hours for my students.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school practices, including holding a pencil, opening a book, writing on paper, etc….</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INFORMAL JOB DUTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Students pulled from the classroom for non-academic matters (such as for mental health counseling, acculturation groups, health skills, etc…).</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I used my own money to buy classroom supplies.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I spent time and money outside of the classroom organizing drives or collections for clothing, food, and other daily necessities for my students.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I ran a program, or out-of-class activity, to help parents.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I attended to activities outside of the classroom to deal with inappropriate student placements.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Arranging for translation services/liaisons to facilitate communication with parents and/or family members.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Scheduling and holding parent-teacher conferences.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Getting parents to sign necessary school paperwork.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Student missed class for family reasons.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Providing professional development for mainstream staff.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I was asked by a mainstream teacher to discuss an English Language Learner (ELL) student issue with</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Working after school and at home to get all of my job responsibilities done.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Advocating for my students outside of the classroom with other school personnel.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Spending time outside of class to develop acculturative lessons (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…).</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Taking class time to discuss acculturative issues (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…).</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Dealing with mental health issues in class.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>I was not able to communicate with a student about a school or personal matter.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school policies and practices.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Explaining to students classroom expectations (leaving seat, raising hand, going to the bathroom, etc…).</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Explaining to students school safety concerns, such as around heating elements, fire alarms, etc…</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Original ETSM Item Ranking by Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Occurrence # times endorsed</th>
<th>Severity (mean, SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working after school and at home to get all of my job responsibilities done. (48)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.99 (.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to spend time differentiating instruction for a class of students who have a diverse range of learning abilities, language proficiencies, and needs. (32)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.54 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing administrative paperwork that mainstream teachers didn’t have to do. (33)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.57 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was asked by a mainstream teacher to discuss an English Language Learner (ELL) student issue with them. (47)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.34 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having adequate time for curriculum planning, paperwork, and meetings. (31)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.33 (.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating mainstream content standards (or common core material) into my teaching. (5)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.96 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I used my own money to buy classroom supplies. (38)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.07 (1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for federal and state (i.e., NCLB) mandated testing. (1)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.51 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with students with learning disabilities that are placed in my English Language Learner (ELL) classes. (26)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.56 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time meeting the targeted Annual Yearly Progress (AYP or smart goals) of my students. (8)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.46 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for my students outside of the classroom with other school personnel. (49)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.20 (1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining to students classroom expectations (leaving seat, raising hand, going to the bathroom, etc…). (55)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.53 (1.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and holding parent-teacher conferences. (43)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.11 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to deal with student reactions to mandated testing. (10)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.19 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting parents to sign necessary school paperwork. (44)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.10 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging for translation services/liaisons to facilitate communication with parents and/or family members. (42)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.26 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student missed class for family reasons. (45)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.83 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for mandatory language testing (i.e., ACCESS). (2)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.27 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school policies and practices. (54)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.63 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with inappropriate placement of students in my classes, regarding English Language Learner (ELL) level. (25)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.58 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students entering and leaving my classes throughout the school year. (24)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.10 (.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking class time to discuss acculturative issues (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…). (51)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.26 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made a recommendation to the administration that they didn’t follow through on. (14)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.81 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having discipline problems in my classroom. (23)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.46 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having in-classroom volunteers or aides. (29)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.08 (1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by other students. (20)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.59 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with mental health issues in class. (52)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.63 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having supplies necessary to do my job. (6)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.97 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a conversation with a mainstream teacher who was not at all supportive of English Language Learner (ELL) students. (17)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.07 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not invited to a meeting where decisions impacting my job as an English Language Learner (ELL) teacher were made. (30)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.62 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having an on-site supervisor to consult with around work issues. (21)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.13 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing professional development for mainstream staff. (46)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.02 (1.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attended to activities outside of the classroom to deal with inappropriate student placements. (41)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.93 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students pulled from the classroom for non-academic matters (such as for mental health counseling, acculturation groups, health skills, etc…). (37)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.83 (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by school adults. (19)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.91 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made suggestions in recent meetings that were disregarded. (15)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.66 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to track down a student who was absent. (34)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.19 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having information about my job next year. (7)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.98 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ran a program, or out-of-class activity, to help parents. (40)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.85 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A school decision was made without my input that affected my classes. (22)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.98 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No availability of, or poor quality of, ongoing training and/or professional development. (9)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.60 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to communicate with the Central Office about the home language survey. (12)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.55 (1.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining to students school safety concerns, such as around heating elements, fire alarms, etc… (56)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.23 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators did not satisfactorily resolve a work problem that I brought to their attention. (13)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.87 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school practices, including holding a pencil, opening a book, writing on paper, etc…. (36)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.47 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had trouble finding other English Language Learner (ELL) teachers to talk to about a school-related issue. (16)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.41 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not getting feedback about my students’ performance on mandated tests. (3)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.23 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to supervise/manage the home language survey for newly registering students for the Central Office. (11)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.76 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in an improvised or isolated space, such as hallways, stairwells, basements, or trailers. (28)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.64 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not able to communicate with a student about a school or personal matter. (53)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.61 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time outside of class to develop acculturative lessons (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…). (50)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.74 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to organize service learning/volunteer hours for my students. (35)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.85 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spent time and money outside of the classroom organizing drives or collections for clothing, food, and other daily necessities for my students. (39)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.60 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being identified as a “not highly qualified” or “low performing” teacher by NCLB (No Child Left Behind). (4)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.64 (1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having a regularly assigned classroom space throughout the day. (27)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.54 (1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Occurrence # times endorsed</td>
