

12-2019

Methods of Instruction for English as a Second Language: The Impact of English as a Second Language Program Models on English Language Learners' English Proficiency

Emily Elizabeth Casaletto
Northeastern Illinois University, e-casaletto@neiu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://neiudc.neiu.edu/uhp-projects>



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Casaletto, Emily Elizabeth, "Methods of Instruction for English as a Second Language: The Impact of English as a Second Language Program Models on English Language Learners' English Proficiency" (2019). *University Honors Program Senior Projects*. 1.
<https://neiudc.neiu.edu/uhp-projects/1>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses and Projects at NEIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Honors Program Senior Projects by an authorized administrator of NEIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact neiudc@neiu.edu.

METHODS OF INSTRUCTION FOR ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE:
THE IMPACT OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM MODELS ON
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS' ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of the University Honors Program
Northeastern Illinois University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
of the NEIU Honors Program
for Graduation with Honors

Emily Elizabeth Casaletto
December, 2019

HONORS SENIOR PROJECT
ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL FORM

Emily Casaletto

Methods of Instruction for English as a Second Language: The Impact of English as a Second Language Program Models on English Language Learners' English Proficiency

This thesis has been reviewed by the faculty of the NEIU Honors Program and is found to be in good order in content, style, and mechanical accuracy. It is accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the NEIU Honors Program and graduation with honors.

Professor Tina M. Villa, Department of TESOL
Faculty Advisor

Date

Professor William Stone, Department of TESOL
Faculty Reader

Date

Professor Denise Cloonan, Department of World Languages and Cultures
Honors Curriculum & Standards Board

Date

Professor Jon B. Hageman, Department of Anthropology
Coordinator, University Honors Program

Date

ABSTRACT

The broad diversity of students learning English as a second language (ESL) has led to inadequate ESL programs among elementary, middle, and high school students in public school systems in the United States. Examined in the paper are the three main types of ESL instruction methods: English-only immersion, bilingual English, and sheltered English instruction. While there has been ample research on the various ESL programs, there has not been as much research on exactly how these programs affect the development of English for both ELL students who are born in the United States and those who immigrated to the United States. ESL instruction methods are highly debated due to the diversity of students who are considered to be English language learners. One of the biggest issues in question is how to design English as a second language curriculum in order to best suit a greater number of English language learners. This research effectively highlights why a specific ESL program works in a particular academic setting, and why the other ESL programs do not.

Keywords: English as a second language (ESL), English language learner (ELL), ESL Program

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I dedicate this thesis to my family and friends.

I'm grateful to my parents and brother, Matt for their support and love. You guys never stopped believing in me. I'm also thankful to my incredible dog, Ozzy and amazing bird, Inti. This educational journey would not have been as meaningful without your encouragement and love.

I am incredibly blessed to also have a support system of friends who love and respect me for who I am, and have helped me to grow as a person and student.

I would also like to thank all those at Northeastern Illinois University who have shaped my educational journey in some way.

Thank you to the University Honors Program for giving me the opportunity to become a part of this community of hard working students.

I would like to acknowledge the dedication and investment that Dr. Villa has shown during the entire experience of working on my thesis. The journey of working on this project with you has been a testament to the dedication you have for all of your students.

Thank you to Dr. Stone for working on this thesis project with me as the faculty reader. Without your expertise in the field, my project would not have been as polished and refined as it is today.

Thank you to Dr. Cloonan for providing me with feedback that analyzed my work and allowed me to ensure that all my ideas were thoroughly explained and fit in well with the project.

I would like to thank my dedicated advisor, Dr. Luedke for helping me every step of the way as a Global Studies major.

Thank you to Dr. Josef Ben Levi for instilling a sense of confidence in my ability to become a scholar during my student career as an undergraduate student.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... v

LIST OF TABLES vi

ABBREVIATIONS PAGE..... vii

DEFINITIONS PAGE viii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

 1.2: Importance of Study..... 1

 1.3: Description of ESL Programs 3

 1.3.1: English Immersion..... 4

 1.3.2: Sheltered English Immersion 7

 1.3.3: Bilingual Education 11

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 18

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY 23

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION..... 25

 4.1: Bilingual Education Programs 29

 4.1.1: Case Study: Hawaiian Language Immersion Program 31

 4.1.2: Case Study: Structured English Immersion in Arizona 36

 4.1.3: Case Study: The SIOP Model in Northern New Jersey School Districts 42

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION..... 47

BIBLIOGRAPHY 51

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. TOP 10 HOME LANGUAGES IN THE UNITED STATES OTHER THAN ENGLISH (Adapted from Batalova, & Zong, 2017).26

TABLE 2. NUMBER OF ELLS ENROLLED IN THE 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN WHO ARE PART OF THE IMMIGRANT POPULATION IN 2017 (Adapted from U.S Immigration Trends, 2019).27

TABLE 3. PEDAGOGY REPRESENTING SUCCESSFUL BILINGUAL PROGRAMS (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010).30

