



University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Student Work

4-1-2011

The Effect of an English Language Learner Program on Student Achievement Outcomes in Language, Reading, and Math

Jennifer L. Reid
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Reid, Jennifer L., "The Effect of an English Language Learner Program on Student Achievement Outcomes in Language, Reading, and Math" (2011). *Student Work*. 3469.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/3469>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



The Effect of an English Language Learner Program on Student Achievement Outcomes
in Language, Reading, and Math

By

Jennifer L. Reid

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College of the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

In Educational Administration

Omaha, Nebraska

April, 2011

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Peter J. Smith, Chair

Dr. Jeanne L. Surface

Dr. Neal F. Grandgenett

Dr. Larry L. Dlugosh

UMI Number: 3450057

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3450057

Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This edition of the work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT**THE EFFECT OF AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNER PROGRAM ON STUDENT
ACHIEVEMENT OUTCOMES IN LANGUAGE, READING, AND MATH**

Jennifer L. Reid

University of Nebraska, 2011

Advisor: Dr. Peter Smith

The purpose of the study was to determine the reading, math, and language proficiency outcomes of 4th-grade through 7th-grade students with limited English proficiency following nearly two years or more of instruction in the English Language Learner Program (ELL) and concurrent general education studies.

The maximum accrual for this study was students ($N = 31$) participating in the research school districts English Language Learner Program. The independent variables for this study were three student groups representing students who were identified as limited English proficient and who had participated in the ELL Program and general education program. Study participants in the first arm ($n = 4$) were limited English proficient students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the ELL Program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2). Study participants in the second arm ($n = 10$) were limited English proficient students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the ELL Program was at the intermediate level (Level 3). Study participants in the third arm ($n = 17$) were limited English proficient students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5). The results of the study supported the effectiveness of the ELL Program and concurrent general education studies in

successfully preparing students to participate meaningfully in the general education program.

Used with other research concerning effective programs for English learners, this study can help inform practitioners in planning and implementing successful ELL programs in local districts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completing this program and dissertation has been one of my most challenging and rewarding experiences to date. I might not have even thought it possible if it weren't for the encouragement of my husband, Dan. Throughout this entire process, he has remained supportive of my need to commit time and energy to this goal, as well as encouraging me when I doubted my ability to get through each step. I share this success with him, as it took both of us to get me to this point.

My husband and children busied themselves many a Sunday afternoon when I was hunkered down at the dining room table or at my office. Dan, Madeline, Thomas and Eleanor, thank you for understanding and cooperating when I was less than present. You have each been so patient and willing to do without Mom when you had to. You are my greatest joy and I look forward to spending more time with each of you now that this goal is accomplished.

Likewise, I am thankful for my parents who have listened with interest as I offered prosaic explanations of my progress along the way. They also laid the foundation for success. Throughout my childhood, there was a quiet expectation of doing one's best and certainly that attitude has carried through to my adult life. There is no reason to do less when you are capable of doing more.

I am thankful for the teaching and support of the professors in the Educational Administration department at UNO. I appreciated the opportunity to engage in conversation with classmates and really push my thinking about the role of educators and the institution of public education. Thank you to Dr. Peter Smith, my committee chair,

for offering your time and expertise as I pulled into the final stretch of this process. I wouldn't have made it through the final steps without your guidance.

Lastly, thank you to all my friends and colleagues who have listened to me prattle on about this experience over the last three years. I appreciate your interest and understanding that social activities often needed to take a back seat to the required task of the moment. At the conclusion of this sometimes overwhelming process, I am eager to reconnect with all aspects of life as usual.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Abstract | ii |
| Acknowledgements | iv |
| Table of Contents | vi |
| List of Tables | ix |
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 1 |
| Purpose of the Study | 3 |
| Research Questions | 3 |
| Assumptions | 6 |
| Delimitations of the Study | 6 |
| Limitations of the Study | 7 |
| Definition of Terms | 8 |
| Significance of the Study | 11 |
| Contribution to research | 12 |
| Contribution to practice | 12 |
| Contribution to policy | 13 |
| Organization of the Study | 13 |
| Chapter 2: Review of Literature | 14 |
| Accountability | 15 |
| Second Language Acquisition | 23 |
| Program of Services | 33 |
| Instructional Practices | 41 |
| Conclusion | 47 |

Chapter 3: Methodology 49

Participants 49

Number of participants 49

Gender of participants 49

Age range of participants 49

Racial and ethnic origin of participants 50

Inclusion criteria of participants 50

Method of participant identification 50

Description of Procedures 51

Research design 51

Implementation of the Independent Variables 53

Dependent Measures 54

Research Questions and Data Analysis 54

Data Collection Procedures 65

Performance site 65

Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of Human Subjects Approval

Category 65

Chapter 4: Results 66

Purpose of the Study 66

Research Question #1 Results 67

Research Question #2 Results 68

Research Question #3 Results 69

Research Question #4 Results 71

| | |
|--|------------|
| Research Question #5 Results | 72 |
| Research Question #6 Results | 75 |
| Research Question #7 Results | 78 |
| Research Question #8 Results | 81 |
| Chapter 5: Conclusions and Discussion | 116 |
| Overview | 116 |
| Conclusions | 117 |
| Research Question #1 | 117 |
| Research Question #2 | 117 |
| Research Question #3 | 118 |
| Research Question #4 | 118 |
| Research Question #5 | 119 |
| Research Question #6 | 120 |
| Research Question #7 | 121 |
| Research Question #8 | 122 |
| Discussion | 123 |
| Further Research | 126 |
| Implications for Practice | 127 |
| Implications for Policy | 128 |
| Overall Conclusion | 129 |
| References | 130 |
| Appendices | 135 |
| A. School District Study Approval Letter | |

List of Tables

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| Table 1 | Student Groups Representing Students Who Were Identified as Limited English Proficient and Who Had Participated in the English Language Learner Program and General Education Program | 86 |
| Table 2 | Pretest/Posttest Essential Learner Outcome Reading Scores for Beginning Level Students | 87 |
| Table 3 | Pretest/Posttest Essential Learner Outcome Math Scores for Beginning Level Students | 87 |
| Table 4 | Pretest/Posttest Essential Learner Outcome Reading Scores for Intermediate Level Students | 88 |
| Table 5 | Pretest/Posttest Essential Learner Outcome Math Scores for Intermediate Level Students | 88 |
| Table 6 | Pretest/Posttest Essential Learner Outcome Reading Scores for Advanced Level Students | 89 |
| Table 7 | Pretest/Posttest Essential Learner Outcome Math Scores for Advanced Level Students | 89 |
| Table 8 | Descriptive Statistics for the Reading Essential Learner Outcome Assessment | 90 |
| Table 9 | Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Reading Essential Learner Outcome Assessment | 90 |
| Table 10 | Descriptive Statistics for the Math Essential Learner Outcome Assessment | 91 |
| Table 11 | Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Math Essential Learner Outcome Assessment | 91 |
| Table 12 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Reading Scores for Beginning Level Students | 92 |
| Table 13 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Writing Scores for Beginning Level Students | 93 |
| Table 14 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Listening Scores for Beginning Level Students | 94 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| Table 15 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Speaking Scores for Beginning Level Students | 95 |
| Table 16 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Comprehension Scores for Beginning Level Students | 96 |
| Table 17 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Composite Scores for Beginning Level Students | 97 |
| Table 18 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Reading Scores for Intermediate Level Students | 98 |
| Table 19 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Writing Scores for Intermediate Level Students | 99 |
| Table 20 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Listening Scores for Intermediate Level Students | 100 |
| Table 21 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Speaking Scores for Intermediate Level Students | 101 |
| Table 22 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Comprehension Scores for Intermediate Level Students | 102 |
| Table 23 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Composite Scores for Intermediate Level Students | 103 |
| Table 24 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Reading Scores for Advanced Level Students | 104 |
| Table 25 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Writing Scores for Advanced Level Students | 105 |
| Table 26 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Listening Scores for Advanced Level Students | 106 |
| Table 27 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Speaking Scores for Advanced Level Students | 107 |
| Table 28 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Comprehension Scores for Advanced Level Students | 108 |
| Table 29 | Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Composite Scores for Advanced Level Students | 109 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| Table 30 | Descriptive Statistics for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Reading Scale Scores | 110 |
| Table 31 | Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Reading Scale Scores | 110 |
| Table 32 | Descriptive Statistics for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Writing Scale Scores | 111 |
| Table 33 | Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Writing Scale Scores | 111 |
| Table 34 | Descriptive Statistics for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Listening Scale Scores | 112 |
| Table 35 | Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Listening Scale Scores | 112 |
| Table 36 | Descriptive Statistics for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Speaking Scale Scores | 113 |
| Table 37 | Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Speaking Scale Scores | 113 |
| Table 38 | Descriptive Statistics for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Comprehension Scale Scores | 114 |
| Table 39 | Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Comprehension Scale Scores | 114 |
| Table 40 | Descriptive Statistics for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Composite Scale Scores | 115 |
| Table 41 | Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Composite Scale Scores | 115 |

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

It is well-known that the demographic make-up of schools has changed dramatically as the number of immigrant and refugee children attending school in the United States continues to rise. Students from non-English speaking backgrounds represent the fastest growing segment of the student population (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2005). Between 1979 and 2008, the number of school-age children (children ages 5-17) who spoke a language other than English at home increased from 3.8 to 10.9 million or from 9 to 21% of the population in this age range. An increase from 18 to 21% was also evident during the more recent period of 2000 through 2008 (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Most certainly, the trend will be for the number of immigrant and refugee children to continue to rise.

As federally mandated accountability for student achievement continues to assert itself, educators are forced to focus not only on the achievement of the entire student body, but also on the achievement of each subgroup as recognized by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB; Public Law No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425, 2002), which includes low-income students, students with limited English proficiency, students with disabilities, and students in major racial and ethnic groups. Educators are grappling with data, research, best practices, and theory to inform actions and policies which will ultimately narrow the achievement gap among these subgroups. Educators everywhere remain steadfast in their belief that all students can learn, all students can reach their full potential, and all students can become productive and successful members of the community. Yet, many are fully bemused by the issue of narrowing the achievement gap. Further complicating matters is the fact that many students are members of more than one subgroup.

For students who are learning English as a second or additional language, the landscape is no less foggy. As the numbers of English learners (ELs) increase, school districts work in earnest to establish highly effective, rigorous programs that address the academic, social, and emotional challenges faced by English learners and promote their academic success. A non-English learner must make ten months gain in ten months of schooling whereas an English learner must make 15 months gain in ten months of schooling (Collier & Thomas, 1999). The rigorous demands of No Child Left Behind seem almost insurmountable. Certainly, there is no time to waste in identifying characteristics of successful English language programs that will deliver valid results.

There are a myriad different programs used in the United States for promoting second language development. The most common models include Dual Language Programs, Early Exit Bilingual Education, English as a Second Language Classes, English Language Development, Heritage Language Preservation, Late Exit Bilingual Education, Newcomer Programs, Pullout ESL Programs, Sheltered Content Area Classes, and Structured Immersion. In the research school district, the program for English learners is recognized as an English Language Development program in which students are grouped by language proficiency level. Since its beginning, language instruction has been delivered primarily through pull-out services in elementary schools and during specific ELL class periods in secondary schools. In the 1980s, the program began with only a few students identified in need of language development services. Today, there are approximately 450 students identified as ELL/LEP.

As the numbers began to rise significantly in the 2005-2006 school year, the district recognized the need to formalize the program and drew together leadership and

teacher participation in the standard curriculum cycle process in order to establish a framework for goals and outcomes and adopt new instructional materials. Over the years, continual improvements have been made to the instructional program for English learners as recommended by research and best practice. An honest and intentional attempt has been made by all parties to improve the academic and social outcomes for English learners. The researcher questioned whether or not the program as it is currently organized is effectively preparing English learners to fully participate in the general education program as well as life beyond public education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the reading, math, and language proficiency outcomes of 4th-grade through 7th-grade students with limited English proficiency following nearly two years or more of instruction in the English Language Learner Program and concurrent general education studies.

Research Questions

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #1. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to ending of program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math?

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #2. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the intermediate level (Level

3) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to ending of program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math?

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #3. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to ending of program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math?

Overarching Posttest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #4. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was determined to be at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2), intermediate level (Level 3), or advanced level (Levels 4 and 5) have congruent or different ending of program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math?

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #5. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to ending of program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite?

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #6. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the intermediate level (Level 3) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to ending of program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite?

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #7. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to ending of program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite?

Overarching Posttest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #8. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2), intermediate level (Level 3), or advanced level (Levels 4 and 5) have congruent or different ending of program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite?

Assumptions

The study had several strong features. The general education program in the research school district is well-known for being a high-performing program. In said district, ACT scores are consistently above metro, state, and national averages. In 2009, the research school district's average ACT score was 23.6 compared to 22.1 (state) and 21.1 (nation). On the Terra Nova Achievement Test, students scored between the 70th and 80th national percentiles on almost all subjects (reading, math, language, science, and social studies), which means that students in the research school district generally score as good or better than three-fourths of their peers nationwide. Additionally, on the State Report Card, students performed at exemplary levels and far exceeded the state's average scores (Millard Public Schools, 2010). Likewise, the English Language Learner (ELL) Program in the research school district is a well-developed program grounded in research-based practices for instruction of English learners and has proven to be effective by consistently meeting Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives set forth by Title III of No Child Left Behind. ELL teachers have earned credentials in working with English learners and are endorsed to work with students from kindergarten through twelfth grade. Both ELL-endorsed teachers and general education teachers receive ongoing, meaningful professional development in the area of English language acquisition and differentiation strategies for English learners.

Delimitations of the Study

The study was delimited to students in 4th-grade through 7th-grade who attend an urban school district and have participated in the ELL Program for nearly two or more years. It should be noted that though each student completed nearly two or more years of

the program, this does not necessarily mean the student has demonstrated proficiency in English at the end of this term. All students identified as limited English proficient are required to participate in the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) each year in the spring. In addition, all students in 4th-grade through 6th-grade at the beginning of this study were required to take the research district's Essential Learner Outcome assessments in math and reading.

Limitations of the Study

This exploratory study was confined to 4th-grade through 7th-grade students ($N = 31$) participating in the ELL Program. Study participants in the first arm ($n = 4$) were limited English proficient students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the ELL Program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2). Study participants in the second arm ($n = 10$) were limited English proficient students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the ELL Program was at the intermediate level (Level 3). Study participants in the third arm ($n = 17$) were limited English proficient students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5). Because the assessments included in the study are administered at various times of the academic school year, students had participated in the program for varying lengths of time before the pretest assessments were given. For example, some students participated in their first English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) within nine months of beginning the ELL Program, whereas some students participated in the program for up to three years before participating in the ELDA for the first time. The limited sample size, age range, and

length of time participating in the ELL Program may limit the utility and ability to generalize the study results and findings.

Definition of Terms

Achievement gap. The Achievement Gap is the difference in performance between low-income and minority students compared to that of their peers on standardized tests. (Retrieved from <http://www.education.com> on October 9, 2010).

Additive bilingualism. Additive bilingualism occurs when both languages spoken by the student are reinforced, resulting in high levels of proficiency in the two languages (Roseberry-McKibbin, 2008).

Advanced Level (Level 5). Advanced level refers to English learners who can express themselves fluently and spontaneously on a wide range of personal, general, academic, or social topics in a variety of contexts, though who are not necessarily fully English proficient, especially across all language domains and all standards (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006).

Beginning Level (Level 1 and 2). Beginning level refers to English learners who initially have little to no understanding of English and grow to understand phrases and short sentences. They can communicate limited information in simple, everyday, and routine situations (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006).