<td>Severity (mean, SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having adequate time for curriculum planning, paperwork, and meetings. (31)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.33 (.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a conversation with a mainstream teacher who was not at all supportive of English Language Learner (ELL) students. (17)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.07 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working after school and at home to get all of my job responsibilities done. (48)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.99 (.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having information about my job next year. (7)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.98 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A school decision was made without my input that affected my classes. (22)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.98 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having supplies necessary to do my job. (6)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.97 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by school adults. (19)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.91 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators did not satisfactorily resolve a work problem that I brought to their attention. (13)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.87 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made a recommendation to the administration that they didn’t follow through on. (14)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.81 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made suggestions in recent meetings that were disregarded. (15)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.66 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in an improvised or isolated space, such as hallways, stairwells, basements, or trailers. (28)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.64 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with mental health issues in class. (52)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.63 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not invited to a meeting where decisions impacting my job as an English Language Learner (ELL) teacher were made. (30)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.62 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not able to communicate with a student about a school or personal matter. (53)</td>
<td>IFD</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.61 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No availability of, or poor quality of, ongoing training and/or professional development. (9)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.60 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by other students. (20)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.59 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with inappropriate placement of students in my classes, regarding English Language Learner (ELL) level. (25)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.58 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing administrative paperwork that mainstream teachers didn’t have to do. (33)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.57 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with students with learning disabilities that are placed in my English Language Learner (ELL) classes. (26)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.56 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having a regularly assigned classroom space throughout the day. (27)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.54 (1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to spend time differentiating instruction for a class of students who have a diverse range of learning abilities, language proficiencies, and needs. (32)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.54 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for federal and state (i.e., NCLB) mandated testing. (1)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.51 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time meeting the targeted Annual Yearly Progress (AYP or smart goals) of my students. (8)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.46 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having discipline problems in my classroom. (23)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.46 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had trouble finding other English Language Learner (ELL) teachers to talk to about a school-related issue. (16)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.41 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for mandatory language testing (i.e., ACCESS). (2)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.27 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging for translation services/ liaisons to facilitate communication with parents and/or family members. (42)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.26 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not getting feedback about my students’ performance on mandated tests. (3)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.23 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for my students outside of the classroom with other school personnel. (49)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.20 (1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to track down a student who was absent. (34)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.19 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to deal with student reactions to mandated testing. (10)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.19 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having an on-site supervisor to consult with around work issues. (21)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.13 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and holding parent-teacher conferences. (43)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.11 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting parents to sign necessary school paperwork. (44)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.10 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students entering and leaving my classes throughout the school year. (24)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.10 (.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having in-classroom volunteers or aides. (29)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.08 (1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I used my own money to buy classroom supplies. (38)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.07 (1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing professional development for mainstream staff. (46)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.02 (1.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating mainstream content standards (or common core material) into my teaching. (5)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.96 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attended to activities outside of the classroom to deal with inappropriate student placements. (41)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.93 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to organize service learning/volunteer hours for my students. (35)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.85 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ran a program, or out-of-class activity, to help parents. (40)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.85 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students pulled from the classroom for non-academic matters (such as for mental health counseling, acculturation groups, health skills, etc…). (37)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.83 (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student missed class for family reasons. (45)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.83 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to explain to a mainstream teacher about the circumstances of English Language Learner (ELL) students. (18)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.82 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to supervise/manage the home language survey for newly registering students for the Central Office. (11)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.76 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time outside of class to develop acculturative lessons (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…). (50)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.74 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being identified as a “not highly qualified” or “low performing” teacher by NCLB (No Child Left Behind). (4)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.64 (1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school policies and practices. (54)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.63 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spent time and money outside of the classroom organizing drives or collections for clothing, food, and other daily necessities for my students. (39)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.60 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to communicate with the Central Office about the home language survey. (12)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.55 (1.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining to students classroom expectations (leaving seat, raising hand, going to the bathroom, etc…). (55)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.53 (1.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Score (Median)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school practices, including holding a pencil, opening a book, writing on paper, etc…. (36)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.47 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was asked by a mainstream teacher to discuss an English Language Learner (ELL) student issue with them. (47)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.34 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking class time to discuss acculturative issues (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…). (51)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.26 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining to students school safety concerns, such as around heating elements, fire alarms, etc… (56)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.23 (.94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5: Correlation Table of Demographics by Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.ETSM (f)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.82***</td>
<td>- .28**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.ETSM (s)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.TSI</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.MBI</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Age</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Gender</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grade</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Education</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.Licensure</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.Years Teaching</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 98. *p < .05. **p < .01.
Gender (0 = female, 1 = male); Licensure (0 = yes, 1 = no); Charter School (0 = yes, 1 = no);
Age (1 = 18-29; 2 = 30-39; 3 = 40-49; 4 = 50-59; 5 = 60+); Grade (1 = K; 2 = ES; 3 = MS; 4 = HS);
Education (1 = HS; 2 = BA/BS; 3 = MA/MS; 4 = Doctoral Candidate; 5 = PhD); Years Teaching (1 = 1-3; 2 = 4-9; 3 = 10-14; 4 = 15-19; 5 = 20-24; 6 = 25-29; 7 = 30+)
### Table 6: Correlation Table of ETSM Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Systemic Impacts (f)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.84**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Systemic Impacts (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social Support/Climate (f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.94**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Support/Climate (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Formal Job Characteristics (f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.82**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Formal Job Characteristics (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Informal Job Duties (f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Informal Job Duties (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 98. *p < .05. **p < .01.*
TABLE 7: CONFIDENCE INTERVAL AND STANDARD ERROR FOR ETSM SEVERITY IN RANK ORDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Occurrence # times endorsed</th>
<th>Severity (mean, SD)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not having adequate time for curriculum planning, paperwork, and meetings. (31)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.33 (.75)</td>
<td>4.18 – 4.49</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a conversation with a mainstream teacher who was not at all supportive of English Language Learner (ELL) students. (17)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.07 (1.06)</td>
<td>3.79 – 4.35</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working after school and at home to get all of my job responsibilities done. (48)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.99 (.98)</td>
<td>3.79 – 4.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having information about my job next year. (7)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.98 (1.16)</td>
<td>3.66 – 4.30</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A school decision was made without my input that affected my classes. (22)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.98 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.69 – 4.27</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having supplies necessary to do my job. (6)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.97 (1.03)</td>