TABLE 4. SCHOOL DIVERSITY IN ARIZONA (Ruiz-Aguilar et al., 2010).40

TABLE 5. INTERVIEW OF ELCs.....41

TABLE 6. COMPARISON DISTRICT COHORTS44

TABLE 7. COMPARISON AND TREATMENT SITE IPT SCORES.....45

ABBREVIATIONS PAGE

- ADE: Arizona Department of Education
- ELC: English Language Coordinators
- ELD: English Language Development
- ELL: English language learner
- ESL: English as a second language
- HAPA: Hawaiian Aligned Portfolio Assessment
- HCPS III: Hawai'i Content Performance Standards III
- HLI: Hawaiian language immersion
- IPT: Idea Proficiency Test
- LEP: Limited English Proficiency
- L1: First language
- L2: Second language
- SEI: Structured English immersion

DEFINITIONS PAGE

Academic Content Areas: Subject classes that are a part of every curriculum like history or math.

Bilingual Education: A program, which present students with instruction in their native language and English.

English Immersion: A type of ESL program, which provides the student with a full day of English-only instruction, and students are placed in classes with ELLs and native English speakers.

Home Language: The language spoken most in the home by parents and the student.

Heritage Language: The first language of the student, which is spoken with family and at home, but it never fully develops because of the second language being used more in school and outside of the home.

Native language: The first language that a person is exposed to.

Sheltered English Immersion: Sheltered English Immersion is an instructional approach, which engages ELLs above the beginner level as the students develop grade-level appropriate content-area knowledge, increased academic skills, and improved English proficiency.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

English language learners (ELLs) make up about 9.5% (4.8 million) of all elementary, middle, and high school students in public school systems in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018) and the percentage of ELLs is projected to increase steadily. A student is considered an English language learner if the student is learning English in addition to their native language. In the context of ELL instruction, English as a second language (ESL) is any number of programs designed to help ELLs become proficient in the English language. The purpose of this research is to analyze the current literature on the methods of ESL instruction and to highlight how these methods impact the development of the language skills of ELLs. One of the biggest issues in question is how to design ESL curriculum in order to best accommodate a greater number of English language learners.

1.2: Importance of Study

The purpose of my thesis is to fill the gaps in the understanding of what makes particular ESL instruction methods more effective for both ELL students who are born in the United States and those who immigrated to the United States. This research will determine which ESL programs best develop English proficiency for the greatest number of ELLs. The results of this work may be used to develop better ESL programs for diverse groups of ELL students.

The study of ESL program design and the effect the programs have on ELLs is necessary for the following reasons:

1. The United States has a high number of students who are learning English as a second language. As of 2018, there are about 4.8 million students in US schools who are ELLs (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018). The high number of ELLs in the United States affects the learning outcomes of the ELLs and it can affect the policies put in place for all students. For example, if a specific ESL program is implemented, and ELL students are not making enough progress to keep up with grade—level appropriate work, more resources will be used to try to correct the issue with the ESL program. The effort and funding used to address the issues with the program could have been used to update the curriculum for all students in the district, which would benefit both ELLs and mainstream students. The continued opportunity for high academic achievement among students on a district-wide basis would mean that the schools would continue to receive resources for the improvement of the schools.
2. Educational policies are often set in place without careful consideration of diverse student needs. The policies can be implemented based on test results or assessments of ELLs, limited funding for schools and resources, and limited research in the effective teaching methods for students of varying abilities and strengths.
3. ESL program models are determined to be effective or ineffective, depending on how well the students in the program perform on the assessment exams. Students in ESL programs are tested for English proficiency from the beginning of their experience in the US school system, but often fail to

succeed on the test because of their limited English exposure. Often, reading comprehension and language fluency assessments of ELL students with less English exposure will not accurately portray the student's English proficiency—but will show limited progress or a lack of any progress at all (Wiley, Lee & Rumberger, 2009, p. 27).

1.3: Description of ESL Programs

In order to understand ESL instruction within the United States, I focus on the 3 frameworks for teaching ELLs. Bilingual education programs present students with instruction in their native language and English. Sheltered English Instruction is an instructional approach, often used with ELLs above the beginner level as the students develop grade-level appropriate content-area knowledge, to increase academic skills, and to improve English proficiency. English immersion is a type of ESL program; which provides the student with a full day of English-only instruction, and the students are placed in classes with both native English speakers and other ELLs.

The diverse population of ELLs can affect the efficacy of certain ESL programs because the programs are not equipped to handle the needs of different levels of English proficiency and or native language backgrounds. For example, bilingual education can be difficult to implement in areas with numerous L1s—L1 refers to the native language of a speaker. The Bilingual education program is only effective if there is one language spoken in the classroom. Additionally, English-immersion instruction can be problematic if there are many different levels of English proficiency in the same ELL classroom and the class material is not accessible for students with less exposure to English. Another issue is if the class material is not suited for the further development of already existing

English skills. In a sheltered- English instruction classroom, a specific grade level will have ELLs with multiple levels of English. If the coursework isn't accessible to all levels of ELLs within the classroom, the students will fail to progress in their English proficiency and knowledge in their academic content areas.

