ATTRIBUTES THAT PROMOTE ACADEMIC RESILIENCE AMONG AT-RISK ENGLISH LEARNERS IN TWO SOUTH TEXAS MIDDLE SHOOLS

A Record of Study

by

IMELDA GRACIELA DE LA ROSA

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Chair of Committee,	Robert M. Capraro
Committee Members,	Jennifer Coronado
	Janet Hammer
	Li-Jen Kuo
Head of Department,	Michael de Miranda

August 2018

Major Subject: Curriculum and Instruction

ABSTRACT

The findings of this study revealed that there were no significant correlations between the intrinsic or extrinsic factors and Resiliency or Proficiency. There were, however, practically significant effect sizes between intrinsic and extrinsic factors and Resiliency and Proficiency. There were strong associations between intrinsic and extrinsic factors, meaning that when intrinsic factors in ELs/monitored ELs were present, the extrinsic factors were also present. ELs and monitored ELs who had more At-Risk factors were in the Non-Resilient group. There were significant associations found between At-Risk and English Proficiency factors. The regression analyses reported in this study indicated that the scores of TELPAS and Proficiency were explained by extrinsic and intrinsic factors with the same amount of variance when both Resilient and Non-Resilient groups were included and when only the Resilient group was analyzed. The Resilient group had a higher percentage of variance explained by the independent variables. The variance of Average Grade was better explained by the intrinsic factor of Motivation when the Resilient and Non-Resilient group were analyzed together. ELs/monitored ELs learn better when teachers incorporate instructional strategies and effective teaching practices in the classroom. The data revealed that students get support from their teacher in the form of encouragement and motivation. Furthermore, the students who did not receive help from their parents at home received it from other family members or from teachers at school.

DEDICATION

I want to thank my husband, Hiram De La Rosa, for being a good listener and providing encouragement to finish my study. You have been so supportive, and, for that, I thank you and love you deeply. I am thankful to my beloved parents, Sergio and Teresa Chapa. Both of you have provided me with a strong work ethic. You always told me that if I worked hard, I could obtain anything I put my mind to. I am beyond blessed to have you as my parents. I am grateful to my siblings, Gabby, Dani, and Checo, who have always cheered me on in any endeavor I have had. Thank you for your support and your unconditional love. I hope that I have served as a good role model for the three of you. I am thankful for my four nephews and three nieces. They are my pride and joy. Thank you, Daniel, for helping me out during this journey.

Thank you, Mrs. Clotilde Gamez for being an outstanding administrator, and for giving me the support I needed throughout my position as Science Pathfinder. Your guidance has helped me reached goals I never thought I could reach professionally. My professional growth has been possible because of you. To Mr. David Gonzalez, thank you, Sir, for believing in me since day one. Your support has also influenced me in becoming a better educator.

I want to thank God for giving me the strength when my body was in pain, and for giving me confidence, when I doubted myself. Thank you, Lord for guiding me through this path and for helping me reach this point.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Capraro, and my committee members, Dr. Coronado, Dr. Hammer, Dr. Kuo, and Dr. Padron, for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research. I would also like to thank Dr. Helfeldt and Dr. Guerra for their mentorship. Dr. Capraro, if it had not been for your constant communication via GoToMeeting with Rosalinda, Sandra, and I, I do not think I would have been able to complete my study. A million thanks to Ms. Ambyr Rios for helping make my graduation journey as smooth as possible. Your patience and timely replies helped me immensely, Ambyr; you were an instrumental part of this journey.

I would like to thank the district and administrators that allowed me to conduct research at their schools. I appreciate the students for their time and attention that they gave to answering the survey and interviews. Thanks to the parent/guardian(s) of the students for giving parental permission, so that their child could participate in the study.

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of Dr. Robert M. Capraro [Chair], Dr. Coronado [Committee member], Dr. Janet Hammer [Committee member], Dr. Li-Jen Kuo [Committee member], and Dr. Yolanda Padron [Substitute Committee member]. This work was also supervised by Dr. John P. Helfeldt [Chair, retired] and Dr. Cathy Guerra [Co-Chair, retired].

All work for the Record of Study was completed independently by the student.

Funding Sources

Graduate study was partially supported by a scholarship from Lamar Bruni Vergara Educational Fund.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Need for the Study

Resilient students are those who, in spite of various risk factors, find it within themselves to become successful in school (Benard, 1993; 1995). According to Benard prevention programs aimed to identify risk factors, such as alcohol use, drug abuse, teen pregnancy, delinquency, gang involvement, and dropping out of high school began in the 1980s (1993/2012). Resilience is a set of attributes that assists people to overcome overwhelming barriers in their life (Sagor, 1996; Benard, 1993). Therefore, academic resilient students are those students who are able to cope with any at-risk factors and are able to be successful in their pursuit of education.

Within the context of this study, academic resilience was referred to as the ability of a student to be academically successful in spite of at-risk factors of dropping out of school. The term English Learner (EL) referred to students whose first language was not English. Projections from a five-year survey indicated that 35.2% of people over the age of 5 in the state of Texas spoke a language other than English, 29.5% being Spanish (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). Moreover, in Texas, there were about 120 different languages spoken by different groups of ELs, however, Spanish was the most prevalent with 90.3% of ELs speaking that language (Texas Education Agency, 2017). The number of ELs in the United States steadily increased for the past couple of years. ELs made up 8.1% of the student population in public schools in the fall 2000 school year, while, in the fall 2015 school year, the EL population increased to close to 10%

(National Center for Education Statistics, 2017). In the state of Texas a similar pattern was observed.

In 1997-1998 ELs made up 12.73% of the Texas student population, whereas in 2016-2017, the percentage of EL students increased to 18.86% (Texas Education Agency, 2017). The U.S. Census Bureau of 2010 reported that 59% of ELs in Texas in grades 6-12 were born in the United States. This was interesting because more than half of the students who had the EL label had been in this country for more than 10 years. Therefore, the issue at the time was not necessarily the increase in ELs in our Texas public schools. The issue lied in addressing ELs appropriately in the classroom because most of these students should have been able to master the necessary English due to attending our schools since early childhood. Furthermore, based on data from the spring 2012 semester there were 838,494 EL students in the state of Texas enrolled in public schools, which translated into ELs representing about 17% of the student population in this state (Texas Education Agency, 2012). In the school year 2016-2017 the total enrollment of ELs was a whopping 1,010,756 (Texas Education Agency, 2017). "In the 2016-17 school year, 18.9 percent of students were identified as ELs, compared to 15.9 percent in 2006-07" (Texas Education Agency, 2017, p. 16).

English proficiency entailed being able to read, write, and speak in English in order to exit the EL program. In the state of Texas, ELs were rated with the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS), which measured their proficiency of the English language. The levels of the TELPAS were as follows: beginner, intermediate, advanced, and advanced high TELPAS. In order to exit the EL

program, one of the requirements was for ELs to score Advanced High in the different domains; or a district decided to transfer (exit, reclassify, transition) a LEP student out of a bilingual or ESL program for the initial time or a subsequent time at the "end of the school year in which a student would be able to participate equally in a general education, all-English instructional program" as determined by satisfactory performance in the assessment areas listed below and the results of a subjective teacher evaluation (19 TAC §89.1225 section (h), 2007) and (ELL exit criteria chart, 2017). The three assessment areas for 6th, 7th, and 8th grade included the following: scored fluent, which is Advanced High, on English in listening and speaking on TELPAS; scored at least a Level II on English Reading on STAAR; and scored fluent, or at least a level II on English Writing—agency approved writing test (in this case it was the TELPAS writing sample for 6th and 8th graders; for 7th graders it would have been the writing STAAR). For STAAR English reading and English writing, the performance level for students to be able to exit the LEP program was to achieve a Level II (Satisfactory Academic Performance) or higher (ELL exit criteria chart, 2017). The proficiency level descriptors are found in Appendix A; the descriptors explain beginner, intermediate, advanced, and advanced high within the context of Listening, Speaking, and Writing. The reading component was not included because was assessed through the online assessment at the middle school level.

Moreover, an English Learner may not only encounter difficulties with learning a second language but may also be additionally labeled "at-risk" with at least one physical or learning disability, retained in a grade at least once, does not live with both parents,

either parent emigrated in past five years, family income below $10,000, or neither parent/guardian is employed (Kominski, Jamieson, & Martinez, 2001). In the state of Texas there were 13 criteria for identification of students being at-risk to drop out. The criteria for at-risk status included each student under 21 years of age who at least falls under one of these: has been retained for one or more grade levels; is in grades 7-12 and was not able to maintain an average of 70 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum; did not perform satisfactorily on an assessment administered under TEC Subchapter B, Chapter 39, and has not in the past or current school year performed on that instrument or another instrument at a level of satisfactory performance on that instrument; is pregnant or is a parent; placed in an alternative education program during the previous or current school year; has been expelled; is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release; previously reported as dropping out; student of LEP; custody or care of the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services, been referred by a school official, officer of the juvenile court, or law enforcement; is homeless; resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility, detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric facility, halfway house, or foster care (Texas Education Agency, 2011).

To better address these [at-risk] students, Texas educators must address the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students (CLD), and at the same time comply with the accountability system in place at this time (Chapa, Garcia, & Guerra, 2011). An example of such accountability system was the State of Texas Assessments of Academic

Readiness (STAAR™). The STAAR was a state exam, which assessed college readiness standards in the content-areas. STAAR disaggregated data based on subgroups to ensure all of them were being served equitably. One of the subgroups targeted was the LEP (Limited English Proficient); the term LEP was replaced with the EL term. Schools were sanctioned based on LEP's lack of progress (Texas Education Agency, 2012). Texas had system safeguards for subgroups: students served under special education, ethnicity, economical disadvantaged, and ELs. The system safeguards referred to students in the subgroups who scored at least a 60% or better on the STAAR. The *National Assessment of Educational Progress* (NAEP) *Long-Term Reading Assessment* shows that English Learners scored lower than non-ELs on four consecutive assessments administered in 2004, 2008, 2012, and 2015; important to note students in the South scored lower than other parts in the nation (U.S. Department of Education, 2013) (Nation's Report Card, 2015.) The NAEP defined ELs as "students who are in the process of acquiring English language skills and knowledge;" Some schools referred to these students using the term limited-English-proficient (LEP) (http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/glossary.aspx#english_language_learners). This is another reason why it was important to search for studies that were conducted on the academic achievement and academic resilience of ELs, who were labeled at-risk in Texas public schools. As mentioned previously, ELs as a group continuously scored lower than their non-EL peers. The importance of this study was that offered educators in South Texas a better understanding of how resilience could be fostered within ELs who were identified at-risk. Furthermore, this study added to the minimal amount of

research in the area of academic resilience comparing ELs, especially at-risk ELs and formerly labeled ELs.

Theoretical Framework

"Resiliency research validates prior theoretical models of human development, including those of Erik Erikson, Urie Bronfenbrenner, Jean Piaget, Lawrence Kohlberg, Carol Gilligan, Rudolf Steiner, Abraham Maslow, and Joseph Chilton Pierce" (Benard, n.d). Benard's resilience framework revolved around the idea that students possessed four attributes or characteristics: social competence, autonomy, sense of purpose, and problem-solving skills (Benard, 1993). Social competence referred to the ability to relate to others (e.g., empathy, sense of humor). Autonomy was observed when a student had ownership and was able to "exert some control over one's environment" (Benard, 1993, p. 44). Sense of purpose entailed possessing aspirations and being persistent. Finally, problem-solving skills referred to the ability to reflect and come up with "alternate solutions for both cognitive and social problems" (Bernard, 1993, p. 44). The five attributes of competence, belonging, usefulness, potency, and optimism were set forth by Sagor (Sagor, 1996). Hence, the review of the literature touched base on most of these attributes of resilience because I decided to use only those attributes that were identified in both Bernard's and Sagor's research. Additionally, some of the factors were combined under one section because they were similar in nature (e.g., sense of purpose and autonomy). The following attributes that were similar from Bernard and Sagor were part of the review of the literature: social competence, autonomy, belonging, and optimism. Additionally, type of schooling, adult support and family configuration were included on

the review of the literature because they were also found to be associated with the academic achievement and/or academic resilience.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify attributes that were associated with academic resilience of Spanish-speaking English Learner (ELs) who were labeled at-risk in two South Texas middle schools, located in a border town. Important to note was that due to ELs' at-risk factors being examined and associated with resilience, the *ability* of these students was not studied. The study focused on resilient ELs and their non-resilient EL peers or those who were formerly labeled as EL. The significance of studying resilient and non-resilient ELs at-risk was due to the fact that they tended to have the similar educational background and shared some of the qualifiers that made them at-risk (as per the definition that was mentioned earlier), and they attended the same schools and had same teachers. Therefore, carrying out this study helped identify factors that were associated with academic resilience more efficiently because these ELs shared more factors than students who were not labeled at-risk. Another significance of this study was that there was no available literature about resilient and non-resilient ELs/monitored ELs based on at-risk qualifiers. Thus, it shed light on the academic resilience of at-risk ELs and monitored ELs.

This study provided educators with a framework so that they can make schools a place in which all students [regardless of label, e.g. LEP/EL] can succeed socially and academically (Benard, 1995). I was particularly interested in determining which factors had an association, effect, and influence in resilient ELs and non-resilient ELs. For the

purpose of this study, resilient ELs were those at-risk ELs who: a) were exited from the EL program and were able to maintain C's or better in all core subject areas; or b) those ELs still in the program but who scored Advanced High in the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and maintained C's or better in all core subject areas. The reason for labeling these students as resilient based on high scores on TELPAS and exiting the program, while maintaining good grades was due to them being able to succeed academically in spite of the language barrier and the at-risk factor(s) that accompanied them to school. Finding out which attributes had an association, effect, and influence in resilient and non-resilient ELs assisted me in focusing on the intrinsic and extrinsic attributes that needed to be further developed in ELs' lives, attending public middle schools in a South Texas border town. Some of the intrinsic attributes that were identified in the literature as having a positive relationship with academic resilience and academic achievement included the following: motivation and autonomy. Hence, extrinsic attributes such as adult support (teacher and family), sense of school belonging, type of schooling, and collaboration amongst at-risk students and peers were also identified as being associated with academic resilience (Benard, 1993; Sagor, 1996; Gonzalez & Padilla, 1997). Moreover, family configuration (family size, number of parents at home, birth order) was reported to have a significant input on students' academic achievement (Gonzalez & Padilla, 1997; Chopra, 1996; Hester, Osborne, & Nguyen, 1992; Bouchey, Shoulberg, Jodl, & Eccles, 2010).

As educators, we must become aware of the attributes that can contribute to the development of academic resilience in students, in particular students whose first

language is not English. As adults, teachers can assist students in the development of most of these intrinsic attributes—self-efficacy, engagement (motivation), sense of belonging—by building a caring relationship with students, setting high expectations, and requiring meaningful participation (Hanson, Austin, Lee-Bayha, 2004). Identifying the factors already mentioned above and additional factors can be helpful in bolstering the academic achievement of these non-resilient ELs who lagged behind their successful EL peers.

Research Questions

Through data collection procedures, which included semi-structured interviews, surveys, TELPAS data, and report card grades this study answered the following research questions:

(a) Is type of schooling linked to EL/monitored EL academic resilience?

(b) Is there a relationship between the following intrinsic factors—motivation and autonomy—and the academic resilience or proficiency of Spanish-speaking ELs?

(c) Which extrinsic factors—school belonging, adult support, and social collaboration--were associated with Spanish speaking EL students' academic resilience or proficiency?

(d) Is there a relationship between extrinsic factors and/or intrinsic factors?

(e) Is family configuration (number of parents at home, number of siblings, and birth order) associated with an EL's opportunity to develop academic resilience or proficiency?

(f) Do non-resilient ELs possess more at-risk factors than their resilient EL peers? Is there an association between At-Risk Factors and English Language Proficiency factors? and

(g) When considered simultaneously, which variables (intrinsic or extrinsic) were most associated with language proficiency, TELPAS scores, and average grade? (These dependent variables will help determine whether they will assist a EL/monitored EL be successful academically.)

Operational Definitions

The following definitions were taken from the literature review and/or reliable websites. The definitions that have citations were taken directly from those sources cited.

Academic Resilience: Resilient students are those who, in spite of various risk factors, find it within themselves to become successful in school. (Benard 1993)

English Learner/Limited English proficient: The term limited English proficient', when used with respect to an individual, means an individual —

(A) who is aged 3 through 21;

(B) who is enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school;

(C) (i) who was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English;

(ii)(I) who is a Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas; and

(II) who comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on the individual's level of English language proficiency; or

(iii) who is migratory, whose native language is a language other than English, and who comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; and

(D) whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individual —

(i) the ability to meet the State's proficient level of achievement on State assessments described in section 1111(b)(3);

(ii) the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English; or

(iii) the opportunity to participate fully in society.

(http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg107.html).

System safeguards: With a performance index framework, poor performance in one subject or one student group does not necessarily result in an Improvement Required accountability rating. However, disaggregated performance will be reported and districts and campuses are responsible for addressing performance for each subject and each student group. The underlying accountability system safeguards results are addressed through the Texas Accountability Intervention System (TAIS) to ensure that poor performance in one area or one student group is not masked in the performance index. Along with possible interventions, the intent of the safeguards system is to also meet

additional federal accountability requirements that are not met in the performance index (http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/faq.html).

Autonomy: when a student has ownership and is able to "exert some control over one's environment" (Benard, 1993).

Self-efficacy: people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives (http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/BanEncy.html).

Motivation: "the willingness to attend and learn material in a development program" (Cole, Feild, & Harris, 2004, p.67).

Engagement: the degree to which an individual is involved in a particular situation (Bickmore, Shulman, & Yin, 2010).

Social Competence: emphasizes peer relations as a criterion for competence (http://www.udel.edu/psych/fingerle/article1.htm). Social competence refers to the social, emotional, and cognitive skills and behaviors that children need for successful social adaptation. (http://www.healthofchildren.com/S/Social-Competence.html).

Community of Practice: In pursuing their interest in their domain, members engage in joint activities and discussions, help each other, and share information. They build relationships that enable them to learn from each other (http://www.ncddr.org/cop/whatiscop.html).

Collaboration: refers to "collaborative and cooperative activities that take place in the context of a learning experience" (Ellis, Han, & Pardo, 2018, p.2).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Resilient students are those who, in spite of various risk factors, find it within themselves to become successful in school (Benard, 1993; 1995). Within the context of this study, academic resilience was referred to as the ability of a student to be academically successful in spite of at-risk factors of dropping out of school. Studies investigating academic resilience have been conducted at several levels ranging from elementary children to college graduates. Hence, the review of the literature focused on the academic resilience of different age groups, but with special focus on secondary ELs and Culturally and Linguistic Diverse (CLD) students. The identified factors that were reported in the literature and any additional factors that were not identified in the literature and arose from this study will be helpful in bolstering the academic achievement of the non-resilient ELs who have lagged behind their successful EL peers. This can happen because teachers and administrators can provide the necessary protective factors for these students to become resilient and/or remain successful in the school setting. The factors identified in the literature were type of schooling, sense of belonging, family configuration, adult support, social competence, autonomy, and motivation.

Type of Schooling

The type of schooling ELs received was an essential component in promoting resilience. Faculty and staff are directly responsible for promoting protective factors in at-risk children while also "nurturing the learning skills, knowledge, self-regulation skills, and self-protective skills that children need to adapt on their own" (Masten, Herbers, Cutuli, & Lafavor, 2008, p. 79). Masten (2014) put together a short list of factors associated with resilience in young children. The resilience factors listed included: effective caregiving and parenting quality, close relationships with capable adults, close friends/romantic partners, intelligence and problem-solving skills, self-control, motivation to succeed, self-efficacy, faith/hope, effective schools, and collective efficacy.

In a study in which Mexican immigrant students were subsampled from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study--Kindergarten Cohort 1998 (ECLS--K), the two central questions were if these students were enrolled in disadvantaged school contexts, and if these students were affected differently in terms of academic and socio-emotional factors (Crosnoe, 2005). The purpose of the study was to find associations between school experiences and student outcomes: mathematics achievement, mental health, and interpersonal functioning, in order to find potential associations and primarily, to find a difference between Mexican immigrant students and their nonimmigrant peers (Crosnoe, 2005). The variables were measured through the NCES reports, teacher ratings, administrator reports, and timed assessments. "In this study Mexican immigrant status was the 'treatment', school context was the outcome, and family background the

potential confounds" (Crosnoe, 2005, p. 282). After looking at the descriptive statistics, it was found that Spanish was spoken somewhere between often and very often in Mexican immigrant family homes; a little under one fourth of the students had not acquired the necessary English proficiency; and more than two thirds of this subgroup had no formal education before entering kindergarten. The researcher pointed out that these findings of the descriptive statistics indicated that Mexican immigrant students already entered our schools with a disadvantage. Additionally, it was reported that these students attended larger schools than their peers. Although other students' achievement in Mathematics increased as the school size increased, Mexican immigrant students' achievement decreased as a result. This, according to the researcher, may have been due to Mexican immigrants preferring closely knit contexts (Crosnoe, 2005). Another finding was that Mexican immigrant students attended schools in which most of the teachers had less experience than those attended by other students. When examined alone, this factor was inversely related to Mathematics achievement. Teacher experience, however, did not have a significant effect on students' functioning in the school. Thus, Mexican immigrant students were reported to attend schools in which most of the student population lived below poverty. This was the only factor to consistently demonstrate academic resilience. Finally, Mexican immigrant students attended schools with different climates, in large part due to their family backgrounds. Such schools were located in disorganized communities and the students exhibited lower academic achievement (Crosnoe, 2005). All in all, these findings signal that these students attend different types of schools than their peers, with the term "different" meaning "worse."

Therefore, educators and administrators should be cognizant of "some of the risks associated with students' failure in school [and how these could be] due to the particular school environment" and not necessarily because of the students themselves (Waxman, Gray, & Padron, 2003, p. 15).

In another study conducted by Gonzalez and Padilla (1997), the researchers analyzed the responses to a 300 item questionnaire of 2,167 (47.3 % males; 52.7% females) students in the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades, who identified themselves as Mexican American and who were either in the regular track or the college track. Gonzalez and Padilla (1997) found that the variable of the type of schooling significantly predicted these Mexican American students' grades. For instance, students who reported being born in Mexico and had attended more years of school in that country, reported higher GPAs than the other Mexican born students with fewer years of schooling in Mexico. Similarly, U.S. born students who reported more years of ESL/Bilingual instruction reported higher GPAs than the students who reported fewer years of such instruction. This means that the necessary background in English and Spanish helped bolster these students' academic achievement.

In an analysis conducted on the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), the authors defined academic resiliency as those students from disadvantaged backgrounds that were able to "perform at a certain level in the PISA…that enabled them to play an active role in their communities and prepared them to make the most of life-long learning opportunities" (Agasisti, Avvisati, Borgnovi, Longoba, 2018, p. 4). The paper highlighted the importance of school environment and the resources those

schools had in decreasing the risk of low academic achievement for students from disadvantaged backgrounds. The analyses also identified factors at the school level that were linked to the academic achievement of these students. Most countries, 83%, had improvements in science scores between 2006 and 2015 as well as an increase in the number of academic resilient students. Additionally, within the same time frame, the variation across countries in average resilience was explained by students' science performance. In the second model, the results indicated that disadvantaged students who attended schools that had better discipline were more likely to be resilient. Furthermore, in model 3, as class size increased, the resilience of disadvantaged students increased.

The type of schooling students attend plays an important role in their academic success. Aside from the type of schooling, feeling part of the school can also assist student in building resiliency. When students are valued as members of a community, they will feel they belong (Sagor, 1996). Of particular importance is that many variables "share similar constructs… [and] relate to school connectedness: 1) academic engagement, 2) belonging, 3) discipline/fairness, 4) participation in school activities, 5) [whether student] likes school, 6) student voice (autonomy), 7) peer relations, 8) safety, and 9) teacher support" (Libbey, 2004, p. 278).

Sense of Belonging

In response to the limitation of school context and school climate on sense of belonging, Ma (2003) conducted a study with 6,883 sixth grade students and 6,868 eighth grade students in New Brunswick, Canada. The data from this study came from the New Brunswick School Climate Study (NBSCS) that was conducted in 1996. The

students completed four achievement tests and a questionnaire. After analysis of the data, the author found that "[s]tudents' self-esteem was the single most important predictor of their sense of [school] belonging, followed by their health status. At the school level, school climate was more important than school context in shaping students' sense of belonging" (Ma, 2003, p. 340).

In another study in which participants between the ages of 14-19 in three different high schools in the Midwest, White participants made up 48.2% of the sample, while 28.5% were African-American, 4.4% were Hispanic, 6.8% were Native American, and 12% categorized themselves as "bi-racial" or "other" (Walker & Greene, 2009). The purpose of the study was to build on previous research by examining the relations among student perceptions toward sense of belonging and other motivation variables (i.e., self-efficacy, perceived instrumentality, personal achievement goals, and perceptions of the classroom goal orientation) that have consistently demonstrated a positive relationship with student engagement. This study reported a positive correlation ($p < .01$) between sense of belonging and cognitive engagement, perceived instrumentality, self-efficacy, and mastery goals. Furthermore, even though it was not reported by the researcher, these four variables had a shared variance of 74%, which means that cognitive engagement, perceived instrumentality, self-efficacy, and mastery goals accounted for sense of belonging 74% of the time in this particular study.

In regards to urban, Latino/a adolescents, sense of school belonging was the same for both males and females; however, females outperformed males (Sanchez, Colon, & Esparza, 2005). According to the researchers, the reason why both genders

may have reported the same level of school belonging could be due to the Latino culture being collective as opposed to individualistic. "As predicted, sense of belonging played a positive role in participants' academic outcomes, including academic motivation, as measured by intrinsic value for and expectancies for success in their English subject, academic effort, and absenteeism" (Sanchez, Colon, & Esparza, 2005, p. 625). Thus, a feeling of belonging will help in curtailing absences since students will want to attend school and will also put more effort in academics.

Additionally, 350 8^{th}, 10^{th}, and 12^{th} graders, largely European descent residing in a city in the northeast of the United States were surveyed. However, only 305 surveys were used for the analysis that will be reported in this section (Whitlock, 2006). In this study, the two variables that had the strongest correlation to school connectedness were *meaningful roles at school* (r=.732, $p < .01$) and *active engagement* (r= .507, $p < .01$). Although not reported, the variables were squared so that the shared variance could be determined. Independently, *active engagement* accounted for 26% of the shared variance with *school connectedness*. Whereas the variable of *meaningful roles at school* accounted for 54% in respect to *school connectedness*. The following variables: *close parental relationships*, *group involvement*, *meaningful roles at school*, and *academic engagement* accounted for 97% (r^2= 0.974) of the shared variance with school connectedness (all the variables had a $p < .01$ except for group involvement $p < .05$). Furthermore, *friends in school*, *close parental relationships*, *creative opportunities at school*, and *meaningful roles at school* had a shared variance of 96% with *school connectedness* (r^2= 0.961266, $p < .01$). However, when *group involvement* was

included, the shared variance in relation to *school connectedness* increased to 99% (r^2= 0.992).

Nevertheless, in a 2009 study, in which EL high school seniors enrolled in four different school districts in southern central California data was obtained from a survey of participants, a follow-up survey, and school record data from school districts (Skokut, 2009). After analyzing the data through logistic regression and discriminant analysis, school connectedness (belonging) was found to not be a significant factor in ELs completing their high school education. This could mean that other contributing factors were more significant (e.g. motivation, adult support, etc.) towards completing high school.