<td>3.70 – 4.24</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by school adults. (19)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.91 (1.21)</td>
<td>3.57 – 4.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators did not satisfactorily resolve a work problem that I brought to their attention. (13)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.87 (1.29)</td>
<td>3.48 – 4.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made a recommendation to the administration that they didn’t follow through on. (14)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.81 (1.18)</td>
<td>3.52 – 4.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made suggestions in recent meetings that were disregarded. (15)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.66 (1.14)</td>
<td>3.35 – 3.98</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in an improvised or isolated space, such as hallways, stairwells, basements, or trailers. (28)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.64 (1.33)</td>
<td>3.19 – 4.09</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with mental health issues in class. (52)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.63 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.36 – 3.91</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not invited to a meeting where decisions impacting my job as an English Language Learner (ELL) teacher were made. (30)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.62 (1.36)</td>
<td>3.26 – 3.99</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not able to communicate with a student about a school or personal matter. (53)</td>
<td>IFD</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.61 (1.10)</td>
<td>3.24 – 3.98</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No availability of, or poor quality of, ongoing training and/or professional development. (9)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.60 (1.25)</td>
<td>3.24 – 3.97</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by other students. (20)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.59 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.32 – 3.86</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with inappropriate placement of students in my classes, regarding English Language Learner (ELL) level. (25)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.58 (1.04)</td>
<td>3.33 – 3.83</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing administrative paperwork that mainstream teachers didn’t have to do. (33)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.57 (1.08)</td>
<td>3.35 – 3.80</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with students with learning disabilities that are placed in my English Language Learner (ELL) classes. (26)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.56 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.33 – 3.80</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having a regularly assigned classroom space throughout the day. (27)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.54 (1.43)</td>
<td>2.98 – 4.09</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to spend time differentiating instruction for a class of students who have a diverse range of learning abilities, language proficiencies, and needs. (32)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.54 (.92)</td>
<td>3.35 – 3.73</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for federal and state (i.e., NCLB) mandated testing. (1)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.51 (1.12)</td>
<td>3.26 – 3.75</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time meeting the targeted Annual Yearly Progress (AYP or smart goals) of my students. (8)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.46 (1.10)</td>
<td>3.21 – 3.70</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having discipline problems in my classroom. (23)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.46 (.94)</td>
<td>3.23 – 3.69</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had trouble finding other English Language Learner (ELL) teachers to talk to about a school-related issue. (16)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.41 (1.22)</td>
<td>3.03 – 3.80</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for mandatory language testing (i.e., ACCESS). (2)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.27 (1.17)</td>
<td>2.99 – 3.55</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging for translation services/lliaisons to facilitate communication with parents and/or family members. (42)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.26 (1.20)</td>
<td>2.99 – 3.53</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not getting feedback about my students’ performance on mandated tests. (3)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.23 (1.25)</td>
<td>2.83 – 3.62</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for my students outside of the classroom with other school personnel. (49)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.20 (1.15)</td>
<td>2.94 – 3.45</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to track down a student who was absent. (34)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.19 (1.13)</td>
<td>2.88 – 3.50</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to deal with student reactions to mandated testing. (10)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.19 (1.08)</td>
<td>2.95 – 3.44</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having an on-site supervisor to consult with around work issues. (21)</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.13 (1.13)</td>
<td>2.82 – 3.43</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and holding parent-teacher conferences. (43)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.11 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.87 – 3.36</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting parents to sign necessary school paperwork. (44)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.10 (1.04)</td>
<td>2.87 – 3.34</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students entering and leaving my classes throughout the school year. (24)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.10 (.96)</td>
<td>2.87 – 3.33</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having in-classroom volunteers or aides. (29)</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.08 (1.27)</td>
<td>2.76 – 3.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I used my own money to buy classroom supplies. (38)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.07 (1.15)</td>
<td>2.83 – 3.31</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing professional development for mainstream staff. (46)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.02 (1.11)</td>
<td>2.72 – 3.32</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating mainstream content standards (or common core material) into my teaching. (5)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.96 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.73 – 3.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attended to activities outside of the classroom to deal with</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.93 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.63 – 3.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inappropriate student placements. (41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to organize service learning/volunteer hours for my</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.85 (1.28)</td>
<td>2.40 – 3.30</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students. (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ran a program, or out-of-class activity, to help parents.</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.85 (1.18)</td>
<td>2.52 – 3.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students pulled from the classroom for non-academic</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.83 (1.19)</td>
<td>2.53 – 3.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matters (such as for mental health counseling, acculturation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups, health skills, etc…). (37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student missed class for family reasons. (45)</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.83 (1.13)</td>
<td>2.58 – 3.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to explain to a mainstream teacher about the</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.82 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.61 – 3.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumstances of English Language Learner (ELL) students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to supervise/manage the home language survey for</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.74 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.37 – 3.10</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newly registering students for the Central Office. (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time outside of class to develop acculturative</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.76 (1.34)</td>
<td>2.31 – 3.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lessons (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…). (50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being identified as a “not highly qualified” or “low</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.64 (1.59)</td>
<td>2.03 – 3.26</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performing” teacher by NCLB (No Child Left Behind). (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.63 (1.14)</td>
<td>2.36 – 2.90</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school policies and practices. (54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spent time and money outside of the classroom organizing drives or</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.60 (1.22)</td>
<td>2.14 – 3.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collections for clothing, food, and other daily necessities for my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students. (39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to communicate with the Central Office about the</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.55 (1.32)</td>
<td>2.17 – 2.94</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home language survey. (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining to students classroom expectations (leaving seat,</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.53 (1.11)</td>
<td>2.29 – 2.78</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raising hand, going to the bathroom, etc…). (55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.47 (1.12)</td>
<td>2.12 – 2.81</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school practices, including holding a pencil, opening a book, writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on paper, etc…. (36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was asked by a mainstream teacher to discuss an English Language</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.34 (1.20)</td>
<td>2.09 – 2.59</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner (ELL) student issue with them. (47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking class time to discuss acculturative issues (teaching hygiene,</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.26 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.02 – 2.50</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the U.S., etc…). (51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining to students school safety concerns, such as</td>
<td>IJD</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.23 (.94)</td>
<td>1.96 – 2.51</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around heating elements, fire alarms, etc… (56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR WHOLE MEASURES AND DOMAINS (FINAL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETSM</td>
<td>.37 (f); 3.18 (s)</td>
<td>.19 (f); .58 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic Impacts</td>
<td>.35 (f); 3.29 (s)</td>
<td>.23 (f); .77 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support/Climate</td>
<td>.44 (f); 3.42 (s)</td>
<td>.29 (f); .81 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Job Characteristics</td>
<td>.35 (f); 3.36 (s)</td>
<td>.21 (f); .60(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Job Duties</td>
<td>.37 (f); 2.83 (s)</td>
<td>.21 (f); .65 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSI</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Professional Stressors</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Distress/Investment</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline and Motivation</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBI</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 98
## Table 9: Discriminant Validity Model of ETSM (Severity) Predicting Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Variable</th>
<th>Original (56 items)</th>
<th>Final (40 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$R^2_{\text{change}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic Variables</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>4.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TSI</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ETSM (severity)</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .41, F(4,91) = 15.85, p = .000$