1.3.1: English Immersion

English immersion is a type of ESL program, which provides the student with a full day of English-only instruction, and the students are placed in classes with native English speakers and ELLs. The idea behind full English immersion is that students will have as much exposure to the language as possible, so they will pick the language up quickly. Students are receiving the maximum amount of English instruction in the academic coursework, as well as using their spoken English language skills to converse with their peers.

“Sink or swim” (Colorín Colorado, 2015) immersion is a version of English immersion that places an ELL in the mainstream classroom, and the student does not receive academic coursework or instruction that is any different from that of the other students. Proponents of this program believe that students succeed when they are placed in classrooms with native English speakers.

In Structured English immersion (SEI) classrooms nearly all instruction is given in English, but the curriculum and the presentation of materials is designed for students who are learning English (Adams & Jones, Unmasking the myth of English Immersion). It is important to note that the SEI instruction model aligns with the definition of English immersion, rather than Sheltered English Immersion. The goal of SEI is to help ELLs succeed in the mainstream classroom. Students are able to use their native language in

class; however, the teacher uses only English in the classroom. The goal of structured immersion is to help ELLs acquire proficiency in English while keeping up with content courses alongside native English speakers. Exercises are differentiated for the students in the class, which means grade level appropriate content in English is used and taught to the class of English language learners, which is slightly different than the content used for mainstream native English speakers in the class. Teachers are trained to maximize instruction in English and use English for about 70% to 90% of instructional time (Barrow, & Markman-Pithers, 2016). Students in the SEI classrooms are exposed to as much English as possible, while receiving extra assistance in the classroom, if feasible. Some school districts are overcrowded; therefore, the students who need more help may not receive it. It is understood that accelerated language programs such as SEI are rooted in the comprehensible output theory (Swain, 1985). “The comprehensible output hypothesis states that we acquire language when we attempt to transmit a message but fail and have to try again. Eventually, we arrive at the correct form of our utterance, our conversational partner finally understands, and we acquire the new form we have produced.” (Swain, 1985). This means that we cannot expect students to advance their language competence mainly through oral comprehension; instead, students get more proficient in English when they actually try to produce increasingly complex English language sentences.

Students in English immersion programs test better in overall English skills than students in a bilingual or similar program (Nakamoto, Jonathan, Lindsey & Manis, 2012). The students develop their English skills through the use of the language in a controlled environment. Teachers are able to focus on tailoring the classroom structure to

accommodate beginning English language learners. The instructors use resources and instructional methods that treat English as a foreign language. Ideally, the program model allows students to listen, speak, read, and write in English. By using the main skills associated with development of a language, it is thought that the students will develop enough skills to flourish in the classroom (Clark, 2009).

As Baker (1998) explains in a study of two separate examples, Russell Gersten and his colleagues found SEI superior to the bilingual education program model for Vietnamese students in California and for Spanish language speakers in Texas. The SEI program for Spanish language speakers in Uvalde, Texas, was found to have improved high school graduation rates and higher retention throughout the grades compared to a prior program (Baker, 1998). The Uvalde program and the program that Gersten and John Woodward studied in a California district were all-English direct instruction programs used with LEP students. The program provides a structured curriculum that can be adjusted to the level of the learner and works well both with ESL students and with English-speaking at-risk students (Baker, 1998). English-speaking at-risk students are students who speak English but are at risk of dropping out or poor academic performance due to a lack of resources or social constraints (Kaufman & Bradbury, 1992).

In the development of English immersion programs if students do not have some level of English language proficiency skills, students will fail to succeed in the program. Cultural capital is lost when students are entirely immersed in English-only instruction. Studies indicate that students learn more effectively when they have access to their own cultural knowledge and linguistic proficiencies and “when linguistic, cultural, and racial differences are understood and respected; that is, students learn best when their human

and cultural capital are given voice, not silenced” (Cole, 2013). Students need to feel that their own cultural beliefs, language and national origin are important. Feeling like you are unable to express your personal identity is incredibly detrimental to the development of a student because students can become isolated, which will hinder a student’s progress in their language development.

1.3.2: Sheltered English Immersion

Sheltered instruction (SI) is one of the most popular forms of English as a second language (ESL) instruction in the United States (Stephens, C., & Johnson, D. C. (2015). Sheltered English instruction engages ELLs above the beginner level as the students develop grade-level appropriate content-area knowledge, increased academic skills, and improved English proficiency (The Education Alliance, 2019). Sheltered instruction programs do have some variety, but SI is generally defined as an ESL method of teaching English language and academic content simultaneously, with English as the medium of instruction. Classes may be composed solely of ELLs or they may include a mix of ELLs and English dominant students. Skills are developed in an environment that is suitable for various levels of English proficiency. Some sheltered instruction programs are taught by specially trained ESL teachers while others are taught by content-area teachers who are required to accommodate the various academic needs of ELLs while maintaining the standards of mainstream curriculum (Stephens, C., & Johnson, D. C., 2015).