English Language Development Assessment (ELDA). ELDA is a battery of tests designed to allow schools to measure annual progress in the acquisition of English language proficiency skills among non-native English speaking students in grades K-12. ELDA measures both academic and social language proficiency in the four domains of

language; listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2005).

English learners (ELs). English learners are children and adults who are learning English as a second or additional language. This term may apply to learners across various levels of proficiency in English. ELs may also be referred to as English language learners (ELLs), non-English speaking (NES), limited English proficient (LEP), and non-native speaker (NNS) (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2008).

English Language Learner services. English language learner services refer to the program of services developed by a school district to meet the needs of English language learners. The development of such a program is guided by the Office for Civil Rights and No Child Left Behind.

Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) Assessment. Essential learner outcome assessments were developed by the research school district to ensure that students between 1st-grade and 11th-grade are ready to transition from one level to the next, producing competent and qualified students who are able to succeed after leaving the school district. The ELO assessment program is also designed for school and district accountability (Millard Public Schools, 2010).

Immigrant. The term ‘immigrant children and youth’ means individuals who—

- (A) are aged 3 through 21;
- (B) were not born in any State; and
- (C) have not been attending one or more schools in any one or more States for more than three full academic years (NCLB; Public Law No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425, 2002).

Intermediate Level (Level 3). Intermediate level refers to English learners who understand more complex speech but may still require some repetition. They use English spontaneously but may have difficulty expressing all their thoughts because of a restricted vocabulary and a limited command of language structure (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006).

Limited English proficient (LEP). Limited English proficient is a term used to refer to a student with restricted understanding or use of written and spoken English; a learner who is still developing competence in using English. The federal government uses the term LEP while EL or ELL is more commonly used in schools (Echevarria et al., 2008). NCLB defines LEP students as (a) being 3 to 21 years of age, (b) enrolled or preparing to enroll in elementary or secondary school, (c) either not born in the United States or speaking a language other than English, and (d) owing to difficulty in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding English, not meeting the state's proficient level of achievement to successfully achieve in English-only classrooms.

Math assessment. Math assessment refers to a locally developed math assessment that measures number concepts, operations, geometry, algebraic symbols, data analysis, and problem solving of 4th-grade and 5th-grade students; algebra, data analysis, measurement/geometry, number computation, and estimation of 6th-grade students; and number sense, estimation, measurement/geometry, algebra, and data analysis of 7th-grade students.

Reading assessment. Reading assessment refers to a locally developed reading assessment that measures decoding/word analysis, vocabulary strategies, reading comprehension, text and story structure, and research and study skills for 4th-grade and

5th-grade students; determine meaning of words, basic comprehension of text, analysis of text, point of view, fact/non-fact and reading strategies of 5th-grade students; and determine meaning of words, basic comprehension of text, analysis of text, reading strategies and research and study skills for 7th-grade students.

Realia. Real-life objects and artifacts used to supplement teaching; can provide effective visual scaffolds for English learners (Echevarria et al., 2008).

Refugee. A refugee is a person who, owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted on account of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of their nationality, and is unable to or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail him/herself of the protection of that country (Office of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2010).

Silent Period. The silent period is an interval of time during which English learners are unable or unwilling to communicate orally in the new language. The silent period may last for a few days or a year depending on a variety of factors. It occurs before English learners are ready to produce oral language and is generally referred to as the “Pre-production” stage of language learning (Krashen, 1987).

Typically progressing. Typically progressing refers to a student whose ability is commensurate with the majority of his or her peers and who has not been found to have a disability as verified by standardized testing.

Significance of the Study

There is a growing body of research guiding educators in implementing best practices for English learners. Nonetheless, the research base is lacking in some areas, such as which type of instruction in English language development is most beneficial

(Goldenberg, 2008). Goldenberg calls for new research that will address what kind of instructional practices can shorten the time it takes to gain native or near-native English proficiency and whether or not the type of instruction delivered will make a significant difference.

The Office for Civil Rights does not advocate any one program for meeting the needs of English learners. According to a report published by the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (1998), an effective program for language minority students includes

- Promoting language and cognitive development
- Providing access to the content-area curriculum
- Creating an active learning environment
- Making appropriate use of the students' native language
- Utilizing the students' home and community background
- Giving students adequate time in special services

The researcher questioned if the ELL Program in the research school district, having adhered to these recommended practices, effectively prepares limited English proficient students for success in the general education program. This study is significant in determining the next steps in the continued growth of this program.

Contribution to research. The research on effective programs for English learners remains limited. The results of this study may inform theoretical and practical literature on the effectiveness of the practices and strategies used in this program.

Contribution to practice. This study may inform practitioners in developing effective programs for the success of English learners.

Contribution to policy. This study may inform local policy makers in decisions regarding funding of English language programs; such as the need to expand physical space, increase teaching staff, and identify and purchase research-based materials.

Organization of the Study

The following chapters will review the literature on best instructional practice and program design for English learners, the procedures utilized in gathering the data, results of the study and discussion of the results.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

As federally mandated accountability for student achievement continues to assert itself, educators are forced to focus not only on the achievement of the entire student body, but also on the achievement of each subgroup as recognized by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB; Public Law No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425, 2002), which includes low-income students, students with limited English proficiency, students with disabilities, and students in major racial and ethnic groups. Educators are grappling with data, research, best practices and theory to inform actions and policies which will ultimately narrow the achievement gap among these subgroups. Educators everywhere remain steadfast in their belief that all students can learn, all students can reach their full potential and all students can become productive and successful members of the community. Yet, many are fully bemused by the issue of narrowing the achievement gap. Further complicating matters is the fact that many students are members of more than one subgroup.

For students who are learning English as a second or additional language, the landscape is no less foggy. It is becoming a well-known fact that the numbers of English learners in U.S. public schools has increased dramatically in the past decade and the persistent achievement gap between English learners and native English speakers is equally well-known. According to a compilation of reports from 41 state education agencies, only 18.7% of students classified as limited English proficient met state norms for reading in English (Kindler, 2002). Additionally, students from language minority backgrounds also have higher dropout rates and are more frequently placed in lower ability groups than native speakers of English (Ruiz-de-Velasco & Fix, 2000).

As the numbers of English learners increase, school districts work in earnest to establish highly effective, rigorous programs that address the academic, social and emotional challenges faced by English learners and promote their academic success. A native English-speaking student is expected to make ten months gain in ten months of schooling whereas an English learner must make 15 months gain in ten months of schooling (Collier & Thomas, 1999). It should be understood that English learners are developing competency in English at the same time they are studying core content areas through English. Therefore, “English learners must perform double the work of native English speakers” (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007, p. 1). For this reason, researchers in the field have worked diligently to identify characteristics of effective programs for English learners.

Gersten and Baker (2000) noted that one major problem in current practice is the inadequate amount of time devoted to English language development. Because of the increased accountability for content learning and a failure to systematically impart the skills students need in speaking and writing English, teachers devote less and less time to English development. Consideration of both needs and due attention to each is drastically needed if educators are to change the statistical achievement profile of English learners. The rigorous demands of No Child Left Behind seem almost insurmountable. Certainly, there is no time to waste in identifying characteristics of successful English language programs and assessment systems that will deliver valid results.

Accountability

With the passage of NCLB, educators were for the first time held accountable for the achievement of English learners, a positive outcome for this population. From the

standpoint of accountability, there is merit in requiring the assessment of students' language proficiency on an annual basis insofar as we all want to ensure the greatest success possible for this population of students. Additionally, the law deserves praise for providing financial support to states to carry out various activities, such as developing and implementing high-quality language instruction educational programs, which are based on scientific research, to improve the instruction and assessment of limited English proficient children. Under NCLB, states must set annual measureable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for moving English learners toward English language proficiency and in meeting the same high academic standards as native English-speaking students. With each of these measures comes assurance that the needs of English learners are being addressed by each state and local district.

We are deeply vested in propelling our English learners toward academic achievement. All educators believe strongly in their mission for each student to achieve, and the belief is the same for English learners. For these students; however, the mountain is steep. Not only are they seeking the same success as native English-speaking students, dreaming the same dreams, yearning for the same opportunities, they must also assimilate into a new culture, face stereotyping and racism, learn in the midst of cultural bias, and acquire academic language proficiency in an additional language. We must be accountable for their achievement and subsequent success in life. They are depending on us to do whatever it takes to prepare them to meet their goals. The law has done right in holding us accountable; indeed we want to be accountable. Now, our charge is to find ways to meet these goals while not only maintaining integrity of best practices for

instruction and assessment, but also remaining mindful of the real human beings that depend on us each and every day for support that goes far beyond the mandates of a law.

Though there are benefits of this accountability system, multiple concerns have been raised regarding the appropriateness of the requirements of NCLB as they relate to Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) reporting for English learners (Abedi, 2004). Experts have cited direct implications for the education of English learners (Abedi, Hofstetter, & Lord, 2004; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007; Verdugo & Flores, 2007). While the intent of the law is to improve the performance of subgroups, such as students who are limited English proficient (LEP), it might have a number of negative effects on schools with large numbers of LEP students. Schools in this position will need to be ever more diligent in finding valid and reliable measures for the achievement of their LEP students.

While a definition of limited English proficiency is provided by the law, the criteria to determine eligibility is a local decision, leading to inconsistencies in classification of LEP students. NCLB defines LEP students as (a) being 3 to 21 years of age, (b) enrolled or preparing to enroll in elementary or secondary school, (c) either not born in the United States or speaking a language other than English, and (d) owing to difficulty in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding English, not meeting the state's proficient level of achievement to successfully achieve in English-only classrooms. However, individual states vary widely in their definitions (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Schools and school districts across the United States use a variety of criteria for classifying their LEP students (Abedi, 2004; Verdugo & Flores, 2007). States and local districts are required to establish entrance criteria, though the criteria can and does vary from state to state, and even between districts within the same state. Without a uniform

definition for English learners, it is difficult to determine who the students are, how well they are doing academically, and what kinds of services they need (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). With this degree of variation in identification of English learners, comparisons between students at the national or even state level are virtually impossible (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007; Verdugo & Flores, 2007). This has a direct affect on the accuracy of AYP reporting for LEP students (Abedi, 2004). If each state and local district is reporting LEP status differently, the statistics reflecting achievement of LEP students will not be accurate.

The LEP subgroup is typically a heterogeneous group in which the students exhibit differences in level of performance, language proficiency, and family and cultural background characteristics (Abedi, 2004). We celebrate this diversity and the richness it brings to our schools. Academic performance of English learners covers a broad range of abilities, which suggests there is a broad range of skills and knowledge among this population (Verdugo & Flores, 2007). Abedi, Leon, and Mirocha conducted a study in 2003 which explored the relationship between parent education and student performance. They found that LEP students whose parents had less than a high school education scored significantly lower on a reading assessment than LEP students whose parents had a higher level of education. The results suggest that there is a high correlation between parent education and student performance. The authors concluded that LEP students differ substantially from their non-LEP peers in a variety of ways, including family characteristics, cultural and language background, and level of English proficiency (Abedi, 2004). Students in this subgroup are uniquely different from their peers and such differences deserve special attention. If we are going to give them the best opportunity to

succeed, we must determine how to address language development and measure achievement in ways that also consider cultural and linguistic differences.

Though the numbers of LEP students in the United States has increased dramatically, numbers in some areas remain statistically small. The sparse LEP population of many districts is a concern for accurate AYP reporting. Meaningful statistical analysis cannot be performed when the population of LEP students falls below a level that will lead to valid and reliable results (Abedi, 2004). To illustrate this point, Abedi cites the work of Linn, Baker, and Herman in 2002 who warned that small districts and individual schools may not be able to report statistically reliable data due to small numbers of students in each subgroup (Abedi, 2004). For this reason, there is concern that it is inequitable to hold all districts to the same standard of achievement for students in the LEP subgroup.

Further complicating AYP reporting is the lack of stability among this population. The LEP subgroup is the least stable among the four subgroup categories identified by NCLB (Abedi, 2004). Participation in language acquisition programs is extremely fluid. When students attain proficiency in English, they are no longer counted as LEP students. By meeting the district's requirements for English proficiency, the label of "limited English proficient" is changed to "redesignated English fluent." Clearly, this is the goal, for all LEP students to be redesignated English fluent. However, this new status affects the LEP count in ways not readily seen by those who are not familiar with these policies. As students reach English proficiency and are no longer counted as LEP, new students still acquiring English move into the school district. The now higher-achieving English proficient students are no longer counted as LEP, only the new students still acquiring

English are counted. Thus, the subgroup of students labeled LEP will almost always be a low-performing group of students and will have difficulty showing academic progress (Abedi, 2004).

In a 2003 study by Abedi, Courtney, and Leon, researchers explored the effect of LEP subgroup instability on test scores. Over the course of seven semesters, researchers followed LEP students who were reclassified as non-LEP and compared their progress to students who remained LEP. The gap between the performance of LEP and formerly LEP students was substantial (Abedi, 2004). Abedi and his colleagues concluded that language proficiency is inevitably a strong determiner of test performance. Therefore, by including test scores of only LEP students in the LEP subgroup data, there is little hope that the subgroup will meet AYP requirements. Some states are currently proposing a change in the legislation that will allow students who have met proficiency requirements to be included in AYP reporting, thus eliminating the seemingly impossible task of meeting AYP requirements with a population of students that is not yet proficient in English.

Under one of the accountability measures, states are required to show increases in the number of students reaching English language proficiency as well as increases in meeting the same high academic standards as required for native English-speaking students. One criticism of the law is that it does not address the development of the native language skills of English learners. The emphasis, instead, is to move students quickly through the English acquisition program, a goal which has been seen to be fraught with problems (Verdugo & Flores, 2007). Verdugo and Flores identified at least four problems with placing such emphasis on moving students quickly out of English

acquisition programs. First, competency of skills in one language is linked to competency of skills in another language (Verdugo & Flores, 2007). Developing native language skills increases the probability that LEP students will acquire English. Students who have the opportunity to learn to read and write in their first language are much more likely to be successful in acquiring academic English.

Second, each student acquires English at a different rate (Verdugo & Flores, 2007). Many factors contribute to the length of time it takes to acquire a second language, such as exposure to formal education in the first language, structural differences between the first and second languages, support of parents, and age. Putting undue pressure on students and educators to attain proficient levels in English quickly may have an adverse effect on the entire process. It is in everyone's best interest to consider the unique situation of each learner and set expectations accordingly.

Third, moving students quickly through language acquisition programs fails to fully use what they already know (Verdugo & Flores, 2007). Building on background knowledge is extremely useful to developing strong academic skills (Echevarria et al., 2008). Information must be presented in a way that students can understand; in other words, using sheltered methods and strategies to overcome limited English proficiency. One way of doing this is to tie information to students' background and experiences (Echevarria et al., 2008). Strategies are used to scaffold students' acquisition of knowledge and skills. It takes time to make these connections and build this background; therefore, it is to no one's benefit to be in a rush and possibly miss these important opportunities.

Finally, moving students through programs too quickly ignores the important fact that students need skills beyond oral proficiency to succeed academically (Verdugo & Flores, 2007). Reading and writing skills are interrelated with listening and speaking skills. ELL students need to be given varied experiences throughout the day that incorporate reading, promote interactions with others, provide the chance to listen to peers' ideas and encourage writing about what is being learned (Echevarria et al., 2008). There is a need to create lessons that integrate practice and use of all four language processes. Students can attain language proficiency and academic content skills simultaneously if given proper time and attention to both.