$R^2 = .41, F(4,91) = 15.62, p = .000$

*Note. Gender (0 = female, 1 = male)*

*p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .001*
### Table 10: Discriminant Validity Model of ETSM (Frequency) Predicting Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Variable</th>
<th>Original (56 items)</th>
<th>Final (40 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>$R^2_{change}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic Variables</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>4.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TSI</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ETSM (frequency)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .38, F(4,91) = 13.65, p = .000$

$R^2 = .37, F(4,91) = 13.62, p = .000$

*Note. Gender (0 = female, 1 = male)*

*p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .001
### Table 11: Whole-Measure Model of ETSM (Severity) Predicting Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Variable</th>
<th>Original (56 items)</th>
<th>Final (40 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$R^2_{\text{change}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic Variables</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>4.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ETSM</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .27, F(3,92) = 12.89, p = .000$

$R^2 = .27, F(3,92) = 11.25, p = .000$

*Note. Gender (0 = female, 1 = male)*

* $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$
TABLE 12: WHOLE-MEASURE MODEL OF ETSM (FREQUENCY) PREDICTING BURNOUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Variable</th>
<th>Original (56 items)</th>
<th>Final (40 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( R^2_{\text{change}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic Variables</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>4.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ETSM</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 = .09, F(3,92) = 3.06, p = .03 \)

\( R^2 = .09, F(3,92) = 3.01, p = .03 \)

*Note.* Gender (0 = female, 1 = male)

\*p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Variable</th>
<th>Original (56 items)</th>
<th>Final (40 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>$R^2_{\text{change}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic Variables</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>4.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ETSM</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>8.76***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic Impacts</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support/Climate</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Job Characteristics</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Job Duties</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .37, F(6,81) = 8.07, p = .000$  

$R^2 = .33, F(6,83) = 6.93, p = .000$

*Note.* Gender (0 = female, 1 = male)

*p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step/Variable</th>
<th>Original (56 items)</th>
<th>Final (40 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( R^2_{\text{change}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ETSM</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic Impacts</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support/Climate</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Job Characteristics</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Job Duties</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 = .14, F(6,89) = 2.44, p = .03 \)

\( R^2 = .12, F(6,89) = 1.22, ns \)

*Note.* Gender (0 = female, 1 = male)