The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) is a research-based and validated program model of sheltered instruction that has been widely and successfully used across the U.S. for over 15 years. The SIOP model was originally developed in a national research project sponsored by the Center for Research on Education, Diversity

& Excellence (CREDE)—a national research center funded by the U.S. Department of Education—from 1996 through 2003 to assist the nation's population of culturally and linguistically diverse students, including those at risk of educational failure, to achieve academic excellence (Learn About SIOP History, 2019).

The SIOP model consists of eight components:

1. Lesson Preparation: The curriculum is created by both educators and coordinators to make sure there is sufficient English language support in the students' content area courses.
2. Building Background: In order for a program to succeed, educators need to find out what their students already know in order to best build their future learning upon that knowledge.
3. Comprehensible Input: Academic tasks and instructions need to be written and explained clearly in language that is accessible and at an academically appropriate level for the ELLs.
4. Strategies: Using a variety of strategies and scaffolding techniques use students' previous experience to help them learn new content while also helping them develop language skills.
5. Interaction: Creating meaningful interactions between students and between the students and the teacher helps encourage better communication and participation during lessons.
6. Practice/Application: Activities should give students the opportunity to practice and apply new content area knowledge while using their language skills.

7. Lesson Delivery: Content and language objectives are met, and students are engaged for 90% to 100% of the class period. All students' levels should be considered in the pacing of each lesson.
8. Review & Assessment: Students should receive comprehensive reviews of material and feedback on their progress. Students' comprehension and learning of lesson objectives should be assessed throughout each lesson (Learn About SIOP History, 2019).

The Sheltered Subject classes have been a part of SI programs in the U.S. for several decades; however, it seems that the program has not gained a lot of attention (Rossell, 2004). The program is for secondary school students (high school) and is often mistaken for mainstream education courses because the courses are taught in English only to ELLs. In the Sheltered Subject program for secondary schools, the students are expected to have a level of English proficiency that makes it possible for them to comprehend and analyze lessons in English only.

Content-based ESL teaching complements sheltered instruction. Content-based language teaching (CBLT) is an instructional approach in which non-linguistic content such as geography or science is taught to students through the medium of the English language (Lyster, & Ballinger, 2011).

Early research found the SIOP Model to be effective with English Language Learners as measured by narrative and expository writing assessments. The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) is currently conducting further research in schools by facilitating professional development on the SIOP Model and examining the effects of SIOP-based instruction on student achievement in core content areas and in English

language development (Learn about SIOP History, 2019.). In studies on SIOP, it has been shown that when teachers implement the model precisely and accurately, student achievement rises in English language proficiency and in content area knowledge (Short, 2013). The SIOP Model offers a system that incorporates best practices for teaching academic English and provides teachers with a coherent method for improving the achievement of their students. Teachers integrate instruction of content concepts with academic language to develop student skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The concepts and language skills are aligned with state standards, and teachers use techniques designed to make academic topics accessible to students and to enable them to practice the use of academic language as it is used in each subject area. By using the main skills associated with the development of a language, it is thought that the students will develop enough skills to flourish in the classroom (Clark, 2009).

In the development of programs such as SIOP, it can be costly to keep up with the current research on program effectiveness. If the SIOP program is to continue to have a place in the instruction of ELLs, research after each academic year will need to be conducted. If the program does not receive enough funding from the department of education, the program will cease to be highly effective.

In Content-based ESL teaching, teachers and program coordinators have run into issues in the way to properly integrate academic content and language. Collaboration between content and language teachers was negatively influenced not only by constraints like exam-driven curricula and minimal training in CBLT, but also by the instructors' feeling of inadequate preparation for teaching in the CBLT model. The instructors believed that they are "only content-area teachers" or "only language teachers" (Lyster,

& Ballinger, 2011). The findings also concluded that in spite of the pairing up of a subject-matter specialist with an ESL specialist in the same classroom, institutional and wider societal agendas worked against equitable integration of content and language by advancing the use of language with less content knowledge (Lyster, & Ballinger, 2011).

Evaluating the testing results of the academic impact of sheltered English immersion can be difficult due to the variety of ways that sheltered English immersion is classified. For example, Rossell (2004) explains that there are numerous bilingual programs within the United States that identify as bilingual; however, the programs should actually be classified as sheltered immersion. These “bilingual programs” are designed to teach in nearly, if not all, English (Rossell, 2004). Because of the confusion among policymakers and program architects, the success rates of both sheltered English immersion and bilingual programs are hard to fully gauge.

1.3.3: Bilingual Education

Bilingual education programs present students with instruction in their native language and English. The idea behind bilingual programs is that students would be able to navigate the educational system with a high level of achievement and eventually become proficient enough in English to take classes with English-only instruction.