When new accountability legislation went into effect, schools were required to define a baseline for AYP based on scores from a state-defined achievement test administered during the 2001-2002 school year (Abedi, 2004). In general, schools with larger numbers of students in the LEP subgroup started with lower baseline scores, therefore requiring greater gains in achievement (Abedi, 2004). The burden on schools with LEP students was and is two-fold. They must simultaneously raise student achievement in content areas while also increasing students' English proficiency. As if this order isn't tall enough, it should not be overlooked that "various economic, social, cultural, physical, and/or linguistic factors are impediments to academic progress as well as to the valid and reliable measurement of the progress of the targeted subgroups (Abedi, 2004, p. 9)." It will require significantly more time and resources for such schools to reach acceptable proficiency levels. To do right by the students, we must be allowed the time it will take to move students toward proficiency in English and to develop valid and reliable assessments for LEP students in order to appropriately report their level of

achievement to the federal government. In order to achieve this, programs for English learners must be grounded in sound theory on second language acquisition and best practices as recommended by research.

Second Language Acquisition

In general, language proficiency may be defined as “the ability to use a language effectively and appropriately throughout the range of social, personal, school, and work situations required for daily living in a given society” (Peregoy & Boyle, 2008, p. 34). During the first four years of life, children spend much time making connections about language use. They absorb and analyze information that will affect their written and oral language skills later in life (Verdugo & Flores, 2007). Researchers have studied the similarities and differences between first language acquisition (often referred to as the native language) and second language acquisition. One of the most noted authors of second language acquisition theory is Dr. Stephen Krashen. Dr. Krashen’s work, and that of many others, has deeply influenced recommendations for effective language teaching and learning. Organizations such as Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) have then synthesized the available research into standards of proficiency and best practices for developing sound language acquisition programs. In exploring second language acquisition theory, it is important to begin with the work of Dr. Krashen.

Dr. Krashen is credited with proposing five hypotheses about second language acquisition (Krashen, 1987). These are:

The Acquisition-Learning Distinction

The Natural Order Hypothesis

The Monitor Hypothesis

The Input Hypothesis

The Affective Filter Hypothesis

The acquisition-learning distinction explores the difference between language acquisition and language learning. Language acquisition is a subconscious process; language acquirers are not usually aware of the fact that they are acquiring language, but are only aware of the fact that they are using the language for communication. Language learning, on the other hand, is to have conscious knowledge of a second language, knowing the rules, being aware of them, and being able to talk about them (Krashen, 1987). This, then, opens the debate as to whether programs for English learners are language acquisition programs or language learning programs. It is possible to say that they are both as students engage in activities that promote both acquisition (unconsciously acquiring the use and rules of language as they go through the school day) and learning (consciously attending to language lessons as presented by teachers).

The natural order hypothesis is based on language acquisition research that suggests the acquisition of grammatical structures proceeds in a predictable order. Dulay and Burt (as cited in Krashen, 1987) reported that children acquiring English as a second language show a natural order for grammatical morphemes (prefixes, suffixes, and root words from which words are formed (Peregoy & Boyle, 2008), regardless of their first language, and that some grammatical features tend to be acquired early, whereas others tend to be acquired late. The order of acquisition for second language is not the same as the order of acquisition for first language, but there are some similarities. Though this may lead one to believe that grammar structures should be taught in a named sequence,

Krashen rejects teaching grammatical structures in such a sequence when the goal is language acquisition based on his theory that language learning does not typically turn into language acquisition (Krashen, 1987). We conclude from Krashen's work that students will acquire grammatical structures through a more natural sequence of introduction. This should not be confused, however, with whether or not grammar should be explicitly taught. This is only to say that a specified sequence of introduction is unnecessary.

The monitor hypothesis claims that acquisition and learning are used in very specific ways. Normally, acquisition is what promotes the ability to make utterances in a second language and is responsible for fluency. Learning has only one function, however, and that is as a Monitor, or editor. The monitor hypothesis implies that formal rules, or conscious learning, play only a limited role in second language performance. Those using a second language can use conscious rules only when three conditions are met, these conditions being time, focus on form, and knowing the rule (Krashen, 1987). Further explanation of these three conditions will clarify the monitor hypothesis.

In order to think about rules and use them effectively, a language learner needs to have sufficient time to think about and use the rules. But time is not enough. The language user must also be focused on form and thinking about correctness. Speakers may be so involved in what they are saying that they do not attend to how they are saying it. Furthermore, language learners must know the grammatical rules of the language and be able to apply them in communicative settings. This is to say that when a language user is using his Monitor, he can use items that he has learned, but not acquired, upsetting

the natural order of language acquisition (Krashen, 1987). Nevertheless, communication is achieved albeit through the function of learned language.

The input hypothesis answers the question of how a language acquirer moves from one stage of language acquisition to another. The input hypothesis states, “a necessary (but not sufficient) condition to move from stage i to stage $i + 1$ is that the acquirer understand input that contains $i + 1$, where “understand” means that the acquirer is focused on the meaning and not the form of the message” (Krashen, 1987, p. 21). In other words, users acquire language that contains content which is a little beyond their ability to comprehend. Acquirers use more than “linguistic competence” to help them understand, they also use context, knowledge of the world, and “extra-linguistic” information. Krashen dubbed this $i + 1$ theory “comprehensible input” (p. 22). The input hypothesis suggests that learners acquire by unearthing meaning first, and as a result, acquire the linguistic structure. Additionally, if communication is successful, then $i + 1$ is provided automatically.

Input must contain $i + 1$ to be useful for language acquisition, but it can also contain more than $i + 1$. If the acquirer understands the input and there is enough of it, then $i + 1$ will be provided. Lastly, it must be understood that speaking fluency cannot be taught directly. Rather, it emerges over time without any direct instruction. According to this view, the best way to teach speaking is to provide comprehensible input ($i + 1$). Known as the Silent Period (Krashen, 1987), those acquiring a new language typically go through a stage in which language expression is delayed for a period of time. Early production of speech will come when the user is ready and this will be at different times for every user. This early speech is not typically grammatically accurate. Accuracy

develops over time as the acquirer hears and understands more input (Krashen, 1987). In culmination of the input hypothesis, the most significant element of second language acquisition is to provide users with information that is just slightly beyond what they are able to understand and this will promote language acquisition.

The affective filter hypothesis states how affective factors relate to the second language acquisition process. According to Krashen (1987), research has confirmed that a variety of affective variables relate to success in second language acquisition. Most of those studied can be placed into one of three categories: motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety. Acquirers with high motivation and self-confidence generally do better in second language acquisition. Classroom teachers will readily share stories of highly motivated English learners who sail through the stages of language acquisition and reach near-native proficiency levels in less time than their less-motivated counterparts. Students are also likely to be much more highly motivated in the early stages of language acquisition, when they must learn enough language to survive in the new culture, as opposed to later stages when they have gained communicative competence, but are still very much needing to acquire academic proficiency.

Also, maintaining low anxiety appears to be conducive to second language acquisition (Krashen, 1987). For this reason, Krashen urges teachers to not force production of language, but rather to allow students a silent period during which they can acquire some language knowledge by listening and understanding. As students emerge from this silent period and begin using oral and written language, teachers can increase the rate at which they acquire additional language by encouraging their progress,

lessening any anxiety over performance, and planning lessons and activities that keep students highly engaged and motivated to learn.

Krashen's five language acquisition hypotheses helped set the stage for second language instruction today. Additionally, the world organization Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) promotes eight general principles of language acquisition that are derived from current research and theory about the nature of language, language learning, human development and pedagogy (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006). These eight principles are

Language is functional.

Language varies.

Language learning is cultural learning.

Language acquisition is a long-term process.

Language acquisition occurs through meaningful use and interaction.

Language processes develop interdependently.

Native language proficiency contributes to second language acquisition.

Bilingualism is an individual and societal asset.

The goal for English learners is to be able to express themselves, orally and in writing, in a variety of communication contexts. This goes beyond the traditional emphasis on grammar and vocabulary. In fact, the focus must be on functional proficiency, whereby learners are able to function effectively in the use of English while learning challenging academic content (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006). This is to say that English learners need to learn more than only

spoken language or language used in social settings; they must learn how to use the language for a variety of purposes and through multiple domains.

Language is divergent, varying according to the person, topic, purpose, and situation. Language also varies with respect to regional, social class, and ethnic-group differences, as well as from one academic domain to another. It is important to recognize that English learners are already proficient in these varied uses of their native language. While studying English, they must learn the oral and written language varieties used in school and in the community. It is important for English learners to retain their own native language varieties and to add the new English varieties to their linguistic structure (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006). This is congruent with additive bilingualism, which occurs when both languages spoken by the student are reinforced and the student's first language continues to be nurtured as the student learns the second language (Roseberry-McKibbin, 2008). In this way, it is assured that English learners gain the full spectrum of language functions.

Language is characteristic of the cultural values, norms, and beliefs that are associated with an individual culture. When children learn their first language, they develop these values, norms, and beliefs and extend these to the social roles and relationships in the culture. When learning an additional language, children and adults must learn a new set of norms, behaviors, and beliefs that are owned by the new culture. Therefore, it can be said that to add a new language is to add a new culture (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006). Programs for English learners must reflect an understanding and respect for diverse cultural backgrounds.

Language learners move through developmental stages as they attain proficiency, thus language learning occurs over time. The rate at which each learner reaches proficiency varies and this variability is due to a number of factors, “including an individual’s educational background, first language background, learning style, cognitive style, motivation, and personality” (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006, p. 14-15). It is common for learners to acquire conversational skills prior to mastering academic language skills. Most students quickly and easily acquire the basic interpersonal communication skills needed in everyday communicative situations. However, the development of cognitive/academic language proficiency needed for academic purposes demands a lot more time and effort (Wertheimer & Honigfeld, 2000). For English learners to be successful, they must be given the time it takes to acquire the academic language skills necessary for success in school. This timeline for attaining full academic proficiency is often from five to ten years (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006). According to research synthesis done by Verdugo and Flores (2007), it takes between four and seven years to develop academic English proficiency. Additionally, Krashen (1987) reports a clear relationship between length of residence in the second language environment and second language proficiency. The length of time required to become proficient in an additional language cannot be overlooked.

When language learners are given opportunities to interact with each other in meaningful contexts in which they must engage in a communicative exchange, they are more likely to be successful at learning language. Likewise, when language learning activities are of a cognitive or intellectual nature, learners can become skilled at using

language for reasoning and mastery of new information. Academic language fluency is especially important for academic achievement (Verdugo & Flores, 2007). Therefore, effective instruction for English learners will include ample participation in meaningful activities in which learners can interact in both social and challenging academic contexts (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006); (Echevarria et al., 2008). The emphasis on this point is the interaction between learners and the opportunity for which must be planned for by the instructor.

Traditionally, English language instruction in school has centered on four domains of language: reading, writing, speaking, and listening. While there has been some distinction in the past that one or more domains should precede another, such as listening and speaking being addressed prior to reading and writing, it is now suggested that these language processes develop interdependently, rather than sequentially (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006). Furthermore, the use of different modes and technologies, such as computers, music, film, and video, are especially effective in the development of each language mode and should be integrated into the learning activities (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006). Therefore, effective instruction for English learners includes the integration of each of the four language domains through a variety of input modes.

It must be noted that second language learners, being already proficient in one language, bring the skills for acquiring language to the task of second language learning. For some learners, they are also literate in their first language. The level of language proficiency a child develops at home in the native language has a direct positive relationship to the acquisition of another language (Teachers of English to Speakers of

Other Languages, Inc., 2006); (Verdugo & Flores, 2007). Additionally, when instruction includes the use of the native language, especially for those who are literate in their native language, academic achievement in English is intensified. The use of the learner's native language becomes a foundation for English language and academic development (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006). Goldenberg (2008) further supports the use of the native language in his claim that teaching students to read in their first language promotes higher levels of reading achievement in English. This is one of many reasons why educators have been particularly interested in providing instruction in the first language.

The continued development of the learner's native language for both social and academic purposes is extremely important, both for the individual and for society as a whole. Bilingual proficiency allows for greater employment opportunities and "enhances the competitive strength of U.S. industry and business worldwide. This means that bilingualism benefits the individual and serves the national interest, and schools need to promote the retention and development of multiple languages" (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., 2006, p. 16). Should programs try to eliminate the native language by either not promoting its continued development or disallowing its use in the classroom; this will only be to the disservice of students.

Finally, language proficiency encompasses a vast and complex array of knowledge. The intricacies of language, from the variety of use, form, and function to considerations of what it means to be bilingual are of great importance when looking at how people acquire additional languages. English learners face a complex task that must take place gradually over time. Many will also develop and maintain proficiency in the

native language, including literacy skills, thereby becoming bilingual and biliterate (Peregoy & Boyle, 2008). These are important and valid goals for students and serve as a foundation for building effective programs that promote language development.

Program of Services

A variety of programs for promoting the development of English language have been in use over the years. The two main distinctions are those that make use of the student's native language and those that rely solely on the use of English. For a time, researchers debated which programs and instructional practices were the most effective at promoting fluency in English. More recently, the focus of research has shifted to identify those characteristics which are present in local districts, schools, and individual programs that are contributing to the success of developing English-fluent students.

Research studies consistently report that English learners who participate in any specialized program are able to match their English-speaking peers in terms of academic achievement; and in some cases even surpass them (Genesee et al., 2005). In fact, one study demonstrated that English learners who were immersed in the general education program without support of an English development program because their parents refused any special services, showed large decreases in reading and math achievement by Grade 5 when compared to students who did receive services (Thomas & Collier, 2002). The same study by Thomas and Collier (2002) found that specialized English development services raise students' achievement levels by significant amounts. When students participate in a variety of programs or receive no special intervention at all, they are the least successful academically and demonstrate the highest dropout rates (Genesee

et al., 2005). Therefore, continued focus on developing rigorous and effective programs for English learners is, without a doubt, the right thing to do.

To be effective, programs for English learners must be well-implemented and well-integrated with the general education program (Thomas & Collier, 2002). Rather than existing as a separate program in which instruction supplants the core curriculum, English development programs should supplement the core curriculum, offering the same meaningful and academically challenging curriculum as is offered to all students.

Districts must ensure there is an explicit focus on building academic literacy and promoting English language development and that English learners have access to the full range of course offerings, including gifted and talented programs and special education (Horwitz et al., 2009). In addition, the curriculum for English learners should be aligned to standards and assessment (Genesee et al., 2005) and there should be a system in place for collecting and storing data measuring the students' educational progress which is available to all who have a vested interest in the success of English learners (Horwitz et al., 2009). It also must not be overlooked that professional development is of utmost importance. Districts must ensure that all teachers of English learners have access to high-quality professional development and that these opportunities are available to general education teachers as well as ELL teachers (Horwitz et al., 2009). Clearly, it requires the focus and commitment of the entire district to create an effective program. The next consideration is that of how long students should remain in the program.

The length of time students spend in English development programs must not be rushed or cut short. In other words, setting a specified length of time students are allowed to be in the program is ill-advised. In order for the achievement gap between

English learners and native English speakers to be closed, programs must be consistent and sustained over time (Genesee et al., 2005). The difficulty is in determining exactly how long students should remain in the program, what should be taught and how it should be taught.