In a study conducted by Scarf et. al (2016), the researchers examined the role of belonging and the increase in resilience after participants took part in an adventure education programme (AEP). One hundred and eighty students from New Zealand high schools participated. 60 of those participants were in the experimental group and were part of a 10-day voyage on the Spirit of New Zealand. The participants were selected on the following conditions: between 15 to 18 years of age, medically fit, and had to feel comfortable with water depth. The control group was made up of 120 teenagers from local high schools (60 students from grade 11, 60 students from grade 12); these teenagers did not go on the voyage. The participants were assessed four times, (T1) 1 month before the voyage; (T2) the first day of the voyage; (T3) the 10th day; and (T4) 9 months after the voyage. Pairwise comparisons suggested significant differences in resilient scores between T2 and T3; however, there were no significant differences in

scores between T1 and T2 and T3 and T4. The increase in resilience was maintained over the course of the voyage and even 9 months after. When the experimental group was compared to the control group, there was no significant difference between T1 scores of the voyage participants and the grade 11 students. There was, however, a significant difference between T4 scores of voyage participants and grade 12 students. Hierarchical multiple regressions were also conducted and it was found that belonging predicted the resilience at T3 and resilience at T4.

Sanders and Munford (2016) conducted a longitudinal study of young people, most of whom had not finished high school (87%), and explored how sense of belonging was associated with the manner these youngsters explained their school experiences. These researchers focused on the importance of sense of belonging at school and understanding the resilience of these participants. This study was based on the Successful Youth Transitions Programme (SYT) in New Zealand. The SYT programme was a longitudinal study of "patterns of resilience, risk, and service use of" 1366 youngsters, 506 were followed for three years due to their history indicating they were at-risk of dropping out, thereby not making a successful transition to the adulthood (Sanders & Munford, 2016, p. 159). The SYT programme participants were interviewed annually and their responses were coded. The 506 youth completed a survey at three separate times between the years 2009 and 2013. The interview asked questions ranging from life experiences, family experiences, school, community, services, informal supports, relationships, risks, and their perceptions on what type of things helped them do well. Most of the participants, (82%) answered that factors that were beyond their control had

caused to stop going to school. Additionally, interviews also had evidence of school-based professionals helping these children with re-authoring their stories (Sanders & Munford, 2016). Furthermore, the relationships between school staff and the youth allowed these students to re-write their educational journey, so that instead of school being a place of risk, school became a place for resilience and a sense of belonging. Thus, the school professionals created a sense of belonging in school for these youth.

Thus, based on most of the studies mentioned, it is no surprise that schools have been listed as a protective factor for the reason being that they are known to be responsible for "nurturing human capital and shaping many of the adaptive systems implicated for resilience" (Masten, Herbers, Cutuli, & Lafavor, 2008, p. 79). In regards to building resiliency in students, Sagor (1996) posited that if students felt alienated or lacked affiliation, a strategic intervention that might assist these students could be a teacher advisory program and instruction that targets the specific learning style(s) of such students; the desired outcome would be students who feel that they belong to their school environment. Thus, the challenge of schools is to provide students opportunities for meaningful activities, so that they can become engaged and are willing to be active participants of their own learning (Benard, 1993) rather than uninvolved passive learners.

Family Configuration

In the study conducted by Gonzalez and Padilla (1997), the researchers analyzed the responses to a 300-item questionnaire of 2,167 (47.3 % males; 52.7% females) students

in the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grades. The researchers reported that one of six variables that predicted GPA was *both parents have at least some college* ($p < .008$).

In a study in which 1359 high school students were randomly selected, the researcher was only able to collect data from high schools that schooled only boys due to Indian schooling being conservative at the time and the principals from only girl high schools refrained from participating in the study since the researcher was a male (Chopra, 1966). The study aimed to determine whether family size and birth order would be correlated to intelligence and academic achievement. The data was gathered by combination of questionnaires (family size and birth order), intelligence tests (measure intelligence), and academic achievement (high school annual exam). The researcher reported the means of intelligence scores and high school marks as well as the family size and number of participants. The findings showed that students who came from families of five or less had higher intelligence mean scores as well as high school marks with statistical significance at the .01 level (Chopra, 1966). Surprisingly, too, was the finding that families of seven had a higher mean intelligence score of .02 points greater than families of six. Nevertheless, academic achievement (as reported by means of high school marks) decreased as family size increased. Additionally, with the exception of the families of six, the mean intelligence scores were higher for students whose families were smaller (Chopra, 1966). The findings regarding birth order did not seem to provide a clear picture. For example, while the first-born students had a higher mean intelligence score than second-born children, third-born and fourth-born children had higher mean intelligence scores and/or academic achievement mean scores than

second born and first born students. This could be due to the researcher not connecting the family size to birth order and not reporting family size and birth order side by side.

In a similar yet different study, the researcher wanted to find out if family configuration had effects on GPA, academic achievement attributions, and differences in GPA expectations and academic achievement attributions (Hester, Osborne, & Nguyen, 1992). In this study, 695 volunteers (336 males, 359 females) from different ethnicities in a Southwestern urban area participated. The participants were mostly students, with the exception of 52 respondents, who were parents of students. Furthermore, 12.4% of the participants were high school students, with the remaining being university students. Parallel survey forms were constructed for both students and parents of students. Attributions were assessed via a Likert-type scale. Data were analyzed by conducting ANOVAs. Findings showed that number of siblings had a significant effect ($p < .03$) for GPA expectations. Moreover, having three or more siblings had higher GPA expectations ($p < .05$) than those with fewer siblings and those without siblings, too (Hester et al., 1992). Additionally, a three-way interaction was found between birth order, number of siblings, and number of parents ($p < .02$)

Jensen and McHale (2015) conducted a study to see what made siblings different from each other, academically. The study, specifically, examined the association between parents' beliefs regarding sibling differences in academics and in grades as well as associations between differences in siblings' grades and sibling differences in academic interests. Parents' ratings of first-born and second-born children were collected on three separate occasions. The findings suggested that parents who rated

children as more competent than the other sibling had higher grades the next school year. Moreover, sibling differences in grades predicted siblings' interests the next school year.

Adult Support

Family support.

Support from adults is crucial in the development of resilience within an EL. At-risk students need adult support (Thomsen, 2002). In a study conducted by Walker (2006) 21 high achieving mathematics students from an urban high school were interviewed on three separate occasions and four mathematics teachers were observed and informally conversed with the researcher. These high-achieving students represented mostly Latino and African American students (11 Latino, nine African American, two mixed students). In the different round of interviews, all of the students contributed their success in large part to their parents' expectations and approval (Walker, 2006). The students also described the type of support their parent(s) offered with mathematics. Moreover, the students reported that other family members were positive influences to their mathematics achievement (siblings, uncles, aunts, cousins). In this particular study, students may not have mentioned parents being main contributors to their success in mathematics, but they "reported that their parents had higher expectations in terms of their graders than did their peers" (Walker, 2006, p. 67). Furthermore, students reported that they wanted to be like people in their lives who they saw as "strong, smart, and supportive" even when these role models had not finished their high school education (Walker, 2006, p. 66). Hence, these students utilized their parents' lack of formal schooling as a form of motivation to succeed in mathematics.

In addition, when parent expectations towards college attendance of their EL child were analyzed as separate variables--mother and father—the findings were significant. Skokut (2009) found that the mothers' expectations were significantly associated with college attendance at a $p=0.05$, and the fathers' expectations were found to significantly predict college attendance at a $p=0.03$. Furthermore, another finding of Hester et al., 1992 study mentioned previously was that there was a significant main effect ($p < .04$) for number of parents. Participants that did not have any parents residing at home reported higher GPA expectations than those with two parents in the home (Hester et al., 1992).

Rodriguez (2016) studied the types and intensity of Latino immigrant parental involvement and its relationship with their child's academic standing. The design utilized for this study was quantitative. Regression analyses were done. The sample consisted of parents/guardians of 134 seventh-grade Latino students that had low scores in reading and mathematics. The parent/guardians answered the Parent Involvement Questionnaire that was made up of 73 Likert-type questions, which asked about parent's school experience, invitations for involvement, reinforcement, parent's perception of knowledge and skills, involvement activities, encouragement, instruction, self-efficacy, and status variables. Results from regression analyses indicated that there was no statistically significant association between parental involvement and reading or mathematics grades.

Misconceptions about family's involvement.

There will be instances in which teachers and administrators will not be aware of parents' experiences when these parents get involved in their child's education. In fact, parents that were involved at their child's school "felt disrespected, distant, and confused" in relation to the culture of the school. [Unfortunately], too, there is a lack of acknowledgement on behalf of teachers and administrators of the kind of support coming from the "home and other cultural spaces or the strengths their *experiences* as *immigrants* bring to their children's lives" (Perez Carreon, Drake, & Calabrese Barton, 2005, p. 495). It is important to note that parents of middle school students may perceive education as being important buy may not know exactly how to "provide help or guidance" (Walker, 2006, p. 67).

Teacher support.

Students who "successfully seek out and receive adult attention are exhibiting resilient behavior" (Thomsen, 2002, p. 16). When students linger around a teacher's class, teachers are supposed to see this as the child trying to connect with an "adult role model rather than a needy child seeking attention" (Thomsen, 2002, p. 17). This signals the importance of adults in the lives (Barone, 1999) of children who have been labeled "at risk" since birth. Furthermore, adults who carry out the role of a middle-class parent can support ELs when the parents are not too involved (Chang, 2003). Thus, it is important for teachers to be supportive of students because some might not have the appropriate support from an adult at home.

Moreover, teachers should acknowledge and capitalize on at-risk students' backgrounds so that students can finish school, thereby beating the odds. For example, teachers can promote resilience by incorporating elements of culturally responsive teaching into their instruction. It is important for educators to provide support and incorporate elements of the students' languages and cultures into their instruction. In so doing, teachers will help these students attain academic success. The manner in which teachers address culturally and linguistically diverse students (CLD) affects the extent to which these students position themselves (participate) in class and interact with their classmates and teachers (Yoon, 2008). In Yoon's study, one teacher supported ELs by offering them multiple opportunities to listen to each other and know about each other's cultures; she viewed these opportunities to be helpful not only to ELs but to non-ELs as well. When students feel comfortable enough in a classroom setting, they will speak up and become active participants in the classroom. Moreover, an "enriched learning environment is critical" for CLDs and students from low socioeconomic status (Chang, 2003, p. 272).

In Walker's (2006) study, more than half of the students (12 out of 21 students) indicated that their math achievement was due in part to their past and present teachers. Additionally, when children know that there are supportive adults in their lives, like parents and teachers; this may help them stay on-task (Blumenfeld, 1992). In Vlach and Burcie's (2010) study, two students, Jocalyn and Brenda, struggled with reading. This particular study demonstrated that students, like Jocalyn and Brenda can form their own narrative as a result of teachers promoting agency (students' ownership of their own

learning) through instructional strategies. Examples of such instructional strategies include the promotion of positive collaboration between students and teachers (Vlach & Burcie, 2010). Hence, rapport between teacher and students can facilitate the development of resilience. In this particular study, rapport allowed for students to make connections with the teacher because of her background; therefore, the gap between teacher and students lessened (Vetter, 2010).

Additionally, in a separate study, teacher and student records as well as survey data were collected from a longitudinal study, 1990-1995; the data was analyzed by Klem and Connell (2004). The authors reported that middle school students with high levels of teacher support were three times as likely to be highly engaged and 47% less likely to look disengaged (Klem & Connell, 2004). In other words, students whose "teachers were perceived as unsupportive were 35% more likely to appear disengaged in class" (p. 269).

In a study in which self-determination theory was used to frame hypotheses about motivation, the researchers examined whether teacher support influenced motivation (Pitzer & Skinner, 2016). The sample consisted of 1020 students in 3rd through 6th grade. The data consisted of self-reported answers. Multiple-regression analysis showed that teacher support was important. Students who began the year with at-risk profile and received increased teacher supported, ended the school year on par with students who had low at-risk factors. At the same time, students who begin with resilient characteristics, but received little teacher support, ended the school year with at-risk profiles.

Thus, having both family and teacher support will help a student blossom. For example, through purposive sampling, four mathematics high-achieving, African-American students were selected for a study in which they had to demonstrate persistence in high school mathematics (Stinson, 2008). The high achieving students had to have taken an advanced placement calculus or statistics class with a 70 or better, complete a dual-enrollment of calculus or statistics with a 70 or better, or score in the 4th quintile (top 25%) of the SAT mathematics portion. Data included written artifacts, interviews, demographic and schooling surveys, and a short autobiography as well as a mathematics autobiography. The students were interviewed on four separate occasions. The interviews along with the written artifacts allowed for triangulation of the data (Stinson, 2008). The high achieving students identified several sociocultural factors that helped them achieve success, like family and teacher support (Stinson, 2008). Most of the factors identified by the students included but were not limited to the following: community members or family members who had achieved success, having family members who showed support and who encouraged them throughout their education, and having "caring and committed teachers" (Stinson, 2008, p. 1002).

In a study conducted by Neal (2017), a population of foster undergraduates completed a survey. There were 57 participants who answered the survey. The analysis of the data indicated that former foster youth believed they were supported by schools, felt they were responsible for their academic achievement, and took part in positive activities at the campus. The analysis also indicated that there were protective factors for youth that were academically successful, which included "relying on a network of

caring adults to create positive environments in which students could excel" (Neal, 2017, p. 244). Most of the participants (89%) indicated that they had an adult supporter while in high school. This suggested the influence that "caring" has in foster youth who have been successful educationally.

Social Collaboration

Not only is adult support, such as family members and teachers important in a child's ability to demonstrate resilience, another factor that can assist students in developing resiliency is a sense of community (Reyes, 2007). In this section, social competence, collaboration, and community of practice will be used interchangeable since they all deal with the students' ability to cooperate with others. Community of practice refers to the interaction between peers, between teachers, and among teachers and students. Collaboration refers to "collaborative and cooperative activities that take place in the context of a learning experience" (Ellis, Han, & Pardo, 2018, p.2). Effective schools are those that provide at-risk students with support systems that promote membership and engagement in the educational setting. (Wehlage, Rutter, Smith, Lesko, & Fernandez, Abstract, 1989). In regards to building resiliency in students, a strategic intervention that might assist students if they feel unneeded or unwanted, is cooperative learning; the desired outcome would be students who feel useful (Sagor, 1996). Teachers can promote student ownership of their own learning. For example, a community of practice can be facilitated through the use of positive collaboration between struggling readers and teachers and between struggling readers and their classmates (Vlach & Burcie, 2010). Once struggling readers feel they have a place in the community, they can change their

own narratives and be the heroes of their stories. In Goering and Baker's (2010) study, a student's comment exemplified the sense of community between her and another student, and that the "two supported each other throughout the …lessons and often offered encouragement and support" (p. 72). Collaboration was also needed for these students to develop ownership of their learning.

Furthermore, autonomy can be developed collectively through affiliation to a group (Johnston, 2004). The four African American high-achieving students in Stinson's (2008) study, mentioned previously, identified associating with high-achieving peers as one of the factors contributing to their academic success. In another study, 21 high achieving mathematics students from an urban high school were interviewed (Walker, 2006). These high-achieving students represented mostly Latino and African American students (11 Latino, 9 African American, 2 mixed students). In this particular study the researcher was interested in exploring the roles of peers in the development of mathematics achievement. The researcher found that intellectual cooperation assisted these students' academic standing. Consequently, this collaboration was not only in the school setting but also in out of school contexts, suggesting that these students helped each other with academics, problem solving strategies, and encouragement (Walker, 2006).

Additionally, data gathered from 232 elementary classrooms and student questionnaires found that teacher instructional strategies and practices play a major role in affecting students' sense of community in the classroom (Solomon, Battistich, Il-Kim, & Watson, 1997). Examples of such teaching practices included: students' voicing their

ideas, cooperative grouping, and teacher support. The study included both low and high socioeconomic status (SES) populations. Regardless of level of SES, relationships were found across the different groups. Furthermore, teachers' encouragement of collaboration in their classrooms had a major influence in the findings (Solomon, et al., 1997). This study signals the importance of the teacher and what she does in her classroom. Nevertheless, extrinsic attributes, such as schools, adult support, including teachers, and sense of community are not the only factors that contribute to resilience. Intrinsic attributes also play a significant role in promoting student resilience.

In a more recent study conducted by Lin et al. (2014) the researchers wanted to examine the social influences on children's development of relational thinking during small-group discussions. The sample consisted of 6 teachers and 120 fourth-grade students, ranging in age from 8 to 12 years. The sample came from six Illinois elementary classrooms. Additionally, two of the classrooms were in a rural area, while the other four classrooms were from three different middle schools. Teachers were trained to facilitate Collaborative Reasoning discussions and the guidelines to follow in order to encourage students to talk without being called on by teacher, not interrupting while other's turn to speak, encourage participation, listen with respect, consider different views on issues, and to think critically about ideas being discussed not the specific person discussing the point (Lin et al., 2014). Research assistants were placed in classrooms whenever discussions would be held. The classes held three discussion groups. The students were placed in groups based on gender, ethnicity, level of talkativeness, and academic achievement. Discussion groups were composed of five to

eight students. As part of the study, the student sample completed a host of cognitive tests—Figure Classification, Figure Analogy, and Figure Analysis from the Cognitive Abilities Test, a checklist vocabulary test, and reading comprehension test from the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (Lin et al., 2014). Peer relationships were measured through a questionnaire that measured peer-nomination, while friendship was tested by asking the respective students in the sample to nominate five of their closest friends in class. Additionally, the data included 176 discussions that consisted of over 32,000 turns for speaking. These discussions were transcribed, recorded the speech, pauses, and notes on non-verbal and distracting instances, like announcements via intercom. Researchers coded the discussion transcripts in order to identify the "relational thinking" (use of the words—because, if, so, like, same, what if, if I were) and to "capture social aspects of interaction" (Lin et al., 2014, p. 87). Examples of dialogic interactions included the response to the last speaker. The responses were categorized as *support*, *refutation*, *ambivalent*, *probing*, and *response to probing*, *self-support*, and *change topic*. The analysis of the data showed that support from peers and refutation influenced relational thinking and, at the same time, was facilitated by friendship and peer status. "The study documents the proximal effects of peer status and friendship on the social and cognitive dynamics of collaborative discussions" (Lin et al., 2014, p. 83). This study signals the importance of building a classroom that celebrates friendly, supportive collaboration. Furthermore, educators must present opportunities for ELs to dialogue with peers in order to assist these students in building their English vocabulary.

Motivation

Aside from extrinsic attributes, intrinsic attributes such as motivation have been found to help build resiliency in students. In this study motivation will be defined as "the willingness to attend and learn material in a development program" (Cole, Feild, Harris, 2004). For the purpose of this paper, self-esteem will be grouped with motivation, engagement, and optimism. Hence, the student needs to have the necessary optimism, motivation, and/or self-esteem to make an effort to achieve in academics.

Based on Walker and Greene's (2009) study mentioned previously, they reported that setting mastery goals (a motivation subscale) was predicted by "instrumentality, self-efficacy, and belonging" (p. 463). A comparison between motivation and learning environment was conducted with Latino middle-school students (Waxman, Huang, & Padrón, 1997). In this particular study, researchers found that there was no significant difference between resilient and non-resilient students on whether they spoke English before enrolling in school. However, there was a significant difference found in the aspirations of both groups. Close to 78% of the resilient students responded they would finish school and 90% of the same group responded they would graduate from college. On the other hand, 43% of the non-resilient group indicated they would finish school and close to 46% reported that they would graduate from college. In another study mentioned earlier, the 21 high achieving mathematics students mentioned that even when they competed for the highest grade in math class, it was mainly done because of the motivation they felt to do math at a more challenging level (Walker, 2006).

One of the key strategies that assist individuals in becoming resilient is positive self-esteem (Noble & McGrath, 2005). "An individual with a healthy self-esteem is likely to be able to weather the storms which accompany such a difficult period" (Jindal-Snape & Miller, 2008, p. 226). An important component of children's optimistic thinking is their explanatory style, i.e. the way they explain to themselves why events have happened to them (Noble & McGrath, 2005, p.751). For example, if a child encounters a discouraging event, and he or she feels that it was "all me" and that the event will not get better, then that child is explaining the event pessimistically. Whereas a child that finds the setback as temporary and not his or her fault and is able to explain why it can get better, will be more likely to think positively about the future. Furthermore, self-esteem or optimism can help students feel they belong even when facing challenges. Optimism can co-exist with stressful and disappointing events in a person's life (Cunningham & Swanson, 2010; Murphy, Blustein, Bohlig, & Platt, 2010).

Moreover, self-esteem helps us endure major setbacks by "acting as a buffer" (Mruk, 1999, p. 40). In a study conducted with 206 African American high school students (more than half being females), the researchers found that these students remained optimistic in spite of difficult times; this optimism was found to be in regards to academic future expectations (Cunningham & Swanson, 2010). It is important to note, however, that possessing optimism or high self-esteem does not necessarily mean that an individual will feel competent; same holds true for those who feel competent (Jindal-Snape & Miller, 2008).

Furthermore, self-esteem or optimism can help students feel they belong. As mentioned in a study previously reported, "[s]tudents' self-esteem was the single most important predictor of their sense of belonging" (Ma, 2003, p. 340). Students who doubt their competence often opt for easy tasks, plan poorly, their effort decreases, and they become discouraged (Johnston, 2004). Teacher and student records and survey data were collected from a longitudinal study, which took place from 1990-1995; the data was analyzed by Klem and Connell (2004). The findings showed that middle school students with high levels of engagement, as reported by the teachers, were more than twice as likely to have high rates of attendance and high achievement scores (Klem & Connell, 2004). Additionally, student engagement was "more strongly influenced by high levels of teacher support at the middle school than at the elementary" (Klem & Connell, 2004, p. 270) level, contrary to popular belief that younger children seek adult approval and support, while teenagers do not.

In a study involving high school biology students in Ankara, Turkey, the researchers were interested in finding whether problem-based learning (PBL) increased motivation (Sungur & Tekkaya, 2006). Students in the experimental group were given PBL instruction, while those in the control group were given traditional instruction by their biology teachers. Motivation was measured by administering the *Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire* (MSLQ). The MSLQ consists of the following motivation subscales: intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, task value, control of learning beliefs, self-efficacy for learning and performance, and test anxiety. Besides these motivation subscales, the questionnaire also consisted of learning

strategies (i.e., rehearsal, elaboration, critical thinking, peer learning). The participant scores on the (MSLQ) suggested that there were no significant differences between the experimental and control groups regarding their motivation levels before the study began (Sungur & Tekkaya, 2006). After the implementation of PBL instruction, participants' post-test MSLQ scores were "statistically significant at the .05 level" (Sungur & Tekkaya, 2006, p. 312). Thus, showing that the control and experimental groups had statistically significant scores on the motivation subscales (i.e., intrinsic goal orientation, extrinsic goal orientation, and self-efficacy). In addition, it was also found that participants in the experimental group scored higher in the intrinsic goal orientation subscale, thereby indicating that they studied biology out of curiosity, to attain mastery, and because they perceived it as a challenge (Sungur & Tekkaya, 2006). Also, the students in the experimental group tended to see biology as interesting and relevant to their lives since they had high scores on the task value subscale of the MSLQ (Sungur & Tekkaya, 2006).

As mentioned above, students who see science as relevant will have higher scores on task value (Sungur & Tekkaya, 2006). Therefore, an important aspect of every type of instruction is relevance and prior knowledge. When motivation is a factor that wants to be promoted within students, it is essential to establish a rationale for learning; students need to know that the concepts they are learning are worth learning and that there is a connection between what is going to be learned in the future and what was learned before (Jalongo, 2007). In an elementary study, motivation was studied with respect to education and goals. The researchers found that these students' level of

identified regulation (relevance/prior knowledge) was more likely to motivate them than other types of motivation (Sungur & Senler, 2010). In other words, a task that was relevant to students' lives "was more likely to motivate them" in completing it (Sungur & Senler, 2010). Students from Japan reported that one of the two strategies that was significantly related to enjoying science was when they were asked how the new topic related to past learning (House, 2003). Additionally, this same study found that students from the United States and Japan reported that frequent opportunities for using things from everyday life in solving science problems…made science learning more enjoyable" (House, 2003, p. 435). These studies showed that students' motivation not only comes from within, but it can also be made possible externally, when the teacher provides the adequate classroom environment. This, in turn, will result in an increase in motivation as opposed to using the traditional "lecture" teaching style.

In a more recent study conducted by Kim and Kim (2017), they got 1620 secondary school learners of English to participate in a study they were interested in seeing whether there was an impact of resilience on English learners' motivated behavior and proficiency in their learning of the English language. The sample was gathered from 11 different schools located in a metropolitan area in Korea. Among the participating secondary school students, 27.30% were junior high school students 72.70% were high school students. The way the data was collected was through a questionnaire survey made of three parts—resilience, motivated behavior, and participants' background information and grade level; items were on Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree, being a 1 and strongly agree, being a 5. Participants also

reported their English proficiency based on the latest English test given at their home campus (Kim & Kim, 2017). The data were analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and the Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS). Data were also analyzed using the Pearson product-moment correlation analysis, standard regression analysis, and sequential regression analysis. The reason the researchers used correlation analysis was to see if there was an association between resilience factors to motivated behaviour and English learner proficiency. Whereas, the standard regression analysis was used to look at "which of the resilience factors [had] statistically significant influences on motivated behaviour and English proficiency" (Kim & Kim, 2017, p. 5). Finally, based on the results from these analyses, they selected the resilience factors that showed to have significant effects on motivated behavior or English proficiency. (Kim & Kim, 2017). Note: The alpha was set at .05. The findings were the following: five factors arose from the analyses, and they accounted for roughly 53% of the variance. The factors included: perceived happiness, empathy, sociability, persistence, and self-regulation (Kim & Kim, 2017). The next step the researchers took was to determine whether the correlations were significant between the factors, motivated behavior, and the English learner proficiency. According to Kim & Kim's findings, all the relationships were found to be statistically significant. The factor with the highest correlation was persistence with motivated behavior (r=.367), then perceived happiness (r=.332); sociability was the factor with the lowest relationship with motivated behavior (r=.168). Important to note, there was a higher correlation between resilience of these English learners and motivated behavior than the correlation between resilience and

English learner proficiency. “This suggests that resilience is more closely related to motivated behaviour than to English proficiency” (Kim & Kim, 2017, pp. 6-7). In their analysis of standard regression it was found that perceived happiness and persistence had a significant positive impact on the English learners’ proficiency.

Autonomy

Besides optimism, self-esteem, and motivation, other factors that are significant in promoting resilience are: potency, self-efficacy, sense of purpose, and autonomy. Potency, self-efficacy, and autonomy are grouped under the same section since they deal with a person’s perception of him/herself. According to Brackenreed (2010), several of the intrinsic protective factors that help students become resilient are high levels of autonomy, independence, and task orientation. Potency refers to the students’ ability to feel empowered (Sagor, 1996). In other words, students feel ownership (autonomy) of their decisions in respect to their learning experiences. Additionally, students with a strong sense of ownership are more dedicated and are not likely to give up when faced with a challenge.

Thus, in this section, I will include self-efficacy and autonomy related references since they both deal with a students’ sense of empowerment. In a study that involved 218 fifth graders from three elementary schools, the researchers tried to determine whether the role of self-efficacy could mediate or predict writing aptitude (Pajares & Valiante, 1997). The authors found that “self-efficacy had a direct effect on comprehension and perceived usefulness. Girls and boys did not differ in [their]

performance, but girls reported higher writing self-efficacy, they found writing more useful, and held lower apprehension" (Pajares & Valiente, 1997, p. 353).

Similar to the study by Noble and McGrath's (2005) explanatory style, "[s]elf-knowledge, and in particular how one thinks about one's competence to work on a task, is a critical component in considering how individuals address common life tasks" (Harlow, & Cantor, 1995, p.172). In a study in which 152 participants (4^{th} and 6^{th} graders) living in a large city in Germany were asked to complete an assignment and provide information about how they felt during the task (anxiety and mood) and what score they expected to receive based on their subjective and objective effort (Schmitz & Skinner, 1993), the results showed that the more effort children put in, the better they perform on tests ($r = .36$, $p < .001$, $N = 152$). These researchers found that children who have high control performed better on academic tasks, and took credit for their successes. On the other hand, students who underperformed, blamed themselves for mistakes, and could not explain how and why they answered correctly on a test. The strongest predictors of high control expectations in this study were the explanations of their correct answer due to effort, ability, and concentration. Thus, allowing for the development of resiliency within a student.