Under the bilingual program classification, the programs can range from a more supported two-language approach to a program that is more of an English-only program because the students are mainstreamed into the classroom with native English speakers.

The transitional bilingual program is intended to provide the students with supported content subjects in the native language, while implementing English lessons within the class period. The student will work in a classroom with other speakers of the

native language and will have English as a second language as a class during the day (Rossell, 2004). The transitional bilingual program is a type of bridge to lead the student into mainstream English-only instruction within a few years. Programs such as the transitional bilingual program are more effective in districts or communities with a strong presence of one or two languages other than English.

Two-way bilingual programs or two-way immersion programs are designed to develop a student's first language and second language fluency (Rossell, 2004). Teachers deliver classroom instruction in the L1 and L2 language in all courses. Within the actual class, there will be native English speakers and non-native English speakers. In the class, the teacher is highly specialized in teaching a wide-variety of language learners (Rossell, 2004). Generally speaking, the two-way bilingual program is set up in a way so that English language learners are surrounded by both native English speakers and ELLs, which, as a result, is supposed to allow students to continue to develop language skills in the native language, while simultaneously absorbing the new language.

Bilingual maintenance programs consist of non-native English speakers and native English speakers (Rossell, 2004). While they are similar to two-way bilingual, they are different because they focus on using more English in the classroom instruction, but still use the native language, too (Developing ELL Programs, 2018). The thought process behind this approach is that once students have enough experience and time to get comfortable with the English language, they will be able to comfortably navigate schoolwork and will not feel like they have lost their native language and cultural identity.

Overall, bilingual educational programs are thought of as more favorable in situations with a school district that predominantly is made up of one dominant language other than English. Learning two languages is associated with: greater cognitive flexibility, divergent thinking, enhanced problem solving, and overall creativity (Ortiz & Franquiz, 2019). Bilingualism can greatly increase a person's development—both mental and emotional.

Cognitive flexibility is the ability of the brain to transition from thinking about one concept to another concept or to think about multiple concepts simultaneously. In bilingualism, students use cognitive flexibility when they have to switch from responding to a question in their native language to responding in the newly acquired language. Greater cognitive flexibility is associated with a child's increased reading abilities, higher resilience to negative events and stress in adulthood, higher levels of creativity in adulthood, and better quality of life in older individuals (Language Switching May Give Bilingual Children Problem-Solving Boost, 2016).

Problem solving skills may be enhanced due to the way a person develops the skills to switch between languages. As was determined in a study from Concordia University in Montreal, the more toddlers switch between two languages, the greater the probability is for enhanced problem-solving skills (Language Switching May Give Bilingual Children Problem-Solving Boost, 2016). It is suggested that the reason for the problem-solving skill development is that switching between languages requires increased mental capacity for language rules and vocabulary.

Divergent thinking is a process that involves a broad search for information and results in the generation of alternative answers to problems. According to Kharkhurin

(2008) “divergent thinking occurs in a mental state where attention is defocused, and thought is associative.” Divergent thinking is an unconscious ability to simultaneously activate and process a large number of often unrelated concepts from distant categories. When a student or language learner is using the L1 and L2 languages within the framework of a conversation without much hesitation, it can be said that the language skills are part of a student’s divergent thinking abilities. Kharkhurin (2008) states that “bilingualism may have a constructive influence on conscious processing, which requires both a focus of attention and an inhibition of misleading cues.”

Creativity is commonly defined as the act of generating new ideas or new connections between existing ideas or concepts (Dijk, Kroesbergen, Blom, & Leseman, 2018). Individual differences in creativity emerge in early childhood and partially relate to differences in age seen as cognitive maturity. Bilingualism among children provides a positive influence in the way that children are exposed to different cultures, conceptual language systems and vocabularies. When children are exposed to multiple cultures, they have a richer exposure than monolinguals. Like other cognitive skills, creative skills emerge in the interaction of an individual with their environment. Research has shown that language and experiences with multiple cultures can have a positive effect on creativity (Dijk, 2018).

Deficit views of linguistic diversity can certainly hinder the process of developing a successful bilingual program (Ortiz & Franquiz, 2019). The definition of a deficit view of linguistic diversity is one where it is believed that students do not meet academic standards due to internal deficiencies, which is compounded by the student’s lack of proficiency in the English language. Additionally, students who are thought to have

language deficiencies are often labeled as fundamentally lacking in academic areas, instead of looking into the individual student's various strengths stemming from the native language (Scanlan, 2007).

Ineffective assessment of ELLs is a major problem area in the development of bilingual programs, and in the understanding of the success of bilingual programs (Ortiz & Franquiz, 2019). Many students in ESL programs are beginning to learn English in the initial part of their experience in the U.S. school system, but the students fail to succeed on any English proficiency test because of their limited English exposure (Wiley, Lee & Rumberger, 2009, p. 27).