The minimal length of time it takes to reach grade-level performance in a second language is four years and this typically only applies to students who have had at least four years of schooling in the native language (Thomas & Collier, 2002). Sadly, students with no schooling in the native language are often not able to reach grade-level performance in the second language (Thomas & Collier, 2002). For students who received four to five years of schooling in their native country, they are typically on grade level when they arrive in the United States, but it takes several years to acquire enough English to do grade-level work, thus they appear to be below grade level. It is as if their schooling has been interrupted for one or two years. To magnify the burden of having to learn an additional language, English learners must then make more gains in a single school year than is required of a native English speaker for several years in a row to eventually catch up to grade level (Thomas & Collier, 2002). As for oral proficiency, most reports currently suggest that students require three to five years to achieve advanced proficiency in oral English, typically making rapid progress from beginning to middle levels of proficiency, but achieving slower progress from middle to upper levels of proficiency (Genesee et al., 2005). Attention to the length of time it takes to master conversational and academic English is critical in developing programs for English learners.

Ideally, instructional gains are best accomplished in an enrichment (not a remedial) program (Thomas & Collier, 2002; Genessee et al., 2005). It has been shown that when English learners initially attend segregated, remedial programs, their achievement after reclassification as English fluent and placement in the general education program only maintains or widens the achievement gap (Thomas & Collier, 2002). An enrichment program will meet the full scale of students' developmental needs, including linguistic, academic, cognitive, emotional, social, and physical needs. Often, the unique relationship that is shared between the student and the ELL teacher is one that supports many of these needs. Being one of the first school personnel members to connect with the English learner, he or she feels very connected to the ELL teacher and leans on him or her for support in many of these developmental areas. Additionally, the ELL teacher becomes a strong advocate for meeting all of the student's developmental needs across the curriculum and throughout the school.

Furthering the characteristics of enrichment programs, schools need to create a natural learning environment with a focus on genuine, rich oral and written language used to solve meaningful, 'real world' problems (Thomas & Collier, 2002). Challenging, thematic units that get and hold students' interest are also characteristic of enrichment programs (Thomas & Collier, 2002). Program developers must keep in mind that there is no merit in "watering down" the curriculum for English learners. Conversely, it is imperative to approach programming and instruction for English learners with the same level of rigor and high expectations as are in place for all students.

Although the empirical literature on oral language development in English learners is relatively small, there is a recognized need for oral language development and

much of the research recommends daily oral English language instruction (Genessee et al., 2005; Gersten & Baker, 2000; Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010). Goldenberg (2008) has called for more research in the area of oral language development. Because of the focus on reading instruction in recent years, the area of oral language development has received very little attention. According to Gersten and Baker (2000), instruction for English learners should blend oral language instruction and intellectual engagement. This is to say that the focus of oral language development should not be merely on social interactions, but rather engage the student in all levels of higher order thinking, thus promoting the development of oral academic language as well as social.

With increased oral proficiency, English learners are more likely to interact and establish friendships with native English-speaking peers, use more complex language learning strategies that allow them to interact with others more effectively, and demonstrate a wider use of academic language (Genessee et al., 2005). Gersten and Baker (2000) argue that academic growth for English learners is dependent upon extended discourse on academic topics. It is possible that the recommendation to emphasize natural language use has misled educators to focus on social language more so than academic language. These are two distinct goals and must be regarded as such. Whereas other courses throughout a student's day will be sure to focus on academic content, it is possible that only during instructional time specific to English development will students have the explicit opportunity to develop oral proficiency (Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010). In sum, instruction for English learners must clearly focus on development of both social and academic discourse. Furthermore, given that numerous studies suggest a positive relationship between oral proficiency in English and reading achievement (Genessee et al.,

2005), there is sufficient reason to advocate for the inclusion of oral proficiency development during English instruction.

In addition to oral proficiency, direct instruction in vocabulary is another area which requires attention. An effective program for English learners should include the teaching of vocabulary as well as standard conventions of grammar and syntax (Gersten & Baker, 2000; Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010). Studies of vocabulary instruction show that the direct instruction of new vocabulary is most effective for English learners (Goldenberg, 2008). If the new words are embedded in meaningful contexts and students are given ample opportunities to use the new vocabulary, they are more likely to learn and retain more words. It is not enough to simply expose students to lists of words or to define new words as they are encountered in text by offering a one-time explanation. And certainly the least effective means of teaching vocabulary is to have students look up words in a dictionary and record the definition (Allen, 1999). Therefore, explicit instruction in vocabulary with emphasis on using new words in a variety of contexts with repetition has a distinct place in programs designed for English learners.

Much has been debated in the field of second language learning about the role of instruction in the student's first, or native, language. There is strong evidence that sustained instruction in the first language is positively related to the educational success of English learners (Genesee et al., 2005). Strategic use of students' native language can help ensure that the development of higher-order thinking skills is given adequate attention in the curriculum (Gersten & Baker, 2000). However, the frequency of use of the native language is under debate. Gersten and Baker (2000) concluded that it is beneficial to use the native language, but it should be done strategically, and, in general,

the tendency to provide dual translations should be resisted. Additionally, program evaluation studies have shown that the length of time in the bilingual program has an effect on outcomes (Genesee et al., 2005). Most long-term studies show the longer a student stayed in the bilingual program, the more positive the outcomes (Genesee et al., 2005). This is to say that programs that provide extended instruction through the first language have a greater affect on the success of students than short-term programs. Therefore, bilingual programs certainly have merit and can be structured to be very successful, though this design is not always feasible in all districts, especially those with a wide variety of native languages spoken. Nonetheless, developers of all programs should remain mindful that supporting students' native language use in the classroom (even if it is not explicitly taught) is regarded as good practice.

The merging of English language development with content instruction has increased in popularity for being one of the most effective means for instructing English learners. In some cases, this approach begins as early as first grade and in others, it begins in third or fourth grade when students begin academic instruction in English (Gersten & Baker, 2000). Though, generally, teachers are more likely to see the relevance of using this approach in the upper grades, especially middle and high school. Because of the double demand of learning content while developing language proficiency, it behooves us to seek ways of addressing both simultaneously. The difficulty is in preparing teachers to deliver both content and language instruction. One solution is to implement a co-teaching model.

Some schools are experimenting with replacing the traditional pull-out program with a model of co-teaching for English language instruction. The theory being that co-

teaching would allow classroom teachers and ELL specialists to combine their expertise to meet the needs of all students. One appealing aspect of the co-teaching model is that team-teaching can reduce the burden placed on the ELL teacher to develop materials and curricula in the content areas. ELL teachers and content-area teachers can work collaboratively to ensure that students meet both language learning and content-area objectives (Wertheimer & Honigfeld, 2000). One down-side of this model is the added requirement of full time equivalent teaching staff, for which most schools are already stretching as far as they can. The addition of ELL teachers to content area classrooms can require significant additions to the certified teaching staff. Nonetheless, schools are finding ways to work around the hardships of a co-teaching model in the interest of providing students with access to the full curriculum while simultaneously developing language proficiency.

Whatever the program, it is clear that English learners are more successful when they participate in programs that are specially designed to meet their needs. These programs are especially successful when they are consistent throughout the student's education. Furthermore, programs that provide a challenging curriculum, enrichment opportunities, and incorporate language development components with appropriate assessment approaches are among the most successful (Genesee et al., 2005; Gersten & Baker, 2000). The overarching goal of any language development program should be development of proficiency and fluency in English. In this vein, both social communication and academic communication of concepts and knowledge should be addressed (Gersten & Baker, 2000). Second to this goal is a focus on learning new academic content (Gersten & Baker, 2000). With the structure of the program in place,

educators can turn their attention to instructional practices supported by research for increasing the achievement of English learners.

Instructional Practices

Those who are immersed in the field of English language development and its accompanying literature are familiar with the phrase “instruction for English learners is just good teaching.” It is more than this, however. It is teaching that is “tempered, tuned, and otherwise adjusted” to a level at which English learners will find it most meaningful (Gersten & Baker, 2000, p. 461). English learners actively use all resources, skills, and strategies at their disposal to acquire literacy skills in English (Genesee et al., 2005). As Goldenberg’s review of research shows, the most effective techniques and strategies used with native English speakers are particularly effective when used with English learners (Goldenberg, 2008). The key is for teachers to make instructional modifications that focus on building English proficiency while providing access to academic content. In other words, the teacher must make some instructional modifications in order to ensure English learners will be able to comprehend the material.

It is important that teachers consider some basic differences among English learners as they plan instruction for them, including differences in their academic backgrounds and academic language proficiency (Freeman & Freeman, 2003). Teaching should also be culturally relevant, which means that it should use the students’ cultural backgrounds to enhance the learning experience and assist students in understanding themselves in relation to the content (Drucker, 2003; Echevarria et al., 2008). It is important that teachers not lump all English learners into one group and approach

instruction through a single lens. Rather, differences among learners must be considered and attended to in order to achieve positive outcomes.

A wide variety of methods, techniques, and strategies for teaching reading and writing skills to English learners have been the focus of many research studies. Approaches can be classified as direct, interactive, and process-based (Genesee et al., 2005). Direct instruction emphasizes the explicit and direct instruction of specific reading and writing skills and strategies. Interactive instruction emphasizes learning that is dependent on interactions with other learners or more competent readers and writers. The goals of interactive approaches include specific literacy skills and strategies, as well as other literacy related outcomes. Process-based instruction emphasizes engagement in the authentic use of written language for communication or self-expression. Process-based approaches de-emphasize teaching the skills and strategies of reading and writing in favor of learning through induction.

Interactive approaches are found to be generally effective (Genesee et al., 2005) and experts favor a combination of interactive and direct approaches (Goldenberg, 2008). In these classrooms, instruction in specific reading and writing skills is delivered within carefully designed interactive contexts. Direct approaches emphasize explicit and direct teaching of skills or knowledge, for example, “letter-sound associations, spelling patterns, vocabulary words, or mathematical algorithms” (Goldenberg, 2008, p. 18). In other words, whereas natural approaches will assume students will acquire the rules of language simply by being exposed to the language, direct instruction leaves nothing to chance. Taking it a step further, the presentation of direct instruction in an interactive learning environment ensures that it is meaningful, contextualized, and individualized

(Genesee et al., 2005). By combining the two approaches, there is a greater chance the rules of language will be learned and retained.

The effects of process-based approaches are limited and researchers have pointed out that simply exposing students to literacy-rich learning environments is not sufficient to promote acquisition of the specific skills that comprise reading and writing. Focused and explicit instruction in particular skills is called for if English learners are to become efficient and effective readers and writers. Therefore, process-based approaches are not recommended (Genesee et al., 2005).

In balance with whole-group instruction, lessons for English learners should be delivered through the use of cooperative learning techniques or in a small group setting (Kendall & Khuon, 2005; Padron & Waxman, 1999). This allows for systematic and explicit delivery of instruction as well as ample opportunities for students to interact with each other and with the teacher. One approach that incorporates these same recommendations is sheltered instruction.

Sheltered instruction techniques have gained in popularity in recent years for being effective at developing language proficiency while simultaneously providing access to academic content. Sheltered instruction is an approach to teaching content to English learners in strategic ways that make the subject matter concepts more comprehensible while promoting the students' English language development (Echevarria et al., 2008). Research supports the importance of incorporating language development components and sheltering techniques into content instruction (Genesee et al., 2005). One criticism of sheltered instruction is that it robs students of the opportunity for English language development because teachers too often focus more heavily on

content instruction. Students are limited in their opportunities to produce language and in their opportunities to produce more complex language (Gersten & Baker, 2000).

However, researchers Echevarria, Vogt, and Short (2008), have done extensive research in support of their approach called The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol Model, commonly referred to as The SIOP Model[®], which aims to adequately promote the development of both content knowledge and language proficiency.

The theoretical underpinning of The SIOP Model[®] is that language acquisition is enhanced through meaningful use and interaction. The Model includes 30 features which fall under eight categories, referred to as “components” of language and content learning.

The eight components include

Lesson Preparation

Building Background

Comprehensible Input

Strategies

Interaction

Practice and Application

Lesson Delivery

Review and Assessment

Through research conducted by the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, & Excellence (CREDE), the authors have shown that intentional use of these components will increase the overall academic success of English learners.

One of the keys to successful SIOP[®] lessons is careful lesson planning around both content and language objectives (Echevarria et al., 2008). Content objectives focus

on the standards of a particular grade level, while the language objective is drawn from local or national standards for English language development. By focusing on the content and language objective, teachers simultaneously and deliberately address both needs for English learners.

Teachers use a variety of techniques and strategies to make content comprehensible for English learners, such as the use of “visual aids, modeling, demonstrations, graphic organizers, vocabulary previews, adapted texts, cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and native language support” (Echevarria et al., 2008, p. 17). One misconception about English learners is that they are lacking in knowledge because they cannot express themselves in English. On the contrary, most English learners have had a variety of experiences in their native culture and language, yet they are unable to relay these experiences in the new language. Therefore, it is extremely important to make connections between what the students are learning and their previous experiences with the content. By exploring previous experiences, teachers build background for the new lesson and develop the vocabulary base needed to learn new content.

Another key component of SIOP[®] lessons is the attention to high levels of engagement and interaction (Echevarria et al., 2008). This can occur between students, with the teacher and with text. By promoting interaction during lessons, students are given opportunities to construct meaning and understand complex concepts from texts and classroom discourse and are also explicitly taught functional language skills, such as how to “negotiate meaning, confirm information, argue, persuade, and disagree” (Echevarria et al., 2008, p. 17). Through meaningful activities involving instructional conversations, students practice and apply their new language and content knowledge.

Students' affective needs, cultural backgrounds, and learning styles must also be considered (Echevarria et al., 2008). An effective teacher creates a classroom environment that invites students to take risks producing language without feeling uncomfortable or fearful of making mistakes. Teachers must design lessons and activities that are culturally responsive and build on the students' differences in the ways they learn, behave, and use language. They must also consider differences among auditory, visual, and kinesthetic learners. Attention to these needs will increase the likelihood that students will have a positive learning experience.

Students should be offered multiple means for demonstrating their understanding of the content. For example, teachers may plan pictorial, hands-on, or performance-based assessments for individual students. They may design group tasks or projects through which students will demonstrate their learning. Or, assessment may be conducted through oral reports, written assignments, portfolios, or more common measures such as paper and pencil tests and quizzes (Echevarria et al., 2008). What is most important for teachers to remember is that there are a myriad ways for students to demonstrate learning. Teachers who employ measures which reduce the linguistic complexity of output required by the student have increased the chance that students will be successful in demonstrating what they have learned.

English learners benefit from the use of a number of supplementary materials that support academic text and conversations in the classroom (Echevarria et al., 2008). These may include story books that relate to the content reading, "graphs and other illustrations, models and other realia, audiovisual and computer-based resources, adapted text, and the like" (Echevarria et al., 2008, p. 18). Rather than relying solely on the

textbook or teacher's lecture, the use of these materials enhances student understanding of the concept being taught. For example, during a lesson on how a plant grows, a teacher may bring in a variety of plants as well as dirt, seeds, and water. She may draw a picture of the sun and show rain coming from the sky. The use of this "realia" will enhance the lesson and make vocabulary and concepts more clear for students.

Implementation of sheltered instruction techniques are key to differentiating instruction to ensure accessibility to content for English learners. This approach provides a comprehensive structural framework for ensuring all aspects of best instructional practices for English learners are being delivered. Teaching through a single component (such as simplifying speech) isn't sufficient and it is unacceptable to provide instruction without any modification of content and instruction at all. Language development, including skills and knowledge in academic discourse, can only be achieved if all aspects of language acquisition are addressed and the best way to guarantee this happens is through a systematic approach that includes all components of research-based best practices for English learners.