In a study conducted in South Texas, the researchers included 200 oral histories of elders who had walked out of Edcouch-Elsa HS in the walkout of 1968 (Guajardo & Guajardo, 2004). The researchers carried out their study to show the impact the Edcouch-Elsa high school walkout has had on educational systems of South Texas. After careful analysis of elders' oral histories, videotapes, pictures, and formal interviews the

authors reported that "landmark judicial decisions such as Brown do not always change the face of local communities. The students who walked out took control of their schools, their politics, and their history. As we uncovered this reality, current high school student researchers gained awareness about the history of their community and their school, and the power of organized action" (Guajardo & Guajardo, 2004, p. 522).

Self-expectations, autonomy, perceived control are all similar factors in nature. However, Skokut's (2009) study did not find that students' self-expectations were a factor in whether or not ELs finished school. On the other hand, self-expectations were found to be significantly associated in these ELs college attendance, which means that regardless of EL's self-expectations to finish high school, these students had the self-expectation of attending college.

In a separate and more recent study conducted by Cassidy (2016), the researcher created a new multidimensional construct measure named the Academic Resilience Survey (ARS-30). The participants consisted of 532 undergraduate students. The ARS-30 aimed to be a context-specific construct that would measure academic resilience based on participants' responses to an academic adversity vignette. The ARS consisted of 30 scale items, based on a 5-point Likert scale from likely (1) to unlikely (5), once they read a short vignette that mimicked academic adversity. The author used two scales of the ARS-30, making a minor change, the vignette; this was done to test construct validity (Cassidy, 2016). The Original group used ARS-30 with the original vignette, while the Alternative group used the ARS-30 with the alternative vignette. The researchers also used the General Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (GASE), this scale is a

measure of academic self-efficacy, and it is used with university students (Cassidy, 2016). The scale reported high internal ($\alpha = 0.86$) and external ($r = 0.71$) reliability. Participants responded to 23 statements that deal with self-efficacy in an academic setting; they selected from each statement, with completely disagree to completely agree using a 9-point Likert scale. Findings from the study showed that the ARS-30 has good internal reliability and construct validity. The author "suggested that a measure such as the ARS-30, which is based on adaptive responses, aligns more closely with the conceptualisation of resilience and provides a valid construct measure of academic resilience relevant for research and practice in university student populations" (Cassidy, 2016, p. 1). The analysis of validity indicated that higher scores on global academic resilience were associated with higher academic self-efficacy ($r = 0.49$, $N = 319$, $p < 0.01$) and being older ($r = 0.20$, $N = 317$, $p < 0.01$). Important to note was that when the comparison of mean GASE scores was made of the two vignette groups, it did not reveal a significant difference ($t = 0.341$, $df = 529$, $p > 0.05$)), indicating that such differences in the ARS-30 scores came from the different version of the vignette and not because of group differences in their academic self-efficacy. Therefore, self-efficacy was associated with global academic resilience, as reported by researcher.

In a study conducted by Su et al. (2018), the researchers were interested in looking at the relationship between English learners' online self-regulation and self-efficacy. The sample consisted of 424 first-year university students (approximately 18-19 years of age). All of the participants had received and finished English language learning in middle and high school before enrolling in the university. Two

questionnaires were used to examine online-self regulation and English self-efficacy. One of the questionnaires was adapted by the researcher, the online self-regulated English learning questionnaire (OSEL). The OSEL assesses English learners' online self-regulation, and it had been reported to have a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.91, which translates into having a high internal consistency reliability (Su et al., 2018). The OSEL questionnaire was made up of 30 items, which were on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (do not agree) to 5 (strongly agree). The second questionnaire used was the English Language self-efficacy (ELSE); it was adapted from Wang et al. (2014). The questionnaire is used to assess listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The questionnaire was made up of 32 items about the students' beliefs on capability and completion of tasks in the English language. Its reliability and validity were within acceptable ranges, 0.88-0.92 for each respectively; Cronbach's internal consistency was high as well, alpha value of 0.99. The questionnaire was adapted to better fit the sample being surveyed. The questions were on a 5-point Likert scale, 1 (I cannot do it at all) to 5 (I can do it well). The data was analyzed by using Pearson correlation analysis to determine whether there was a relationship between OSEL and ELSE factors as well as stepwise regression analysis between the scales used on the two questionnaires. Based on literature, Su et al. (2018) used OSEL scales as the predictor variables and the ELSE scales as the outcome variables. The Pearson correlation analysis of the OSEL scales found to have an association with self-efficacy in speaking (r= 0.15--0.32) and writing (r= 0.15—0.37) than with other skills of self-efficacy. The findings also reported that self-evaluation predicted listening ($\beta = 0.28$, $t = 5.87$, $p < 0.001$), speaking ($\beta = 0.27$, $t =$

5.51, $p < 0.001$), and reading ($\beta = 0.24$, $t = 5.12$, $p < 0.001$). It indicated that self-evaluation is crucial in English Learners. Furthermore, these results signal that the "students with higher self-evaluation capacity in the online English learning environment would be more likely to possess higher English language self-efficacy in listening, speaking, and reading" (Su et al., 2018, p. 112).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

School Setting

In this investigation the academic resilience of 50 to 75 Spanish-speaking ELs between the ages of 11 and 16 attending two South Texas middle schools was studied by administering surveys, conducting semi-structured interviews, and analyzing extant TELPAS data and report card grades. For purposes of this study academic resilience was referred to as the ability of a student to be academically successful in spite of at-risk factors of dropping out of school. At one of the middle schools, school A, there were a total of 471 students. Most of the students at this school were labeled economically disadvantaged, 96%. At this school, the average class size was calculated when all subjects were added and averaged out, both the state and school A had a ratio of about 18 students to 1 teacher. However, the average class size of Reading/Language arts was significantly larger than the state, (state—17 to 1, school A—21 to students to 1 teacher); and Science and Social Studies class sizes were comparable to the state about 20 students to 1 teacher. However, the Math class sizes were significantly smaller than the state average (state—18 to 1, school A—14 students to 1 teacher) (Texas Education Agency, 2017). Furthermore, the total number of students labeled Limited English proficiency (LEP/EL) was 253, which made up 54% of the student population. The total number of students labeled 1st year monitored (M1) and 2nd year monitored (M2), was 38; thus, this subgroup made up 11% of the entire student population. Additionally, 98% of the LEP were labeled at-risk, while 82% of M1s and M2s are labeled at-risk. The

teacher experience was also looked at, 42% of the teachers had 5 years or less experience, 18% had 6 years to 10 years in teaching experience, and 40% had over 10 years of teaching experience (Texas Education Agency, 2017).

In the second middle school, school B, there was a total of 1,124 students. In this school, 88% of the student population was considered economically disadvantaged. The average class size of this school was slightly larger than the state level (state—17 students to 1 teacher, school B—20 students to 1 teacher), and the Reading/Language Arts classes were significantly larger than the state's average class size (state—17 to 1, school B—20 students to 1). Science & Social Studies class sizes where somewhat larger than the state (state—19 to 1, School B—22 students to 1 teacher). The Math average class size was slightly smaller than the state's average (state—18 to 1, school B—17 students to 1 teacher) (Texas Education Agency, 2017). Furthermore, the total number of students labeled LEP was 489 students, which made up close to 44% of the student population. Moreover, the total number of M1 (1st year monitored students) and M2 (2nd year monitored students) was 200, which roughly made up 18% of the student population. Additionally, 98% of the LEP were labeled at-risk, while 55% of M1 and M2 are labeled at-risk. At both schools, a little over or close to half of the student population were LEP. Also, nearly all of the LEP students (98%) were labeled at-risk due to one or more of the factors that are mentioned in the next section. When the teacher experience was looked at, 34% had 5 years or less of experience, 25% had 6 years to 10 years experience, while 41% had over 10 years in teaching experience. Thus,

this school had significantly less of its teachers with beginning experience, being 5 years or less.

Participants and Sampling Procedures

The researcher obtained permission from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) from A&M College Station and the particular school district's IRB and school administrators. The participants were selected through a combination of criterion and purposive sampling since I only selected students from these two middle schools and because the specific group I was interested in was at-risk ELs who had consistently attained C's or better in core subjects and either scored Advanced High on TELPAS or were exited from the LEP program as well as those ELs who were unsuccessful in getting out of the program and had a difficult time in core classes (report card grades). In order to determine which students were ELs, I went to the administrator who was in charge of this subgroup and asked her for an Instruction Research and Information Services (IRIS) list that contained demographics (gender, ethnicity, at-risk, LEP status) in order to determine which students were current LEP and those who had been recently exited from the program (M1 and M2s).

For this study, I made two groups of which one was resilient while the other was non-resilient. As mentioned in Chapter 1, for the purpose of this study, resilient ELs were those at-risk ELs who: a) were exited from the EL program and were able to maintain C's or better in all core subject areas; or b) those ELs still in the program but who scored Advanced High in the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and maintained C's or better in all core subject areas. Additionally,

only those at-risk ELs and former ELs, who had parental permission and who were willing to participate in the study were surveyed and interviewed. The participants were told that their information would be kept confidential (their name, school, and current city would not be revealed to anyone). In order to determine whether a student was at-risk, this district used the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), which establishes criteria of "at-risk" factors for students in the public schools in Texas. The criteria for at-risk status includes each student under 21 years of age who at least falls under one of these: has been retained for one or more grade levels; is in grades 7-12 and was not able to maintain an average of 70 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum; did not perform satisfactorily on an assessment administered under TEC Subchapter B, Chapter 39, and has not in the past or current school year performed on that instrument or another instrument at a level of satisfactory performance on that instrument; is pregnant or is a parent; placed in an alternative education program during the previous or current school year; has been expelled; is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release; previously reported as dropping out; student of LEP; custody or care of the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services, been referred by a school official, officer of the juvenile court, or law enforcement; is homeless; resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility, detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric facility, halfway house, or foster care (Texas Education Agency, 2011).

After I created the two groups, of resilient and non-resilient ELs/monitored ELs, I examined how many at-risk factors on average each group had. Based on the definition of academic resilience, I hypothesized that non-resilient students would have more at-risk factors on average. Only those at-risk ELs or formerly EL (M1 and M2), who returned the necessary forms, were included in the study. The forms informed the participants and their parents about the purpose of this study (identifying factors that contribute to EL academic success and/or lack of academic success); confidentiality procedures describing how the information was going to be kept confidential. The information provided as well as the extant data--report cards and TELPAS scores--were kept confidential by not revealing the students' names, the campus name, nor the location. The EL/formerly EL groups were coded with a number and either an "R" for resilient or "NR" for non-resilient, e.g., EL 1; 1R, EL 2: 1NR, etc. Furthermore, the data were kept under lock and key. The participants were informed about 1) being able to withdraw from the study if they feel they no longer want to participate, 2) the type of data collection procedures, and 3) the number of items on surveys and number of questions on interview.

Report Cards and English Proficiency Assessment

Finally, the last type of data I used were report card numerical grades and scores in the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS). The report card grades were used in order to determine whether the students were academically successful (C's or better) or unsuccessful in their core classes. The grades were computed numerically—70s, 80s, etc. The TELPAS scores were used to determine

whether these students were developing the necessary English language proficiency. TELPAS "[was] designed to assess the progress that limited English proficient (LEP) students make in learning the English language" (Texas Education Agency, 2011, para. 1). TELPAS assessed students in the following four domains: reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills. Teachers rated middle school students (1 representing *Beginner* and 4 representing *Advanced High*) in the writing portions, while the reading component was assessed through the TELPAS reading assessment and listening and speaking was being tested online starting in 2018 (TELPAS, 2017).

Instruments

Academic resilience survey.

The *Academic Resilience Survey* (ARS) was developed for this investigation. The *ARS* was administered in groups of five either in the morning or afternoon with parent permission. The researcher was present while the students filled out the survey in case they needed clarification of particular items. The survey consisted of 75 items and was adapted from the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS): High school longitudinal study (2002-2006), the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) (WestEd, 2012), and a motivation and adult support scales from Van Ryzin, Gravely, & Roseth, 2009. See Appendix A for copy of the Academic Resilience Survey.

The student survey I administered consisted of 27 items from the ELS (2002), 11 items from the CHKS (2013), and 37 items from engagement and classroom life scale from Van Ryzin, et al. (2009). The survey consisted of 75 items (many of which were not individually numbered on the ELS 2002 study rather they were grouped under the

same category). The student questionnaire that I administered to the participants was categorized into the following subcategories: native language, family configuration (siblings, birth order, live with parents, parent education level), adult support, school belonging, collaboration, autonomy, motivation/engagement, family expectations and support, self-expectations, support in general, and plans for the future. Furthermore, 64 of the 75 items on the survey were on a Likert scale (1) *Not at all True*, (2) *A Little True*, (3) *Pretty Much True*, and (4) *Very Much True*. Eleven items required the students to make a selection amongst choices or to write a short answer. These instruments assisted me in determining the degree of motivation, autonomy, the type of adult support these at-risk ELs/monitored ELs possessed. The following sections included descriptions of the instruments from which items were selected, along with an explanation for my selection process.

Education longitudinal study of 2002.

The Education Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS) was a longitudinal survey that was "designed to monitor the transition of a national sample of young people as they progress from tenth grade through high school and on to postsecondary education and/or the world of work" (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). The first year of the study, the 10th grade students' academic achievement, experiences, and attitudes were collected. Four years later, in the second follow-up, the students were surveyed in order to determine if they had completed high school and if they were attending, had attended temporarily, or planned to attend college (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). Since the particular group of students I was interested in studying are not in high school, they

attended middle school, I will only use the questionnaire that was given to the students in the first year of the study. Moreover, the survey consisted of 98 items that required students to answer most of the questions on a Likert-scale. Out of the 98 items this questionnaire had, I did not use over 60 items because they were not directly relevant to my study The items that were not used dealt with the following themes: questions that asked for information for follow-up contact for longitudinal study; race and ethnicity; tests they planned to take (SAT, ACT); college advice; if they planned to participate in sports at collegiate level; if they hoped to receive a college scholarship; job occupation; work-based learning experience in high school; occupation of parent/guardian(s); available literature at home; how often they discussed grades, attending college, current events with parents; additional reading out of school; activities outside of school (hobbies, volunteer work); television, computer, DVD players, computer games at home; library use; plans for future; questions about close friends; opportunities for girls in sports; and kids they had stayed friends with from middle school. I did not use the previous items because they did not address any of the factors included on the literature review and because some of the questions were designed for high school students and not middle school students. Out of the 98 items this questionnaire had, I selected 31 items since they were directly relevant to my study. I decided to use these items because they assessed native language, adult support, sense of belonging, and most of the internal attributes that were identified as being associated with academic resilience. The items from the *Academic Resilience Survey* that were adapted and adopted from the ELS 2002 include the following: 1, 2, 3, 13-20, 40-48, 67, 69-75, and 87-89. An item that was

adapted and was found on the Academic Resilience survey was item number 1, which was changed from requiring students to bubble in answer to requiring a short answer. The items that were adapted were items 67,70, 73-75, and 87-89 because students were either requested to circle the answer versus bubbling in the answer or the questions got reworded to better fit the aim of the study. The ELS 2002 questionnaire was included on the references section.

California healthy kids survey.

The California Healthy Kids Survey, or CHKS, was developed to find health risks and resilience in different schools in the state of California. It was designed as part of the NCLB act. The survey consisted of 100 Likert-scale items and it was considered the "largest statewide survey of resiliency, protective factors, and risk behaviors in the nation" (San Dieguito Union High School District, 2016, para. 1). I adapted this survey in two ways: I selected 11 items and I adapted the rating from a five-point to a four-point scale. Most of the items on the CHKS questionnaire pertained to the health of students, e.g., drug use, bullying. The 11 items I selected deal with sense of belonging in school and adult support. The following items that were incorporated into the *ARS* were adaptations of items: 5-10 and 24-28. Items #24-28 were on a Likert-type scale with 1 being *Strongly disagree* to 5 being *Strongly agree*. I adapted these items to be on Likert scale of 1 through 4 scale: (1) *Not at all True*, (2) *A Little True*, (3) *Pretty Much True*, and (4) *Very Much True* because I wanted most of the items on the *ARS* to be on the same four point scale. The CHKS link was included on the references section of this paper.

Engagement and classroom life scales.

Finally, the *Engagement and Classroom Life Scale* on the survey was adapted from Van Ryzin, et al. (2009). The first scale measured the degree of student engagement vs. disengagement in school and it consisted of 20 items that require Likert-type answers from definitely false (1) to definitely true (8). I adapted this eight-point scale to a four-point scale, scale (1) *Not at all True*, (2) *A Little True*, (3) *Pretty Much True*, and (4) *Very Much True*. The scale produced a Cronbach's alpha reliability of .79 in the same study. The second scale was called *Classroom Life Scale* and it measured the degree of teacher and peer support. This scale consisted of 17 items that required Likert-type answers (1) *never*, (5) *always*. I adapted this survey by changing it to scale (1) *Not at all True*, (2) *A Little True*, (3) *Pretty Much True*, and (4) *Very Much True*. I also adapted this scale by reducing the number of items to 11 instead of 17 because I only wanted questions that assessed social competence (collaboration) and motivation. Furthermore, this support scale produced a Cronbach's reliability of .91. The items on the Academic Resilience Survey that were adapted from the scales included the following: 29-39, and 49-68. The *Engagement and Classroom Life Scale* was listed on the references section.

Semi-structured interview.

The 10 items on the student semi-structured interview questions were presented in Appendix A. The questions were developed to address the different factors presented in the literature review. Below, each question was placed under one of the factors from the literature review.

Adult support—1) List the different instructional strategies that help you learn concepts in your classes (researcher will offer examples); 2) List different teaching practices (researcher will offer examples) that help you learn concepts; 5) What kinds of things do your parents do to help you with schoolwork? If they do not help you, whom do you go to for help? 6) What type of support does your teacher give you in order for you to improve and to be successful in class?

Autonomy—3) Do you consider yourself the type of student who can succeed in school and in life in general? Why or why not? 8) If you struggle in classes, why do you think you have a hard time? Do you think there is something you can do in order to struggle less in classes?

Motivation/Optimism—4) Do you feel motivated to do well in your classes, so that you can pass to high school? 9) If you have been retained in at least one grade level and/or have failed one or more of your core classes during a grading period, do you try your best to improve your grades over the course of the year in order to pass to the next grade level?

Social Competence/Collaboration—7) When do you retain (learn) information better, when you are placed in a group, or by yourself?

English Language Proficiency—10) Do you feel you have learned the necessary English to read, write, listen, and speak it every day at school? In other words, do you feel that you understand most of the information presented in your classes, or do you need additional assistance, before/after school? Why or why not?

The *ARS* and semi-structured interview were administered separately in up to 6 sessions (before class or after school) in a classroom, 3 sessions to complete ARS and up to 3 sessions to complete the interview. Participants were asked the interview questions by the researcher, and the researcher elaborated or clarified any question for the student. An IRB member translated instruments, the ARS and semi-structured interview questions, into Spanish. I, the researcher, checked with other colleagues to ensure that instruments were appropriately translated.

Qualitative Analysis

For the qualitative portion of the study, the interview transcripts were used. The semi-structured interviews were analyzed so that they can be coded. These data were analyzed in order to determine if there were common themes. Not only did common themes arise, but any major difference in participants' responses (EL resilient and non-resilient) were also identified and reported. I began with open coding, coding for the main categories, or themes. Next, axial coding was conducted, which began by focusing on the main categories that emerged from open coding. Axial coding referred to the connection between categories. These data, in turn, could be made into a theoretical model. Lastly, selective coding was done, which required for me come up with propositions, or hypotheses (Creswell, 2007).

Once categories or themes were found, I was able to determine whether they could be grouped under any of the already identified attributes mentioned in the review of the literature. Moreover, to determine if the themes were indicative of resilience or the opposite, I looked at the factors, which the at-risk ELs/monitored ELs stated that played

a significant role in their success in the classroom. Success, as mentioned before, was based on these students' Language Proficiency level and their report card grades.

Quantitative Analysis

The quantitative data gathered by the surveys as well as the report card grades and TELPAS scores were analyzed by utilizing the program, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software, or SPSS acquired by IBM. The following research questions were analyzed quantitatively: (b) Is there a relationship between the following intrinsic factors—motivation and autonomy, —and the academic resilience or proficiency of Spanish-speaking ELs? (c) Which extrinsic factors—school belonging, adult support, and social collaboration--are associated with Spanish speaking EL students' academic resilience or proficiency?; (d) Is there a relationship between extrinsic factors and/or intrinsic factors? Is family configuration (number of parents at home, number of siblings, and birth order, family education expectations, parent education level, and parent education expectations) associated with an EL's opportunity to develop academic resilience or proficiency? (f) Do non-resilient ELs possess more at-risk factors than their resilient EL peers? Is there an association between At-Risk Factors and English Language Proficiency factors? and (g) When considered simultaneously, which variables (intrinsic or extrinsic) are most associated with language proficiency, TELPAS scores, and average grade? (These dependent variables will help determine whether they will assist a EL/monitored EL be successful academically.)

SPSS is a software that is used to analyze quantitative data. Thus, I analyzed the data and determined whether students' responses to survey items were indicative of ELs'

need of developing resilience and/or proficiency, and in some instances the responses indicated if certain factors fostered academic resilience in at-risk ELs/monitored ELs. First, I used G-power to determine the sample size I needed. The t-test was ran with a multiple linear regression single regression coefficient; 1 tail, effect size of 0.15, alpha error probability of 0.05, Power (beta error probability) of 0.80, and the number of predictors was set to two—intrinsic and extrinsic. Once it was calculated, the sample size came out to 43. This means the number of participants that needed to be in the sample was 43 in order to ensure that the null hypothesis was rejected appropriately.

In this study, to determine whether results were indicative of resilience in at-risk EL siblings, the variables were analyzed to indicate whether they were associated or not and statistically, using Person's correlations on SPSS. Findings that were shown to have statistical significance were reported; however, practical significance was also reported in cases in which small, medium, or large effect sizes resulted. Therefore, Cohen's *d* will be used to measure effect sizes. Cohen's *d* "measures effect sizes in standard deviation units;" small effect sizes range from .2 to .5, medium effect sizes range from .5 to .8, and large effect sizes will be those that are .8 or higher (Education Commission of the States, 2004). The means of the different variables: optimism, social competence, etc. were used to compute the effect sizes. An online calculator was used to input the means of two factors in order to determine if a factor had an influence on another factor.

Furthermore, multiple regression analyses were conducted. Multiple regression is a "statistical technique that can be used to investigate relationships between a single outcome variable and two or more predictor variables" (Thompson, 2006, p. 217).

Multiple regression was used to predict and explain (theory testing) (Thompson, 2006, p. 217). In other words, multiple regression examined how two or more predictor variables (in this study—intrinsic and extrinsic) have an effect on an outcome variable (EL proficiency or average grades). Academic Resilience was dummy variable and a single multiple regression analysis will be conducted. A two part regression analysis was done. First, with resilient and non-resilient students. Second, with only resilient students. The predictor variables used were extrinsic and intrinsic. The outcome variables were proficiency levels, TELPAS scores, and average grade.

Additionally, I created latent variables based on the items using exploratory factor analysis. These, in turn, resulted in composite variables for each factor. The way non-resilient students responded was analyzed using factor analysis. This analysis was used to see patterns in the data. The specific procedure for this analysis is explained in Chapter 4 of this study.

Analysis of Research Questions

The research questions were answered in the following manner:

Correlations, effect sizes, and multiple regression analyses of survey data and extant data (average grades, TELPAS scores, at-risk factors, proficiency levels) were done through SPSS. Interview questions were coded for common themes.

(a) Is type of schooling linked to EL/monitored EL academic resilience? This question was answered by looking at the demographics of both schools as well as the information. Academic resilience was measured through extant average grades and proficiency levels. Proficiency was measured through proficiency levels that were assigned to students from

TELPAS scores. Averages were calculated for resilient and non-resilient students separately, the group with more at-risk factors was linked to academic resilience.

(b) Is there a relationship between the following intrinsic factor—motivation and autonomy, —and the academic resilience or proficiency of Spanish-speaking ELs? (c) Which extrinsic factors—school belonging, adult support, and social collaboration--are associated with Spanish speaking EL students' academic resilience or proficiency? (d) Is there a relationship between extrinsic factors and/or intrinsic factors? These research questions were answered with the *ARS* items. School belonging was answered with items 13 through 28; adult support factor was answered with student interview questions 1 and 2 and survey items 5 through 12 and 71; the collaboration factor was answered with student survey items 29 through 39 and semi-structured interview items 1 and 7; the motivation factor was answered with student survey items 49 through 68 and semi-structured interview items 4 and 9; and the autonomy factor was answered with student survey items 40 through 48 and survey items 3 and 8. SPSS was used to do correlations, and an online calculator was used to calculate effect sizes. Coding for common themes was used for interview questions.

(e) Is family configuration (number of parents at home, number of siblings, and birth order, family education expectations, parent education level, and parent education expectations) associated with an EL's opportunity to develop academic resilience or proficiency? This research question was answered with the help of survey item 4, 69, 70, and 72. SPSS was used to run correlations, and an online calculator was used to compute effect sizes. Coding for common themes was used for interview questions.

(f) Do non-resilient ELs possess more at-risk factors than their resilient EL peers? Is there an association between At-Risk Factors and English Language Proficiency factors? The first question was answered by looking at the particular risk factors found on *PEIMS* that resilient and non-resilient ELs have or do not have. The second question was answered by analyzing the number of At-Risk factors and extant TELPAS scores and Proficiency levels and using SPSS to run correlations and/or compute effect sizez using online calculator.

(g) When considered simultaneously, which variables (intrinsic or extrinsic) are most associated with language proficiency, TELPAS scores, and average grade? Inputting the data and conducting multiple regression analyses in a two part regression analysis answered this research question. The firs step was done with both resilient and non-resilient students, while the second step regression was done with only resilient students.

The research questions were answered by analyzing the following instruments: Likert-type responses to the student survey, the themes that emerged from the semi-structured interviews, and the data that was gathered from extant data.

Furthermore, by analyzing the variables through correlations, effect sizes, multiple regression, and exploratory analysis, I was able to determine whether or not these factors were associated with at-risk ELs'/monitored ELs' success in these middle school classrooms. At the same time, by analyzing the variables, I was able to determine which factors are present in successful at-risk ELLs (or former ELs).

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter contains the data analyses of the 75-item Academic Resilience Survey (ARS), 10 questions from a questionnaire, at-risk factors as per the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), TELPAS scores, and average grades of participants in this study. The ARS was made by combining two different surveys and 2 scales, and, for most of the items, students had to respond to a Likert-scale. For the copy of the ARS, look at Appendix A.

The SPSS program was used to analyze the data from the survey. The ARS was made up of the following sections:

- Native Language
- Family Configuration
- Adult & Family Support
- School Belonging
- Social Collaboration
- Autonomy
- Motivation
- Adult level of Education
- Family & Adult Expectations on Education

The participants' responses on the interview were analyzed by looking for commonalities and coding them accordingly. The questions dealt with how these ELs

and M1 and M2 students learned in their core classes; if they considered themselves the type of student who can succeed; if they felt motivated to do well in classes, what type of help they received at home and at school from their teacher; and if they felt they had acquired the necessary skills to speak, read, listen, and write in the English language.

Native Language Correlations

This section of the survey covered the participants' native language, how often they spoke their native language at home, and how well they understood, spoke, read, and wrote English. This part helped contextualize the findings, make correlations amongst the answers on the native language to other factors studied in this study, and it also helped make appropriate recommendations to assist teachers in effectively addressing the needs of ELs and monitored ELs. Table 1 reported the correlations found.

Native language was divided into 2 factors: Native language 2 and Native language 3. The questions on "Native Language 2" asked how often did the student speak his native language with family and friends. The answers for this section were on a Likert-scale Never, Sometimes, About ½ of the time, Always or most of the time, and Does not apply. Table 1 showed the factors that were shown to have a correlation with Native Language 2 and Native Language 3.