*p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .001*
### TABLE 15: FINAL ETSM ITEMS WITH FREQUENCY AND SEVERITY BY DOMAIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Severity (mean, SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYSTEMIC IMPACTS (8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for federal and state (i.e., NCLB) mandated testing.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.51 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for mandatory language testing (i.e., ACCESS).</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.27 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integrating mainstream content standards (or common core material) into my teaching.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.96 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not having information about my job next year.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.98 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Spending time meeting the targeted Annual Yearly Progress (AYP or smart goals) of my students.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.46 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No availability of, or poor quality of, ongoing training and/or professional development.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.60 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I had to deal with student reactions to mandated testing.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.19 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I had to supervise/manage the home language survey for newly registering students for the Central Office.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.76 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL SUPPORT/CLIMATE (8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I made a recommendation to the administration that they didn’t follow through on.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.81 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I made suggestions in recent meetings that were disregarded.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.66 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I had trouble finding other English Language Learner (ELL) teachers to talk to about a school-related issue.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.41 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I had a conversation with a mainstream teacher who was not at all supportive of English Language Learner (ELL) students.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.07 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I had to explain to a mainstream teacher about the circumstances of English Language Learner (ELL) students.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.82 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by school adults.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.91 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative ways by other students.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.59 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Not having an on-site supervisor to consult with around work issues.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.13 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORMAL JOB CHARACTERISTICS (10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Students entering and leaving my classes throughout the school year.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.10 (0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Dealing with inappropriate placement of students in my classes, regarding English Language Learner (ELL) level.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.58 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Dealing with students with learning disabilities that are placed in my English Language Learner (ELL) classes.</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.56 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Given that the total sample size is 98 (i.e., 2 points away from 100), the ranking number (# of times endorsed) is also indicative of the percentage that ranking represents. For example, for item 1, 83 represents both the number of times the items was endorsed, as well as the overall percentage that item represents.
20. Teaching in an improvised or isolated space, such as hallways, stairwells, basements, or trailers. | FJC | 36 | 3.64 (1.33) 
21. Not having in-classroom volunteers or aides. | FJC | 63 | 3.08 (1.27) 
22. I was not invited to a meeting where decisions impacting my job as an English Language Learner (ELL) teacher were made. | FJC | 56 | 3.62 (1.36) 
23. I had to spend time differentiating instruction for a class of students who have a diverse range of learning abilities, language proficiencies, and needs. | FJC | 93 | 3.54 (1.92) 
24. Doing administrative paperwork that mainstream teachers didn’t have to do. | FJC | 91 | 3.57 (1.08) 
25. I had to track down a student who was absent. | FJC | 53 | 3.19 (1.13) 
26. I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school practices, including holding a pencil, opening a book, writing on paper, etc…. | FJC | 43 | 2.47 (1.12) 

**INFORMAL JOB DUTIES (14)**

27. Students pulled from the classroom for non-academic matters (such as for mental health counseling, acculturation groups, health skills, etc…). | IJD | 54 | 2.83 (1.19) 
28. I spent time and money outside of the classroom organizing drives or collections for clothing, food, and other daily necessities for my students. | IJD | 30 | 2.60 (1.22) 
29. I ran a program, or out-of-class activity, to help parents. | IJD | 52 | 2.85 (1.18) 
30. I attended to activities outside of the classroom to deal with inappropriate student placements. | IJD | 55 | 2.93 (1.09) 
31. Arranging for translation services/liaisons to facilitate communication with parents and/or family members. | IJD | 77 | 3.26 (1.20) 
32. Getting parents to sign necessary school paperwork. | IJD | 78 | 3.10 (1.04) 
33. Providing professional development for mainstream staff. | IJD | 55 | 3.02 (1.11) 
34. I was asked by a mainstream teacher to discuss an English Language Learner (ELL) student issue with them. | IJD | 91 | 2.34 (1.20) 
35. Advocating for my students outside of the classroom with other school personnel. | IJD | 81 | 3.20 (1.15) 
36. Spending time outside of class to develop acculturative lessons (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…). | IJD | 34 | 2.74 (1.05) 
37. Taking class time to discuss acculturative issues (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…). | IJD | 69 | 2.26 (1.00) 
38. Dealing with mental health issues in class. | IJD | 60 | 3.63 (1.07) 
39. I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school policies and practices. | IJD | 70 | 2.63 (1.14) 
40. Explaining to students classroom expectations (leaving seat, raising hand, going to the bathroom, etc…). | IJD | 81 | 2.53 (1.11) 

Items Removed: 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, 22, 23, 27, 31, 35, 38, 43, 45, 48, 53, 56
### TABLE 16: FINAL ETSM ITEMS WITH FREQUENCY BY DOMAIN AND SEVERITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Occurrence 13 # times endorsed</th>
<th>Severity (mean, SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYSTEMIC IMPACTS (8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having information about my job next year.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.98 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No availability of, or poor quality of, ongoing training</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.60 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.51 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>federal and state (i.e., NCLB) mandated testing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time meeting the targeted Annual Yearly Progress (AYP or</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.46 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smart goals) of my students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing English Language Learner (ELL) students for mandatory</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.27 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language testing (i.e., ACCESS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to deal with student reactions to mandated testing.</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.19 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating mainstream content standards (or common core material)</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.96 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to supervise/manager the home language survey for</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.76 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newly registering students for the Central Office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL SUPPORT/CLIMATE (8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a conversation with a mainstream teacher who was not at all</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.07 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supportive of English Language Learner (ELL) students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.91 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ways by school adults.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made a recommendation to the administration that they didn’t</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.81 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow through on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made suggestions in recent meetings that were disregarded.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.66 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing English Language Learner (ELL) students treated in negative</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.59 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ways by other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had trouble finding other English Language Learner (ELL) teachers</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.41 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to talk to about a school-related issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having an on-site supervisor to consult with around work issues.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.13 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to explain to a mainstream teacher about the</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.82 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumstances of English Language Learner (ELL) students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORMAL JOB CHARACTERISTICS (10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in an improvised or isolated space, such as hallways,</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.64 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stairwells, basements, or trailers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not invited to a meeting where decisions impacting my job</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.62 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as an English Language Learner (ELL) teacher were made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with inappropriate placement of students in my classes,</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.58 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regarding English Language Learner (ELL) level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing administrative paperwork that mainstream teachers didn’t</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.57 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Note: Given that the total sample size is 98 (i.e., 2 points away from 100), the ranking number (# of times endorsed) is also indicative of the percentage that ranking represents. For example, for item 1, 83 represents both the number of times the items was endorsed, as well as the overall percentage that item represents.
| Dealing with students with learning disabilities that are placed in my English Language Learner (ELL) classes. | FJC | 82 | 3.56 (I.07) |
| I had to spend time differentiating instruction for a class of students who have a diverse range of learning abilities, language proficiencies, and needs. | FJC | 93 | 3.54 (.92) |
| I had to track down a student who was absent. | FJC | 53 | 3.19 (I.13) |
| Students entering and leaving my classes throughout the school year. | FJC | 69 | 3.10 (.96) |
| Not having in-classroom volunteers or aides. | FJC | 63 | 3.08 (I.27) |
| I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school practices, including holding a pencil, opening a book, writing on paper, etc… | FJC | 43 | 2.47 (I.12) |