Many policy makers and bilingual education instructors lack adequate expertise in the area of assessment, which may skew the results of student success. Regarding the legislation surrounding the decisions for English as a second language (ESL) program models, linguistic experts and educators are not necessarily piloting all of the ESL program initiatives. As Adams and Jones (2006) point out, Proposition 227 was introduced by a businessman, Ron Unz, who had no expertise in the field of linguistics or education (Adams & Jones, 2006). Ron Unz initiated Proposition 227 and stated that California was not educating immigrant children properly and that financial resources were being wasted on “costly experimental language programs whose failure over the past two decades [was] demonstrated by the current high drop-out rates and low English literacy levels of many immigrant children” (Bangs, 2000). The idea that money was being wasted on education was enough to drive the process of changing the way that ELLs were being instructed, and Proposition 227 was created.

When the state of California enacted Proposition 227 in June 1998, the initiative violated the Fourteenth Amendment, which guarantees equal protection and prohibits states from placing burdens on racial minorities. Proposition 227 makes it more difficult for children who may speak another language and their parents to access appropriate educational programs (Bangs, 2000). Proposition 227 results in "the near elimination of bilingual education programs" in California by requiring that all children be placed in English language classrooms for instruction (Bangs, 2000). The proposition contradicts the last twelve years of California's history, during which the state's governors and legislature assured that local school districts would be granted wide discretion over the education of limited English proficient (LEP) students. Proposition 227 has been difficult to overturn or change because there needs to be a new popular referendum or a majority vote of the legislature in order to do so.

In this paper, I analyze the current research on ESL programs and provide thorough analysis of successful ESL programs. In Chapter 1, I introduce the need for good ESL programs that help ELLs achieve a high level of English proficiency and content area knowledge. I provide descriptions of the 3 most widely used ESL program types: bilingual education, sheltered English immersion and English immersion. Chapter 2 reviews the current literature on ESL programs and incorporates the foundational ESL literature. Chapter 3 provides an overview of the methodology used for this research, which incorporates the use of various databases from the Ronald Williams Library at Northeastern Illinois University. Chapter 4 examines 3 specific implementations of ESL programs (one of each major ESL program type) and discusses both the successful and unsuccessful aspects of each program. Chapter 5 summarizes the importance of ESL

programming and its affect on ELLs, the 3 ESL program models, each of the 3 case studies in bilingual education, sheltered English immersion and English immersion, and a need for further research into effective ESL programming.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

In the further development of English as a second language (ESL) programs, it is beneficial to discuss the current frameworks of English as a second language instruction. In the United States, there is a growth trend in the number of English language learners (ELLs) each year. An ESL program is any number of programs designed to help ELLs become proficient in the English language. A student is an English language learner (ELL) if the student is learning English in addition to their native language. In order to understand the different ESL programs, districts that design or implement ESL programs should gather insight into the current successes and issues with current ESL programs. The three main types of ESL frameworks examined are English-only immersion, sheltered English instruction, and bilingual education. Before the three main ESL program models are investigated, it is important to understand how significant an impact ELL students have on the United States public school system.

In the United States, the projected growth rate of ELLs in public schools is expected to continue to increase at a steady rate (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). As was stated above in 2015, 9.5% of public school students were known to be ELLs, accounting for 4.8 million students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018). From 1995 to 2005, ELL public school enrollment increased by over 60% (Gamez & Levine, 2013). The following examination of data over a ten-year period is vital in the understanding of ELL growth patterns in long-term studies of ESL students because data can show a long-term population growth trend of ELLs in the U.S. public school system.

As the population of ELLs has grown at a steady rate, it seems that the academic English proficiency of ELLs has tended to be lower than students who are native English

speakers. There is a great achievement gap between ELLs and native English speakers (Aly & Faten, 2017). Roughly 44% of ELLs are under the age of 18 (MacSwan, Thompson, Rolstad, McAlister & Lobo, 2017). Due to the high number of students who are considered English language learners, it has become apparent that there may not be sufficient research on effective educational goals and models for ESL programs.

A major issue in the proper understanding of what should be addressed in the future school curriculum of ESL is that the ESL programs in U.S. public schools are not necessarily focused on meeting the English proficiency standards (MacSwan, 2017). Aside from the poor record keeping and insufficient evidence to back up the best practices for the further development of ESL programs, it seems that teachers are not equipped to handle the diverse and changing student populations (Aly & Faten, 2017). ELLs can come from diverse language backgrounds and use their native language (L1) in the home or outside of the home to varying degrees depending on how comfortable the student is with English (Aly & Faten, 2017).

Another issue within certain ESL programs is that ELLs are not learning the academic content because they lack the needed level of English proficiency to do so. Academic content courses are major courses that are part of the academic curriculum in all U.S. public schools. As a student progresses in their academic career, not having the appropriate English language skills can impede a student's academic success.