Table 1

Correlations between Native Language and Other Factors

Variable	Native Language 2	Native Language 3	Adult Ed lvl	Siblings	Fam Ed Expec	At-Risk	Res.	Prof.	TELPAS
Native Language 2	1	.211*	.248*	.339**	NS	.226*	NS	NS	NS
Native Language 3		1	NS	NS	-.219*	.522**	.306**	-.346**	-.340**

Note. N=64 for all variables. * *p<.05, ** p<.01. NS=not statistically significant, Res = resiliency, Prof=proficiency, Fam Ed Expec= Family Education Expectations, Adult Ed lvl=Adult Education Level*

The first table showed a positive Pearson correlation of .248 (significant 0.05 level) between Native Language 2 and Adult Education Level (parents' highest level of education). This finding meant that the participants used their native language with their family and friends more often when their parents' level of education was higher (e.g. graduated from college). The second correlation of .339 (significant 0.01 level) was between Number of Siblings and Native Language 2. The more siblings a participant had, the more likely it was associated with them using their native language with their family and friends. Family Education Expectations of these students did not have an association with Native Language 2. There was an association of .226 ($p < 0.5$), however, between Native Language 2 and At-Risk Factors; this meant that the more at-risk factors a student had, the more likely they would speak their native language with family and friends.

The table also showed the correlation between different factors and Native Language 3. The questions on "Native Language 3" dealt with how well EL and monitored EL understood, spoke, read, and wrote English. The answers for this section ranged from Very Well to Not at All. On Table 1, the correlation of .211 was significant at the 0.05 level; this association was between Native Language 2 and Native Language 3. This association meant that the more a student spoke their native language with family and friends, the more likely it was associated with students not feeling comfortable with speaking, reading, and understanding spoken English. Table 1 showed a negative correlation of -.219 (significant at the 0.05 level) between Native Language 3 and the Family Education Expectations. This means that if the parents had higher expectations,

there was an inverse relationship to participants' rating of how they felt they understood, spoke, read, and wrote English; in this case they felt they spoke, read, wrote, and understood spoken English well and vice versa.

Similarly, as reported on the table, Native Language 3 and Proficiency was negatively associated (r= -.346, significant at the 0.05 level) and Proficiency was negatively associated with TELPAS scores (r= -.340, p<.05). As far as participants' proficiency level in English, this factor involved a students' current label in the public school (EL coded as 0, 1st year monitored coded as 1, 2nd year monitored coded as 2.) The TELPAS factor was ranked 1 for beginner, 2 for intermediate, 3 for advanced, 4 for advanced high, 5 exited from the program. These findings suggested that when participants' Proficiency was higher it was associated with students who felt they spoke, read, wrote, and understood spoken English well. Interestingly, both negative correlations were extremely close to each other. This could be due to proficiency being indicative of the TELPAS coding the state of Texas goes by. For more information about proficiency, please see Appendix A "TELPAS Proficiency Level Descriptors." Both negative associations indicate that when the participants had lower proficiency, there was an association to EL and monitored EL not understanding, speaking, reading, and writing in English that well.

Table 1 also reported a positive correlation between Native Language 3 and Resiliency (r=.306) and At-Risk Factors (r=.522) both significant at the 0.01 level. Resiliency was coded as a 2 for non-resilient and 1 for resilient. The number of at-risk factors a participant fell under was coded as 1 for one at-risk factor, 2 for two at-risk

factors, etc. These two correlations go hand in hand. The more at-risk factors a student possessed, the more it was associated with the student feeling they did not understand, speak, read, and write in English. Similarly, if a student was non-resilient, the more likely it was associated to them answering they did not understand, speak, read, and write in English very well.

Table 2

Correlations between Native Language& Extrinsic and Intrinsic Factors

Variable	NatLang 2	NatLang 3	Adult Supp	School Bel	Soc Collab	Auton	Motivation
NatLang2	1	.211*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
NatLang3		1	NS	-.241*	NS	NS	-.219*

Note. N=64 for all variables. * *p<.05, ** p<.01. NS=not statistically significant, Adult Supp= Adult Support, School Bel= School Belonging, Soc Collab= Social Collaboration, Auton= Autonomy.*

Table 2 showed a negative correlation (r= -.241) between Native Language 3 and School Belonging that was significant at the 0.05 level. The table also reported a negative correlation between Native Language 3 and Motivation (r= -.219), significant at the 0.05 level. These two findings mean that when Motivation and School Belonging were ranked high, there was an association with students' understanding, speaking, reading, and writing in English well. Furthermore, the factors of Adult Support, School Belonging, Social Competence, and Autonomy were not found to be associated to Native Language.

Family Configuration Correlations

Besides native language, family configuration was an extrinsic factor that was included on this study. Family configuration consisted of how many siblings the ELs and monitored ELs have, the birth order of the participant, and whether they lived with their parents or not. Table 3 includes the correlations between family configuration and native language 2. Native Language 3 did not have a significant correlation with family configuration.

Table 3

Correlations between Family Configuration and Other Factors

Variable	Nat Lang2	Nat Lang3	Adult Ed Level	Res.	Prof.	Average Grade	AR
Siblings	.339**	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	.216*
Live with Parents	-.209*	NS	NS	NS	NS	.227*	NS
Birth Order	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

Note. N=64 for all variables. * *p<.05, ** p<.01. NS=not statistically significant*

Based on the third table there were only four statistically significant associations—Live with Parents and Native Language 2, Live with Parents and Average Grade, Number of Siblings and Native Language 2, and Number of Siblings and At-Risk factors. The table reported Live with Parents and Native Language 2 (r= -.209, significant at the 0.05 level). The negative correlation between Living with Parents and Native Language 2 indicated that it was more likely for participants who lived with their parents to speak

their native language than those who did not. Additionally, Live with Parents was found to associated ($r = .227$, $p<.05$) with Average Grade. In other words, those students who did not live with their parents were associated with higher Average Grades.

It is important to note that Birth Order did not have any positive or negative significant associations with any factor studied in this study. Furthermore, Number of Siblings only had two positive correlations, and that was with Native Language 2 ($r = .339$, $p<.01$) and At Risk factors ($r = .216$, $p<.05$). These positive correlations meant that the higher the number of siblings, the more likely it was associated with higher number of at risk factors and with students who spoke their native language with family and friends regularly. No other significant correlations were found between Family Configuration and intrinsic and extrinsic factors. With such findings, it is safe to state that the factors that were connected to Family Configuration were not significantly associated with ELs and monitored ELs success in school or lack there of.

Adult Support Correlations

The adult support section consisted of questions on a Likert-scale that included items, such as *There's a teacher/adult who really cares about me*, *There's a teacher/adult who always wants me to do my best*, *There's a teacher/adult who listens to me when I have something to say*, and *There's a teacher who is available to help me before/after school*. Adult support also included questions about Adult Expectations on ELs/monitored ELs future educational plans as well as Family Expectations on these students' plans for the future.

Table 4

Correlations between Extrinsic and Intrinsic Factors

Variable	Adult Supp	School Bel	Social Collab	Autonomy	Motivation
Adult Supp	1	.745**	.643**	.636**	.515**
School Bel		1	.659**	.493**	.569**
Social Collab			1	.651**	.573**
Autonomy				1	.527**
Motivation					1

Note. N=64 for all variables. * *p*<.05, ** *p*<.01. *NS=not statistically significant*

Based on Table 4, Adult Support had significant positive associations with the following extrinsic factors, School Belonging (*r*= .745) and Social Collaboration (*r*= .643), both significant at the 0.01 level. These findings translate to the higher the participant ranked Adult Support, the higher the association it had with the way they ranked School Belonging and Social Competence/Collaboration. Moreover, there was a stronger relationship between Adult Support and School Belonging. There were also positive correlations between Adult Support and the following intrinsic factors, Autonomy (*r*= .636) and Motivation (*r*= .515), both significant at the 0.01 level. These findings meant that there was a direct relationship between Adult Support and Autonomy and Adult Support and Motivation; the higher the rank on Adult Support, the higher the rank on Autonomy and Motivation. Autonomy, having a slightly higher correlation to Adult Support. This also meant that students who felt they had adult support from teachers and/or an adult felt they were in control of their own learning. Similarly, participants

who ranked adult support high possessed more autonomy. Important to note is that this factor did not have an association with At-Risk Factors, Resiliency, Proficiency, TELPAS, Average Grade, Number of Siblings, Birth Order, and neither did it have an association with Family Support or Adult Expectations on Education.

School Belonging Correlations

The section of School Belonging was made up of questions, such as *Students get along well with teachers*, *Students make friends with other group of students*, *There is real school spirit*, and *Other students disrupt my learning in class*. Table 4 demonstrated the correlations between School Belonging and the other factors in this study. Only the following factors showed a positive association with School Belonging: Adult Support (correlation described above), Social Collaboration, Autonomy, and Motivation.

Based on the Table 4, School Belonging had significant positive associations with the following extrinsic factors, Adult Support (r= .745) and Social Collaboration (r= .659), both statistically significant at the 0.01 level. These findings translate to the higher the participant ranked School Belonging, the higher the association it had with the way they ranked Adult Support and Social Competence/Collaboration. Furthermore, there was a stronger relationship between School Belonging and Adult Support.

Additionally, there were also positive correlations between School Belonging and the following intrinsic factors, Autonomy (r= .493) and Motivation (r= .569), both significant at the 0.01 level. These findings mean that there was a direct relationship between School Belonging and Autonomy, School Belonging and Adult Support, and School Belonging and Motivation. The higher the rank on School Belonging, the higher

the rank on Adult Support, Autonomy, and Motivation. Motivation, having a slightly higher correlation to School Belonging. This means that students who felt they belonged to their school possessed more motivation. Similarly, participants who ranked feeling a high sense of belonging to their school possessed more autonomy based on their rankings. Important to note, this factor did not have an association with At-Risk factors, Resiliency, Proficiency, TELPAS, Average Grade, Number of Siblings, or Birth Order. It did, however, have a correlation with Native Language 3 as previously reported.

Social Collaboration Correlations

The Social Collaboration factor consisted of questions, such as *Other students in this school want me to do my best schoolwork*, *In this school, other students care about how much I learn*, and *In class, the teachers give us opportunities to collaborate with others*. The tables that will be included under this section will include the positive correlations between Social Collaboration and Adult Support, School Belonging, Autonomy, and Motivation.

Based on Table 4, Social Collaboration had significant positive associations with the following extrinsic factors, Adult Support (r= .643) and School Belonging (r= .659), both statistically significant at the 0.01 level. These findings meant that the higher the participant ranked Social Collaboration, the higher the association it had with the way they ranked Adult Support and School Belonging. Moreover, there was a stronger relationship between Social Collaboration and School Belonging. There were also positive correlations between Social Collaboration and the following intrinsic factors, Autonomy (r= .651) and Motivation (r= .573), both significant at the 0.01 level. These

findings meant that there was a direct relationship between Social Collaboration and Autonomy and Social Collaboration and Motivation; the higher the participants ranked on Social Collaboration, the higher they ranked the Autonomy and Motivation scales. Autonomy had a slightly higher correlation to Social Collaboration. This association signaled that students who felt they had opportunities for Social Collaboration at school possessed more Autonomy. Important to note, this factor did not have an association with Resiliency, Proficiency, TELPAS, Average Grade, Number of Siblings, or Birth Order.

At-Risk and Proficiency Correlations

When at-risk factors were analyzed, only the associations that resulted in statistical significance were reported. Non-resilient students had a total of 59 risk factors when they were all added together. However, when the 59 risk factors were divided by 24 (number of non-resilient students), the mean resulted in 2.46. On the other hand, resilient students had a total of 73 risk-factors, collectively, and that was divided by the 40 resilient students; the mean resulted in 1.83. Therefore, in this study, Non-resilient students possessed more at-risk factors than Resilient students did. If this is so, it would be possible to state that a lower number of at-risk factors could determine if a EL/monitored EL is considered academically resilient. Table 5 included the correlations between At-Risk factors and English Proficiency Factors (Resiliency, Proficiency, TELPAS.)

Table 5

Correlations between At-Risk Factors & Proficiency Factors

Variable	AR Factors	Resiliency	Proficiency	TELPAS
AR Factors	1	.422**	-.550**	-.427**
Resiliency		1	-.537**	-.860**
Proficiency			1	.741**
TELPAS				1

Note. N=64 for all variables. * *p*<.05, ** *p*<.01. *NS=not statistically significant, AR= At Risk, TELPAS= Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System.*

In Table 5, the association between At-Risk Factors and Resiliency was positive .422; meaning that when students had a higher number of risk factors they were also on the non-resilient group which was coded as a 2, while resilient students were coded as a 1. Where as the correlation between At-Risk Factors and Proficiency and At-Risk Factors and TELPAS were negative at the $p < .01$ level. This meant that the higher the number of Risk Factors, the more associated it was with students having less proficiency and a lower score on the TELPAS.

The proficiency factors used for this study were the English Proficiency Level, the TELPAS scores, and the Resiliency categorical factor by which each student was labeled. Proficiency (0=LEP, 1=M1, 2=M2; getting out of the program). TELPAS score (1-Beginner, 2-Intermediate, 3-Advanced, 4-Advanced High). Resiliency label (1-Resilient, 2-Non-Resilient). The three factors were found to be strongly associated with each other. The association between Resiliency and Proficiency was -.537 ($p < .01$ level), which translates to being more proficient increases the association of being

considered non-resilient. Similarly, Resiliency and TELPAS had a negative correlation. However, it was a stronger one, -.860 (p <.01 level). The higher scores on TELPAS were associated with students who were categorized as Resilient and vice versa, lower scores on TELPAS were associated with students who were labeled as non-Resilient. Finally, the last association reported was that of Proficiency and TELPAS, both had a statistically significant positive correlation of .741 (p<.01 level), which means that the higher the English Proficiency level of the EL/Monitored EL, the higher their TELPAS score and vice versa. It is important to make note of the following finding: At-Risk factors did not have any significant association with Average Grade, and neither extrinsic or intrinsic factors.

Autonomy Correlations

The section that dealt with Autonomy on the survey had students answer questions, like *When I do assignments, I sometimes get totally absorbed*; *Most people can learn to be good in subjects*; *I can do most things if I try*; *and I don't have to rely on people to do things for me.* The sections above already reported the statistically significant relationships between Autonomy and the following factors: Adult Support (r= .636), School Belonging (r= .493), and Social Collaboration (r= .651), all significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 4 indicated that there was a positive correlation between Autonomy and Motivation (r=.527, significant at the 0.01 level.) This finding means that the way students feel about their autonomy is significantly related to the way they ranked their motivation. Both factors are intrinsic, come from within the students. Interestingly, the

factor with the strongest relationship was Social Collaboration. This is important to note because Autonomy and Social Collaboration are usually seen as opposites on the spectrum of learning modalities. However, this finding might signal that through the use of social collaboration and opportunities for discussion, students will feel more autonomy and ownership of their learning. This factor did not have an association with At-Risk Factors, Resiliency, Proficiency, TELPAS, Average Grade, Number of Siblings, or Birth Order, Native Language.

Motivation Correlations

The section on the survey that dealt with Motivation had students answer questions, like *When I am in school, I feel good*; *I enjoy learning new things in school*; *When we work on something in school, I feel bored*; *and I pay attention in school to my teachers/advisor.* The sections above reported the significant relationships between Motivation and the following factors: extrinsic (Adult Support (r= .636), School Belonging (r= .493), Social Collaboration (r=. 651)), all significant at the 0.01 level; and the intrinsic factor of Autonomy (r= .527, significant at the 0.01 level.). Moreover, Motivation was the only factor to be associated with Average Grade (r= .334, significant at the 0.01 level.) This was important because it points to the importance of students having motivation to maintaining good grades in school. The factor of Motivation had no significant association with Family Configuration and English Proficiency factors. It did, however, have a correlation with Native Language 3 as previously reported. The next section included effect sizes in cases in which statistically significant correlations were not found.

Effect Sizes

The following tables showed the effect sizes that were calculated on an online effect size calculator. Small medium effect sizes were at .2, medium were at .5, and large at .8.

Table 6

Effect Sizes of Number of Siblings on Factors

Factor	N	*M*	SD	*d*	*Level of practical significance*
Adult Support	64	3.23	.58	.01	none
Family Expectation	64	2.85	1.44	-.36	small
Family Support	64	2.73	.65	.38	small
Adult Expectation	64	3.98	2.49	.28	small
Average Grade	64	83.42	5.25	-20.42	gigantic
Social Collaboration	64	3.01	.60	.18	none
School Belonging	64	3.13	.40	.09	none
Motivation	62	3.13	.44	.09	none
Autonomy	63	2.49	.48	.58	medium
At-Risk Factors	64	2.06	.73	.86	large
TELPAS	64	3.80	1.03	-.37	small
Resiliency	64	1.38	.49	1.41	very large
Proficiency	64	.55	.80	1.93	very large
Native Language 3	64	1.60	.56	1.23	large

Note: Siblings factor (N= 64, M= 3.25, SD= 1.81). In most cases, N= 64, except in cases in which respondent left item blank.

Among ELs/monitored ELs answering the ARS (N=64), Table 6 showed that there were practically significant effect sizes among Number of Siblings on factors, which were not shown to have statistically significant correlations. Number of Siblings and Adult Expectations on Education produced a small effect size (*d*= -.33). Adult Expectations on

Education included parents, other family, teachers, coaches, and other school staff. . Also, Number of Siblings (M= 3.25, SD= 1.81) and Family Expectations on Education (M= 2.85, SD= 1.44) resulted in a small effect size, *d*= -.36. Family Expectations on Education dealt with how far parent/guardians wanted their child to get in their education (High School Graduate, College Graduate). Additionally, Family Support (M= 2.73, SD= .65) and Number of Siblings (M= 3.25, SD= 1.81) yielded a small effect size, *d*= .38; and Number of Siblings and TELPAS, resulted in a small effect size (*d*= -.37). Thus, Number of Siblings mattered a little when it came to Family Expectations on Education, Adult Expectations on Education, Family Support, and TELPAS scores.

Number of Siblings (M= 3.25, SD= 1.81) and Autonomy (M= 2.49, SD= .48) produced a Cohen's d value (*d*= .58), which suggested a moderate practical significance. This finding meant that the higher the Number of Siblings, the higher the Autonomy in these students. Number of Siblings and At-risk factors resulted in a large effect size (*d*= .86). Number of Siblings (M= 3.25, SD= 1.81) and Native Language 3 (M= 1.60, SD= .56) also resulted in a large effect size (*d*= 1.23). This finding meant that as the Number of Siblings increased, the more likely the students felt they did not understand spoke English, spoke, read, and wrote in English and the more At-Risk factors they had.

Additionally, Number of Siblings (M= 3.25, SD= 1.81) and Resiliency (M= 1.38, SD= .49) produced a Cohen's d value of 1.41, which suggested a very large effect size. Similarly, Proficiency (M= .55, SD= .80) and Number of Siblings (M= 3.25, SD= 1.81), produced a very large effect size (*d*= 1.94). While Adult Support did not result in a practically significant effect, other factors revolving around the area of adult and family

support and/or expectations practically significant effect sizes. Therefore, Number of Siblings had a very large influence on Resiliency and Proficiency. The higher the Number of Siblings, the less, the more likely students were labeled Non-Resilient. However, as Number of Siblings increased, the Proficiency increased. Lastly, Number of Siblings (M= 3.25, SD= 1.81) and Average Grade (M= 83.42, SD= 5.25) resulted in a gigantic effect size, *d*= -20.42. Thus, as the Number of Siblings increased, the Average Grades of these students decreased. The following factors besides Adult Support had no influence from the Number of Siblings an EL/monitored EL had: Social Collaboration, School Belonging, and Motivation.

According to Table 7, found below, there was a practically significant effect size between Birth Order and most of the factors. Birth Order (M= 2.50, SD= 1.41) and Adult Support (M= 3.23, SD= .58), Cohen's d value of -.68 suggested a moderate practical significance. As far as Birth Order and the intrinsic factor of Motivation (M= 3.13, SD= .44), the Cohen's d value resulted in -.60. Same holds true for Birth Order and the extrinsic factors of School Belonging (M= 3.13, SD= .40), (d= -.60), which suggested a moderate influence. Birth Order and Adult Expectations on Education produced a slightly higher effect size, *d*= -.68. These findings meant as Birth Order increased (younger children), the less Adult Support, School Belonging, Motivation and lower Adult Expectations on Education.

Important to note is that Birth Order had no influence on Autonomy. Birth Order (M= 2.50, SD= 1.41) and Native Language 3 (M= 1.60, SD= .56) resulted in a large effect size (*d*= .83). Thus, as Birth Order increased (younger children), felt less

comfortable with speaking, reading, and writing English. Additionally, Birth Order and Resiliency showed a practical significance. Birth Order (M= 2.50, SD= 1.41) and Resiliency (M= 1.38, SD= .49) produced a Cohen's value of 1.06, which suggested a large effect size. Similarly, Birth Order and TELPAS yielded a large effect size, *d*= -1.05. These two findings suggested that as Birth Order increased (younger children), the more likely it influenced Non-Resilient students and students having lower TELPAS scores. Same holds true for the students who were born first, they were more likely to be Resilient and have higher TELPAS scores. Birth Order (M= 2.50, SD= 1.41) and Proficiency (M= .55, SD= .80), produced a very large effect size (*d*= 1.70). These two factors' effect sizes meant that the students who were younger had more English proficiency. However, it is important to note that Birth Order and Adult Expectations on Education produced a slightly lower effect size, but it still had a large influence. This meant that as the Birth Order increased (younger students), the Adult Expectations on their education decreased.

Table 7

Effect Sizes of Birth Order on Factors

Factor	N	*M*	SD	*d*	*Level of practical significance*
Adult Support	64	3.23	.58	-.68	medium
Family Expectation	64	2.85	1.44	-.21	small
Family Support	64	2.73	.65	-.21	small
Adult Expectation	64	3.98	2.49	-.68	medium
Average Grade	64	83.42	5.25	-21.05	gigantic
Social Collaboration	64	3.01	.60	-.47	small
School Belonging	63	3.13	.40	-.60	medium
Motivation	62	3.13	.44	-.60	medium
Autonomy	63	2.49	.48	.01	none
At-Risk Factors	64	2.06	.73	.39	small
TELPAS	64	3.80	1.03	-1.05	large
Resiliency	64	1.38	.49	1.06	large
Proficiency	64	.55	.80	1.70	very large
Native Language 2	64	2.94	.81	-.38	small
Native Language 3	64	1.60	.56	.83	large

Note: Birth Order (N= 64, M= 2.50, SD= 1.41). In most cases, N= 64, except in cases in which respondent left item blank.

Lastly, Birth Order (M= 2.50, SD= 1.41) and Average Grade (M= 83.42, SD= 5.25) resulted in a gigantic effect size, *d*= -21.05, meaning that as Birth Order increased (younger children) their Average Grades decreased. However, Birth Order and At-Risk factors resulted in a small effect size (*d*= .39). Number of Siblings and Native Language 2 produced a small effect size (*d*= -.38), too. Similarly, Birth Order (M= 2.50, SD= 1.41) and Family Support (M= 2.73, SD= .65) resulted in a small effect (*d*= .21). Birth

Order (M= 2.50, SD= 1.41) and Family Expectations on Education (M= 2.85, SD= 1.44) resulted in a small effect size, *d*= -.21. These small effect sizes indicated that Number of Siblings matter very little to Native Language 2 (how often ELs/monitored ELs spoke their Native Language with family and friends), Family Expectations on Education, and Family Support they received.

Table 8

Effect Sizes of Various Factors on Resiliency

Factor	N	*M*	SD	*d*	*Level of practical significance*
Adult Support	64	3.23	.58	3.46	very large
Adult Education Level	64	1.51	1.65	.11	none
Family Expectation	64	2.85	1.44	1.37	very large
Adult Expectation	64	3.98	2.49	1.45	very large
Birth Order	64	2.50	1.41	1.06	large
Number of Siblings	64	3.25	1.81	1.41	very large
Social Collaboration	64	3.01	.60	2.99	very large
School Belonging	63	3.13	.40	3.91	very large
Motivation	62	3.13	.44	3.76	very large
Autonomy	63	2.49	.48	2.29	very large
Native Language 2	64	2.94	.81	2.32	very large

Note: Resiliency (N= 64, M= 1.38, SD= .49). In most cases, N= 64, except in cases in which respondent left item blank.

Table 8 showed that there was a practically significant effect size between all factors listed and Resiliency. The large effect size between Birth Order and Resiliency was already discussed on the previous section. Adult Support (M= 3.23, SD= .58) and

Resiliency (M= 1.38, SD= .49), (*d*= 3.46) suggested a very large practical significance. The other factors revolving around the area of Adult and Family Support and/or Expectations yielded very large effect sizes as well. Family Expectations on Education (M= 2.85, SD= 1.44) and Resiliency (M= 1.38, SD= .49) resulted in a very large effect size, *d*= 1.37. However, Adult Expectations on Education and Resiliency produced a slightly higher effect size, *d*= 1.45. Native Language 2 (M= 2.94, SD= .81) and Resiliency (M= 1.38, SD= .49) also resulted in a very large effect size (*d*= 2.32). Additionally, Social Collaboration (M= 3.01, SD= .60) and Resiliency (M= 1.38, SD= .49) produced a Cohen's value of (*d*= 2.99), which suggested a very large effect size. Autonomy and Resiliency yielded a very large effect size as well, *d*= 2.29. Motivation (M= 3.13, SD= .44) and Resiliency (M= 1.38, SD= .49), produced a very large effect size (*d*= 3.76). However, School Belonging and Resiliency resulted in a slightly higher effect size (*d*= 3.91). These findings meant that the higher these factors were the more they influenced Non-Resilient students. Important to note is that Adult Education Level did not have an influence on Resiliency.

Table 9

Effect Sizes of Various Factors on Proficiency

Factor	N	*M*	SD	*d*	*Level of practical significance*
Adult Support	64	3.23	.58	3.86	very large
Adult Education Level	64	1.51	1.65	.74	medium
Family Expectation	64	2.85	1.44	1.97	very large
Family Support	64	2.73	.65	3.00	very large
Siblings	64	3.25	1.81	1.93	very large
Birth Order	64	2.50	1.41	1.70	very large
Social Collaboration	64	3.01	.60	3.50	very large
School Belonging	63	3.13	.40	4.09	very large
Motivation	62	3.13	.44	4.01	very large
Autonomy	63	2.49	.48	2.95	very large
Native Language 2	64	2.94	.81	2.97	very large

Note: Proficiency (N= 64, M= .55, SD= .80). In most cases, N= 64, except in cases in which respondent left item blank.

Table 9 reported practically significant effect size between all factors listed and Resiliency. Adult Support (M= 3.23, SD= .58) and Proficiency (M= .55, SD= .80), (*d*= 3.86) suggested a very large influence. However, Family Support and Proficiency produced a slightly lower effect size, *d*= 3.00. The other factors revolving around the area of adult support and/or expectations produced very large effect sizes as well. Family Expectations on Education (M= 2.85, SD= 1.44) and Proficiency (M= .55, SD= .80) resulted in a very large effect size, *d*= 1.97. Native Language 2 (M= 2.94, SD= .81) and Proficiency (M= .55, SD= .80) resulted in higher large effect size (*d*= 2.97). Additionally, Social Collaboration and Proficiency produced a practical significance. Social Collaboration (M= 3.01, SD= .60) and Proficiency produced a Cohen's value of

(*d*= 3.50), which suggested a very large effect size. Autonomy and Proficiency suggested a very large effect size as well, *d*= 2.95. Motivation (M= 3.13, SD= .44) and Proficiency produced a very large effect size (*d*= 4.01) as well. School Belonging and Proficiency resulted in a slightly higher effect size (*d*= 4.09). All these findings suggested that the higher they were, the more likely it influenced the Proficiency of an EL/monitored EL positively. Important to note, however, is that Adult Education Level (M= 1.51, SD= 1.65) had a moderate influence on Proficiency (M= .55, SD= .80), (*d*= .74). This finding indicated that the higher the Adult Education Level, the higher the Proficiency. The following section reported the regression analysis of Proficiency, TELPAS scores, and Average Grades.