Conclusion

The LEP subgroup is clearly a unique population of students deserving of rigorous and effective programs that will guarantee their success in school as well as unique consideration for reporting on academic achievement. In an effort to combat the negative effects current legislation may have on the LEP subgroup, research must be done on the impact of imposing these measures on students who have not yet attained proficiency in English. Assessment and accountability of LEP students cannot be pursued in isolation of other important factors. There is a call for a paradigm shift in the

testing of LEP students and this will require a systematic transformation (Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2003). In the area of assessment, the validity and equitability of assessment measures for LEP students may be compromised by unnecessary linguistic complexity of the assessment, leading to invalid reports for Adequate Yearly Progress of the LEP subgroup. For these reasons, there is a call out to educators and experts in the field of psychometrics to develop methods of assessment that are grounded in scientific research which measure content knowledge in light of language proficiency for federal accountability.

In the area of instruction, English learners are faced with the double task of learning academic content while simultaneously developing English language proficiency. Local districts must provide the resources necessary to develop sound programs based on researched principles for the education of English learners, including the theoretical underpinnings of how a second language is acquired. Educators at all levels must be adequately prepared to deliver instruction using methods supported by research and sufficient time for participation in the program must be allowed for students to reach academic English proficiency.

Until we invest the time and resources necessary to determine instructional and assessment practices that work for English learners, this population has limited chance of succeeding under the parameters of the law. Those working with the students know that each individual student is an amazing success story, but we will be unable to prove this at the federal level without clear and focused intentions on increasing reliability and validity of accountability measures as well as the implementation of effective programs.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Participants

Number of participants. The maximum accrual for this study was students ($N = 31$) participating in the research school districts English Language Learner Program. Naturally formed groups of students whose English language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was determined to be at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2; $n = 4$), intermediate level (Level 3; $n = 10$), or advanced level (Level 4; $n = 17$).

Gender of participants. Of the total number of selected research subjects identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2; $n = 4$), the gender ratio was 1 boy (25%) and 3 girls (75%). Of the total number of selected subjects identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was at the intermediate level (Level 3; $n = 10$), the gender ratio was 4 boys (40%) and 6 girls (60%). Of the total number of selected subjects identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5; $n = 17$), the gender ratio was 9 boys (53%) and 8 girls (47%). The gender of the study participants was congruent with the research school districts gender demographics for students in the English Language Learner Program.

Age range of participants. The age range for all study participants was from 9 years old to 13 years old and all research subjects were in 4th-grade through 7th-grade.

The age range of the study participants was congruent with the research school districts age range demographics for students in the English Language Learner Program.

Racial and ethnic origin of participants. Of the total number of selected subjects identified as limited English proficient and whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2; $n = 4$), the ethnic and racial origin of the participants was 1 Asian (25%), 1 Hispanic (25%), 1 Pacific Islander (25%), and 1 White (25%). Of the total number of selected subjects identified as limited English proficient and whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was at the intermediate level (Level 3; $n = 10$), the ethnic and racial origin of the participants was 10 Hispanic (100%). Of the total number of selected subjects identified as limited English proficient and whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5; $n = 17$), the ethnic and racial origin of the participants was 4 Asian (24%), 1 Black (6%), 10 Hispanic (58%), 1 Pacific Islander (6%), and 1 White (6%). The racial and ethnic origin of the study participants was congruent with the research school districts racial and ethnic demographics for students in the English Language Learner Program.

Inclusion criteria of participants. Students in 4th-grade through 7th-grade who attended the research school district, participated in the English Language Learner Program for nearly two or more years, and completed all study assessments were eligible for inclusion.

Method of participant identification. Students who were identified as limited English proficient based on research school district entrance criteria and evaluation and

participated in the English Language Learner Program for nearly two or more years, were included as participants.

Description of Procedures

Research design. The pretest-posttest three-group comparative efficacy study design is displayed in the following notation.

Group 1 $X_1 O_1 Y_1 O_2$

Group 2 $X_1 O_1 Y_2 O_2$

Group 3 $X_1 O_1 Y_3 O_2$

Group 1 = study participants #1. Naturally formed cohort of students ($n = 4$) identified as limited English proficient.

Group 2 = study participants #2. Naturally formed cohort of students ($n = 10$) identified as limited English proficient.

Group 3 = study participants #3. Naturally formed cohort of students ($n = 17$) identified as limited English proficient.

X_1 = study constant. All participants were typically progressing 4th-grade through 7th-grade students who completed nearly two years or more of instruction in the English Language Learner Program and completed nearly two years or more of concurrent general education studies.

Y_1 = study independent variable, limited English proficient students, condition #1. Limited English proficient students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2).

Y₂ = study independent variable, limited English proficient students,

condition #2. Limited English proficient students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the intermediate level (Level 3).

Y₃ = study independent variable, limited English proficient students,

condition #3. Limited English proficient students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5).

O₁ = study pretest dependent measures. (1) Achievement as measured by the research school districts beginning of English Language Learner Program instruction (a) Reading Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scores and (b) Math Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scores converted to standard scores. (2) English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) as measured by the research school districts beginning of English Language Learner Program instruction for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite scale scores.

O₂ = study posttest dependent measures. (1) Achievement as measured by the research school districts subsequent English Language Learner Program instruction (a) Reading Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scores and (b) Math Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scores converted to standard scores. (2) English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) as measured by the research school districts subsequent English Language Learner Program instruction for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite scale scores.

Implementation of the Independent Variables

The independent variables for this study were the three student groups representing students who were identified as limited English proficient and who had participated in the English Language Learner Program and general education program. The students in the first group were those whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was determined to be at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2). The second group included students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was determined to be at the intermediate level (Level 3). The third group included students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was determined to be at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5). These groups comprised the three research arms of the study. All three groups of students were selected from the same student population that received instruction through the English Language Learner Program and the general education program. The English Language Learner Program, a study constant, was a content-based English language development program in which students were grouped by language ability level. All instruction was in English, with support in the native language as needed. Students spent the majority of the school day mainstreamed in the general education program, receiving relevant, meaningful support services from highly trained ELL teachers in ELL classes.

The purpose of the study was to determine the reading, math, and language proficiency outcomes of 4th-grade through 7th-grade students with limited English proficiency following nearly two years or more of instruction in the English Language Learner Program and concurrent general education studies.

Dependent Measures

The study's two dependent variables were (1) achievement and (2) English language proficiency. Achievement in reading and math was determined by the research school districts Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale score converted to standard scores. English language proficiency was determined by the administration of the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) and evaluation of the reading, writing, listening, speaking, comprehension, and test composite scale scores.

Research Questions and Data Analysis

Research questions 1 through 4 were used to analyze the research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for reading and math proficiency outcomes.

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #1. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math?

Sub-Question 1a. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading?

Sub-Question 1b. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district

administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (b) math?

Analysis. Research Sub-Questions #1a and 1b were analyzed using dependent *t* tests to determine the significance of the difference between Level 1 and 2 students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math following nearly two years or more of English Language Learner Program instruction and concurrent general education studies. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a two-tailed .05 alpha level was employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #2. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the intermediate level (Level 3) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math?

Sub-Question 2a. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading?

Sub-Question 2b. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district

administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (b) math?

Analysis. Research Sub-Questions #2a and 2b were analyzed using dependent *t* tests to determine the significance of the difference between Level 3 students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math following nearly two years or more of English Language Learner Program instruction and concurrent general education studies. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a two-tailed .05 alpha level was employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #3. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math?

Sub-Question 3a. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading?

Sub-Question 3b. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district

administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (b) math?

Analysis. Research Sub-Questions #3a and 3b was analyzed using dependent *t* tests to determine the significance of the difference between Level 4 and 5 students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math following nearly two years or more of English Language Learner Program instruction and concurrent general education studies. Because multiple statistical tests will be conducted, a two-tailed .05 alpha level was employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Overarching Posttest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #4. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was determined to be at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2), intermediate level (Level 3), or advanced level (Levels 4 and 5) have congruent or different subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math?

Sub-Question 4a. Was there a significant difference in students identified as limited English proficient subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading?

Sub-Question 4b. Was there a significant difference in students identified as limited English proficient subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (b) math?

Analysis. Research questions #4a and 4b were analyzed utilizing a single classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine the main effect variance between the three comparison groups. Contrast analysis was conducted using independent *t* tests if a significant main effect was found. A .05 alpha level was used to determine significance. Means and standard deviations are displayed in tables.

Research questions 5 through 8 were used to analyze the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for reading, writing, speaking, listening, comprehension, and composite proficiency outcomes.

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #5. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite?

Sub-Question 5a. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading?

Sub-Question 5b. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (b) writing?

Sub-Question 5c. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (c) listening?

Sub-Question 5d. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (d) speaking?

Sub-Question 5e. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (e) comprehension?

Sub-Question 5f. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (f) composite?

Analysis. Research Sub-Questions #5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e, and 5f were analyzed using dependent *t* tests to determine the significance of the difference between beginning level students' (Level 1 and 2) beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e)

comprehension, and (f) composite following nearly two years or more of English Language Learner Program instruction and concurrent general education studies. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a two-tailed .05 alpha level was employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #6. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the intermediate level (Level 3) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite?

Sub-Question 6a. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading?

Sub-Question 6b. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (b) writing?

Sub-Question 6c. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (c) listening?

Sub-Question 6d. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (d) speaking?

Sub-Question 6e. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (e) comprehension?

Sub-Question 6f. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (f) composite?

Analysis. Research Sub-Questions #6a, 6b, 6c, 6d, 6e, and 6f were analyzed using dependent *t* tests to determine the significance of the difference between intermediate students' (Level 3) beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite following nearly two years or more of English Language Learner Program instruction and concurrent general education studies. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a two-tailed .05 alpha level was employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #7. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of

entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite?

Sub-Question 7a. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading?

Sub-Question 7b. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (b) writing?

Sub-Question 7c. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (c) listening?

Sub-Question 7d. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (d) speaking?

Sub-Question 7e. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered

English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (e) comprehension?

Sub-Question 7f. Was there a significant difference between students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (f) composite?

Analysis. Research Sub-Questions #7a, 7b, 7c, 7d, 7e, and 7f were analyzed using dependent *t* tests to determine the significance of the difference between advanced students' (Level 4 and 5) beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite following nearly two years or more of English Language Learner Program instruction and concurrent general education studies. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a two-tailed .05 alpha level was employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Overarching Posttest-Posttest Achievement Research Question #8. Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2), intermediate level (Level 3), or advanced level (Levels 4 and 5) have congruent or different subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite?

Sub-Question 8a. Was there a significant difference in students identified as limited English proficient subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading?

Sub-Question 8b. Was there a significant difference in students identified as limited English proficient subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (b) writing?

Sub-Question 8c. Was there a significant difference in students identified as limited English proficient subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (c) listening?

Sub-Question 8d. Was there a significant difference in students identified as limited English proficient subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (d) speaking?

Sub-Question 8e. Was there a significant difference in students identified as limited English proficient subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (e) comprehension?

Sub-Question 8f. Was there a significant difference in students identified as limited English proficient subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (f) composite?

Analysis. Research questions #8a, 8b, 8c, 8d, 8e, and 8f were analyzed utilizing a single classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine the main effect variance between the three comparison groups. Contrast analysis was conducted using

independent t tests if a significant main effect was found. A .05 alpha level was used to determine significance. Means and standard deviations are displayed in tables.

Data Collection Procedures

All study achievement data was retrospective, archival, and routinely collected school information. Permission from the appropriate school research personnel was obtained. Naturally formed groups of 4 students in one arm, 10 students in a second arm, and 17 students in a third arm were obtained to include achievement data. Non-coded numbers were used to display individual de-identified achievement data. Aggregated group data, descriptive statistics, and parametric statistical analysis was utilized and reported with means and standard deviations on tables.

Performance site. The research was conducted in the public school setting through normal educational practices. The study procedures did not interfere with the normal educational practices of the public school and did not involve coercion or discomfort of any kind. Data was stored on spreadsheets and computer flash drives for statistical analysis in the office of the primary researcher and the dissertation chair. Data and computer files were kept in locked file cabinets. No individual identifiers were attached to the data.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of Human Subjects Approval

Category. The exemption categories for this study were provided under 45CFR.101(b) categories 1 and 4. The research was conducted using routinely collected archival data.

A letter of support from the district was provided for IRB review

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the reading, math, and language proficiency outcomes of 4th-grade through 7th-grade students with limited English proficiency after nearly two years or more of instruction in the English Language Learner Program and concurrent general education studies.

Student Participation

Students in 4th-grade through 7th-grade who attended the research school district, participated in the English Language Learner Program for nearly two or more years, and completed all study assessments were eligible for inclusion. Students were identified as limited English proficient based on research school district entrance criteria and evaluation and were placed in groups by level of English proficiency according to results of the entrance evaluation. The students in the first group were those whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was determined to be at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2). The second group included students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was determined to be at the intermediate level (Level 3). The third group included students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was determined to be at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5). These groups comprised the three research arms of the study. All three groups of students were selected from the same student population that received instruction through the English Language Learner Program and the general education program. The English Language Learner Program, a study constant, was a content-based English language

development program in which students are grouped by language ability level. All instruction was in English, with support in the native language as needed. Students spent the majority of the school day mainstreamed in the general education program, receiving relevant, meaningful support services from highly trained ELL teachers in ELL classes. Based on the specified criteria, Table 1 indicates four students were placed in the beginning level group, ten students were placed in the intermediate level group and 17 students were placed in the advanced level group.

Research Question #1

Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math? Dependent *t* tests were used to determine the significance of the difference between Level 1 and 2 students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math.

Sub-Question 1a determined whether or not there was a difference between beginning level students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading. Analysis of the scores using the dependent *t* test indicated no significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 104.72$, $SD = 7.18$), and subsequent scores ($M = 105.80$, $SD = 3.40$), $t(3) = .46$, $p = .68$

(two-tailed) in reading as measured by the research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) in reading. Table 2 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 1b determined whether or not there was a difference between beginning level students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (b) math. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated no significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 108.70$, $SD = 5.82$), and subsequent scores ($M = 107.42$, $SD = 1.42$), $t(3) = -.56$, $p = .61$ (two-tailed) in math as measured by the research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) in math. Table 3 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Research Question #2

Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the intermediate level (Level 3) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math? Dependent t tests were used to determine the significance of the difference between Level 3 students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math.

Sub-Question 2a determined whether there was a difference between intermediate level students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated no significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 108.60$, $SD = 8.32$), and subsequent scores ($M = 111.11$, $SD = 6.72$), $t(9) = 1.28$, $p = .23$ (two-tailed) in reading as measured by the research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) in reading. Table 4 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 2b determined whether there was a difference between intermediate level students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (b) math. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated no significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 113.27$, $SD = 9.45$), and subsequent scores ($M = 110.97$, $SD = 7.70$), $t(9) = 1.12$, $p = .29$ (two-tailed) in math as measured by the research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) in math. Table 5 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Research Question #3

Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome

(ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math? Dependent *t* tests were used to determine the significance of the difference between Level 4 and 5 students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math.

Sub-Question 3a determined whether or not there was a difference between advanced level students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading. Analysis of the scores using the dependent *t* test indicated no significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 114.40$, $SD = 10.79$), and subsequent scores ($M = 111.20$, $SD = 4.05$), $t(16) = 1.33$, $p = .20$ (two-tailed) in reading as measured by the research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) in reading. Table 6 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample *t* test.