In order to understand the failures and successes of ELL students in U.S public schools, the three most commonly used frameworks of ESL instruction need to be discussed. Nakamoto, Lindsey, Kim, Manis & Franklin, (2012) examined the English and Spanish reading and oral skills sampled from 502 Kindergarten through 3rd grade

students enrolled in three types of instructional programs: transitional bilingual, dual-language, and English immersion. Students in the dual-language and transitional bilingual programs had significantly higher scores in the Spanish reading and oral language parts of the test, and lower scores in the English reading and oral language sections of the test (Nakamoto et al., 2012).

Students in bilingual education programs stay in the mainstream classroom for all their academic content courses, but they get pulled out for additional English instruction during supplemental language time, such as language arts (Reynolds-Young & Hood, 2014). According to Lara-Alecio, Tong, Beverly, & Mathes (2009), understanding that content courses need to be taught in English only is a major finding in the randomized trial study comparing pedagogical behaviors in two separate bilingual and structured English immersion programs in an urban school district in Texas. Lara-Alecio et al., (2009) found that the English immersion program teachers used more classroom time to focus on building cognitive areas, and expressive language-related tasks in English.

Sheltered language instruction is an ESL framework that separates ELL learners from native English speakers. Sometimes, more advanced ELLs are placed in classes with native English speakers. According to Gamez & Levine (2013), ELLs receive extra help in understanding the coursework in the classroom and overcoming difficulties due to the language barrier. The students learn both content and English through a comprehensive and developmental language program. However, Aguirre-Muñoz, Park, Amabisca, & Boscardin (2008) assert that ELL classes do not always include sufficient amounts of grade-level appropriate academic content. Students are often unable to

progress further within this ESL program due to the lack of advanced English proficiency skills required for higher-level work.

English immersion is a type of ESL framework that provides the student with a full day of English-only instruction. In order for a student to be able to be in English immersion, it would be best for the student to have had some English language background. Cole (2013) suggests that peer-to-peer interaction has been very successful in the English immersion-type ESL framework because it focuses on a group-learning atmosphere, which can make the students feel less singled out in the classroom. Students can feel nervous about speaking or reading aloud in the classroom, so working with another student can help build the ELL's confidence. In support of English-only instruction, Lara-Alecio et al., (2009) found that students who have more English instruction may be more likely to mirror the teacher's English skills. By observing more English, the students are thought to have a better ability to pick up on more academic and English skills. Additionally, students tested better in English skills than did the students in dual immersion English programs (Nakamoto et al., 2012).

In the study of ESL language model programs, one of the most notable literature gaps is the inconsistency in the research studies being carried out long-term. For example, the literature of the progression of students in bilingual language programs may not be accurate due to the students changing skill levels. If a student starts out in a bilingual kindergarten classroom but progresses to mainstream academic instruction during the middle of second grade, there will be inconsistencies with understanding how far the student progressed in the English program in second grade. Test scores may not necessarily reflect all the students who were in the English language program because the

students may test into mainstream programs during the middle of the school year.

Another gap in the literature is that there is not enough statistical analysis on the test scores of students considered to be ELLs. For example, the test results of the English-only model in a school district might be tracked for five years. By tracking progress and comparing the development over periods of time, the school boards can determine if the ESL program is achieving the desired results, or if it is at least making some form of progress.

The study of the different ESL programs is less about which methods are the best overall, and more about whether certain models of ESL instruction may be more effective in certain school districts, depending on student population types.

Understanding the different ESL programs allows the school districts to analyze the overall success of the most commonly used ESL programs and make the necessary adjustments to allow students to develop proficient English language skills without falling behind in content areas.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The focus of this research is how English as a second language (ESL) programs affect an English language learner's (ELL) English proficiency. ELLs can be born in the United States or they could have immigrated to the United States. The literature review provides thorough explanations of the three most commonly used ESL instruction frameworks (i.e., bilingual education, sheltered language model, and full English immersion) and how they ultimately affect the success of ELLs. The following databases found in ProQuest's Social Science Premium Collection server have provided numerous sources of beneficial information for this research: Education database, Linguistics Database, Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (Ronald Williams Library). The search terms in this paper are as follows: English as a second language instruction (ESL), English immersion, sheltered English program, bilingual language program, English language learner (ELL), and English language learners in the classroom. To expedite the search for scholarship on the methods of ESL, using advanced search criteria to find articles with the noted keywords can be found anywhere within the literature and also within the abstract.

As the field of study develops, new findings can invalidate much of what has been studied of ESL programs in the past. For example, a study and data collection that was completed in 1990 may not provide enough current research on the issues found within ESL programs currently, and therefore, the literature is too outdated for the purposes of this research. The date range for much of the literature used in this research is from 2007 to 2018. However, the foundational scholarship in ESL will be cited

because current research and data collection will rely on the foundations in the field of study.

The study of the relationship between English as a second language instruction and ELL success in the classroom allows for a better understanding of what ESL methods are effective in specific academic settings and which methods may not be as useful in certain settings.