Regression Analysis

In the regression analysis portion, independent variables that were measured through the survey and extant data, such as report card grades, at-risk factors, Proficiency, family configuration, and TELPAS were entered to determine whether they had an effect on different dependent variables: proficiency, average grade, and TELPAS. The multiple regression analyses were conducted two separate times. The first time with no rule, meaning Resilient and Non-Resilient students were included, while the second time a rule was inserted. The rule that was entered for the three different dependent variables was *Resiliency*, in other words, the students who were coded "Resilient." Resilient ELs and Resilient monitored ELs were added as a rule in order for the results to assist in determining the effect of these variables on academic resiliency of these ELs. The first dependent variable that was tested was Proficiency. Also, each dependent

variable was tested with the independent variables that dealt with intrinsic and extrinsic factors, scores (TELPAS, Proficiency Levels, Average Grade), and At-Risk factors.

Regression Analysis of Proficiency—Extrinsic Factors

The first regression produced an adjusted R^2 value of .63. Therefore, 63% of the variance in Proficiency was explained by the following independent variables: TELPAS scores, number of Siblings, Social Collaboration, Live with Parents, At-Risk factors, Average Grade, Birth Order, Adult Support, and School Belonging. Most of these variables were considered extrinsic, while others dealt with Family Configuration yet others with scores (Average Grade and TELPAS scores).

Table 10

Regression of Level of Proficiency by Resilient & Non-Resilient

Proficiency	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Overall Model				62	12.803	.63	.001
At-Risk Factors	-.327	.001*	-.302				
Siblings	-.049	.251	-.112				
Birth Order	.107	.053	.191				
Live with Parents	.442	.255	.098				
Social Collaboration	-.010	.482	-.082				
School Belonging	-.002	.898	-.017				
Adult Support	.000	.988	-.022				
Average Grade	.016	.262	.104				
TELPAS	.439	.000*	.569				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.63$; $p<0.05$

Table 10 indicated that the regression of Proficiency level was statistically significant because it was less than 0.001; anything less than 0.05 means that it is significant. This also meant that the predictors had an impact on the outcome variable. The values signaled that the At-risk factors were statistically significant at less than .001. The *B* value meant that for every 1 unit of change in the At-Risk factors (having more at-risk factors), the outcome variable of Proficiency decreased (0=LEP, 1=M1, 2=M2) by .33. In addition, the *B* value of TELPAS meant that for every unit of change in TELPAS (having a higher score), the outcome variable of Proficiency increased by 0.44. It is important to make note that the extrinsic factors did not produce a significant *B* value and neither did any of the Family Configuration factors.

On the next regression model of Proficiency level, the analysis was done by Resilient students only. The model only included Resilient students' responses. The same independent variables (predictors) were selected. The adjusted R^2 indicated that 81% of the variance in the EL's proficiency was explained by the extrinsic factors, family configuration, and scores.

Table 11

Regression of Level of Proficiency by Resilient

Level of Proficiency	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Overall Model				38	18.844	.81	.001
At-Risk Factors	-.447	.000*	-.359				
Siblings	-.043	.262	-.086				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.81$; $p<0.05$

Table 11 Continued

Regression of Level of Proficiency by Resilient

Level of Proficiency	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Birth Order	.062	.316	.085				
Live with Parents	.481	.258	.090				
Social Collaboration	-.019	.275	-.138				
School Belonging	.001	.968	.005				
Adult Support	.007	.806	.033				
Average Grade	-.002	.910	-.009				
TELPAS	1.176	.000*	.699				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.81; p<0.05$

Table 11 indicated that the regression of Proficiency level was statistically significant because it was less than 0.01. This also means that the predictors had an impact on the outcome variable. The values signaled that the β value of At-risk factors were statistically significant .000. The β values meant that for every 1 unit of change in the At-Risk factors (having more at-risk factors), the outcome variable of Proficiency decreased (0=LEP, 1=M1, 2=M2) by .45. Another predictor variable that had already been reported on the first regression that resulted in statistical significance on the Resilient group was TELPAS. The β value for TELPAS indicated that for every 1 unit of change in that score (Beginner to Intermediate, Intermediate to Advanced, Advanced to Advanced High), the Proficiency increased by 1.18. The Resilient group had a larger

effect from TELPAS scores and At-Risk factors when compared to the regression analysis by Resilient and Non-Resilient. On this analysis, it is important to make note that the extrinsic factors did not produce a significant β value and neither did any of the Family Configuration factors.

Regression Analysis of Proficiency—Intrinsic Factors

The 2nd part of the regression of Proficiency was found on Table 12 and resulted in an adjusted R^2 value of .62. Therefore, 62% of the variance in Proficiency was accounted by the intrinsic factors (Autonomy and Motivation), scores (Average Grade and TELPAS), and At-Risk factors. On this particular regression and based on Table 8, none of the intrinsic factors produce a significant β value and neither did Average Grade. However, the two independent variables that did were At-Risk Factors and TELPAS scores. The β values showed that the At-risk factors were statistically significant at a .003 level and TELPAS was statistically significant at a .000 level. The β value meant that for every 1 unit of change in the At-Risk factors (having more at-risk factors), the outcome variable of Proficiency decreased (0=LEP, 1=M1, 2=M2) by .30. Similarly, the β value of TELPAS meant that for every unit of change in TELPAS (having a higher score), the outcome variable of Proficiency increased by 0.43.

Table 12

Regression of Level of Proficiency by Resilient and Non-Resilient

Level of Proficiency	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Overall Model				60	20.886	.62	.001
At-Risk Factors	-.302	.003*	.085				
Motivation	-.012	.196	.090				
Autonomy	-.009	.621	-.138				
Average Grade	.027	.077	-.009				
TELPAS	.433	.000*	.699				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.62$; $p<0.05$

The next part of the 2nd regression of Proficiency resulted in an R^2 of .83 an adjusted R^2 value of .81. Therefore, 81% of the variance in Proficiency was accounted by the intrinsic factors (Autonomy and Motivation), scores (Average Grade and TELPAS), and At-Risk factors in the Resilient group. For this 2nd part of Proficiency, only the Resilient group was selected. In this particular regression and based on Table 13, none of the intrinsic factors produced a significant β value and neither did Average Grade. Nevertheless, the two independent variables that did were At-Risk Factors and TELPAS scores. The β values showed that the At-risk factors were statistically significant at less than .001 level and TELPAS was statistically significant at less than .001 level.

Table 13

Regression of Level of Proficiency by Resilient

Level of Proficiency	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Overall Model				37	31.981	.81	.001
At-Risk Factors	-.413	.000*	-.322				
Motivation	-.016	.093	-.163				
Autonomy	.011	.603	.051				
Average Grade	.008	.634	.041				
TELPAS	1.302	.000*	.776				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.81$; $p<0.05$

The β value meant that for every 1 unit of change in the At-Risk factors (having more at-risk factors), the outcome variable of Proficiency decreased (0=LEP, 1=M1, 2=M2) by .41, slightly higher than when both groups were analyzed in previous model. Whereas, the β value of TELPAS meant that for every unit of change in TELPAS (having a higher score), the outcome variable of Proficiency increased by 1.30; this value was also higher when compared to the analysis of both groups.

Regression Analysis of TELPAS—Extrinsic Factors

The first regression produced an adjusted R^2 value of .55. Therefore, 55% of the variance in TELPAS was explained by the following independent variables: Proficiency, number of Siblings, Social Collaboration, Live with Parents, At-Risk factors, Average Grade, Birth Order, Adult Support, and School Belonging. Most of these variables were considered extrinsic (Social Collaboration, School Belonging, and Adult Support), while

others dealt with Family Configuration (Birth Order, number of Siblings, and Live with Parents) and yet others with scores (Average Grade and Proficiency).

Table 14

Regression of TELPAS Score by Resilient and Non-Resilient

TELPAS score	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Overall Model				62	9.490	.55	.001
At-Risk Factors	-.011	.942	-.008				
Siblings	.045	.460	.080				
Birth Order	-.068	.399	-.093				
Live with Parents	-.984	.073	-.168				
Social Collaboration	-.015	.459	-.095				
School Belonging	.023	.320	.143				
Adult Support	.011	.731	.049				
Average Grade	.031	.114	.161				
Proficiency	.895	.000*	.691				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.55; p<0.05$

On this particular regression found on Table 14 none of the extrinsic factors, Family Configuration, or Average Grade produced a statistically significant β value. The only independent variable that produced a statistical β value was Proficiency. The β value of Proficiency meant that for every unit of change in Proficiency, the TELPAS score increased by .9 (close to 1.) TELPAS scores were 1 for Beginner, 2 for Intermediate, 3 for Advanced, and 4 for Advanced High.

Table 15

Regression of TELPAS Score by Resilient

TELPAS score	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Overall Model				38	13.055	.80	.001
At-Risk Factors	.170	.054	.230				
Siblings	.025	.349	.084				
Birth Order	.001	.991	-.001				
Live with Parents	-.135	.648	-.043				
Social Collaboration	.008	.474	.106				
School Belonging	.004	.682	.055				
Adult Support	-.019	.314	-.156				
Average Grade	.563	.000*	.947				
Proficiency	.015	.157	.136				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.74$; $p<0.05$

The second regression was conducted only on the Resilient group. This analysis produced an adjusted R^2 value of .74. Therefore, 74% of the variance in TELPAS was explained by the same independent variables listed above. In this particular regression, Table 15, none of the extrinsic factors, Family Configuration, or Average Grade produced a statistically significant β value. The β value of Average Grade meant that for every unit of change in grades, the TELPAS score increased by .56 (close to half of 1 unit.) TELPAS scores were 1 for Beginner, 2 for Intermediate, 3 for Advanced, and 4 for Advanced High.

Regression Analysis of TELPAS—Intrinsic Factors

The 2nd part of the regression of TELPAS resulted in an adjusted R^2 value of .55. Therefore, 55% of the variance in TELPAS was accounted by the intrinsic factors (Autonomy and Motivation), scores (Average Grade and Proficiency), and At-Risk factors.

Table 16

Regression of TELPAS score by Resilient and Non Resilient

TELPAS score	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*P*
Overall Model				60	15.906	.55	.001
At-Risk Factors	-.052	.723	-.037				
Proficiency	.865	.000*	.666				
Motivation	.010	.437	.084				
Autonomy	-.005	.836	-.021				
Average Grade	.029	.180	.141				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.55$; $p<0.05$

On this regression and based on Table 16 above, none of the intrinsic factors produce a significant β value and neither did Average Grade. However, the only independent variable that did was English Proficiency scores. Similarly, the β value of Proficiency meant that for every unit of change in it (being M1/M2/Out Program), the outcome variable of TELPAS increased by 0.87, which is close to 1 level, e.g. from Advanced to Advanced High.

Table 17

Regression of TELPAS score by Resilient

TELPAS score	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Overall Model				37	26.619	.78	.001
At-Risk Factors	.168	.026*	.220				
Proficiency	.537	.000*	.902				
Motivation	.012	.048*	.205				
Autonomy	-.020	.120	-.161				
Average Grade	.011	.296	.097				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.78$; $p<0.05$

The 2nd part of the 2nd regression of TELPAS involved running the same regression. However, this time only with Resilient participants. This Resilient regression of TELPAS resulted in an adjusted R^2 value of .78. Thus, 78% of the variance in TELPAS was accounted by the intrinsic factors (Autonomy and Motivation), scores (Average Grade and Proficiency), and At-Risk factors.

On this regression and based on Table 17 above, one of the intrinsic factors produce a significant β value, Motivation. Additionally, there were two more independent variables that yielded in significant β values, At-Risk factors and English Proficiency levels. The β value of Proficiency, referred to every unit of change in that variable, had the effect of increasing the TELPAS score by .54 points. Furthermore, the β value of At-Risk factor resulted in .17, meaning that when At-Risk factors increased by 1, there was an increase in TELPAS scores. This result is peculiar because one would think an increase in At-Risk factors would decrease TELPAS scores. However, when looking at the TELPAS scores (1-Beginner, 2-Intermediate, 3-Advanced, 4-Advanced

High), in order for it to get the next level down, it would take 5 additional At-Risk factors to be added to a student in order to decrease in TELPAS scores. The β value of Motivation indicated that for every unit of change in it TELPAS scores would increase by .012 (very small increase).

Regression Analysis of Average Grade—Extrinsic Factors

The first regression of Average Grade produced an adjusted R^2 value of .19. Therefore, 19% of the variance in Average Grade was explained by the following independent variables: TELPAS scores, number of Siblings, Social Collaboration, Live with Parents, At-Risk factors, Proficiency, Birth Order, Adult Support, and School Belonging. Most of these variables were considered extrinsic (Social Collaboration, School Belonging, and Adult Support), while others dealt with Family Configuration (Birth Order, number of Siblings, and Live with Parents) and yet others with scores (Proficiency and TELPAS scores.)

Table 18

Regression of Average Grade by Resilient and Non-Resilient

TELPAS score	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Overall Model				62	2.642	.19	.013
At-Risk Factors	.119	.910	.017				
Siblings	.582	.163	.200				
Birth Order	-.681	.213	-.184				
Live with Parents	7.969	.033*	.267				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.19$; $p<0.05$

Table 18 Continued

Regression of Average Grade by Resilient and Non-Resilient

TELPAS score	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Social Collaboration	.057	.681	.071				
School Belonging	-.213	.176	-.260				
Adult Support	.197	.364	.172				
TELPAS	1.479	.114	.290				
Proficiency	1.506	.262	.228				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.19; p<0.05$

Table 18 indicated that the regression was of statistical significance because it was at a 0.013; anything less than 0.05 means that it is significant. This also meant that the predictors had an impact on the outcome variable. The values signaled that the Live with Parents factor was statistically significant .03. The Live with Parents β value meant that for every 1 unit of change in that specific variable (1—Live with Parents, 2—Do not live with parents), the outcome variable of Average Grade increased by 7.97. This is interesting because in this study, students who did not live with their parents had an effect on the Average Grade on both Resilient and Non-Resilient ELs/monitored ELs. None of the other factors (extrinsic, family configuration, or scores) resulted in a significant β value.

Table 19

Regression of Average Grade by Resilient

TELPAS score	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Overall Model				38	1.188	.043	.339
At-Risk Factors	-.078	.961	-.012				
Siblings	-.034	.943	-.013				
Birth Order	.240	.751	.060				
Live w/Parents	3.669	.480	.127				
Social Collaboration	-.012	.954	-.017				
School Belonging	-.006	.973	-.009				
Adult Support	.113	.741	.099				
TELPAS	4.576	.157	.501				
Proficiency	-.258	.910	-.048				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.04$; $p<0.05$

The next section will analyze Average Grade as the dependent variable (outcome) and intrinsic factors as independent/predictor variables.

Regression Analysis of Average Grade—Intrinsic Factors

The 2nd part of the regression of Average Grade resulted in an R^2 of .34 an adjusted R^2 value of .28. Therefore, 28% of the variance in Average Grade was accounted by the intrinsic factors (Autonomy and Motivation), scores (TELPAS and Proficiency), and At-Risk factors.

Table 20

Regression of Average Grade by Resilient and Non-Resilient

TELPAS score	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Overall Model				60	5.559	.28	.001
At-Risk Factors	.671	.470	.096				
TELPAS	1.133	.180	.230				
Proficiency	2.102	.077	.328				
Motivation	.161	.041*	.275				
Autonomy	.096	.556	.077				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.28; p<0.05$

Table 20 above, one of the intrinsic factors produce a significant β value, Motivation. Additionally, there were no other intrinsic factors and neither did Proficiency and TELPAS produce a significant β value. The β value of Motivation indicated that for every unit of change in motivation (being more motivated) resulted in an increase of .16 on the Average Grade. Even though the increase of .16 might not seem too high, it is still significant due to Average Grades going on decimals and being rounded off when calculated on report card grades.

The 2nd part of the second regression of average grade involved running the same regression. However, this time it was done with Resilient participants. This Resilient regression of TELPAS resulted in an adjusted R^2 value of .18. Thus, 18% of the variance in Average grade was accounted by the intrinsic factors, scores and At-Risk factors.

Table 21

Regression of Average Grade by Resilient

TELPAS score	B	*p*	β	*df*	*F*	adj. R^2	*p*
Overall Model				37	2.626	.18	.042
At-Risk Factors	.772	.563	.114				
TELPAS	3.145	.296	.353				
Proficiency	.927	.634	.175				
Motivation	.090	.397	.172				
Autonomy	.156	.494	.137				

Note: adj. $R^2=0.18$; $p<0.05$

Table 21 indicated that the regression was of statistical significance because it was at a 0.042; anything less than 0.05 means that it is significant. This also meant that the predictors had an impact on the outcome variable of Average Grade. Thus, intrinsic factors, TELPAS scores, Proficiency levels, and At-Risk factors predicted Average Grade of the ELs/monitored ELs. Nevertheless, none of the β values of the intrinsic factors, scores, or At-Risk factors were statistically significant.

Exploratory Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis reduces data to a "smaller set of summary variables and to explore the underlying theoretical structure of the phenomena; it is used to identify the structure of the relationship between the variable and [participants]" (Statistics Solutions, para. 1) Factors were analyzed based on the rotated component matrix. Orthogonal rotation was used because Varimax was used to analyze the factors. Varimax refers to the simplification of the columns of the factor matrix, thereby

allowing the extraction of the factor to be associated and to allow for "separation among the variables" (Statistics Solution, para. 5) The components reported on this section will only include the components that had two or more factor loadings at or higher than a magnitude of 0.50 (practically significant.) The factor analysis was done on resiliency factor, in particular looking for the way the non-resilient ELs answered to ARS. Table 22 depicts the extraction of each question. The values of the extractions explain the proportion of variance for each variable that can be explained by the component. All of the variables in this particular table showed strong extraction values.

Table 22

Factor Analysis Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Motivation68r	1	0.916
Motivation67r	1	0.939
Motivation66r	1	0.906
Motivation65r	1	0.857
Motivation64r	1	0.972
Motivation57r	1	0.935
Motivation58r	1	0.936
Motivation56r	1	0.932
Motivation55r	1	0.916
Motivation54r	1	0.843
SchoolBel23r	1	0.857
SchoolBel22r	1	0.977
SchoolBel21r	1	0.943
SchoolBel20r	1	0.947
SchoolBel19r	1	0.918
SchoolBel16r	1	0.991
Motivation49	1	0.939
Motivation50	1	0.948
Motivation51	1	0.864
Motivation52	1	0.955
Motivation53	1	0.806

	Initial	Extraction
Motivation59	1	0.967
Motivation60	1	0.939
Motivation61	1	0.872
Motivation62	1	0.981
Motivation63	1	0.98
SchoolBel13	1	0.922
SchoolBel14	1	0.993

Furthermore, as seen on Table 23, the total variance explained by the components was 92%. However, once the rotated component matrix was analyzed, it was only nine factors that had two or more factor loadings higher than 0.50. These nine components explained 76.8% of the variance. For this particular study, only the first six components were recoded into new variables because they were extremely similar to the extrinsic/intrinsic factors I used in the study. The six components accounted for 64% of the variance.

Table 23

Total Variance Explained

Total Variance Explained			
Component	Initial Eigenvalues		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	16.386	26.429	26.429
2	6.346	10.236	36.664
3	5.843	9.425	46.089
4	4.395	7.089	53.178
5	3.597	5.802	58.98
6	3.126	5.043	64.023
7	2.772	4.471	68.494
8	2.715	4.379	72.874
9	2.414	3.893	76.766
10	2.361	3.808	80.575
11	1.777	2.865	83.44
12	1.677	2.705	86.146
13	1.408	2.271	88.417
14	1.257	2.027	90.444
15	1.167	1.883	92.327

Table 24

Rotated Component Matrix

Question	1	2	3	4	5	6
SchoolBel28	0.805			0.352		
Motivation53	0.803	0.146		0.195	0.119	0.151
Motivation52	0.778	0.303		0.121	-0.124	
AdultSupp12	0.777		0.311	-0.14		
AdultSupp8	0.771		0.313		-0.136	0.157
SocCollab33	0.681	0.276	0.138	0.267	-0.14	
SocCollab34	0.632	0.259		0.544		-0.2
SchoolBel27	0.602	0.216	0.152	0.199	-0.243	
AdultSupp7	0.571		0.502			-0.202
Motivation49	0.562	0.543	0.142	0.199		0.21
Motivation62	0.181	0.914	0.133			
Motivation60	0.107	0.876			0.178	
Motivation63		0.873			0.103	-0.166
Motivation59	0.213	0.865	0.188		-0.14	
SchoolBel19r		0.78	0.179	0.133		-0.171
Motivation61	0.467	0.565			0.36	0.226
SocCollab35	0.466	0.524		0.386	0.325	
AdultSupp5		0.135	0.798	0.144	0.152	0.254
SchoolBel15	0.381		0.797	0.133	-0.217	-0.214
AdultSupp10		0.181	0.781			0.243
AdultSupp11	0.145	0.152	0.749	0.324		-0.121
Autonomy46	0.123		0.744	0.269	0.295	0.128

Table 24 Continued

Rotated Component Matrix

AdultSupp9	0.438		0.688			
Autonomy42		0.472	0.594	0.238	0.152	0.22
SchoolBel26			0.584			0.287
Autonomy48	0.412		0.506	0.248	0.391	0.284
SocCollab37	0.266	0.155		0.875		
SocCollab39	0.372	0.131		0.799	0.199	0.157
SocCollab31	-0.257		0.363	0.673		
SocCollab30		0.115	0.361	0.647	0.121	
SocCollab38	0.196	0.186	0.389	0.609	0.209	
Autonomy40		-0.181	0.422	0.608		
Motivation51	0.503	0.146		0.598		
SocCollab32	0.208	-0.154	0.345	0.501	0.187	
Motivation68r	-0.128				0.823	
Motivation64r	-0.142	0.2	0.227	0.273	0.806	0.179
Motivation67r					0.797	
Motivation58r	0.242	0.398		0.268	0.459	0.19
Motivation50	0.421	0.143	0.275	0.289	0.456	0.265
SchoolBel24			0.202		0.118	0.88
SchoolBel23r	-0.127	0.126		0.104		-0.771
SchoolBel25	0.38	0.2		0.174	-0.197	0.53
SchoolBel14	-0.175	0.412	0.24	-0.165	-0.406	-0.509

The first factor loading consisted of the following ARS questions. The questions read: *There's a teacher/adult who notices when I am not here*; *There's a teacher/adult who notices when I'm not here*; *There's a teacher who praises me who is available to help me before/after school*; *The teachers at this school treat students fairly*; *I feel safe at my school*; *I work well with other students in class assignments/projects*; *When I work with a group, I usually understand concepts better*; *When I'm in school, I feel good*; *I enjoy learning new things in school*; *When we work on something in school, I get involved.*

The questions on the first factor loading were coded as a new variable "School: Positive Aspects." All questions had a magnitude of 0.50 or higher, practically significant.

The second factor loading included the following questions: *In class I often feel "put down" by my teachers* (this questions was reversed since it was stated negatively; hence the name SchoolBel-19r); *I like to help my peers when they are struggling*; *I try hard to do well in school*; *In school, I work hard as I can*; *When I'm in school, I like to participate in discussions*; *I pay attention in school to my teachers/advisor in school*; *When I'm in school, I listen carefully to my teachers/advisor*.

All of the questions for this factor loading produced a magnitude of .50 or higher. Therefore, these questions were coded as the new variable "School: Participant Motivation."

The third factor loading was made up of the following questions: *There's a teacher/adult who really cares about me*; *There's a teacher/adult who listens to me when I have something to say*; *There's a teacher/adult who believes that I will be a success*; *There's a teacher/adult who praises when I work hard*; *Theirs is real school spirit at my school*; *I feel like I am part of this school*; *Academics is important to me personally*; *I can do most things if I try*; *I don't have to rely on people to do things for me*.

All of the questions for this third factor loading produced a magnitude of .50 or higher. These were coded as the new variable "School: Adult Support and Being Successful."

The fourth factor loading consisted of the following questions: *In this school, other students like to help me learn*; *In this school, other students care about how much I learn*; *Other students in this school want me to come to school every day*; *There's a*

group of students which I can identify myself with; *There's a group of students with who I can discuss my issues*; *My peers value my input when completing assignments/projects*; *When I do assignments, I sometimes get totally absorbed*; *School is fun*.

On table 7, all of the magnitudes for this particular factor are at or higher than 0.50, being practically significant. These questions were collectively named "School: Enjoyment & Collaboration."

The following factor loading had the questions: *When we work on something in school, I feel interested*; *When I'm in school, I feel bad*; *When I'm in school, I just act like I'm working*; *When I'm in school, I think about other things*; *When I'm in school, my mind wanders* (the last 4 questions were reversed; hence the "r" next those questions).

On this fifth loading, only three questions had a magnitude higher than 0.50 for practical significance. The other two questions were within the "more important level." These questions were grouped as the new variable "School Interest."

The next and last factor loading was made up of the following questions: *Students make friends with other group of students*; *Misbehaving students often get away with it*; *I feel close to people at this school*; *I am happy to be at this school.*

Based on the questions, they collectively were coded as "School: Sense of Belonging." All questions resulted in an absolute value of 0.50 or higher.

In sum, non-resilient students answers indicated that there were six components that explained 64% of the variance in the survey questions. Based on the way the components were grouped with the corresponding questions, the following summary variables were obtained:

1. "School: Positive Aspects."
2. "School: Participant Motivation."
3. "School: Adult Support and Being Successful."
4. "School: Enjoyment & Collaboration."
5. "School: Interest."
6. "School: Sense of Belonging."

Analysis of Interview Responses

The qualitative analysis was done on the 10-item questionnaire. The ELs and monitored ELs answered these questions in writing. In cases where elaboration was needed, the researcher ensured the students understood the question. The table provided explains the percentage of participants who responded in a certain manner. Coding was used for this portion of the analyses. Common themes were found among the answers from the participants. Percentages do not add up to 100% because in some questions the participants wrote more than one answer.

Table 25

Student Responses to Interview

Item	Questions	Percentage of Most Common Response	Percentage of Other Answers
1	List the different instructional strategies that help you learn concepts in your classes.	92%--Mnemonics, graphic organizers, anchor charts.	38%--Songs. 22% --videos
2	List different teaching practices that help you learn concepts.	53%--cooperative groups	17% hands-on activities;16%--instructional strategies; 13%--rewards; 8% after school help; 5%--breaking it down;
3	Do you consider yourself the type of student who can succeed in school and in life in general? Why or why not?	95%-yes; 63%--try my best; work hard to be successful	6% don't know. 3% no. 1—no answer 25% did not explain reasons
4	Do you feel motivated to do well in your classes, so that you can pass to high school?	89%--yes;	6%--maybe; 5% no
5	What kinds of things do your parents do to help you with schoolwork? If they do not help you, who do you go to for help?	44%--parents help. Ex: sit on table, advice, show video, break it down simpler, read instructions, explain it like they learned when they were in school	17%--siblings/cousins; 17%--no one helps, I do it on my own; 11%--teachers
6	What type of support does your teacher give you in order for you to improve and to be successful in class?	45%--encouragement & motivation	20%: intervention;17% enrichment, additional practice; 6% rewards; 3% groups

Table 25

Student Responses to Interview Continued

Item	Questions	Percentage of Most Common Response	Percentage of Other Answers
7	When do you retain (learn) information better, when you are placed in a group, or by yourself? Explain why.	64% in groups. Answers: I can learn from classmates, alternative way in explaining, learn from others in groups; opportunity for discussion	23% by myself, concentrate more; 8% both ways, I concentrate on my own; 1—no answer
8	If you struggle in classes, why do you think you have a hard time? Do you think there is something you can do in order to struggle less in classes?	84%--have struggled. 36%do not understand material is difficult or they do not understand teacher. 30% no focus. 11% disruptions	8%--do not struggle; 2—no answer
9	If you have been retained in at least one grade level and/or have failed one or more of your core classes during a grading period, do you try your best to improve your grades over the course of the year in order to pass to the next grade level?	75% responded they try their best to make up assignments or bring up their grade	22%-- have not been retained or have failed one or more of the core classes per grading period. 2—no answer
10	Do you feel you have learned the necessary English to read, write, listen, and speak it every day at school? In other words, do you feel that you understand most of the information presented in your classes, or do you need additional assistance, before/after school? Why or why not?	81%--have learned necessary English to read, write, listen, and speak it every day at school. I do not need additional assistance; I feel comfortable with the English language, I do not need extra help.	19% No—still struggle with English. I do not feel comfortable speaking English; I feel I do not speak it well; I do not practice English as often as I should.