### INFORMAL JOB DUTIES (14)

| Dealing with mental health issues in class. | IJD | 60 | 3.63 (I.07) |
| Arranging for translation services/liaisons to facilitate communication with parents and/or family members. | IJD | 77 | 3.26 (I.20) |
| Advocating for my students outside of the classroom with other school personnel. | IJD | 81 | 3.20 (I.15) |
| Getting parents to sign necessary school paperwork. | IJD | 78 | 3.10 (I.04) |
| Providing professional development for mainstream staff. | IJD | 55 | 3.02 (I.11) |
| I attended to activities outside of the classroom to deal with inappropriate student placements. | IJD | 55 | 2.93 (I.09) |
| I ran a program, or out-of-class activity, to help parents. | IJD | 52 | 2.85 (I.18) |
| Students pulled from the classroom for non-academic matters (such as for mental health counseling, acculturation groups, health skills, etc…). | IJD | 54 | 2.83 (I.19) |
| Spending time outside of class to develop acculturative lessons (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…). | IJD | 34 | 2.74 (I.05) |
| I oriented a newly arrived English Language Learner (ELL) student to school policies and practices. | IJD | 70 | 2.63 (I.14) |
| I spent time and money outside of the classroom organizing drives or collections for clothing, food, and other daily necessities for my students. | IJD | 30 | 2.60 (I.22) |
| Explaining to students classroom expectations (leaving seat, raising hand, going to the bathroom, etc…). | IJD | 81 | 2.53 (I.11) |
| I was asked by a mainstream teacher to discuss an English Language Learner (ELL) student issue with them. | IJD | 91 | 2.34 (I.20) |
| Taking class time to discuss acculturative issues (teaching hygiene, about the U.S., etc…). | IJD | 69 | 2.26 (I.00) |

Items Removed: 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, 22, 23, 27, 31, 35, 38, 43, 45, 48, 53, 56
### Table 17: Internal Reliability Coefficients for the ETSM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Original (56 items)</th>
<th>Final (40 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETSM</td>
<td>.90 (f); .92 (s)</td>
<td>.87 (f); .93 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic Impacts</td>
<td>.65 (f); .74 (s)</td>
<td>.62 (f); .71 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support/Climate</td>
<td>.80 (f); .83 (s)</td>
<td>.75 (f); .88 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Job Characteristics</td>
<td>.70 (f); .72 (s)</td>
<td>.63 (f); .55 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Job Duties</td>
<td>.75 (f); .82 (s)</td>
<td>.72 (f); .78 (s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 98
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Original (56 items)</th>
<th>Final (40 items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETSM</td>
<td>.88 (f); .85 (s)</td>
<td>.81 (f); .76 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic Impacts</td>
<td>.69 (f); .76 (s)</td>
<td>.58 (f); .70 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support/Climate</td>
<td>.79 (f); .73 (s)</td>
<td>.77 (f); .91 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Job Characteristics</td>
<td>.69 (f); .73 (s)</td>
<td>.67 (f); .73 (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Job Duties</td>
<td>.70 (f); .80 (s)</td>
<td>.70 (f); .61 (s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 98. SPSS was used to randomly assign items to the two halves for analysis; the Spearman-Brown Coefficient is reported here.
### Table 19: Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the ETSM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>One-Factor Model</th>
<th>Four-Factor Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>2666.02</td>
<td>2609.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degrees of freedom</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>1478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 98.

Note: Due to the limited sample size, Item Response Theory (IRT) parameterization of the bifactor model developed by Gibbons et al. (2007) could not be conducted as proposed. However, a traditional confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using MPlus software. A CFA was conducted to assess model fit for a one-factor and four-factor model: (i) a one-factor model comprised of all ETSM items and (ii) a four-factor model forcing the items onto four separate domains. The $\chi^2$ difference test was used to test for significant differences between models. If the $\chi^2$ is significant, it indicates that the more complex model fits significantly better than the alternative. Thus, the one-factor model was compared to the four-factor model. Given the inherent power issues with the small sample size, these fit indices provides evidence of a four-factor solution being a better fit than a one-factor solution ($\Delta\chi^2(6) = 56.24$, $p < .001$).
IRB APPROVAL & PROTOCOL NUMBER

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT CHICAGO

Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS)
Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research (MC 672)
203 Administrative Office Building
1737 West Polk Street
Chicago, Illinois 60612-7227

Approval Notice

Initial Review (Response to Modifications)

February 13, 2012

Traci Weinstein, MA
Psychology
1007 W. Harrison Street
M/C 285
Chicago, IL 60607
Phone: (978) 328-8722 / Fax: (312) 413-4122

RE: Protocol # 2011-1088

“The Development of an Instrument to Measure ELL Teacher Stress”

Dear Ms. Weinstein:

Your Initial Review (Response to Modifications) was reviewed and approved by the Expedited review process on February 13, 2012. You may now begin your research
Please note the following information about your approved research protocol:

**Protocol Approval Period:** February 13, 2012 - February 11, 2013

**Approved Subject Enrollment #:** 600

**Additional Determinations for Research Involving Minors:** These determinations have not been made for this study since it has not been approved for enrollment of minors.