Sub-Question 3b determined whether or not there was a difference between advanced level students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (b) math. Analysis of the scores using the dependent *t* test indicates no significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 112.38$, $SD = 6.54$), and subsequent scores ($M = 113.66$, $SD = 5.40$), $t(16) = 1.14$, $p = .27$ (two-tailed) in math as measured by the research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) in math. Table 7 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample *t* test.

Research Question #4

Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was determined to be at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2), intermediate level (Level 3), or advanced level (Levels 4 and 5) have congruent or different subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading and (b) math? Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the main effect variance between the three comparison groups.

Sub-Question 4a determined whether or not there was a difference in students identified as limited English proficient subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (a) reading. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicates no main effect for reading $F(1,28) = .01, p = .94$. There was no interaction between level of English proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program and the standard score on the ELO in reading $F(2,28) = 1.56, p = .23$. There was no main effect for level of language proficiency $F(2,28) = 2.38, p = .11$. The means and standard deviations for the Reading ELO are displayed in Table 8. The ANOVA for the Reading ELO is displayed in Table 9.

Sub-Question 4b determined whether there was a difference in students identified as limited English proficient subsequent program research school district administered Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) scale scores converted to standard scores for (b) math. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicated no main effect for math $F(1,28) = 0.46, p = .51$. There was no interaction between level of English proficiency at the time of

entrance to the English Language Learner Program and the standard score on the ELO in math $F(2,28) = 1.53, p = .24$. There was no main effect for level of language proficiency $F(2,28) = 1.03, p = .38$. The means and standard deviations for the Math ELO are displayed in Table 10. The ANOVA for the Math ELO is displayed in Table 11.

Research Question #5

Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite? Dependent t tests were used to determine the significance of the difference between Level 1 and 2 students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite.

Sub-Question 5a determined whether there was a significant difference between beginning ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 461.50, SD = 282.79$), and subsequent scores ($M = 763.75, SD = 146.31$), $t(3) = 3.91, p = .03, d = 1.95$ (two-tailed) in reading as measured by the research

school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 12 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 5b determined whether there was a significant difference between beginning ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (b) writing. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 525.00$, $SD = 167.39$), and subsequent scores ($M = 782.25$, $SD = 100.50$), $t(3) = 3.76$, $p = .03$, $d = 1.88$ (two-tailed) in writing as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 13 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 5c determined whether there was a significant difference between beginning ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (c) listening. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated no significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 578.00$, $SD = 197.34$), and subsequent scores ($M = 788.25$, $SD = 24.20$), $t(3) = 2.43$, $p = .09$, ns (two-tailed) in listening as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 14 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 5d determined whether there was a significant difference between ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language

Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (d) speaking. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicates a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 564.25$, $SD = 200.51$), and subsequent scores ($M = 793.25$, $SD = 92.17$), $t(3) = 3.30$, $p < .05$, $d = 1.65$ (two-tailed) in speaking as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 15 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 5e determined whether there was a significant difference between beginning ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (e) comprehension. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 520.25$, $SD = 237.89$), and subsequent scores ($M = 776.00$, $SD = 83.95$), $t(3) = 3.21$, $p < .05$, $d = 1.61$ (two-tailed) in comprehension as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 16 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 5f determined whether there was a significant difference between beginning ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (f) composite. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 532.50$, $SD = 208.01$), and subsequent scores ($M = 782.24$, $SD = 82.10$), $t(3) = 3.52$, $p = .04$, $d = 1.76$ (two-tailed) on the composite score as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment.

Table 17 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample *t* test.

Research Question #6

Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the intermediate level (Level 3) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite? Dependent *t* tests were used to determine the significance of the difference between Level 3 students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite.

Sub-Question 6a determined whether there was a significant difference between intermediate ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading. Analysis of the scores using the dependent *t* test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 350.30$, $SD = 225.75$), and subsequent scores ($M = 768.10$, $SD = 86.37$), $t(9) = 5.79$, $p < .05$, $d = 1.83$ (two-tailed) in reading as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 18 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample *t* test.

Sub-Question 6b determined whether there was a significant difference between intermediate ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (b) writing. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 385.70$, $SD = 276.22$), and subsequent scores ($M = 746.80$, $SD = 64.55$), $t(9) = 3.79$, $p < .05$, $d = 1.20$ (two-tailed) in writing as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 19 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 6c determined whether there was a significant difference between intermediate ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (c) listening. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 381.50$, $SD = 273.33$), and subsequent scores ($M = 812.90$, $SD = 74.77$), $t(9) = 5.96$, $p < .05$, $d = 1.89$ (two-tailed) in listening as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 20 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 6d determined whether there was a significant difference between intermediate ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (d) speaking. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning

of program scores ($M = 432.30$, $SD = 312.87$), and subsequent scores ($M = 863.30$, $SD = 65.52$), $t(9) = 4.02$, $p < .05$, $d = 1.27$ (two-tailed) in speaking as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 21 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 6e determined whether there was a significant difference between intermediate ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (e) comprehension. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 366.10$, $SD = 245.37$), and subsequent scores ($M = 790.80$, $SD = 70.45$), $t(9) = 6.10$, $p < .05$, $d = 1.93$ (two-tailed) in comprehension as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 22 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 6f determined whether there was a significant difference between intermediate ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (f) composite. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 387.60$, $SD = 269.47$), and subsequent scores ($M = 798.00$, $SD = 45.73$), $t(9) = 4.87$, $p < .05$, $d = 1.54$ (two-tailed) on the composite score as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment.

Table 23 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample *t* test.

Research Question #7

Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5) lose, maintain, or improve their beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite? Dependent *t* tests were used to determine the significance of the difference between Level 3 students' beginning of program compared to subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite.

Sub-Question 7a determined whether there was a significant difference between advanced ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading. Analysis of the scores using the dependent *t* test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 401.12$, $SD = 279.34$), and subsequent scores ($M = 641.94$, $SD = 257.89$), $t(16) = 3.67$, $p < .05$, $d = 0.89$ (two-tailed) in reading as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 24 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample *t* test.

Sub-Question 7b determined whether there was a significant difference between advanced ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (b) writing. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 396.18$, $SD = 275.52$), and subsequent scores ($M = 617.12$, $SD = 262.31$), $t(16) = 3.99$, $p < .05$, $d = 0.97$ (two-tailed) in writing as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 25 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 7c determined whether there was a significant difference between advanced ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (c) listening. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 430.71$, $SD = 312.66$), and subsequent scores ($M = 662.00$, $SD = 270.99$), $t(16) = 3.34$, $p < .05$, $d = 0.81$ (two-tailed) in listening as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 26 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 7d determined whether there was a significant difference between advanced ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (d) speaking. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of

program scores ($M = 414.53$, $SD = 274.43$), and subsequent scores ($M = 647.29$, $SD = 267.64$), $t(16) = 3.73$, $p < .05$, $d = 0.90$ (two-tailed) in speaking as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 27 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 7e determined whether there was a significant difference between advanced ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (e) comprehension. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 416.18$, $SD = 294.05$), and subsequent scores ($M = 652.12$, $SD = 262.40$), $t(16) = 3.58$, $p < .05$, $d = 0.87$ (two-tailed) in comprehension as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 28 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Sub-Question 7f determined whether there was a significant difference between advanced ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (f) composite. Analysis of the scores using the dependent t test indicated a significant difference between beginning of program scores ($M = 410.65$, $SD = 282.74$), and subsequent scores ($M = 642.18$, $SD = 256.38$), $t(16) = 3.85$, $p < .05$, $d = 0.93$ (two-tailed) on the composite score as measured by the research school district administered English Language Development Assessment. Table 29 displays the means and standard deviations and the results of the paired-sample t test.

Research Question #8

Did students identified as limited English proficient whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program was at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2), intermediate level (Level 3), or advanced level (Levels 4 and 5) have congruent or different subsequent program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, (e) comprehension, and (f) composite? Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the main effect variance between the three comparison groups.

Sub-Question 8a determined whether there was a significant difference between ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) reading. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicated a significant main effect for reading $F(1,28) = 37.00, p < .05$. There was no interaction between level of English proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program and the scale score on the ELDA in reading $F(2,28) = 1.62, p = .22$. There was no main effect for level of English proficiency $F(2, 28) = 0.36, p = .70$.

The statistically significant main effect for reading indicates that students in all levels of English proficiency had statistically significant gains from time of entrance to subsequent district assessments. The means and standard deviations for the ELDA Reading are displayed in Table 30. The ANOVA for the ELDA Reading is displayed in Table 31.

Sub-Question 8b determined whether there was a significant difference between ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (a) writing. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicated a significant main effect for writing $F(1,28) = 28.23, p < .05$. There was no interaction between level of English proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program and the scale score on the ELDA in writing $F(2,28) = 1.02, p = .37$. There was no main effect for level of English proficiency $F(2,28) = .934, p = .405$.

The statistically significant main effect for writing indicates that students in all levels of English proficiency had statistically significant gains from time of entrance to subsequent district assessments. The means and standard deviations for the ELDA Writing are displayed in Table 32. The ANOVA for the ELDA Writing is displayed in Table 33.

Sub-Question 8c determined whether there was a significant difference between ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (c) listening. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicated a significant main effect for listening $F(1,28) = 28.02, p < .05$. There was no interaction between level of English proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program and the scale score on the ELDA in listening $F(2,28) = 2.13, p = .14$. There was no main effect for level of English proficiency $F(2,28) = .684, p = .513$.

The statistically significant main effect for listening indicates that students in all levels of English proficiency had statistically significant gains from time of entrance to subsequent district assessments. The means and standard deviations for the ELDA Listening are displayed in Table 34. The ANOVA for the ELDA Listening is displayed in Table 35.

Sub-Question 8d determined whether there was a significant difference between ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores converted to standard scores for (d) speaking. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicated a significant main effect for speaking $F(1,28) = 25.31, p < .05$. There was no interaction between level of English proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program and the scale score on the ELDA in speaking $F(2,28) = 1.74, p = .19$. There was no main effect for level of English proficiency $F(2,28) = 1.49, p = .24$.

The statistically significant main effect for speaking indicates that the students at the beginning level of English proficiency had no statistically significant gains in speaking while the intermediate and advanced levels of proficiency both had statistically significant gains in speaking. The means and standard deviations for the ELDA Speaking are displayed in Table 36. The ANOVA for the ELDA Speaking is displayed in Table 37.

Sub-Question 8e determined whether there was a significant difference between ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language

Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (e) comprehension. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicated a significant main effect for comprehension $F(1,28) = 33.88, p < .05$. There was no interaction between level of English proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program and the scale score on the ELDA in comprehension $F(2,28) = 1.92, p = .17$. There was no main effect for level of English proficiency $F(2,28) = 0.53, p = .60$.

The statistically significant main effect for comprehension indicates that students in all levels of English proficiency had statistically significant gains from time of entrance to subsequent district assessments. The means and standard deviations for the ELDA Comprehension are displayed in Table 38. The ANOVA for the ELDA Comprehension is displayed in Table 39.

Sub-Question 8f determined whether there was a significant difference between ELL students' proficiency at the time of entrance and subsequent proficiency as measured by program research school district administered English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) scale scores for (f) composite. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) indicated a significant main effect for composite $F(1,28) = 32.33, p < .05$. There was no interaction between level of English proficiency at the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program and the scale score on the ELDA composite $F(2,28) = 1.74, p = .19$. There was no main effect for level of English proficiency $F(2,28) = 0.81, p = .45$.

The statistically significant main effect for composite indicates that the students at the beginning level of English proficiency had no statistically significant gains on the composite while the intermediate and advanced levels of proficiency both had

statistically significant gains on the composite scores. The means and standard deviations for the ELDA Composite are displayed in Table 40. The ANOVA for the ELDA Composite is displayed in Table 41.

Table 1

Student Groups Representing Students Who Were Identified as Limited English Proficient and Who Had Participated in the English Language Learner Program and General Education Program

| Beginning Level (<i>n</i> = 4) Group 1 | Intermediate Level (<i>n</i> = 10) Group 2 | Advanced Level (<i>n</i> = 17) Group 3 |
|--|--|--|
| Asian (<i>n</i> = 1) | Asian (<i>n</i> = 0) | Asian (<i>n</i> = 4) |
| Black (<i>n</i> = 0) | Black (<i>n</i> = 0) | Black (<i>n</i> = 1) |
| Hispanic (<i>n</i> = 1) | Hispanic (<i>n</i> = 10) | Hispanic (<i>n</i> = 10) |
| Pacific Islander (<i>n</i> = 1) | Pacific Islander (<i>n</i> = 0) | Pacific Islander (<i>n</i> = 1) |
| White (<i>n</i> = 1) | White (<i>n</i> = 0) | White (<i>n</i> = 1) |

Table 2

Pretest/Posttest Essential Learner Outcome Reading Scores for Beginning Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| Beginning (Levels and 2) | 104.72 | 7.18 | 105.80 | 3.40 | 0.46 | .68 | ns |

Table 3

Pretest/Posttest Essential Learner Outcome Math Scores for Beginning Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| Beginning (Levels and 2) | 108.70 | 5.82 | 107.42 | 1.42 | 0.56 | .61 | ns |

Table 4

Pretest/Posttest Essential Learner Outcome Reading Scores for Intermediate Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| Intermediate (Level 3) | 108.60 | 8.32 | 111.11 | 6.72 | 1.28 | .23 | ns |

Table 5

Pretest/Posttest Essential Learner Outcome Math Scores for Intermediate Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| Intermediate (Level 3) | 113.27 | 9.45 | 110.97 | 7.70 | 1.12 | .29 | ns |

Table 6

Pretest/Posttest Essential Learner Outcome Reading Scores for Advanced Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|-----------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| Advanced (Levels 4-5) | 114.40 | 10.79 | 111.20 | 4.05 | 1.33 | .20 | ns |

Table 7

Pretest/Posttest Essential Learner Outcome Math Scores for Advanced Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|-----------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| Advanced (Levels 4-5) | 112.38 | 6.54 | 113.66 | 5.40 | 1.14 | .27 | ns |

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for the Reading Essential Learner Outcome Assessment

| | Pretest | | Posttest | |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Beginning (Levels 1 and 2) | 104.72 | 7.18 | 105.80 | 3.40 |
| Intermediate (Level 3) | 108.60 | 8.32 | 111.11 | 6.72 |
| Advanced (Levels 4 and 5) | 114.40 | 10.79 | 111.20 | 4.05 |
| Total | 111.28 | 10.08 | 110.47 | 5.17 |

Table 9

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Reading Essential Learner Outcome Assessment

| Source of Variation | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Between Subjects | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 199.47 | 2.38 | .11 |
| Error | 28 | 83.81 | | |
| Within Subjects | | | | |
| Reading Test | 1 | .19 | .01 | .94 |
| Reading Test * Group | 2 | 55.48 | 1.56 | .23 |
| Error | 28 | 35.61 | | |

ns = not significant

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for the Math Essential Learner Outcome Assessment

| | Pretest | | Posttest | |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Beginning (Levels 1 and 2) | 108.70 | 5.82 | 107.42 | 1.42 |
| Intermediate (Level 3) | 113.27 | 9.45 | 110.97 | 7.70 |
| Advanced (Levels 4 and 5) | 112.38 | 6.54 | 113.66 | 5.40 |
| Total | 112.19 | 7.42 | 111.99 | 6.18 |

Table 11

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Math Essential Learner Outcome Assessment

| Source of Variation | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Between Subjects | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 79.69 | 1.02 | .38 |
| Error | 28 | 78.51 | | |
| Within Subjects | | | | |
| Math Test | 1 | 6.44 | 0.46 | .51 |
| Math Test * Group | 2 | 21.61 | 1.53 | .24 |
| Error | 28 | 14.15 | | |

ns = not significant

Table 12

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Reading
Scores for Beginning Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|--------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Reading | 461.50 | 282.79 | 763.25 | 146.31 | 3.91 | .03 | 1.95 |

Note: Minimum Beginning Level Reading Scale Score for grades 3-5 is 456 and for grades 6-8 is 468.