Instructional strategies are methods teachers use to assist students in becoming independent learners, while learning strategies refer to the instances in which "students independently select the appropriate ones and use them effectively to accomplish" a particular task (Alberta Learning, 2002, p. 67). The data from the questionnaires indicated that most students (92%) learn with instructional strategies, such as mnemonics, graphic organizers, diagrams. The next instructional strategies were

content-related songs (38%) and videos about abstract concepts, such as Earth & Space and Atom (22%).

Additionally, the favored teaching practice among ELs and monitored ELs was cooperative groups (53%); followed by hands-on activities, instructional strategies, rewards, and candy. At these two particular campuses that belonged to the same school district, teachers had been trained to use cooperative grouping through Kagan Structures. Kagan Structures were developed by Dr. Spencer Kagan and they include cooperative groups, such as Quiz-Quiz trade and Think-Pair-Share (Kagan, 2010). For more information on Kagan structures, please use link on references.

Most of the participants (95%) felt they were the type of student who can succeed in school and in life general. The different reasons they offered included: "I try my best" "I work hard" "I want to make parents proud." Answers indicated that 89% of the ELs and monitored ELs felt motivated to go on to high schools, while 6% responded "maybe" and 5% responded "no." Furthermore, less than half (44%) of the participants responded they received help from parents/guardians. The rest of the participants (17%) responded they received help from a family member, a couple said they got help from teachers (11%), and yet others (17%) stated they got help from no one.

The type of support teachers gave students included motivation and encouragement (45%), intervention after school and during school (20%), enrichment and additional practices (17%), rewards (6%), and cooperative grouping (3%.) In addition, 64% of ELs and monitored ELs responded that they learned better in cooperative groupings because they could getter an alternative explanation and there was

opportunity for discussion. Whereas, 23% stated that they learn better by themselves because they tend to get distracted with others. However, a few (8%) said that they learn both ways.

When asked if they struggled and if so why, 84% of the participants responded they had struggled in classes because they did not understand material when presented by the teacher. A couple of participants (36%) stated because they cannot focus during lesson, while a few (11%) said it was due to other students being disruptive or loud when lesson was going on. A small number of participants answered they did not struggle (8%.) A large majority of the ELs and monitored ELs, 75%, responded that they have been retained or have failed a grading period. In order to improve, they stated that they try their best to bring up grade and pass the following grading period. Some of the participants, 22%, answered that they had not been retained or had never failed a grading period.

Finally, when asked if they felt they had learned the necessary English to listen, speak, read, and write every day at school, 81% answered they felt they had learned enough English to do so. Their reasons were due to not needing additional assistance and they felt comfortable with the English language that they did not need extra help. However, 19% of the ELs and monitored ELs responded they still felt they had not learned the necessary English in school. Theses students' explanations include that they did not feel comfortable speaking English because they felt they did not speak it well and because they did not practice English as often as they should have.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In Chapter 4, academic resilience of ELs and former ELs (monitored) was examined by determining the associations between certain variables (intrinsic and extrinsic) and simple multiple regression models. Chapter 5 contains the summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations based on the results reported in Chapter 4. Some limitations are identified as well.

Summary of Research

The focus of this study was to determine which factors make a resilient EL/EL monitored successful, when compared to their non-resilient EL/monitored peers. The aim of this study is to:

- Increase teacher awareness of the extrinsic and intrinsic factors that are helpful in boosting the academic resilience and English proficiency of these students
- Incorporate instructional strategies that will assist ELs and monitored ELs be successful in the classroom
- Close the achievement gap between ELs and non-ELs
- Increase parent/guardian awareness on how they can help their child(ren) be successful

State assessments as well as national assessments have shown that the EL population lags behind their non-EL peers. The literature review is included in Chapter 2 in the record of study. The factors that have been shown to help increase EL and

monitored EL's academic resilience and academic achievement are discussed in length in the review of the literature by citing studies and the findings to these studies.

The research questions of this study were:

(a) Is type of schooling linked to EL/monitored EL academic resilience?

(b) Is there a relationship between the following intrinsic factors—motivation and autonomy,—and the academic resilience or proficiency of Spanish-speaking ELs?;

(c) Which extrinsic factors—school belonging, adult support, and social collaboration--are associated with Spanish speaking EL students' academic resilience or proficiency?;

(d) Is there a relationship between extrinsic factors and/or intrinsic factors?

(e) Is family configuration (Live with parents, Number of Siblings, Birth Order), Parent Education Level, and Family Expectations associated with an EL's opportunity to develop academic resilience or proficiency?

(f) Do non-resilient ELs possess more at-risk factors than their resilient EL peers? Is there an association between At-Risk Factors and English Language Proficiency factors? and

(g) When considered simultaneously, which variables (intrinsic or extrinsic) are most associated with language proficiency, TELPAS scores, and average grade? (These dependent variables will help determine whether they will assist a EL/monitored EL be successful academically.)

The questions were answered quantitatively and qualitatively. The ARS responses, TELPAS scores, At-Risk factors, and Proficiency factors were analyzed with SPSS. The interview was analyzed by looking for common themes among the participant answers.

The participants that took part in this study were ELs and monitored ELs in two middle schools. They were labeled as "Resilient" if they were out of the EL program and/or if they were still in the program but had a high scoring proficiency score as well as good report card grades, being ≥70 in core classes. Participants were asked to participate through the use convenient and purposive sampling. The researcher was able to get a list of students who were labeled as EL/monitored ELs (purposive) and only students from those two campuses were given permission slips (convenient). The total number of participants who took part in this study was 64.

The findings were presented and discussed in Chapter 4 by making use of correlation tables, regression tables, exploratory analysis tables, and percentages of participant answers. Below, I will discuss the findings that address the research questions.

Research Questions Findings

Research question 1.

Is type of schooling linked to EL/monitored EL academic resilience?

School A was located in a rural area, south of that respective city. A large majority of the students (96%) were considered economically disadvantaged. At this school, the average class size was calculated when all subjects were added and averaged out, both the state and school A had the same average class size. Language Arts/Reading classes were, however, significantly larger than the state average. Science class size was comparable to the state level. Math classes were significantly smaller than the state average. School A had a total of 253 ELs. Thus, 54%, a little more than half of the student population was EL. Additionally, 38 students were 1st year and 2nd year

monitored students, which accounted for 11% of the student population. Out of the 253 ELs, 98% of them had At-Risk factors, while 82% of the M1 and M2s had At-Risk factors. There were a total of 42 participants (ELs/monitored ELs) in this study from School A. From those 42, 36% were labeled as Non-Resilient and 64% were labeled as Resilient. At School A, 40% of the teachers had more than teachers of teaching experience, while 18% had from 6 years to 10 years in experience and 42% were teachers who had less than 5 years experience (Texas Education Agency, 2017).

School B was located on the eastern part of the same city. A large majority of the students (88%) were considered economically disadvantaged. The average of class sizes at School B was significantly higher than the state. Language Arts/Reading classes were also significantly larger than the state average. Science class size was comparable to the state level. Math classes were slightly smaller in size than the state average. Some of the students attending that school live in rural subdivisions, while other students live in the suburbs. School B had a total of 489 ELs, which made up 44% of the student population was made up of ELs. Furthermore, 200 students were M1 and M2s, which roughly made up 18% of the student population. Out of the 489 ELs, 98% had At-Risk factors, while 55% of the M1 and M2s had At-risk factors. The larger percent in M1 and M2s probably means that School B exits their ELs at a higher rate. There were a total of 22 participants from School B. From these 22, 41% were labeled as Non-Resilient and 59% as Resilient. This is an interesting finding because although School B had less ELs, there were more participants found to be Non-Resilient. At School B, 41% of the teacher had over 10 years in teaching experience, while 25% had from 6 years to 10 years in

teaching experience and 34% had 5 years or less of teaching experience (Texas Education Agency, 2017).

When both schools were compared in terms of EL/monitored EL makeup, the smaller school, School A had more ELs yet less of the participants from this school were labeled Non-Resilient. More than half of the students who participated from School A were labeled Resilient. This could be due to smaller class sizes in that particular school; small student to teacher ratio. School B has larger class sizes. This, in turn, could be causing for ELs and monitored ELs to be lagging behind their non-EL peers. Additionally, School A had more ELs but less monitored ELs, while School B had fewer ELs but more monitored ELs. Hypothetically speaking, School B might be exiting ELs out of the program before these ELs are academically ready. This could be the reason why more of the participants from School B were labeled Non-Resilient; they are being exited without the appropriate listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in English.

Research question 2.

Is there a relationship between the following intrinsic factors—motivation and autonomy—and the academic resilience or proficiency of Spanish-speaking ELs?

The findings of this research question showed that there was no statistically significant association between intrinsic factors and the academic resilience or proficiency of Spanish speaking ELs/monitored ELs. However, the findings did show a very large statistically significant effect size between Motivation and Resilience, meaning that increased Motivation largely influenced Non-Resilient students. There was a negative moderate association between Resilience and Proficiency, which translated into the

Resilient students had higher Proficiency levels. In the literature review, Kim and Kim (2017), found that there was a higher correlation between Resilience of ELs and Motivation than Resilience and Proficiency. Therefore, Kim and Kim's (2017) study and the study I carried out had similar findings. Additionally, Average Grades and Motivation (r=.334, p<.01 level) were found to have a small positive association. This finding points out the importance of Motivation in ELs and monitored ELs maintaining good Average Grades.

In this specific study, there were practically significant influences on Resiliency. Autonomy suggested a very large effect size (d= 2.29) and Motivation a very large effect size as well (d= 3.76). In addition Autonomy and Motivation also suggested a very large influence on Proficiency. Autonomy produced an effect size of (d= 2.95) and Motivation the effect size of (d= 4.01). These findings also showed that Autonomy and Motivation are major influence agents of Resiliency and Proficiency in these ELs/monitored EL students. Both of these factors' effect sizes on Resiliency meant that the high Autonomy and Motivation largely influenced Non-Resilient students. Additionally, Autonomy and Motivation had a very large influence Proficiency. The higher the Autonomy and Motivation, the higher the Proficiency of those ELs/monitored ELs. Moreover, Motivation had a slightly larger influence on Proficiency than on Resiliency. The difference was not big, though.

The participants' answers to the semi-structured interview questionnaire showed that 95% felt they could succeed in life; out of those, 63% responded they tried their best and worked hard to be successful. Additionally, 89% of the respondents stated they felt

motivated enough to do well in school and go on to high school. The findings of the interview showed that most of the ELs/monitored ELs thought they could succeed in life and were persistent in becoming successful. Thus, the Motivation factor was found to be present in most of the participants. If students have Motivation, they will maintain good grades and be persistent in doing well in school and completing their education.

Research question 3.

Which extrinsic factors—School Belonging, Adult Support, Adult Education Expectations, Social Collaboration, and Average Grades--are associated with Spanish speaking EL students' academic resilience or proficiency?

The only extrinsic factors found to be negatively associated with Resiliency were Average Grades $p<.01$ and Family Support $p<.05$. These findings meant that when students were Non-Resilient, it was associated with lower Average Grades and less Family Support. Similarly, Resilient students were associated with higher Average Grades and more Family Support. In addition, there was a positive association reported between Proficiency and Adult Education Expectations $p<.05$; high English Proficiency levels were associated with higher Adult Education Expectations. The findings of this study showed no other statistically significant association between extrinsic factors and the ELs/monitored ELs academic Resiliency and Proficiency.

However, practically significant effect sizes were found between extrinsic factors and Resiliency and between extrinsic factors and Proficiency. Adult Support ($d= 3.46$), Adult Expectations ($d= 2.95$), Social Collaboration ($d= 2.99$), and School Belonging ($d= 3.91$) were found to have a very large influence on Resiliency. These findings meant that

the higher these extrinsic factors were, the more they influenced a Non-Resilient student. Whereas, Adult Support (*d*= 3.86), Social Collaboration (*d*= 3.50), and School Belonging (*d*= 4.09) yielded higher influences on Proficiency. These results indicated that the higher these extrinsic factors were, the more it influenced Proficiency levels, for example, increasing the level from EL to M1 or M2).

The participants' responses in the semi-structured questionnaire revealed that they preferred to be in cooperative groups. In both schools, teachers had been trained in Kagan structures. According to an educator's action research, after incorporating Kagan structures into her lessons, it helped her fourth grade students by reducing discipline problems and increasing their positive social skills (Magnesio & Davis, 2010).

Additionally, half of the ELs/monitored ELs received teacher support through the motivation and encouragement of their teachers as well as intervention and enrichment activities. In the review of the literature, Stinson's study (2008) reported that high-achieving students identified factors such as family and teacher support helping them achieve success. Few participants felt motivated by extrinsic things, such as candy and/or prizes. Additionally, less than half (44%) of the ELs/monitored ELs stated that their parents helped them with schoolwork. Less than one fourth (17%) responded they got assistance from other family members, such as cousins and siblings. The same percentage, 17%, answered they did not get assistance from anyone. Finally, about one tenth (11%) of the respondents stated they got assistance from teachers. In sum, a little more than half, 61%, received assistance at home from parents or family members. In the same study mentioned previously, high-achieving students attributed their success to

family members who demonstrated support and had motivated them to continue their schooling as well as having teachers who cared and were dedicated (Stinson, 2008).

Research question 4.

Is there a relationship between extrinsic factors and/or intrinsic factors?

The findings of this study reported positive associations between all intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The intrinsic factors of this study were autonomy and motivation, while the extrinsic factors were school belonging, social collaboration, and adult support. The associations were all significant at the $p<.01$ level. The strongest associations were found within the Adult Support factor. These findings show that when students ranked Adult Support high, they ranked the intrinsic and other extrinsic factors high as well. The strongest correlation was that of Adult Support and School Belonging. Within the School Belonging factor, the strongest association was with Social Collaboration. The other two factors it was associated with were intrinsic factors, Autonomy and Motivation; these associations were slightly lower than those School Belonging had with extrinsic factors. According to Libbey (2004) the variables related to school connectedness (School Belonging) were teacher support (Adult Support), student voice (Autonomy), peer relations (Social Collaboration), and academic engagement (Motivation). The last extrinsic factor reported was Social Collaboration. Like mentioned before, this factor was strongly associated with School Belonging. Social Collaboration was also strongly associated with Autonomy. Johnson (2004) stated that autonomy can be developed collectively through affiliation to a group.

In Chapter 4, I mentioned how this finding was sort of like an "oxymoron" because Social Collaboration involves working with others yet Autonomy involves independence in your own learning. Furthermore, the association Social Collaboration had with Motivation was slightly lower than the others. In a study by Walker (2006) it was found through collaboration in school and out of school, students helped each other with academics, problem solving, and encouragement. Finally, the last association found was between Autonomy and Motivation. Overall, the higher associations were found among extrinsic factors with each other. Additionally, the intrinsic factor that yielded slightly higher positive correlations was Autonomy. Nevertheless, Motivation was still found to be associated with Autonomy and the other extrinsic factors at a value $r>0.50$. Motivation had a strong association with Adult Support ($r= .64$). This finding is supported by Klem and Connell's (2004) study in which student engagement was "more strongly influenced by high levels of teacher support at the middle school than at the elementary" (p. 270)

Research question 5.

Is family configuration (Live with parents, Number of Siblings, Birth Order), Parent Education Level, and Family Expectations associated with an EL's opportunity to develop academic resilience or proficiency?

In the literature review, a study conducted by Chopra (1996) reported that academic achievement (grades from report cards) decreased as family size increased. The findings of my study that were somewhat related to the research questions indicated that the Number of Siblings was negatively associated with Family Educational Level,

$p<.05$; the more siblings the participants had an association with a lower level of education their parent(s) completed. In this study, there was no statistically significant association between number of Siblings and Family Education Expectations. However, Hester et al. (1992) found that number of siblings had a significant effect on GPA expectations. In my study, as mentioned in Chapter 4, there were no statistically significant associations found between family configuration and intrinsic or extrinsic factors. Additionally, there were no associations found between family configuration and resiliency or between family configuration and proficiency.

However, in this study, the Number of Siblings (d= 1.41), Birth Order (d= 1.06), and Family Expectations on Education (d= 1.37) were found to influence Resiliency in terms of practical significance. These effect sizes indicated that the higher the number of Siblings, the more likely it was associated with Non-Resilient students. Also, the higher the Birth Order (youngest children), the more it influenced a student to be Non-Resilient. The higher the Education Level had, the lower the Family Expectations on these children's education. Similarly, Number of Siblings (d= 1.93), Birth Order (d= 1.70), Adult Education Level (d= 1.76), Family Expectations on Education (d= 1.97), and Family Support (d= 5.70) were reported to influence Proficiency. These findings indicated that the higher the number of siblings, the higher Birth 0rder (younger children), the more parent's education level, and increased Family Expectations on Education and Family Support, the higher the Proficiency levels of these ELs/monitored ELs.

Moreover, in this study the Live with Parents factor had negative association a

Live with Parents had a negative correlation with Native Language 2 at *a p*<.05, which indicated that the when students Lived with Parents, they spoke more of their Native Language with them and with friends. Live with Parents had a positive association with Average Grade. In other words, those students who did not live with their parents had a higher Average Grades. Similarly, in Hester et al.'s study (1992), it was reported that participants who did not have any parents residing at their home, had higher GPA expectations than those who had two parents at home.

In study by Chopra (1996), Birth Order did not seem to provide a clear finding because it found that first-born children had higher intelligence scores than second-born children. However, in the same study third-born and fourth-born had higher intelligence scores and academic achievement scores than first and second-born children. In my study, Birth Order did not have a positive association with any factors. Nevertheless, when effect sizes were calculated, some of the factors were found to be influenced by Birth Order.

Research question 6.

Do non-resilient ELs possess more at-risk factors than their resilient EL peers? Is there an association between At-Risk Factors and English Language Proficiency factors?;

The findings showed that non-resilient ELs/monitored ELs possessed more At-Risk factors than their resilient peers. This is important to know because there were statistical significant associations at the p<.01 level found between At-Risk factors and the English Language Proficiency factors (Resiliency, Proficiency, and TELPAS). For Resiliency I used the label (1-Resilient, 2-Non-Resilient), with Proficiency I used (0=LEP, 1=M1,

2=M2; getting out of the program), and for TELPAS score I used (1-Beginner, 2-Intermediate, 3-Advanced, 4-Advanced High). The first association—At-Risk factors and Resiliency was found to be statistically significant. The next association was between At-Risk factors and Proficiency, it was higher and negative. The more At-Risk factors were associated with lower proficiency, e.g. being labeled as a LEP. Finally, the last correlation between At-Risk factors and proficiency factors was with that of TELPAS. This resulted in a negative association, similar to the Proficiency finding, the more At-Risk factors, the lower the TELPAS score, e.g. beginner level. The next correlations were within the English Proficiency factors (Resiliency, Proficiency, and TELPAS).

There were strong associations between the English Proficiency factors. The correlation between Resiliency and Proficiency and Resiliency and TELPAS were negative. The high negative association between Resiliency and TELPAS means that students who were Non-Resilient (coded as 2) were associated with a lower TELPAS score, like beginner and vice versa. The TELPAS scores help schools determine whether students shall remain in the LEP program or exit and be monitored for the following two years. Lastly, the association between Resiliency and Proficiency was positive. The Proficiency of Advanced or Advanced High was associated with the students who were labeled as Resilient. This finding makes sense because the researcher coded students as Resilient and Non-Resilient based on their Proficiency. And their Proficiency is mainly based on the TELPAS scores.

On the semi-structured questionnaire, 81% of the ELs/monitored ELs answered

that they felt they had learned the necessary English to listen, speak, read, and write it every day in school. The ARS had a particular question that dealt with this; it was labeled Native Language 3. When Native Language 2 and Native Language 3 were analyzed (how often did the student speak his native language with family and friends and how well do ELs/monitored ELs felt they understood, spoke, read, and wrote in English), associations were found. The first association reported was Native Language 2 and Family Educational Level. As mentioned before, the participants that spoke more of their Native Language with family and friends were associated with a high family educational level, $p<.05$. Positive correlations resulted from Native Language 2 and At-Risk factors, $p<.05$. These two findings are interesting because it means that students who spoke their native language more often with family and friends were also likely to possess more At-risk factors as indicated by the state of Texas public education systems. Native Language 2 was not found to be associated with extrinsic and intrinsic factor. As far as Native Language 3 (how well do students feel they understand, speak, read, and write in English), there were associations found. The first association was with At-Risk factors, $p<.01$, which means that there was a higher likelihood of students who felt they did not understand, speak, read, and write English well also had more At-risk factors. The next association between Native Language 3 and Resiliency, $p<.01$; the more students felt comfortable speaking the English language, the more likely it was associated with students labeled Non-Resilient and vice-versa. Its associations with Proficiency and TELPAS, $p<.01$ were extremely close. This is likely due to the fact that TELPAS scores are indicative of what Proficiency a student is assigned for the school

year.

At-Risk factors were found to be influenced largely by Number of Siblings. As Number of Siblings increased, the number of At-Risk factors increased, too. Additionally, even though it was a small effect size, Birth Order had a small influence on At-Risk factors.

In Kim and Kim (2017) study, resilience was found to be more closely associated to motivation than to proficiency. Similarly, in the study I conducted, the extrinsic factor found to be associated with Native Language 3 (how well the student felt they spoke, read, and wrote in English) was School Belonging, $p<.05$, and the one intrinsic factor associated with it, Motivation, $p<.05$. Both findings indicated that when an EL/monitored EL ranked School Belonging and Motivation high, it was associated with them feeling they understood, spoke, read, and wrote their second language well. Proficiency produced a negative association with Native Language 3 at a $p<.01$. Less proficiency in English was associated with students who spoke their native language more often with family and friends.

Research question 7.

When considered simultaneously, which variables--intrinsic or extrinsic--are most associated with English Proficiency, TELPAS scores, and Average Grade?

The findings for this research question are based on regression analyses models. The analysis was conducted two separate times. Once with all participants included—Resilient and Non-resilient. The second time the regression analysis was done was only with Resilient students. The reason being that I wanted to know which factors predicted

Proficiency, TELPAS, and Average Grade better. It is important to note that additional factors were added to intrinsic and extrinsic factors because together they accounted for more of the variance. The additional factors were students' Proficiency levels, TELPAS scores, Average Grade, and At-risk factors.

The first regression was done with Proficiency as dependent variable and the following as independent variables: At-Risk factors, Family Configuration (Birth Order, Siblings, Live with Parents), Scores (Average Grade and TELPAS scores), and extrinsic factors (School Belonging, Adult Support, Social Collaboration). Family Configuration factors were also considered extrinsic factors. When both groups—Resilient and Non-resilient—were included on regression, the adjusted R^2 resulted in .63. Therefore, 63% of the variance was explained by Family Configuration, At-Risk Factors, Scores, and Extrinsic Factors. At-Risk factors and TELPAS scores showed statistically significant β values. When only Resilient students were put as a rule. The adjusted R^2=.81, higher variance was explained by the factors, 81% as opposed to 63% when both groups were analyzed. This means that the At-Risk Factors, Family Configuration, and Scores, Extrinsic factors accounted for more variance in the Resilient group. The β values that resulted in statistical significance were At-Risk factors and TELPAS again. In addition, the β value of TELPAS had a higher effect on the Resilient group.

The second part of the Proficiency regression was done with the intrinsic factors (Autonomy, Motivation), At-Risk factors, Score (Average Grade and TELPAS). On the regression that included both Resilient and Non-resilient ELs/monitored ELS, the independent variables accounted for 62%, where as when the Resilient group was

analyzed, the same independent variables accounted for 81% of the Proficiency levels. Both regressions resulted in statistical significance, meaning that intrinsic factors, At-Risk factors, and scores predicted Proficiency. The β values of At-Risk factors and TELPAS scores in the first group (Resilient and Non-Resilient) and second group (Resilient only) were statistically significant. However, the At-risk factor had a bigger effect on the Resilient group. Lastly, in the Resilient group, the TELPAS scores had a larger effect on the dependent variable of Proficiency.

The second regression that was analyzed was of the dependent variable of TELPAS. The independent variables were: scores (Average Grade and Proficiency), extrinsic factors (Social Collaboration, Adult Support, and School Belonging), Family Configuration (Number of Siblings, Birth Order, Live with Parents) and At-Risk factors. Most of the factors included on this regression were extrinsic. In this regression, 55% of the variance was accounted by the independent factors of extrinsic factors, scores, family configuration, and at-risk factors. The only factor that produced a statistically significant β value, was Proficiency. As mentioned in Chapter 4, this would make sense due to TELPAS scores indicating an ELs/Monitored ELs Proficiency. The second regression of this dependent variable was made only with the Resilient group. The independent factors accounted for 81% of the variance; more of the variance was accounted for in the Resilient group. Also, in this regression, Proficiency had a β value that had a significant effect on TELPAS scores. In this regression, Proficiency levels had a smaller effect on the TELPAS scores of the Resilient group.

The second part of the TELPAS regression analyses was done with the independent variables—intrinsic (Autonomy and Motivation), At-Risk factors, and scores (Proficiency and Average Grade. The regression that included Resilient and Non-Resilient participants accounted for 55% of the variance in TELPAS scores, whereas in the Resilient group it accounted for 78% of the variance in the TELPAS scores. Therefore, the Resilient group's TELPAS scores were predicted better with the intrinsic, At-Risk factors, and scores. The β value that was statistically significant when both groups were analyzed was Proficiency. Nevertheless, when the analysis was done on only Resilient ELs/monitored ELs, three of the independent variables had a significant β value—At-Risk factors, Proficiency, and Motivation. This is important to point out because when both groups were included on analysis, the only variable of Proficiency yielded in a significant β value. Even though the At-Risk factors and Motivation variable seems to have a small effect on the TELPAS scores, they both produced a significant β value, which it is why it was reported.

The last regression was done with Average Grade as dependent variable and the following as independent variables: At-Risk factors, scores, Family Configuration and other extrinsic factors. When both groups—Resilient and Non-resilient—were included on regression, 19% of the variance was accounted by the independent variables (partially intrinsic factors.) In this particular regression, the independent variable of Lived with Parents had a significant effect on Average Grade. The β value of Lived With parents meant that for every 1 unit of change in that variable (not living with parents), the outcome variable of Average Grade increased by close to 8 points. When the regression

analysis was done on the Regression group, the independent variables accounted for 4% of the outcome variable, Average Grade. However, this regression analysis was not statistically significant. As a result of these findings, it is safe to conclude that Average Grade of Non-Resilient and Resilient students was affected by the factor Live with Parents and none of the other factors, extrinsic, scores, and the rest of the Family Configuration factors.

The second regression analysis of Average Grade regression analysis was done with intrinsic factors, scores, and At-risk factors. These variables accounted for 28% of the variance in Average Grade. The β value of Motivation resulted in statistical significance. On the second part, when the Resilient group was analyzed, the regression was statistically significant. In this group, the independent variables accounted for 18% of the variance in the outcome variable of Average Grades. Nevertheless, none of the β values were statistically significant. The intrinsic factor of Motivation only had an influence when both groups were included.