**Performance Sites:** UIC

**Sponsor:** Department of Psychology

**PAF#:** Not available

**Grant/Contract No:** Not available

**Grant/Contract Title:** Not available

**Research Protocol(s):**

- a) Research Protocol: ELL Teacher Stress Measure; Version 2; 01/16/2012

**Recruitment Material(s):**

- a) Recruitment Email; Version 2; 01/16/2012
- b) Snowballing Email; Version 2; 01/16/2012

**Informed Consent(s):**

- a) Informed Consent; Version 2; 01/16/2012
- b) Waiver of Signed Consent Document granted under 45 CFR 46.117

Your research meets the criteria for expedited review as defined in 45 CFR 46.110(b)(1) under the following specific categories:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including but not limited to research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Please note the Review History of this submission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipt Date</th>
<th>Submission Type</th>
<th>Review Process</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Review Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2012</td>
<td>Response to Modifications</td>
<td>Expedited</td>
<td>02/02/2012</td>
<td>Modifications Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please remember to:

→ Use your research protocol number (2011-1088) on any documents or correspondence with the IRB concerning your research protocol.

→ Review and comply with all requirements on the enclosure, "UIC Investigator Responsibilities, Protection of Human Research Subjects"

Please note that the UIC IRB has the prerogative and authority to ask further questions, seek additional information, require further modifications, or monitor the conduct of your research and the consent process.

Please be aware that if the scope of work in the grant/project changes, the protocol must be amended and approved by the UIC IRB before the initiation of the change.

We wish you the best as you conduct your research. If you have any questions or need further help, please contact OPRS at (312) 996-1711 or me at (312) 996-9299. Please send any correspondence about this protocol to OPRS at 203 AOB, M/C 672.

Sincerely,

Marissa Benni, M.S.
IRB Coordinator, IRB # 2
Office for the Protection of Research Subjects

Enclosure(s):

1. UIC Investigator Responsibilities, Protection of Human Research Subjects
2. Informed Consent Document(s):
   a) Informed Consent; Version 2; 01/16/2012
3. Recruiting Material(s):
   a) Recruitment Email; Version 2; 01/16/2012
   b) Snowballing Email; Version 2; 01/16/2012

cc: Jon D. Kassell, Psychology, M/C 285
    Edison J. Trickett, Psychology, M/C 285
CURRICULUM VITAE

Traci L Weinstein

University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC)
Department of Psychology
1007 W Harrison Street (M/C 285)
Behavioral Sciences Building #1080
Chicago, IL 60607

Phone: (978) 328-8722
Fax: (312) 413-4122
Email: tweins2@uic.edu
https://sites.google.com/site/tracilweinstein

EDUCATION

2013 Doctoral Thesis, Community & Prevention Research, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Chicago;
   The Development of an Instrument to Measure ELL Teacher Work Stress
   Committee: Edison J. Trickett (Chair), Dina Birman, David B. Henry, Karen Sakash, & Victoria Chou
   Minor: Special Education

2009 Preliminary Examination, Community & Prevention Research, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Chicago;
   Special Education & ELL Teachers: The Experiences of Educating Youth in Substantially Separate Public School Programs
   Committee: Edison J. Trickett (Chair), Karen Sakash, & Karina Reyes

2006 M.A., Community Social Psychology, University of Massachusetts Lowell;
   Predictors of Academic-Related Outcomes among Cambodian High School Students
   Committee: Khanh T. Dinh (Chair), Meg Bond, & Jason Lawrence

1997 B.A., Psychology/Russian, University of Michigan Ann Arbor;
   Minor: Spanish

PUBLICATIONS


**In Preparation**


**CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS**


RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

2012 – 2013  Research Assistant, The Language Ideologies of Teachers Serving Linguistically Diverse Learners
Principal Investigators:  P. Zitlali Morales, Ph.D and Victoria Trinder, Ph.D
- Development of a quantitative measure to assess the language beliefs of teachers working with diverse learners.

2010 – 2013  Co-Investigator, The Development of An Instrument to Measure ELL Teacher Stress
Faculty Advisor:  Edison J. Trickett, Ph.D
- Development of a quantitative measure to assess the work stress of ELL teachers.

Co-Investigator:  Eric S. Weiner, M.A.
- Quantitative investigation of testing outcomes among college students in general psychology courses.

2009 – 2013  Co-Investigator, Special Education & ELL Teachers: The Experiences of Educating Youth in Substantially Separate Public School Programs
Faculty Advisor:  Edison J. Trickett, Ph.D
• Qualitative investigation intended to capture the work experiences of Special Education and ELL teachers.

Principal Investigator: Edison J. Trickett, Ph.D  
• Qualitative portrait of the work experiences of ELL teachers in Chicagoland area public schools.

2006 – 2012  **Research Assistant, Developing Effective School-Based Mental Health Services for Immigrant and Refugee Youth**  
Principal Investigator: Dina Birman, Ph.D  
• Funded by Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, School-Based Intervention for Immigrants Grant  
• Participated in site visits by funding foundation and developing funding reports, as well as participation in support activities across various collaborating sites.

2006 – 2007  **Research Assistant, Validating the BOSS and CLASS Classroom Observation Measures**  
Principal Investigator: Marc S. Atkins, Ph.D and Elisa Shernoff, Ph.D  
• Developed and implemented by the UIC Institute of Juvenile Research  
• Participated in classroom observations to validate the measures

2005 – 2006  **Co-Investigator, Psychosocial Correlates of Academic Achievement among Asian American High School and College Students**  
Faculty Advisor: Khanh T. Dinh, Ph.D  
• Developed and conducted quantitative surveying of high school and college students in one New England city.