Table 13

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Writing
Scores for Beginning Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|--------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Writing | 525.00 | 167.39 | 782.25 | 100.50 | 3.76 | .03 | 1.88 |

Note: Minimum Beginning Level Writing Scale Score for grades 3-5 is 461 and for grades 6-8 is 555.

Table 14

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Listening Scores for Beginning Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Listening | 578.00 | 197.34 | 788.25 | 24.20 | 2.43 | .09 | ns |

ns = not significant

Note: Minimum Beginning Level Listening Scale Score for grades 3-5 is 455 and for grades 6-8 is 559.

Table 15

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Speaking
Scores for Beginning Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|---------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Speaking | 564.25 | 200.51 | 793.25 | 92.17 | 3.30 | <.05 | 1.65 |

Note: Minimum Beginning Level Speaking Scale Score for grades 3-5 is 458 and for grades 6-8 is 466.

Table 16

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale
 Comprehension Scores for Beginning Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|--------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Comprehension | 520.25 | 237.89 | 776.00 | 83.95 | 3.21 | <.05 | 1.61 |

Note: Proficiency levels For Comprehension are based on combination of proficiency levels received on Listening and Reading.

Table 17

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Composite Scores for Beginning Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Composite | 532.50 | 208.01 | 782.25 | 82.10 | 3.52 | .04 | 1.76 |

Note: Composite proficiency levels are based on combination of proficiency levels on all four language domains.

Table 18

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Reading
Scores for Intermediate Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|--------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Reading | 350.30 | 225.75 | 768.10 | 86.37 | 5.79 | <.05 | 1.83 |

Note: Minimum Intermediate Level Reading Scale Score for grades 3-5 is 589 and for grades 6-8 is 616.

Table 19

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Writing
Scores for Intermediate Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|--------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Writing | 385.70 | 276.22 | 746.80 | 64.55 | 3.79 | <.05 | 1.20 |

Note: Minimum Intermediate Level Writing Scale Score for grades 3-5 is 594 and for grades 6-8 is 670.

Table 20

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Listening
Scores for Intermediate Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Listening | 381.50 | 273.33 | 812.90 | 74.77 | 5.96 | <.05 | 1.89 |

ns = not significant

Note: Minimum Intermediate Level Listening Scale Score for grades 3-5 is 554 and for grades 6-8 is 635.

Table 21

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Speaking
Scores for Intermediate Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|---------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Speaking | 432.30 | 312.87 | 863.30 | 65.52 | 4.02 | <.05 | 1.27 |

Note: Minimum Intermediate Level Speaking Scale Score for grades 3-5 is 553 and for grades 6-8 is 617.

Table 22

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale

Comprehension Scores for Intermediate Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|--------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Comprehension | 366.10 | 245.37 | 790.80 | 70.45 | 6.10 | <.05 | 1.93 |

Note: Proficiency levels For Comprehension are based on combination of proficiency

levels received on Listening and Reading.

Table 23

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Composite Scores for Intermediate Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Composite | 387.60 | 269.47 | 798.00 | 45.73 | 4.87 | <.05 | 1.54 |

Note: Composite proficiency levels are based on combination of proficiency levels on all four language domains.

Table 24

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Reading
Scores for Advanced Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|--------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Reading | 401.12 | 279.34 | 641.94 | 257.89 | 3.67 | <.05 | 0.89 |

Note: Minimum Advanced Level Reading Scale Score for grades 3-5 is 660 and for grades 6-8 is 701.

Table 25

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Writing
Scores for Advanced Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|--------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Writing | 396.18 | 275.52 | 617.12 | 262.31 | 3.99 | <.05 | 0.97 |

Note: Minimum Advanced Level Writing Scale Score for grades 3-5 is 682 and for grades 6-8 is 749.

Table 26

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Listening
Scores for Advanced Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Listening | 430.71 | 312.66 | 662.00 | 270.99 | 3.34 | <.05 | 0.81 |

ns = not significant

Note: Minimum Advanced Level Listening Scale Score for grades 3-5 is 658 and for grades 6-8 is 730.

Table 27

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Speaking
Scores for Advanced Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|---------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Speaking | 414.53 | 274.43 | 647.29 | 267.64 | 3.73 | <.05 | 0.90 |

Note: Minimum Advanced Level Speaking Scale Score for grades 3-5 is 675 and for grades 6-8 is 727.

Table 28

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale
 Comprehension Scores for Advanced Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|--------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Comprehension | 416.18 | 294.05 | 652.12 | 262.40 | 3.58 | <.05 | 0.87 |

Note: Proficiency levels For Comprehension are based on combination of proficiency levels received on Listening and Reading.

Table 29

Pretest/Posttest English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Scale Composite Scores for Advanced Level Students

| | Pretest | | Posttest | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>d</i> |
|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | | |
| ELDA Composite | 410.65 | 282.74 | 642.18 | 256.38 | 3.85 | <.05 | 0.93 |

Note: Composite proficiency levels are based on combination of proficiency levels on all four language domains.

Table 30

Descriptive Statistics for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Reading Scale Scores

| | Pretest | | Posttest | |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Beginning (Levels 1 and 2) | 461.50 | 282.79 | 763.25 | 146.31 |
| Intermediate (Level 3) | 350.30 | 225.75 | 768.10 | 86.37 |
| Advanced (Levels 4 and 5) | 401.12 | 279.34 | 641.94 | 257.89 |
| Total | 392.52 | 257.24 | 698.35 | 209.39 |

Table 31

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Reading Scale Scores

| Source of Variation | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|
| Between Subjects | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 29667.85 | 0.36 | .70 |
| Error | 28 | 81713.82 | | |
| Within Subjects | | | | |
| ELDA Reading | 1 | 1129188.85 | 37.00 | < .05 |
| ELDA Reading * Group | 2 | 49315.84 | 1.62 | .22 |
| Error | 28 | 30520.02 | | |

ns = not significant

Table 32

Descriptive Statistics for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Writing Scale Scores

| | Pretest | | Posttest | |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Beginning (Levels 1 and 2) | 525.00 | 167.39 | 782.25 | 100.50 |
| Intermediate (Level 3) | 385.70 | 276.22 | 746.80 | 64.55 |
| Advanced (Levels 4 and 5) | 396.18 | 275.52 | 617.12 | 262.31 |
| Total | 409.42 | 261.24 | 680.26 | 209.95 |

Table 33

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Writing Scale Scores

| Source of Variation | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Between Subjects | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 76718.50 | 0.93 | .41 |
| Error | 28 | 82127.30 | | |
| Within Subjects | | | | |
| ELDA Writing | 1 | 861508.24 | 28.23 | <.05 |
| ELDA Writing * Group | 2 | 31133.90 | 1.02 | .37 |
| Error | 28 | 30518.44 | | |

ns = not significant

Table 34

Descriptive Statistics for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Listening Scale Scores

| | Pretest | | Posttest | |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Beginning (Levels 1 and 2) | 578.00 | 197.34 | 788.25 | 24.20 |
| Intermediate (Level 3) | 381.50 | 273.33 | 812.90 | 74.77 |
| Advanced (Levels 4 and 5) | 401.12 | 279.34 | 641.94 | 257.89 |
| Total | 433.84 | 286.59 | 726.97 | 215.07 |

Table 35

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Listening Scale Scores

| Source of Variation | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Between Subjects | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 64738.54 | 0.68 | .51 |
| Error | 28 | 94609.19 | | |
| Within Subjects | | | | |
| ELDA Listening | 1 | 931980.89 | 28.02 | <.05 |
| ELDA Listening * Group | 2 | 70916.20 | 2.13 | .14 |
| Error | 28 | 33260.94 | | |

ns = not significant

Table 36

Descriptive Statistics for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Speaking Scale Scores

| | Pretest | | Posttest | |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Beginning (Levels 1 and 2) | 564.25 | 200.51 | 793.25 | 92.17 |
| Intermediate (Level 3) | 432.30 | 312.87 | 863.30 | 65.52 |
| Advanced (Levels 4 and 5) | 414.53 | 274.43 | 647.29 | 267.64 |
| Total | 439.58 | 275.68 | 735.81 | 225.03 |

Table 37

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Speaking Scale Scores

| Source of Variation | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Between Subjects | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 124103.87 | 1.49 | .24 |
| Error | 28 | 83518.64 | | |
| Within Subjects | | | | |
| ELDA Speaking | 1 | 974783.45 | 25.31 | <.05 |
| ELDA Speaking * Group | 2 | 67045.59 | 1.74 | .19 |
| Error | 28 | 38510.98 | | |

ns = not significant

Table 38

Descriptive Statistics for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA)
Comprehension Scale Scores

| | Pretest | | Posttest | |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Beginning (Levels 1 and 2) | 520.25 | 237.89 | 776.00 | 83.95 |
| Intermediate (Level 3) | 366.10 | 245.37 | 790.80 | 70.45 |
| Advanced (Levels 4 and 5) | 416.18 | 294.05 | 652.12 | 262.40 |
| Total | 413.45 | 268.53 | 712.84 | 208.72 |

Table 39

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA)
Comprehension Scale Scores

| Source of Variation | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|
| Between Subjects | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 45523.80 | 0.53 | .60 |
| Error | 28 | 86208.91 | | |
| Within Subjects | | | | |
| ELDA Comprehension | 1 | 1027060.25 | 33.88 | <.05 |
| ELDA Comprehension * Group | 2 | 58270.39 | 1.92 | .17 |
| Error | 28 | 30310.64 | | |

ns = not significant

Table 40

Descriptive Statistics for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Composite Scale Scores

| | Pretest | | Posttest | |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Beginning (Levels 1 and 2) | 532.50 | 208.01 | 782.25 | 82.10 |
| Intermediate (Level 3) | 387.60 | 269.47 | 798.00 | 45.73 |
| Advanced (Levels 4 and 5) | 410.65 | 282.74 | 642.18 | 256.38 |
| Total | 418.94 | 266.14 | 710.52 | 205.53 |

Table 41

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) Composite Scale Scores

| Source of Variation | <i>df</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Between Subjects | | | | |
| Group | 2 | 67172.51 | .81 | .45 |
| Error | 28 | 82532.10 | | |
| Within Subjects | | | | |
| ELDA Composite | 1 | 972414.89 | 32.33 | <.05 |
| ELDA Composite * Group | 2 | 52371.04 | 1.74 | .19 |
| Error | 28 | 30078.13 | | |

ns = not significant

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Discussion

Overview

The intent of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of student participation in the English Language Learner Program (ELL) and concurrent general education studies in preparing students to be successful on academic and language proficiency measures. Students were identified as limited English proficient based on research school district entrance criteria and evaluation and were placed in groups by level of English proficiency according to results of the entrance evaluation. The students in the first group were those whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was determined to be at the beginning level (Levels 1 and 2). The second group included students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was determined to be at the intermediate level (Level 3). The third group included students whose language proficiency at the time of entrance to the program was determined to be at the advanced level (Levels 4 and 5). All three groups of students were selected from the same student population that received instruction through the English Language Learner Program and the general education program.

The English Language Learner Program in the research school district was a content-based English language development program in which students were grouped by language ability level. All instruction was in English, with support in the native language as needed. Students spent the majority of the school day mainstreamed in the general education program, receiving relevant, meaningful support services from highly trained ELL teachers in ELL classes.

This chapter contains the conclusions drawn from the research followed by discussion directly related to the study, as well as considerations and recommendations for possible future research.

Conclusions

Research Question #1. Students at the beginning level of English proficiency demonstrated no significant difference in performance on the research school districts Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) assessment in reading or math. These assessments increase in expectation of student performance from one grade level to the next; therefore, lack of significant increase in performance indicates that students maintained academic growth equal to time. For example, in the area of reading, a beginning ELL student taking the reading assessment in 4th-grade performed at least as well on the 6th-grade reading assessment, demonstrating sustained growth over time. The mean difference in scores from pretest to posttest on the reading ELO was 1.08, indicating a slight increase in the mean score. On the math ELO, students performed slightly less well, with a mean difference in scores from pretest to posttest of -1.28, indicating a slight decrease in the mean score. The low n of 4 students must also be taken into consideration in interpreting these scores, meaning it is difficult to show statistical significance with only four subjects.

Research Question #2. Students at the intermediate level of English proficiency demonstrated no significant difference in performance on the research school districts Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) assessment in reading or math. These assessments increase in expectation of student performance from one grade level to the next; therefore, lack of significant increase in performance indicates that students maintained

academic growth equal to time. For example, in the area of reading, an intermediate ELL student taking the reading assessment in 4th-grade performed at least as well on the 6th-grade reading assessment, demonstrating sustained growth over time. The mean difference in scores from pretest to posttest on the reading ELO was 2.51, indicating a slight increase in the mean score. On the math ELO, students performed slightly less well, with a mean difference in scores from pretest to posttest of -2.30, indicating a slight decrease in the mean score.

Research Question #3. Students at the advanced level of English proficiency demonstrated no significant difference in performance on the research school districts Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) assessment in reading or math. These assessments increase in expectation of student performance from one grade level to the next; therefore, lack of significant increase in performance indicates that students maintained academic growth equal to time. For example, an advanced ELL student taking the math assessment in 5th-grade performed at least as well on the 7th-grade math assessment, demonstrating sustained growth over time. The mean difference in scores from pretest to posttest on the reading ELO was -3.20, indicating a slight decrease in the mean score. On the math ELO, students performed slightly better, with a mean difference in scores from pretest to posttest of 1.28, indicating a slight increase in the mean score.

Research Question #4. Statistical analysis found no significant difference between the students' beginning of program performance on the research school districts Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) assessments in reading or math, nor was there an interaction between level of English proficiency as the time of entrance to the English Language Learner Program and the standard score on the ELO in reading or math. This

means that there was no difference between the three groups on the outcome of the assessments, indicating students at all levels of English proficiency had similar non-significant increases or decreases in their scores on the district reading and math assessments. This suggests that students at all three levels of proficiency are treated the same insofar as preparation for the district reading and math ELO assessments.

There was also no main effect for level of language proficiency. This means that students' level of English proficiency had no effect on their performance on the district reading and math ELOs, indicating that level of English proficiency is not a determining factor in how well students will perform on these assessments. The conclusion can also be drawn that the effect of language instruction throughout the ELL Program, regardless of English proficiency level, equally affects student performance on grade-level reading and math assessments, meaning that students did no better or worse because of their level of English proficiency. The researcher hypothesized that advanced level students would perform far better than their beginning level counterparts; however, the outcome of this study indicates all students performed about the same; there were no significant differences or interactions found.

Research Question #5. The English Language Development Assessment measures English language proficiency in the domains of Reading, Writing, Listening, Speaking, and Comprehension. The Comprehension score is derived from the Reading and Listening scores. It also provides an overall composite score. Students who had been in the program since the beginning level of English proficiency demonstrated significant gains in all areas assessed by the ELDA with the exception of Listening. This indicates that the ELL Program, with concurrent general education studies, is generally successful

in helping beginning students acquire English language skills in reading, writing, speaking, and comprehension and that students make significant gains in a relatively short period of time. In this study, beginning students' participation in the program ranged from two to four years. The ELL Program was less successful at preparing beginning students in the area of Listening, though the low n of four students should be taken into consideration when generalizing these results to the broader population. Even so, given current research-based support for increasing oral language development instruction during ELL class time (Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010), it is recommended that the ELL Program in the research school district explore ways to include more time for oral language proficiency development in order to improve speaking and listening skills of beginners.