The different regression analyses are supported by Sagor (1996) and Benard (1993) resilience framework. Benard's resilience framework revolves around the idea that students possess four attributes or characteristics: social competence, autonomy, sense of purpose, and problem-solving skills (Benard, 1993). The five attributes of competence, belonging, usefulness, potency, and optimism are set forth by Sagor (Sagor, 1996). Furthermore, particular importance is that many variables "share a similar construct [and] relate to school connectedness: 1) academic engagement, 2) belonging, 3) discipline/fairness, 4) participation in school activities, 5) [whether student] likes

school, 6) student voice (autonomy), 7) peer relations, 8) safety, and 9) teacher support" (Libbey, 2004, p. 278).

Recommendations and Implications For Practice

The recommendations that arise from this study include but are not limited to educators, administrators, students, and families. The semi-structured questionnaire had the following three questions: *List the different instructional strategies that help you learn concepts in your classes*; *List different teaching practices that help you learn concepts*; and *When do you retain (learn) information better, when you are placed in a group, or by yourself? Explain why*. These questions were answered by ELs/monitored ELs and the answers give way to recommendations for practice in schools. For the first question, the instructional strategies that helped 92% of these students included: Mnemonics, graphic organizers, anchor charts. Out of the same percentage, 38% stated they learned better with songs about the concepts they learned in class, while 22% of the respondents said instructional videos helped them learn in class. In a meta-analysis conducted by Hattie (2009), he reported that metacognitive strategies (d= .69) and teaching strategies (d= .60) influenced student achievement.

Educators must take these findings into consideration. Instructional strategies that are used consistently and effectively in the classroom will help ELs/monitored ELs learn concepts in class as well as music and instructional videos. Instructional strategies are methods teachers use to assist students in becoming independent learners, while learning strategies refer to the instances in which students, themselves, choose the appropriate strategy that is needed for a particular task (Alberta Learning, 2002).

Administrators should do observations of all subjects and become familiar with each subjects instructional strategies. Some subjects will be able to use the same instructional strategies, while others because of the objectives they teach will have their own. Parents can help by becoming familiar with the instructional strategies each subject uses. These can be presented to the parents at the beginning of the school year and they can check their child's work to ensure they are using them when working at home.

The second question listed dealt with the teaching practices that help students learn. A little more than half of the ELs, 53%, responded they learned better in cooperative groups (social collaboration), while 16% answered the use of instructional strategies, 17% hands-on activities, 8% intervention after school, and 5% breaking down the concepts. The ELs and monitored ELs answers to this question implies for educators to place these students in cooperative groups, use instructional strategies, and hands-on activities as part of their instruction. If students struggle, teachers should carry out an intervention plan and break down concepts. Examples of such teaching practices include: students' voicing their ideas, cooperative grouping, and teacher support. Furthermore, teachers' encouragement of collaboration in their classrooms [can play] a major influence in the sense of community in the classroom (Solomon, et al., 1997). Administrators should know the teaching practices that assist these students learn better, that way they can look for such practices when they observe teachers in the classroom.

Lastly, the third question dealt with when do ELs/monitored ELs learned better, in groups or by him/herself. In regards to building resiliency in students, a strategic intervention that might assist students if they feel unneeded or unwanted, is cooperative

learning; the desired outcome would be students who feel useful (Sagor, 1996). Nearly two-thirds of the participants, 63%, responded they learned better in cooperative groups (social collaboration), while close to one-fourth (23%) answered they learned better by themselves. A small percentage, 8%, said they learned better both ways. Therefore, the finding of my study implicates for educators to place students in cooperative groups, which already had been reported on the second question listed on this section. Effective schools are those that provide at-risk students with support systems that promote membership and engagement in the educational setting. (Wehlage, Rutter, Smith, Lesko, & Fernandez, Abstract, 1989). Nevertheless, the answers to this question also points to the fact that some students prefer to work on their own. Administrators should offer professional opportunities for teachers to attend in the area of effective cooperative grouping as well as self-directed learning training.

The next recommendation for practice involved the following questions on the semi-structured questionnaire: *If you struggle in classes, why do you think you have a hard time? Do you think there is something you can do in order to struggle less in classes?*; *If you have been retained in at least one grade level and/or have failed one or more of your core classes during a grading period, do you try your best to improve your grades over the course of the year in order to pass to the next grade level?* The students' answer to the first question dealt with whether students had struggled and why they thought they did. A large majority, 84%, answered they had struggled in subjects. A little over one-third (36%) responded that they had struggled because they did not understand the material or that they thought it was difficult. According to Hattie (2009)

teacher clarity had an effect size of .75. A little less than one-third, 30%, responded they did not focus or were distracted. A few, 11%, stated that other students disrupted their learning and therefore they did not understand the lesson. In Hattie's meta-analysis, classroom behavior had a large influence on student learning (*d*= .80). Therefore, the findings of my study and Hattie's meta-analysis implicates for teachers to plan ahead in order to have engaging lessons, effective classroom discipline, use constant evaluation techniques to ensure students are understanding the material, have a reteach plan in case students do not understand lesson, break down concept, especially if it is an abstract concept or a higher-level objective. Administrators can assist in this by providing professional development opportunities on the topics of intervention and re-teaching of concepts as well as supporting teachers when students disrupt lessons, pushing for attendance in school and attendance at after school intervention sessions. Parents can help by cooperating with teachers and ensuring their child stays for after school intervention, assure their child that they can ask questions in class when they do not understand the concept, and to emphasize the importance to focus during the lesson.

For the second question, 75% of the ELs/monitored ELs responded that they have been retained or have failed a six weeks grading period, but that they have tried their best to pick up grade and to not fail again. A couple of participants, 22%, stated they had never failed a grade or six weeks grading period. The implication for educators is to document when these students fail a grading period, such as at progress report, which is half-way through a grading period. Interventions should be documented along with the improvement of student, such as bi-weekly assessment grades. The results from

Su et al. (2018) signal that the "students with higher self-evaluation capacity in the online English learning environment would be more likely to possess higher English language self-efficacy in listening, speaking, and reading" (p. 12). Self-regulation and self-evaluation can be strategies used by ELs and monitored ELs to help be cognizant of their learning in the classroom environment. Administrators should emphasize the importance of documentation of interventions and progress monitoring. Parents can assist by emphasizing to their child the importance of self-evaluation and self-regulation techniques, getting good grades and attending after school intervention, if that's when it will take place.

The other findings that are helpful in making implications for practice were the results to the research questions. For instance, the findings reported about type of school. School A and School B were clearly different types of schools. School A had average class sizes comparable to the state average class size with the exception of Language Arts/Reading due to it being larger, it had a smaller population with a bigger proportion of ELs, but less Non-Resilient students. Where as, School B had larger class sizes than the state with the exception of Language Art/s Reading because their class size was bigger; this school had a bigger population with less Resilient students but with more Non-Resilient students. Average class size seems to be linked to the Resiliency of ELs/monitored ELs. Therefore, when it comes to type of schooling, educators and administrators should be cognizant of "some of the risks associated with students' failure in school [and how these could be] due to the particular school environment" and not necessarily because of the students themselves (Waxman, Gray, & Padron, 2003, p. 15).

The results from the regression analyses are also helpful in making recommendations for practice. The reason the findings from the regression analyses will be used is because it looks at the variables simultaneously predicting the outcome variables that dealt with English Proficiency (Proficiency Levels and TELPAS scores) and Average Grade. These outcome variables of English Proficiency--Proficiency levels and TELPAS scores--played an important role in an EL/monitored EL being labeled as Resilient or Non-Resilient.

When Proficiency levels and TELPAS scores were designated as the outcome variables, they both had a higher variance accounted for by the independent variables than the variance reported by the regression of Average Grade. This occurred when the independent variables included At-Risk factors, scores/levels, family configuration, and extrinsic factors and when the predictor variables were At-Risk factors, scores/levels, and intrinsic factors. Also, important to note is that when the Resilient group was inputted as a rule on the regression analyses more of the variance of Proficiency and TELPAS was accounted for by the independent variables.

These findings implicate that educators should become familiar with their students At-Risk factors set by the state of Texas, TELPAS scores and Proficiency levels before they enter their classroom in the fall semester. Knowing these data will assist educators in promoting the academic resiliency of ELs/monitored ELs in their classrooms. Administrators can assist by emphasizing the importance of "knowing" your students and promoting the use of these data to lesson plan. Parents should know their child's TELPAS scores and Proficiency levels, that way, they can motivate their child to

want to improve on these English Proficiency factors.

Average Grade resulted in a higher adjusted R^2 when intrinsic variables were in the regression model as opposed to extrinsic factors. This, however, only happened in the model that included both Resilient and Non-Resilient. Motivation produced a statistically significant β value, meaning Average Grades increased when Motivation increased by a unit of 1. Knowing this information will assist teachers in boosting the academic success of these students in their classrooms. Also, becoming familiar with how to increase motivation within the students will aid in students getting better grades in core subjects. Administrators can assist by emphasizing the importance of using Proficiency levels when designing a lesson and offering professional development in the area of motivational techniques will also be helpful in increasing student success. Parents can help by emphasizing the importance of getting good grades and motivating their child in keeping up with their assignments and lessons.

Another finding that helped in making implications for practice is the fact that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors seemed to have yielded similar results in variance within the Proficiency levels and TELPAS scores. For instance, in the group that included both Resilient and Non-Resilient students, 63% of the variance in the Proficiency variable was accounted for by the model that included the extrinsic factors, where as 62% of the variance was accounted for by the model that included the intrinsic factors. In addition, the group that included both Resilient and Non-Resilient produced a 55% of the variance in TELPAS in the model that included extrinsic factors, where as the same percentage resulted when intrinsic factors where inputted in the model.

Similarly, when only Resilient students were put in the model, 81% of the variance in Proficiency was accounted for when the independent variables were extrinsic and intrinsic. Finally, 74% of the variance in TELPAS scores was accounted for by extrinsic factors in the Resilient group. Whereas, a small increase, 78% of the variance was accounted for by the intrinsic factors. Therefore, it is safe to recommend for teachers to become familiar and well-versed in increasing intrinsic factors as well as promoting extrinsic factors in their classroom through the use of cooperative grouping (e.g., Kagan structures) and offering support to their students in the form of motivation, encouragement, and intervention.

Intrinsic factors, such as Motivation influence students' resiliency. A study found that there was a higher correlation between resilience of English learners and motivated behavior than the correlation between resilience and English learner proficiency. "This suggested that resilience was more closely related to motivated behaviour than to English proficiency" (Kim & Kim, 2017, pp. 6-7). In the analysis of standard regression it was found that perceived happiness and persistence had a significant positive impact on the English learners' proficiency. Therefore, when students are excited in a classroom and eager to learn the material it will influence resilience and proficiency greatly. The other intrinsic factor of Autonomy can be seen as self-efficacy. In a study by Cassidy (2016) students with higher scores on global academic resilience were associated with higher academic self-efficacy ($r = 0.49$, $N = 319$, $p < 0.01$). The findings of my study indicated that Autonomy and Motivation are major influence agents of Resiliency and Proficiency in these ELs/monitored EL students. Thus,

administrators should build a sense of community at the campus-level and help promote joining organizations in which the students feel more pride for their school. Last but not least, parents can help their child by reminding them to complete homework and attending school meetings and parent conferences. Together, all stakeholders will help boost the academic resilience of ELs and monitored ELs in South Texas middle schools.

The last finding that helps to make implications for practice are the effect sizes of family factors. Most of the family factors (Family Support, Adult Support, Family Expectations on Education, Adult Expectations on Education, Birth Order, and Number of Siblings) had a large influence on Resiliency and Proficiency. Therefore, parents should be invited to educational sessions after school or on the weekend. If parents are involved in their child's education, they will most likely give them the support and set high expectations to all their children. If these educational sessions do not function in giving information to most parents, a brochure or a section of a campus newsletter will be sent home with information relevant to helping their child become successful in school.

The findings about Birth Order and Number of Siblings influence on Resiliency and Proficiency cannot be recommended to parents. However, these findings should be shared with teachers and administrators of these schools, so that they can incorporate protective factors school-wide in order to influence English Learners' and monitored English Learners' academic resilience and proficiency in English.

Recommendations For Further Research

The *National Assessment of Educational Progress* (NAEP) *Long-Term Reading Assessment* shows that English Learners have scored lower than non-ELs on four consecutive assessments administered in 2004, 2008, 2012, and 2015; important to note students in the South scored lower than other parts in the nation (U.S. Department of Education, 2013) (Nation's Report Card, 2015). Recommendations for future research in order to increase ELs' and monitored ELs' academic resilience include looking at STAAR testing data as an additional factor. As I did my research and carried out the study, I realized that some of the students had needed intervention because they had failed their STAAR Reading or STAAR Math. This data is available to teachers through a website the district uses. It was interesting to note that in large part, most of the students who needed STAAR intervention were the ELs/monitored ELs labeled as Non-Resilient. There were few exceptions in which Resilient students needed the intervention. However, the majority who did not pass the STAAR the first time were in the Non-Resilient group. It would be interesting to study if there is an association between Proficiency levels and STAAR Reading scores, or an association between TELPAS scores and STAAR Reading scores. Additionally, it would be helpful to know whether the intrinsic, extrinsic, and English Proficiency factors could simultaneously predict STAAR Reading scores. This would add to the significance of the study because the Texas Education Agency has set system safeguards and the target score for ELs and monitored ELs at a $\geq$ 60%, meaning 60% or more of this subgroup is required to pass the STAAR exam in any subject in order for the campus to not get "flagged."

In a study conducted by Walker (2006), more than half of the students (12 out of 21 students) indicated that their math achievement was due in part to their past and present teachers. Additionally, when children know that there are supportive adults in their lives, like parents and teachers; this may help them stay on-task (Blumenfeld, 1992). Therefore, another recommendation for future research is to look at what qualities do teachers possess that help students become academically resilient or at least, help a student gain resiliency in the classroom setting. By studying the teacher behaviors and actions, it would give a clearer picture of what an educator can do to help boost the academic success of ELs and monitored ELs. This study only looked at intrinsic, extrinsic, family configuration, instructional strategies, teaching practices, and English proficiency. It did not specifically set to find the qualities of teachers who help these students become resilient.

Another recommendation for future research is to carry out a study of an "Academic Resilience" framework at the campus or district-level that promotes becoming familiar with data, such as Proficiency levels, TELPAS scores, past Average Grades. This framework would emphasize intrinsic and extrinsic factors set forth by Sagor (1996) and Benard (1993) and in this study in order to help increase the academic resilience of the ELs and monitored ELs.

The last recommendation for future research is to carry out this type of study longitudinally. For example, in this study, 78% of the Non-Resilient group had aspirations of graduating from college, whereas the 77% of the Resilient group had plans to attend college. No significant difference was found based on their reported answers.

However, if the study were to be carried out longitudinally, the researcher could report how many of the ELs and monitored ELs from both groups (resilient and non-resilient) actually graduated from college. These findings could also be vital in districts deciding to implement an "Academic Resilience" framework described in the paragraph above.

Limitations

One of the limitations of this study was that only two campuses in South Texas were sampled. Because of convenient sampling, not all of the ELs and monitored ELs at the second campus were given a parent authorization letter and an information sheet to participate. Another limitation is sample size, even though the G*power indicated the size of the sample was appropriate, perhaps, increasing the number of participants would have yielded in a clearer picture of the analyses of the data. The last limitation is that only factors that students responded to where analyzed. Teachers were not part of this study.

Summary

The findings of this study revealed that there were no significant correlations between any of the intrinsic factors and resiliency or proficiency. Similarly, extrinsic factors did not produce any significant associations with resiliency or proficiency. However, practically significant effect sizes were found between intrinsic/extrinsic factors and Resiliency and Proficiency, meaning that Benard's and Sagor's factors in building academic resilience were shown to work with this particular subgroup of students.

The correlations, however, clearly pointed to the strong associations between intrinsic and extrinsic factors, meaning that when intrinsic factors in ELs/monitored ELs are present, the extrinsic factors are also present. The correlations among the extrinsic and intrinsic were the highest associations found in this study. The strongest associations were in the extrinsic factor of Adult Support. This is important to note because it implies that students who have Adult Support at school will likely have the other intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Therefore, educators play an important role in the development of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Additionally, the Number of Siblings was positively associated with At-Risk factors; the more siblings the participants had an association with a higher number of At-Risk factors. There were no associations found between Family Configuration and Resiliency or Proficiency. There was a negative association between Resiliency and Average Grade and Resiliency and Family Support. Thus, Resiliency was associated with higher Average Grades and more Family Support. In addition, there was a positive association reported between Proficiency and Adult Education Expectations; high English Proficiency levels were associated with higher Adult Education Expectations. However, no other correlations found between family configuration and the expectations they had for the ELs/monitored ELs. There were practically significant influences found from Family Support, Family Expectations on Education, Parent Education Level, Birth Order, and Number of Siblings on Resilience and Proficiency. This finding implicates the important role family plays in the academic resilience and proficiency of this subgroup.

Furthermore, the ELs and monitored ELs who had more At-Risk factors were in the Non-Resilient group. The Resilient group had less At-Risk factors overall. There were significant associations found between At-Risk factors and English Proficiency factors (Native language, Resiliency, Proficiency, and TELPAS.) When the correlations were done between the English Proficiency factors, the highest positive associations were between Resiliency and Proficiency and Resiliency and TELPAS scores. Therefore, a high score on TELPAS was associated strongly with a student who was Non-Resilient. Similarly, a high Proficiency level was also strongly associated with a student who was Non-Resilient. Native language 2 (how often do ELs use Spanish with family and friends) and At-Risk factors as well as Native Language 3 (how well do you understand, speak, read, and write in English) were found to be associated with At-Risk factors. Native language 3 produced a stronger association, meaning that the level of comfort an EL/monitored EL had speaking, writing, and reading in English is indicative of how many At-Risk factors they come to school with. Native Language 2 did not result in a significant association with any of the Proficiency factors, intrinsic, or extrinsic factors. However, Native Language 3 yielded associations with the Proficiency, TELPAS, Resiliency, School Belonging, and Motivation.

The regression analyses reported in this study indicated that the scores of TELPAS and Proficiency were explained by extrinsic and intrinsic factors with the same amount of variance when both Resilient and Non-Resilient groups were included and when only the Resilient group was analyzed. Nevertheless, the Resilient group had a higher percentage of variance explained by the independent variables, which is

important to make note of because this will help educators understand that Resiliency was explained better by extrinsic and intrinsic factors. Furthermore, in the Resilient Intrinsic group, TELPAS scores had additional significant β values of factors when compared to the Resilient Extrinsic group. The additional β values were Motivation and At-Risk factors. Finally, the variance of Average Grade was better explained by the intrinsic factor of Motivation in the Resilient and Non-Resilient group than in the Resilient group.

ELs and monitored ELs learn better when teachers incorporate instructional strategies and effective teaching practices in the classroom. The data also revealed that students get support from their teacher in the form of encouragement and motivation. Furthermore, the students who did not receive help from their parents at home, received it from other family members or from teachers at school. The data also explained that ELs/monitored ELs try their best in improving grades when they fail a grade level or a grading period.

In conclusion, the findings of this study signal the importance of educators and administrators to become familiar with Proficiency factors, intrinsic factors, extrinsic factors, and effective instructional strategies and teaching practices in order to help an EL/monitored EL become academically resilient and thereby becoming successful.

REFERENCES

Agasisti, T., Avvisati, F., Borgonovi, F., Longoba, S. (2018). Academic resilience: What schools and countries do to help disadvantaged students succeed in PISA. *Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Devlopment*, Working Paper, No. 167.

Alberta Learning. (2002). *Instructional strategies*. Retrieved from https://education.alberta.ca/ media/ 482311/is.pdf

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human Behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], Encyclopedia of mental health. San Diego: Academic Press, 1998).

Benard, B. (n.d.). *The foundations of the resilience framework*. Retrieved from https://www.resiliency.com/free-articles-resources/the-foundations-of-the-resiliency-framework/

Benard, B. (1993). Fostering resiliency in kids. *Educational Leadership*, *51*, 44-48.

Benard, B. (1995). *Fostering resilience in children.* ERIC: Clearinghouse on Education and Early Childhood Education. Retrieved from http://resilnet.uiuc.edu/library/ benard95.html

Benard, B. (2012). *Turning the corner from risk to resiliency*. National Resilience Resource Center. University of Minnesota. (Original work published in Western Center News between 1993).

Bickmore, T., Schulman, D., & Yin, L. (2010). Maintaining Engagement in Long-term Interventions with Relational Agents. *Applied Artificial Intelligence : AAI*, *24*(6), 648–666. http://doi.org/10.1080/08839514.2010.492259

Blumenfeld, P. C. (1992). Classroom learning and motivation: Clarifying and expanding goal theory. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *84*(3), 272-281.

Brackenreed, D. (2010). Resilience and risk. *International Education Studies*, *3*(3), 111-121.

California Department of Education. 2013. *California healthy kids survey*. Retrieved from https://chks.wested.org/resources/chks-ms-core-1314.pdf

Cameron, C.A., Lau, C., & Tapanya, S. (2009). Passing it on during a day in the life of resilient adolescents in diverse communities around the globe. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, *38*(6), 305-325.

Cassidy, S. (2016). The academic resilience scale (ARS-30): A new multidimensional construct measure. *Frontier Psychology, 7*(1787). doi: 0.3389/fpsyg.2016.01787

Chang, J. (2003). Multilevel collaboration for English learners: An Asian American perspective. In *English learners: Reaching the highest level of English literacy* (pp. 259-285). Newark, DE: the International Reading Association, Inc.

Chapa, I. G., Garcia, R., & Guerra, C. (2011). Capitalizing on English Language Learners' funds of knowledge to increase achievement in Math and Science: An equity pedagogy. *Journal of Border Educational Research, 9*, 95-206.

Chopra, S. L. (1966). Family size and sibling position as related to measured intelligence and academic achievement. *Journal of Social Psychology, 70*(1), 133-137.

Cole, M., Feild, H., & Harris, S. (2004). Student learning motivation and psychological hardiness: Interactive effects on students' reactions to a management class. Academy of Management Learning and Education, 3(1), 64–85.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five Approaches* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Corwin. *The research of John Hattie* [available in PDF]. Retrieved from https://www.visiblelearningplus.com/content/research-john-hattie

Crosnoe, R. (2005). Double disadvantage or signs of resilience? The elementary school contexts of children from Mexican immigrant families. *American Educational Research Journal*, *42*(2), 269-303.

Cunningham, M., & Swanson, D. P. (2010). Educational resilience in African American adolescents. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *79*(4), 473-487.

Education Commission of the States & Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning. (2004). *A policymaker's primer on education research: How to understand, evaluate, and use it*. Retrieved from http://www.ecs.org/html/ educationIssues/Research/primer/understandingtutorial.asp

Ellis, R. A., Han F., & Pardo, A. (2018). When does collaboration lead to deeper learning? Renewed definitions of collaboration for engineering students. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*. doi: 10.1109/TLT.2018.2836942

ELL Texas Org. (2014). *English Proficiency Exit Criteria 2013-2014*. Retrieved from http://www.elltx.org/docs/2013_2014_Exit_Criteria_Chart.pdf

Encyclopedia of Children's Health. (2014). *Social competence definition*. Retrieved from http://www.healthofchildren.com/S/Social-Competence.html

Goering, C.Z., & Baker, K. F. (2010). Like the whole class has reading problems: a study of oral reading fluency activities in a high intervention setting. *American Secondary Education*, *39*(1), 61-77.

Gonzalez, R., & Padilla, A. M. (1997). The academic resilience of Mexican American high school students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *19*(3), 301-317.

G*Power. (2017). G*power: Statistical power analysis program (Version 3.1.9.3) [Software]. Available from https://www.macupdate.com/app/mac/24037/g-power

Guajardo, M.A., & Guajardo, F.J. (2004). The impact of Brown on the brown of South Texas: A micropolitical perspective on the education of Mexican Americans in a South Texas community. *American Educational Research Journal*, *41*(3), 501-526.

Harlow, R. E., & Cantor, N. (1995). Overcoming a lack of self-assurance in an achievement domain: Creating agency in daily life. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Plenum series in social/clinical psychology*. *Efficacy, agency, and self esteem* (pp. 171-195). New York, NY, US: Plenum Press.

Hanson, T. L., Austin, G. A., & Lee-Bayha, J. (2004). *Ensuring that no child is left behind: How are student health risks & resilience related to the academic progress of schools?* San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

Hester, C., Osborne, G.E., Nguyen, T. (1992). The effects of birth order and number of sibling and parental cohabitants on academic achievement. *Individual Psychology, 48*(3), 330-348.

House, J. D. (2003). Instructional activities and interest in science learning for adolescent students. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, *30*(4), 429-443.

Hoy, W.K., Tarter, C.J., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2006). Academic optimism of schools: A force for student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, *43*(3), 425-446.

IBM Corp. Released 2013. IBM SPSS Statistics for Mac, Version 22.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

Jalongo, M. R. (2007). Beyond benchmarks and scores: Reasserting the role of Motivation and interest in children's academic achievement. *Childhood Education*, *83*(6), 395-407.

Jensen, A., McHale, S.M. (2015). What makes siblings different? The development of sibling differences in academic achievement and interests. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *29*(3), 469-478.

Jindal-Snape, D., & Miller, D.J. (2008). A change of living? Understanding the psycho-social of the child during primary-secondary transition through resilience and self- esteem theories. *Educational Psychology*, *20*, 217-236.

Johnston, P. H. (2004). *Choice words: How our language affects children's learning*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Kagan. (2018). *About Kagan publishing & professional development: It's all about engagement*. Retrieved from https://www.kaganonline.com/about_us.php

Kim, T-Y., Kim, Y-K. (2017). The impact of resilience on L2 learners' motivated behavior and proficiency in L2 learning. Educational Studies, 43(1), 1-15. doi: 10.1080/03055698.2016.1237866

Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 262-273.

Kominski, R., Jamieson, A., & Martinez, G. (2001). *U.S. Census Bureau: At-risk conditions of U.S. school-age children*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0052/twps0052.html

Libbey, H. P. (2004). Measuring student relationships to school: Attachment, bonding, connectedness, and engagement. *Journal of School Health, 74*, 274-283.

Lilles, E.D., Furlong, M.J., Quirk, M. (2016). Academically resilient Latino Elementary students bridging the achievement gap. *Contemporary School Psychology,* doi:10.1007/s40688-016-0088-8

Lin, T.J., Anderson, R.C., Jadallah, M., Nguyen-Jahiel, K., Kim, I.H., Kuo, L.J., Miller, Logis, H.A., Dong, T., Wu, X., Li, Y. (2014). Social influences on children's development of relational thinking during small-group discussions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *41*(2015), 83-97.

Ma, X. (2003). Sense of belonging to school: Can schools make a difference? *The Journal of Educational Research*, *96*(6), 340-349.

Magnesio, S. & Davis, B. (2010). *A Teacher fosters social competence with cooperative Learning.* San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publishing. ***Kagan Online Magazine,*** *Fall/Winter*. Retrieved from: www.KaganOnline.com

Masten, A. S., Herbers, J. E., Cutuli, J. J., & Lafavor, T. L. (2008). Promoting competence and resilience in the school context. *Professional School Counseling*, *12*(2), 76-84.

Masten, A. S. (2014). Ordinary magic: Resilience in development. New York: Guilford Press (in press).

Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster'swebster.com/

Mruk, C.J. (1999). *Self-esteem: Research, theory, and practice*. New York: Springer Pub. Co.

Murphy, K. A., Blustein, D. L., Bohlig, A. J., & Platt, M. G. (2010). The college-to-career transition: An exploration of emerging adulthood. *Journal of Counseling and Development. 88*(2), 174-181.

National Center for the Dissemination of Disability Research. (2014). *What are Communities of Practice*. Retrieved from http://www.ncddr.org/cop/whatiscop.html

National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). *The NAEP Glossary of Terms*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/ glossary.aspx #english_language_learners

National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *Educational Longitudinal Study 2002*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/els2002/pdf/StudentQ_baseyear.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *English Language Learners in public schools*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp

Nation's Report Card. (2015). *National scores by student group: Reading*. Retrieved from https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_g12_2015/#reading/groups

Neal, D. (2017). Academic resilience and caring adults: The experiences of former foster youth. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *79*(2017), 242-248.