2004 – 2006  **Research Assistant, The Effects of Contact with Asians and Asian Americans on White American College Students: Attitudes, Awareness of Racial Discrimination, and Psychological Adjustment**  
Principal Investigator: Khanh T. Dinh, Ph.D  
• Quantitative investigation of college student experiences at one New England college.

**TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

2012 – 2013  **Instructor, St. Augustine College, Chicago, IL**  
Human Growth and Development/PSY 202 (Fall 12)  
Introduction to Psychology/PSY 101 (Spring 13)

2009 – 2013  **Instructor, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL**  
Introduction to Psychology/PSCH 100 (Summer 13)  
Introduction to Community Psychology/PSCH 231 (Spring 09; Fall 10; Spring 12)  
Writing in Psychology/PSCH 303 (Fall 09, Summer 10, Summer 11, Spring 2013)  
Teaching in Psychology Colloquium (Fall 08)

2006 – 2013  **Direct Contact Teaching Assistant, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago IL**  
Applied Psychology Internship/PSCH 385 (Spring 10, Spring 11, Fall 11; Spring 12; Fall 12)  
Writing in Psychology/PSCH 303 (Spring 07; Fall 07; Spring 08, Summer 08; Fall 08; Summer 09);  
Introduction to Community Psychology/PSCH 231 (Summer 07; Spring 09);  
Introduction to Psychology/PSCH 100 (Fall 06, Summer 12)

2000 – 2006  **Special Education Teacher, Lowell High School, Lowell, MA**  
English (Grades 9-12)  
Mathematics (Grades 9-12)  
History (Grades 9-12)
Science (Grades 9-12)
Health (Grades 9-12)
Social-Emotional Learning & Career Development (Grades 9-12)

2007 – 2008  **ELL Tutor**, Roosevelt High School, Chicago, IL

1997 – 1998  **ESL Teacher**, Jewish Family Services, Framingham, MA

1994 – 1995  **ESL Tutor**, MLK Jr. Middle School, Detroit, MI

COMMUNITY PRACTICE

2012 – 2013  Educational Assessment, Pearson Education, Inc., Chicago, IL
- Qualitative scoring of federal/state-mandated educational assessment portfolios for Special Education students.

2010  Census Enumerator, U.S. Census, Chicago, IL
- Learned all aspects of federal Census enumeration, including data collection, data entry, and citizen support.

2009 – 2010  Program Evaluator, El Valor, Chicago, IL
- Quantitative and qualitative program evaluation for a community non-profit agency that supports adults with developmental disabilities.

2008 – 2009  Community Practicum Intern, University of Illinois at Chicago
Placement: Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, IL
- Qualitative program evaluation with the Department of Program Evaluation at the Office of Research and Accountability, in collaboration with the Office of Language & Culture.

2005 – 2006  Community Practicum Intern, University of Massachusetts Lowell
Placement: Angkor Dance Troupe, Lowell, MA
- Developed professional development program for Cambodian American students and recent graduates.

CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

2000  **Clinician**, Spectrum Health Systems, Westboro, MA
- Supported teenagers and adults with heroin, cocaine, and alcohol addictions in a detoxification setting.
- Provided case management and aftercare referrals to patients.
- Conducted psycho-educational classes on addiction and healthy living skills.
- Implemented crisis interventions involving mental health emergencies.

1997 – 2000  **Program Manager, Counselor**, Advocates, Inc., Framingham, MA
- Supported adults in a residential setting with dual diagnoses of developmental disabilities and mental illness.
- Provided case management and aftercare referrals to patients.
- Conducted psycho-educational classes living skills.
- Implemented crisis interventions involving mental health emergencies.

1997 – 1998  **Counselor**, Burncoat Family Center, Worcester, MA
- Supported children and adolescents with emotional disabilities in a residential setting.
- Provided case management and aftercare referrals to patients.
- Implemented crisis interventions involving mental health emergencies.
PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

2011 – Present  
Selection Committee Member, Tina B. Carver Fund, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL)

2011 – 2013  
Chair, Refugee Concerns Interest Group, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL)

2011 – 2013  
Organizer and Co-Creator, Spirit of Community Awards, Community & Prevention Research Program, University of Illinois at Chicago

2010 – 2011  
Chair-Elect, Refugee Concerns Interest Group, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL)

2006 – 2013  
Member, PSI CHI Graduate Student Organization, University of Illinois at Chicago

2005 – 2006  
Member, PSI CHI Graduate Student Organization, University of Illinois Massachusetts Lowell

AWARDS

2013  
Certificate of Service, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL)

2013  
Certificate of Achievement, University of Illinois at Chicago

2012  
Certificate of Service, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL)

2012  
Certificate of Achievement, University of Illinois at Chicago

2011  
Harry S Upshaw Award for Excellence in Teaching, University of Illinois at Chicago

2011  
Certificate of Achievement, University of Illinois at Chicago

2011  
Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society

2010  
Certificate of Achievement, University of Illinois at Chicago

2009  
University of Illinois at Chicago Graduate Student Travel Award ($200)

2009  
Certificate of Achievement, University of Illinois at Chicago

2008  
Certificate of Achievement, University of Illinois at Chicago

2007  
University of Illinois at Chicago Graduate Student Travel Award ($200)

2006  
University of Massachusetts Lowell Graduate Student Research Award

2006  
University of Massachusetts Lowell Council on Diversity and Pluralism ($3000)

2006  
Society for Community Action and Research Student Travel Award ($100)

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

2010 – 2013  
Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL)

2010 – 2013  
Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues

2008 – 2013  
Midwest Psychological Association (MPA)
2008 – 2013  Society for Teaching in Psychology (STP)
2005 – 2013  American Psychological Association (APA)
2004 – 2013  Society for Community Research and Action (SCRA)