Research Question #6. The English Language Development Assessment measures English language proficiency in the domains of Reading, Writing, Listening, Speaking and Comprehension. The Comprehension score is derived from the Reading and Listening scores. It also provides an overall composite score. Students who had been in the program since the intermediate level of English proficiency demonstrated significant gains in all areas assessed by the ELDA. Given the significant values for p at less than the .01 alpha level, this indicates the ELL Program, with concurrent general education studies, is highly effective at helping intermediate students acquire English language skills in the assessed areas. Students included in this group participated in the ELL Program from four to six and one half years, less than the typically reported average for English acquisition, which is five to ten years (Verdugo & Flores, 2007). The students in the intermediate group spent more time in the ELL Program than the beginning or

advanced students. Given the significance of their performance on all subtests, it can be concluded that spending more time in the ELL Program is more beneficial than spending less time. Students at the intermediate level have had greater continuity of services and have clearly benefitted from participation in the ELL Program.

Research Question #7. The English Language Development Assessment measures English language proficiency in the domains of Reading, Writing, Listening, Speaking and Comprehension. The Comprehension score is derived from the Reading and Listening scores. It also provides an overall composite score. Students who had been in the program since the advanced level of English proficiency demonstrated significant gains in all areas assessed by the ELDA. Given the significant values for p at less than the .01 alpha level, this indicates the ELL Program, with concurrent general education studies, is highly effective at helping advanced students acquire English language skills in the assessed areas. Students included in this group participated in the research school district's ELL Program from one and two-thirds years to five and two-thirds years. The broad range of time spent in the program indicates that some students are able to meet the ELL Program exit requirements very soon after entering the research school district at this level of English proficiency, while others still qualify to participate for several years after entering at this level. This leads to the possibility that some students are misidentified at the time of entrance and are placed in the advanced level when they should actually be placed at the intermediate level. The research school district has just recently adopted a new measure for language proficiency used to assess and place students at the time of entrance to the program. It is believed that this measure

will be more accurate in initial placement of students in the program. Further research will indicate if the new measure is indeed more effective.

Research Question #8. The English Language Development Assessment measures English language proficiency in the domains of Reading, Writing, Listening, Speaking and Comprehension. The Comprehension score is derived from the Reading and Listening scores. It also provides an overall composite score. Statistical analysis found that there was a significant main effect for Reading, Writing, Listening, Speaking, Comprehension and the composite. This means that students in all levels of English proficiency made statistically significant gains in these areas from the time of entrance to the program to subsequent district assessments. There was no interaction found on any of the subtests, which indicates that no group outperformed another. Students at all levels are treated equally in their language instruction through the ELL Program.

There was no main effect for level of English proficiency in Reading, Writing, Listening, Comprehension, or the composite. This means that students made significant gains on the named subtests regardless of level of English proficiency. However, there was a main effect for level of English proficiency in Speaking at the intermediate and advanced levels. Students in these groups made significant gains in the area of speaking from the time of entrance to the program to subsequent district assessments; however students at the beginning level of English proficiency did not. The lack of significant gains in speaking for beginning students could be attributed to the language acquisition stage known as the silent period (Krashen, 1987), in which students produce little or no output for an extended period of time. Nonetheless, as is the case with Listening, it is

recommended to consider extending the opportunity for oral language instruction during ELL class time.

Discussion

Overall, the results of this study support other research that concludes it is more advantageous to have an English acquisition program than to not have one (Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010). Through participation in the ELL Program, students at all levels of English proficiency showed statistically significant gains in all areas of language development, with the exception of beginning students' non-significant gains in listening and speaking. Given the significant results in all other areas, it can be concluded that the ELL Program in the research school district is appropriately organized to support ELL students in their acquisition of English. Students are given ample opportunities to participate and interact in meaningful activities through a focused and well-developed enrichment program.

Assessment scores in reading and math were included as a means of measuring students' progress in these content areas. As noted in the findings, students did not make statistical gains in these areas. It was observed that students' mean scores on the research district's reading and math assessments remain essentially stable, with only slight increases or decreases. This could be an indicator of sustained growth over time, meaning students have acquired the necessary academic growth over time; however, depending on the determined cut score for passing each grade-level assessment, a stable score could reference a student's position as failing or being "below proficient" on the reading or math assessment. In which case, these findings could be less than positive,

indicating continued failure instead of sustained growth. Further analysis of individual student scores is warranted to determine the true nature of these findings.

It was noted that although all students made significant gains in language proficiency, the students in the intermediate group outperformed students in the advanced group. Genesee et al., (2005) offers an explanation in noting that while it takes three to five years for students to achieve advanced proficiency, students typically make rapid progress from beginning to middle levels of proficiency, yet progress at a slower rate from middle to upper levels of proficiency. Students in this study exemplified this pattern. While the effect sizes of the significant gains among the advanced students were still large, they were less than the effect sizes of the beginner and intermediate groups.

As a point of discussion, it is important to examine the nature of each of the two different types of assessments included in the study. The Essential Learner Outcome (ELO) assessments are grade-level assessments used to measure student performance on grade-level standards. In contrast, The ELDA is organized by grade clusters and used to measure level of English language proficiency. Students in this study participated in 3rd-grade, 4th-grade, 5th-grade, 6th-grade, and 7th-grade Math ELO assessments and 3rd-grade, 4th-grade, 5th-grade, and 6th-grade Reading ELO assessments. Students also participated in the ELDA 3-5 (administered to 3rd-graders through 5th-graders) and ELDA 6-8 (administered to 6th-graders through 8th-graders). Analysis of district ELO assessments must take into consideration the increase in rigor of each grade-level assessment (typically from one grade level to the next); whereas the ELDA uses grade cluster assessments to measure language proficiency on an annual basis. The rigor of the ELDA comes into consideration when acknowledging that a student in 3rd-grade taking

the ELDA 3-5 for the first time is at a greater disadvantage than a student in 5th-grade who has taken the same assessment three times. Likewise, a student in 6th-grade takes the ELDA 6-8 three times: once in 6th-grade, again in 7th-grade, and again in 8th-grade. These differences may explain why there were no significant gains on the district reading and math assessments, yet significant gains were found in language acquisition as measured by the ELDA.

It is important to note that there may have been a greater span between pre and post ELDA than pre and post reading or math assessments, resulting in greater significance on ELDA than ELOs. The first occurrence of ELDA may have happened anywhere from three-quarters of a year after starting the program to four years after starting the program (a student beginning the program as a Kindergartner will not participate in the paper-pencil ELDA until the spring of 3rd-grade). Therefore, some students had more time to acquire language both before and between ELDA assessments than they had to acquire reading and math skills between ELO assessments.

Though exceptions have been noted that could explain the lack of significant gains on district reading and math assessments, it is important to also consider the possibility that students were less well prepared for the district reading and math assessments. This indicates a need to more adequately prepare students to use language in the content areas of reading and math. As supported by Krashen (1987), the importance of differentiating instruction so it is comprehensible to the language learner cannot be overlooked. Given that students spend the majority of their day in general education classrooms, it is extremely important that all classroom teachers receive timely and effective professional development in making content comprehensible for English

language learners. The research school district makes a good effort at offering this professional development; however, these findings could suggest that perhaps more is needed. Perhaps greater gains could be seen for students at all proficiency levels, especially beginners, if general education program teachers were provided even more professional development and in turn applied effective differentiation techniques throughout the school day.

Finally, the researcher questions why the study shows significant gains on the ELDA reading subtest, but not the district ELO assessment in reading. Three possible explanations can be offered. First, one explanation may be that for many students, there was less time between the ELO assessments in reading than ELDA assessments, leaving less time to acquire the tested skills. A second explanation might be that the ELDA may control more effectively for bias, given that it is specifically intended to measure language acquisition of limited English proficient students who come from a variety of cultural backgrounds. Third, the district reading ELO, based on district reading standards that meet and exceed state standards, may be more rigorous than the ELDA which is based on a review of multiple state standards. Any one, or a combination of these may explain the differences in the scores on what would seem to be similar assessments, given only their name.

Further Research

All those immersed in the field of English language development collectively cry for more research to inform best practice for instruction and assessment of linguistically diverse children. The results of this study suggest that participation in English acquisition programs is beneficial to students acquiring a second language and therefore

it would behoove the profession to know as much as possible about what works best for this population of students. One area of particular need is oral language development and how to accelerate progress in this area for ELLs. Also, more studies need to be done that focus on the overall experience of the learner in school, throughout the school day and across grade levels. Decision-makers need guidance in how to structure the school day for ELLs, how much time should be spent receiving English language development each day and what should be taught during that time. A research program that includes linguistically diverse students learning in various content areas is clearly needed (Genesee, 2005). Studies focusing on the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and what should be taught within each, would help inform practitioners and curriculum writers.

More research is also called for in the area of assessment for ELLs. This in particular has created much angst among professionals as the intent of No Child Left Behind and the very nature of ELL students are mismatched. All students cannot be 100% proficient in content assessments given in English if they are still in the process of acquiring English. Therefore, more research is needed in how to create and administer valid content assessments for ELLs. Until this practice is fully realized, ELLs have little chance of demonstrating they are 100% proficient in any content area.

Implications for Practice

The program for English learners in the research school district has been found to be generally effective at preparing students to participate meaningfully in the general education program. There are strong features of the program that led to this finding, including highly qualified teachers who receive ongoing professional development in best

practices for ELLs, classroom practices that include meaningful, relevant and interactive activities designed to increase academic proficiency in English, and timely formative and summative assessments that determine student progress and inform instructional practice. These practices should remain as strong and consistent features of the ELL Program.

Given the findings of non-significant increases in performance on district reading and math assessments, it is recommended that the research school district identify and implement activities that will increase student preparation to use English in the content areas. A collective commitment by all staff to embrace the needs of the English learner in the general education classroom is needed. This may include increased professional development for content area teachers in differentiation strategies for ELLs, increased accountability of content area teachers to make content comprehensible, the analysis of ELL achievement data by collaborative data teams with subsequent recommendations for instructional needs, and a revised curriculum for the ELL Program that provides systematic and explicit instruction in English language development, including a strong focus on academic oral language development.

Implications for Policy

Based on this research, local policies for the identification and instruction of English learners are appropriately applied and effective. At the national level, policy regarding the assessment of English learners is hotly debated and widely believed to be inappropriately applied to English learners. The results of this study suggest that ample time is needed to make significant progress in acquiring English. The greatest gains in achievement were made by those who had spent the most time in the program. Therefore, this research may inform national policy makers in corroborating other

research studies that suggest the need to provide ample time for students to become proficient in English.

Overall Conclusion

The results of this study suggest that the English Language Learner Program in the research school district is generally effective at preparing students for success in school. This indicates that the program model, which includes content-based English language development instruction with concurrent general education program participation, and is delivered by highly qualified and effective teachers, is a successful model for students. The program is consistent and well-integrated with the general education program. Students at all levels of English proficiency demonstrated significant gains in language acquisition; therefore it can be concluded that the program model is just as effective for beginning ELL students as it is for advanced ELL students.

The results of this study call attention to the area of language acquisition in the content areas. Students demonstrated growth equal to time, but this does not necessarily indicate that students were proficient on subsequent assessments or that the common achievement gap that exists between ELLs and non-ELLs was closed. It will be important to continue an energized effort to identify and implement best practices for language development in the content areas so that linguistically diverse students have equal opportunities to achieve at the level of their native English-speaking peers.

References

- Abedi, J. (2004). The no child left behind act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues. *Educational Researcher*, 33(1), 4-14. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699838>.
- Abedi, J., Courtney, M., & Leon, S. (2003). Research-supported accommodation for english language learners in NAEP. CSE technical report No. CSE-TR-586)UCLA/Center for the Study of Evaluation, 301 GSE&IS, Box 951522, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1522. Tel: 310-206-1532. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Abedi, J., Hofstetter, C. H., & Lord, C. (2004). Assessment accommodations for English language learners: Implications for policy-based empirical research. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 1-28. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3516059>.
- Abedi, J., Leon, S., & Mirocha, J. (2003). Impact of students' language background on content-based assessment: Analyses of extant data No. 603). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Allen, J. (1999). *Words, words, words: Teaching vocabulary in grades 4-12*. Portland: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (1999). Making U.S. schools effective for English language learners. *TESOL Matters*, 9(4), November 19, 2008.

- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2005). English language development assessment (ELDA).
- Drucker, M. (2003). What reading teachers should know about ESL learners. *The Reading Teacher*, 57 (No. 1), 22-29.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2008). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (2003). Struggling English language learners: Keys for academic success. *TESOL Journal*, 12 (No. 3), 5-10.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2005). English language learners in U.S. schools: An overview of research findings. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 10(4), 363-385.
- Gersten, R., & Baker, S. (2000). What we know about effective instructional practices for English-language learners. *Exceptional Children*, 66(4), 454-470.
- Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does - and does not - say. *American Educator*, 8.
- Horwitz, A., Uro, G., Price-Baugh, R., Simon, C., Uzzell, R., Lewis, S., et al. (2009). *Succeeding with English language learners: Lessons learned from the great city schools*. Alexandria, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Kendall, J., & Khuon, O. (2005). *Making sense: Small-group comprehension lessons for English language learners*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

- Kindler, A. L. (2002). *Survey of the states' limited English proficient students and available educational programs and services: 200-2001 summary report*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.
- Krashen, S. (1987). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Great Britain: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Millard Public Schools. (2010). *Assessment program 2010-2011* (pamphlet). Omaha, NE: Millard Public Schools.
- Millard Public Schools. (2010). *A message from Dr. Keith Lutz*. Retrieved from <http://www.mpsomaha.org> on September 18, 2010. Omaha, NE: Millard Public Schools.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (1998). *What are the defining characteristics of effective instructional programs for language minority students?* Retrieved from <http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/pathways/effective/noframe.htm> on March 24, 2010.
- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2010). Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. Retrieved from <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/refugees.htm>.
- Padron, Y., & Waxman, H. (1999). Classroom observations of the five standards of effective teaching in urban classrooms with English language learners. *Teaching and Change*, 7(1), 79-100.
- Peregoy, S., & Boyle, O. (2008). *Reading, writing and learning in ESL*. United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.

- Roseberry-McKibbin, C. (2008). *Multicultural students with special language needs* (third ed.). Oceanside, CA: Academic Communication Associates, Inc.
- Ruiz-de-Velasco, J., & Fix, M. (2000). *Overlooked and underserved: Immigrant students in U.S. secondary schools*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Saunders, B., & Goldenberg, C. (2010). Research to guide English language development instruction. In Ong, F., & Aguila, V. (Eds.), *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.
- Short, D. J., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners - A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Solano-Flores, G., & Trumbull, E. (2003). Examining language in context: The need for new research and practice paradigms in the testing of English-language learners. *Educational Researcher*, 32(2), 3-13.
- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (2006). Graham K., Garshick E. (Eds.), *PreK-12 English language proficiency standards*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.

U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *The condition of education 2010* No. NCES 2010-028) U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Verdugo, R. R., & Flores, B. (2007). English-language learners: Key issues. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(2), 167-193. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013124506294852>.

Wertheimer, C., & Honigsfeld, A. (2000). Preparing ESL students to meet the new standards. *TESOL Journal*, Spring, 23-28.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Please contact the author for information regarding the school district study approval letter.