Noble, T., & McGrath, H. (2005). Emotional growth: Helping children and families 'bounce back.' *Australian Family Physician*, *34*(9), 749-752.

Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (1997). Influence of self-efficacy on elementary students' writing. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *90*(6), 353.

Pérez Carreón, G., Drake, C., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2005). The importance of x from Immigrant parents' school engagement experiences. *American Educational Research Journal*, *42*(3), 465-498.

Pitzer, J., Skinner, E. (2016). Predictors of changes in students' motivational resilience over the school year: The roles of teacher support, self-appraisals, and emotional reactivity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *41*(1), 15-29. doi: 10.1177/0165025416642051 journals.sagepub.com/home/ijbd

Reyes, R. (2007). A collective pursuit of learning the possibility to be: The CAMP experience assisting situationally marginalized Mexican-American students to a successful student identity. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *18*(4), 618-659. Retrieved from ProQuest Education Journals. (Document ID: 1383231591).

Rodriguez, Cory R., "The Relationship of the Parental Involvement of Latino Immigrant parents of Middle School Students and Student Academic Achievement" (2016). *FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations*, 2449.

Sagor, R. (1996). Building resiliency in students. *Educational Leadership*, *54*(1), 38-43.

Sanchez, B., Colon, Y, & Esparza, P. (2005). The role of sense of school belonging and gender in the academic adjustment of Latino adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *34*(6), 619-628.

Sanders. J., Munford, R., (2016). Fostering a sense of belonging at school—five orientations to practice that assist vulnerable youth to create a positive student identity. *School Psychology International*, 37(2) 155-171. doi: 10.1177/0143034315614688

San Dieguito Union High School. (2016). *California health kids survey (CHKS).* Retrieved from http://www.sduhsd.net/Parents--Students/Student-Support--Wellness/California-Healthy-Kids-Survey-CHKS/index.html

Scarf, D., Moradi, S., McGaw, K., Hewitt, J., Hayhurst, J.G., Boyes, M., Ruffman, T., Hunter, J. (2016). Somewhere I belong: Long-term increases in adolescents' resilience are predicted by perceived belonging in the in-group. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *55*, 588-599.

Schloesser, N. (2002). *Independent samples t-test*. Retrieved from http://www.wellesley.edu/Psychology/Psych205/indepttest.html

Schmitz, B., & Skinner, E. (1993). Perceived control, effort, and academic performance: Interindividual, intraindividual, and multivariate time-series analyses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*(6), 1010-1028.

Shuck, G. (2004). Ownership of texts, ownership of language: Two students' participation in a student-run conference. *The Reading Matrix*, *4*(3), 24-32.

Skinner, E. A., Zimmer-Gembeck, J., & Connell, J. P. (1998). Individual differences and the development of perceived control (#254). *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *63*(2-3).

Skokut, M. A. (2009). *Educational resilience among English language learners: Examining factors associated with high school completion and post-secondary school attendance*. Ph.D. from Dissertations & Theses: The Humanities and Social Sciences Collection. (Publication No. AAT 3375561). Retrieved from ProQuest Journals.

Solomon, D., Battistich, V., Il-Kim, D., & Watson, M. (1997). Teacher practices associated with students' sense of the classroom as a community. *Social Psychology of Education, 1,* 235-267.

Social Science Statistics. 2018. *Effect size calculator for T*-test. Retrieved from http://www.socscistatistics.com/effectsize/Default3.aspx

Statistics Solutions. 2018. *Exploratory factor analysis.* Retrieved from http://www.statisticssolutions.com/factor-analysis-sem-exploratory-factor-analysis/

Stinson, D. (2008). Negotiating sociocultural discourses: The counter-storytelling of academically (and mathematically) successful African American male students. *American Educational Research Journal*, *45*(4), 975-1010.

Su, Y., Zheng, C., Liang, J.C., Tsai, C.C. (2018). Examining the relationship between English language learners' online self-regulation and their self-efficacy. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, *34*(3), 105-121.

Sungur, S., & Tekkaya, C. (2006). Effects of problem-based learning and traditional instruction on self-regulated learning. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *99*(5), 307-317.

Sungur, S., & Senler, B. (2010). Students' achievement goals in relation to academic motivation,competence expectancy, and classroom environment perceptions. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *16*(4), 303-324.

Tae-Young, K., & Yoon-Kyoung, K. (2017). The impact of resilience on L2 learners' motivated behavior and proficiency in L2 learning, *Educational Studies*, *43(1)*,1-15, doi: 10.1080/03055698.2016.1237866

Texas Administrative Code. (2012). Rule §89.1225. *Testing and classification of students*. Retrieved from http://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=19&pt=2&ch=89&rl=1225

Texas Education Agency. (2011). *TELPAS resources*. Retrieved from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/ell/telpas/

Texas Education Agency. (2011). *Glossary for the Academic Excellence Indicator System*. Retrieved from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/2011/glossary.html

Texas Education Agency. (2014). *2013 Accountability system: Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2013/faq.html

Texas Education Agency. (2017). *Snapshot of ELLs in Texas*. Retrieved from http://www.elltx.org/snapshot.html

Texas Education Agency. (2017). *TELPAS update*. Retrieved from https://tea.texas.gov/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=51539617277

Texas Education Agency. (2017). *2017-2018 English proficiency exit criteria chart*. Retrieved from https://tea.texas.gov/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=51539609137

Texas Education Agency. (2017). *Enrollment trends*. Retrieved from https://tea.texas.gov/acctres/enroll_index.html

Texas Education Agency. (2017). *Supporting ELs in Texas: Proficiency level descriptors.* Retrieved from http://www.elltx.org/proficiency_level_descriptors.html

Texas Education Agency. (2017). *School report card*. Retrieved from https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/src/2017/campus.srch.html

Texas Education Agency. (2017). *Texas academic performance reports*. Retrieved from https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tapr/2017/index.html

Thomsen, K. (2002). Resiliency: The basics. In *Building resilient students: Integrating resiliency into what you already know and do* (pp. 1-43). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc.

Thompson, B. (2006). *Foundations of behavioral statistics: An insight-based approach* (pp. 216-217). New York, New York: The Guilford Press.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2017). *Quick facts: Texas*. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/TX/POP815216#viewtop

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *American Community Survey*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/acs/www/

U.S. Department of Education. (2011). NCES: Education Longitudinal Study (ELS) of 2002-2006 [data file]. Available from http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/els2002/

U.S. Department of Education. (2013). *NCES data explorer: National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), long-term trend reading assessment*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/lttdata/report.aspx

U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *NCELA: Texas rate of EL growth* 1997/1998-2007/2008. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/20/Texas_G_0708.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *NCELA: The growing number of English learner students 1998/99-2008/09*. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/9/growingLEP_0809.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2014). *Title IX: General provisions*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg107.html

Van Ryzin, M. J., Gravely, A. A., & Roseth, C. J. (2009). Autonomy, belongingness, and engagement in school as contributors to adolescent psychological well-being. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*(1), 1-12. doi: 10.1007/s10964-007-9257-4

Vlach, S., & Burcie, J. (2010). Narratives of the struggling reader. *The Reading Teacher*, *63*(6), 522-525.

Walker, C., & Greene, B. (2009). The relations between student motivational beliefs and cognitive engagement in high school. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *102*(6), 463-471.

Walker, E. (2006). Urban High School students' academic communities and their effects on mathematics success. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*(1), 43-73.

Waxman, H. C., Huang, S. L., & Padron, Y. N. (1997). Motivation and learning environment differences between resilient and non-resilient Latino middle school students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *19*, 137-155.

Waxman, H. C., Gray, J. P., & Padron, Y. N. (2003). Review on research of educational resilience. *Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence*, Research report 11.

Weare, K., & Markham, W. (2005). What do we know about promoting mental health through schools? *Global Health Promotion*, *12*(3-4), 118-122.

Wehlage, G., Rutter, R., Smith, G., Lesko, N., & Fernandez, R. (1989). *Reducing the risk: Schools as communities of support.* London, England: Falmer Press.

Wested. (2012). *California school climate survey*. Retrieved from http://cscs.wested.org/

Whitlock, J. L. (2006). Youth perceptions of life at school: Contextual correlates of school connectedness in adolescence. *Applied Developmental Science, 10*(1), 13-29.

Yoon, B. (2008). Uninvited guests: The influence of teachers' roles and pedagogies on the positioning of English language learners in the regular classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, *45*(2), 495-522.

APPENDIX A

Proficiency Level Descriptors

ELPS-TELPAS Proficiency Level Descriptors
Grades K–12 Listening

Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Advanced High
Beginning English language learners (ELLs) have little or no ability to understand spoken English used in academic and social settings.	**Intermediate ELLs have the ability to understand simple, high-frequency spoken English used in routine academic and social settings.**	**Advanced ELLs have the ability to understand, with second language acquisition support, grade-appropriate spoken English used in academic and social settings.**	**Advanced high ELLs have the ability to understand, with minimal second language acquisition support, grade-appropriate spoken English used in academic and social settings.**
These students: • struggle to understand simple conversations and simple discussions even when the topics are familiar and the speaker uses linguistic supports (e.g., visuals, slower speech and other verbal cues, gestures) • struggle to identify and distinguish individual words and phrases during social and instructional interactions that have not been intentionally modified for ELLs • may not seek clarification in English when failing to comprehend the English they hear; frequently remain silent, watching others for cues	**These students:** • usually understand simple or routine directions, as well as short, simple conversations and short, simple discussions on familiar topics; when topics are unfamiliar, require extensive linguistic supports and adaptations (e.g., visuals, slower speech and other verbal cues, simplified language, gestures, preteaching to preview or build topic-related vocabulary) • often identify and distinguish key words and phrases necessary to understand the general meaning (gist) during social and basic instructional interactions that have not been intentionally modified for ELLs • have the ability to seek clarification in English when failing to comprehend the English they hear by requiring/requesting the speaker to repeat, slow down, or rephrase speech	**These students:** • usually understand longer, more elaborated directions, conversations, and discussions on familiar and some unfamiliar topics, but sometimes need processing time and sometimes depend on visuals, verbal cues, and gestures to support understanding • understand most main points, most important details, and some implicit information during social and basic instructional interactions that have not been intentionally modified for ELLs • occasionally require/request the speaker to repeat, slow down, or rephrase to clarify the meaning of the English they hear	**These students:** • understand longer, elaborated directions, conversations, and discussions on familiar and unfamiliar topics with only occasional need for processing time and with little dependence on visuals, verbal cues, and gestures; some exceptions when complex academic or highly specialized language is used • understand main points, important details, and implicit information at a level nearly comparable to native English-speaking peers during social and instructional interactions • rarely require/request the speaker to repeat, slow down, or rephrase to clarify the meaning of the English they hear

Note. Proficiency level descriptors. Reprinted from “Supporting ELs in Texas” by Texas Education Agency, 2017. Retrieved February 22, 2018, from http://www.elltx.org/proficiency _level _descriptors.html

ELPS-TELPAS Proficiency Level Descriptors
Grades K–12 Speaking

Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Advanced High
Beginning English language learners (ELLs) have little or no ability to speak English in academic and social settings.	**Intermediate ELLs have the ability to speak in a simple manner using English commonly heard in routine academic and social settings.**	**Advanced ELLs have the ability to speak using grade-appropriate English, with second language acquisition support, in academic and social settings.**	**Advanced high ELLs have the ability to speak using grade-appropriate English, with minimal second language acquisition support, in academic and social settings.**
These students: • mainly speak using single words and short phrases consisting of recently practiced, memorized, or highly familiar material to get immediate needs met; may be hesitant to speak and often give up in their attempts to communicate • speak using a very limited bank of high-frequency, high-need, concrete vocabulary, including key words and expressions needed for basic communication in academic and social contexts • lack the knowledge of English grammar necessary to connect ideas and speak in sentences; can sometimes produce sentences using recently practiced, memorized, or highly familiar material • exhibit second language acquisition errors that may hinder overall communication, particularly when trying to convey information beyond memorized, practiced, or highly familiar material • typically use pronunciation that significantly inhibits communication	**These students:** • are able to express simple, original messages, speak using sentences, and participate in short conversations and classroom interactions; may hesitate frequently and for long periods to think about how to communicate desired meaning • speak simply using basic vocabulary needed in everyday social interactions and routine academic contexts; rarely have vocabulary to speak in detail • exhibit an emerging awareness of English grammar and speak using mostly simple sentence structures and simple tenses; are most comfortable speaking in present tense • exhibit second language acquisition errors that may hinder overall communication when trying to use complex or less familiar English • use pronunciation that can usually be understood by people accustomed to interacting with ELLs	**These students:** • are able to participate comfortably in most conversations and academic discussions on familiar topics, with some pauses to restate, repeat, or search for words and phrases to clarify meaning • discuss familiar academic topics using content-based terms and common abstract vocabulary; can usually speak in some detail on familiar topics • have a grasp of basic grammar features, including a basic ability to narrate and describe in present, past, and future tenses; have an emerging ability to use complex sentences and complex grammar features • make errors that interfere somewhat with communication when using complex grammar structures, long sentences, and less familiar words and expressions • may mispronounce words, but use pronunciation that can usually be understood by people not accustomed to interacting with ELLs	**These students:** • are able to participate in extended discussions on a variety of social and grade-appropriate academic topics with only occasional disruptions, hesitations, or pauses • communicate effectively using abstract and content-based vocabulary during classroom instructional tasks, with some exceptions when low-frequency or academically demanding vocabulary is needed; use many of the same idioms and colloquialisms as their native English-speaking peers • can use English grammar structures and complex sentences to narrate and describe at a level nearly comparable to native English-speaking peers • make few second language acquisition errors that interfere with overall communication • may mispronounce words, but rarely use pronunciation that interferes with overall communication

Note. Proficiency level descriptors. Reprinted from “Supporting ELs in Texas” by Texas Education Agency, 2017. Retrieved February 22, 2018, from http://www.elltx.org/proficiency _level _descriptors.html

ELPS-TELPAS Proficiency Level Descriptors
Grades 2–12 Writing

Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Advanced High
Beginning English language learners (ELLs) lack the English vocabulary and grasp of English language structures necessary to address grade-appropriate writing tasks meaningfully.	**Intermediate ELLs have enough English vocabulary and enough grasp of English language structures to address grade-appropriate writing tasks in a limited way.**	**Advanced ELLs have enough English vocabulary and command of English language structures to address grade-appropriate writing tasks, although second language acquisition support is needed.**	**Advanced high ELLs have acquired the English vocabulary and command of English language structures necessary to address grade-appropriate writing tasks with minimal second language acquisition support.**
These students: • have little or no ability to use the English language to express ideas in writing and engage meaningfully in grade-appropriate writing assignments in content area instruction • lack the English necessary to develop or demonstrate elements of grade-appropriate writing (e.g., focus and coherence, conventions, organization, voice, and development of ideas) in English **Typical writing features at this level:** • ability to label, list, and copy • high-frequency words/phrases and short, simple sentences (or even short paragraphs) based primarily on recently practiced, memorized, or highly familiar material; this type of writing may be quite accurate • present tense used primarily • frequent primary language features (spelling patterns, word order, literal translations, and words from the student's primary language) and other errors associated with second language acquisition may significantly hinder or prevent understanding, even for individuals accustomed to the writing of ELLs	**These students:** • have a limited ability to use the English language to express ideas in writing and engage meaningfully in grade-appropriate writing assignments in content area instruction • are limited in their ability to develop or demonstrate elements of grade-appropriate writing in English; communicate best when topics are highly familiar and concrete, and require simple, high-frequency English **Typical writing features at this level:** • simple, original messages consisting of short, simple sentences; frequent inaccuracies occur when creating or taking risks beyond familiar English • high-frequency vocabulary; academic writing often has an oral tone • loosely connected text with limited use of cohesive devices or repetitive use, which may cause gaps in meaning • repetition of ideas due to lack of vocabulary and language structures • present tense used most accurately; simple future and past tenses, if attempted, are used inconsistently or with frequent inaccuracies • descriptions, explanations, and narrations lacking detail; difficulty expressing abstract ideas • primary language features and errors associated with second language acquisition may be frequent • some writing may be understood only by individuals accustomed to the writing of ELLs; parts of the writing may be hard to understand even for individuals accustomed to the writing of ELLs	**These students:** • are able to use the English language, with second language acquisition support, to express ideas in writing and engage meaningfully in grade-appropriate writing assignments in content area instruction • know enough English to be able to develop or demonstrate elements of grade-appropriate writing in English, although second language acquisition support is particularly needed when topics are abstract, academically challenging, or unfamiliar **Typical writing features at this level:** • grasp of basic verbs, tenses, grammar features, and sentence patterns; partial grasp of more complex verbs, tenses, grammar features, and sentence patterns • emerging grade-appropriate vocabulary; academic writing has a more academic tone • use of a variety of common cohesive devices, although some redundancy may occur • narrations, explanations, and descriptions developed in some detail with emerging clarity; quality or quantity declines when abstract ideas are expressed, academic demands are high, or low-frequency vocabulary is required • occasional second language acquisition errors • communications are usually understood by individuals not accustomed to the writing of ELLs	**These students:** • are able to use the English language, with minimal second language acquisition support, to express ideas in writing and engage meaningfully in grade-appropriate writing assignments in content area instruction • know enough English to be able to develop or demonstrate, with minimal second language acquisition support, elements of grade-appropriate writing in English **Typical writing features at this level:** • nearly comparable to writing of native English-speaking peers in clarity and precision with regard to English vocabulary and language structures, with occasional exceptions when writing about academically complex ideas, abstract ideas, or topics requiring low-frequency vocabulary • occasional difficulty with naturalness of phrasing and expression • errors associated with second language acquisition are minor and usually limited to low-frequency words and structures; errors rarely interfere with communication

Note. Proficiency level descriptors. Reprinted from "Supporting ELs in Texas" by Texas Education Agency, 2017. Retrieved February 22, 2018, from http://www.elltx.org/ proficiency _level _descriptors.html

Academic Resilience Survey

Please complete the following information.

Last name	First Name	Middle Initial	ID#	Date of Birth	Grade

1. **What is your Native (First/Home) Language _____**

2 **How often do you speak your native language with …**

(IF ANY EXAMPLE DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, PLEASE MARK "Does not apply.")

(MARK ONE RESPONSE ON EACH LINE)

	Never	Some-times	About half of the time	Always or most of the time	Does not apply
a. your mother?	○	○	○	○	○
b. your father?	○	○	○	○	○
c. your brothers and sisters?	○	○	○	○	○
d. your friends?	○	○	○	○	○

3. **How well do you do the following?**

(MARK ONE RESPONSE ON EACH LINE)

	Very well	Well	Not well	Not at all
a. Understand spoken English	○	○	○	○
b. Speak English	○	○	○	○
c. Read English	○	○	○	○
d. Write English	○	○	○	○

4. **Family Configuration**

a. How many siblings do you have? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

b. Are you the… 1st born 2nd born 3rd born 4th born 5th born 6th born 7th born 8th born

c. Do you live with your parents? Yes No

d. If you answered "no" to letter "c", who do you live with? _____

External-School Supports Scale (Adult Support)

1=Not at All True, 2=A Little True, 3=Pretty Much True, 4=Very Much True

5. There's a teacher/adult who really cares about me	1	2	3	4
6. There's a teacher/adult who challenges me in class often	1	2	3	4
7. There's a teacher/adult who notices when I'm not here	1	2	3	4
8. There's a teacher/adult who always wants me to do my best	1	2	3	4
9. There's a teacher/adult who listens to me when I have something to say	1	2	3	4
10. There's a teacher/adult who believes that I will be a success	1	2	3	4
11. There's a teacher who praises me when I work hard	1	2	3	4
12. There's a teacher who is available to help me before/after school	1	2	3	4

External-School Connectedness Scale (Sense of Belonging)

At my school…

13.Students get along well with teachers	1	2	3	4
14. Students make friends with other group of students	1	2	3	4
15. There is real school spirit	1	2	3	4
16. Other students often disrupt class	1	2	3	4
17. The teaching is good	1	2	3	4
18. Teachers are interested in students	1	2	3	4
19. In class I often feel "put down" by my teachers	1	2	3	4
20. In class I often feel "put down" by other students	1	2	3	4
21. I don't feel safe at this school	1	2	3	4
22. Other students disrupt my learning in class	1	2	3	4
23. Misbehaving students often get away with it	1	2	3	4
24. I feel close to people at this school	1	2	3	4
25. I am happy to be at this school	1	2	3	4
26. I feel like I am part of this school	1	2	3	4
27. The teachers at this school treat students fairly	1	2	3	4
28. I feel safe at my school	1	2	3	4

External-Social Competence & Collaboration Scale

29. Other students in this school want me to do my best schoolwork	1	2	3	4
30. In this school, other students like to help me learn	1	2	3	4
31. In this school, other students care about how much I learn	1	2	3	4
32. Other students in this school want me to come to school every day	1	2	3	4
33. I work well with other students in class assignments/projects	1	2	3	4
34. When I work with a group, I usually understand concepts better	1	2	3	4
35. I like to help my peers when they are struggling	1	2	3	4
36. In class, the teachers give us opportunities to collaborate with others	1	2	3	4
37. There is a group of students which I can identify myself with	1	2	3	4
38. There is a group of students with whom I can discuss my issues	1	2	3	4
39. My peers value my input when completing assignments/projects	1	2	3	4

Internal-Autonomy and Self-efficacy Scale

40. When I do assignments, I sometimes get totally absorb	1	2	3	4
41. Because academics (subjects) are fun, I wouldn't want to give up	1	2	3	4
42. Academics (grades) is important to me personally	1	2	3	4
43. Most people can learn to be good in subjects	1	2	3	4
44. You have to be born with the ability to be good in subjects	1	2	3	4
45. I can work out my problems	1	2	3	4
46. I can do most things if I try	1	2	3	4
47. There are many things I do well	1	2	3	4
48. I don't have to rely on people to do things for me	1	2	3	4

Internal-Motivation and Engagement Scale

49. When I'm in school, I feel good	1	2	3	4
50. When we work on something in school, I feel interested	1	2	3	4
51. School is fun	1	2	3	4
52. I enjoy learning new things in school	1	2	3	4
53. When we work on something in school, I get involved	1	2	3	4
54. When we work on something in school, I feel bored	1	2	3	4
55. When I'm in school, I feel worried	1	2	3	4
56. When we work on something in school, I feel discouraged	1	2	3	4
57. School is not all fun for me	1	2	3	4
58. When I'm in school, I feel bad	1	2	3	4
59. I try hard to do well in school	1	2	3	4
60. In school, I work as hard as I can	1	2	3	4
61. When I'm in school, I like to participate in discussions	1	2	3	4
62. I pay attention in school to my teachers/advisor in school	1	2	3	4
63. When I'm in school, I listen very carefully to my teachers/advisor	1	2	3	4
64. When I'm in school, I just act like I'm working	1	2	3	4
65. I don't try very hard in my school	1	2	3	4
66. In school, I do just enough to get by	1	2	3	4
67. When I'm in school, I think about other things	1	2	3	4
68. When I'm in school, my mind wanders	1	2	3	4

External-Family Support and Expectations

69. **w far in school did your parents go? Indicate your mother's and father's highest level of education.**

(MARK ONE RESPONSE IN EACH COLUMN)

	Mother (or female guardian)	Father (or male guardian)
Did not finish high school	○	○
Graduated from high school or equivalent (GED)	○	○
Graduated from high school and attended a two-year school (such as a vocational or technical school, a junior college, or a community college), but did not complete a degree	○	○
Graduated from a two-year school (such as a vocational or technical school, junior college, or a community college)	○	○
Graduated from high school and went to college, but did not complete a four-year degree	○	○
Graduated from college	○	○
Completed a Master's degree or equivalent	○	○
Completed a Ph.D., M.D., or other advanced professional degree	○	○
Don't Know	○	○
Does Not Apply	○	○

70**. How far in school do you think your mother and father want you to go? Circle one answer.**

Less than high school graduation
High school graduation or GED only
Attend or complete a 2-year school
Attend college, but not complete a 4-year degree
Graduate from college
Obtain a Master's degree or equivalent
Obtain a Ph.D., M.D., or other advanced degree
Don't know
Does not apply

71

How often do your parents do the following?

(MARK ONE RESPONSE ON EACH LINE)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
a. Check on whether you have done your homework	○	○	○	○
b. Help you with your homework	○	○	○	○
c. Give you privileges as a reward for good grades	○	○	○	○
d. Limit privileges because of poor grades	○	○	○	○
e. Require you to do work or chores	○	○	○	○
f. Limit the amount of time watching TV/playing video games	○	○	○	○
g. Limit the amount of time going out with friends on school nights	○	○	○	○

External-Support in General

72. **ıt do the following people think is the most important thing for you to do right after high school?**

(MARK ONE RESPONSE ON EACH LINE)

	Does not apply	Go to college	Get a full-time job	Enter a trade school or an apprentice-ship	Enter military service	Get married	They think I should do what I want	They don't care	I don't know
a. Your mother	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
b. Your father	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
c. Your friends	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
d. A close relative	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
e. School counselor	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
f. Your favorite teacher	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
g. Coach	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Internal-Self-Expectations

73. As things stand now, how far in school do you think you will get? Circle one response.

Less than high school graduation
High school graduation or GED only
Attend or complete a 2-year school course in a community or vocational school
Attend college, but not complete a 4-year degree
Graduate from college
Obtain a Master's degree or equivalent
Obtain a Ph.D., M.D., or other advanced degree
Don't know

74. Do you plan to continue your education right after high school or at some time in the future? Circle one response. If you circle "No" or "I don't know…," please answer item #75.

Yes, right after high school
Yes, after staying out of school for one year
Yes, after staying out of school for over a year
Yes, but I don't know when
No, I don't plan to continue my education after high school
I don't know if I will continue my education after high school

75. Which of the following are reasons why you have decided NOT to continue your education past high school? (You may circle more than one choice)

a. I do not like school
b. My grades are not high enough
c. I will not need more education for the career I want
d. I cannot afford to go on to school
e. I'd rather work and make money than go to school
f. I plan to be a full-time home maker (stay at home)
g. I do not feel that going to school is important
h. I need to help support my family

Note. Adapted from *Educational Longitudinal Study 2002,* by NCES, 2002. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/els2002/pdf/StudentQ_baseyear.pdf;*California Healthy Kids Survey: Core Module,* by California Department of Education, 2013. Retrieved from https://chks.wested.org/resources/chks-ms-core-1314.pdf; Autonomy, belongingness, and engagement in school as contributors to adolescent psychological well-being, by M.J. Van Ryzin, A.A. Gravely, and C.J. Roseth, 2009. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*(1), pp. 5-6.

Academic Resilience Semi-Structured Interview

1. List the different instructional strategies that help you learn concepts in your classes (Researcher will offer examples since this is semi-structured interview).

2. List different teaching practices that help you learn concepts. (Researcher will offer examples since this is semi-structured interview).

3. Do you consider yourself the type of student who can succeed in school and in life in general? Why or why not?

4. Do you feel motivated to do well in your classes, so that you can pass to high school?

5. What kinds of things do your parents do to help you with schoolwork? If they do not help you, who do you go to for help?

6. What type of support does your teacher give you in order for you to improve and to be successful in class?

7. When do you retain (learn) information better, when you are placed in a group, or by yourself? Explain why.

8. If you struggle in classes, why do you think you have a hard time? Do you think there is something you can do in order to struggle less in classes?

9. If you have been retained in at least one grade level and/or have failed one or more of your core classes during a grading period, do you try your best to improve your grades over the course of the year in order to pass to the next grade level?

10. Do you feel you have learned the necessary English to read, write, listen, and speak it every day at school? In other words, do you feel that you understand most of the information presented in your classes, or do you need additional assistance, before/after school? Why or why not?