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION

The education of immigrants in the United States is both a complicated and often misrepresented topic of discussion in policymaking and in the culture of society. Roughly 13% of the population in the United States is foreign-born or born to immigrant parents (Hirschman, 2014). It is also worth noting that 1 in 4 people in the U.S. are part of the recent immigrant population. The effects of global immigration patterns are experienced in the United States in a strong sense because of the high number of immigrants that have made the United States their home—roughly one-fifth of the global population of international migrants live in the U.S (Hirschman, 2014).

Over the last 3 decades or so, the population of immigrants living in the U.S has more than doubled (i.e., 23,250,000 in 1990 to 49,780,000 immigrants in 2017 [Global Migration Map, 2018]). Of the more than 49 million immigrants living in the U.S, certain countries contribute large percentages of the immigrant population (Global Migration Map, 2018). As of 2017, the 5 highest immigrant populations in the United States are from: Mexico (12,680,000), China (2,420,000), India (2,310,000), Philippines (2,080,000), and Puerto Rico (1,900,000) (Global Migration Map, 2018).

Linguistically, about 1 in 5 people in the United States speak a language other than English in the home (Batalova, & Zong, 2017). Speaking another language at home does not necessarily mean that everyone or anyone in the family is LEP, it just means that household language demographics are highly diverse in the U.S. TABLE 1 below lists the top 10 languages spoken at home, and how many speakers of that language there are.

Rank	Languages Spoken at Home	Total	Bilingual Share (%)	LEP Share (%)
	Total	64,716,000	60.0	40.0
1	Spanish or Spanish Creole	40,046,000	59.0	41.0
2	Chinese	3,334,000	44.3	55.7
3	Tagalog	1,737,000	67.6	32.4
4	Vietnamese	1,468,000	41.1	58.9
5	French	1,266,000	79.9	20.1
6	Arabic	1,157,000	62.8	37.2
7	Korean	1,109,000	46.8	53.2
8	German	933,000	85.1	14.9
9	Russian	905,000	56.0	44.0
10	French Creole	863,000	58.8	41.2

TABLE 1. TOP 10 HOME LANGUAGES IN THE UNITED STATES OTHER THAN ENGLISH (Adapted from Batalova, & Zong, 2017).

In the United States, certain states have a significantly higher population of ELLs enrolled in K-12th grade. During the 2015-2016 school year, it was reported that 10% or 4.8 million public school children were ELLs (U.S Immigration Trends, 2019). The top 5 states with ELLs enrolled in K-12th grade are as follows: California (1,332,400), Texas (921,900), Florida (288,900), New York (236,700), and Illinois (205,700). In Table 2 below, the top 26 states with ELLs enrolled in U.S public schools is represented. Then, the total population of children from immigrant families is displayed for that particular state. A large percentage of students from immigrant populations are considered ELLs.

Rank and State	Number of ELLs Enrolled (K-12th) in 2015-2016 School Year	Number of Children Who are Part of the Immigrant Population in 2017
1. California	1,332,400	4,137,900
2. Texas	921,900	2,489,300
3. Florida	288,800	1,391,300
4. New York	236,700	1,469,800
5. Illinois	205,700	765,200
6. Washington	122,600	464,400
7. Virginia	112,100	432,700
8. Georgia	111,800	527,900
9. Colorado	105,800	277,800
10. Michigan	94,600	287,500
11. North Carolina	92,300	427,400
12. Massachusetts	86,600	384,600
13. Nevada	75,400	243,000
14. Minnesota	72,100	248,200
15. New Jersey	70,900	766,800
16. Arizona	70,500	441,400
17. Maryland	69,100	379,000
18. Ohio	56,600	220,200
19. Oregon	56,600	200,400
20. Pennsylvania	56,100	342,000
21. Kansas	54,600	106,000
22. New Mexico	49,500	88,400
23. Indiana	47,600	174,000
24. Oklahoma	46,300	117,400
25. Wisconsin	46,300	135,100
26. South Carolina	46,300	111,700

TABLE 2. NUMBER OF ELLS ENROLLED IN THE 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN WHO ARE PART OF THE IMMIGRANT POPULATION IN 2017 (Adapted from U.S Immigration Trends, 2019).

Many students who are considered to be ELLs are not actually enrolled in ELL specific programs, which could be due to a number of factors such as: limited resources in the school district, accidental placement of ELLs in special education programs, or parents of ELLs not understanding the need to sign their children up for the ELL program. Due to the high number of ELL students in many cities, school districts may be overburdened and unable to provide staff and instructors with the training and tools to

educate ELLs effectively (Council for Exceptional Children, 2014). Placement in special education is common among ELLs because educators and school officials are not always able to distinguish learning issues from language issues. As a result of the lack of instructor training and lack of classroom resources, students may not progress in their studies and can be identified as having a learning disability. The lack of ELL enrollment in ESL programs can drastically alter the understanding for a need to examine the ESL programs in U.S public schools.

This research of current ESL programs benefits educators, policymakers, and school officials in the understanding of what makes certain ESL programs work in a specific situation, and why certain ESL programs prove to be less beneficial. The complexity of the issues found in many of the ESL programs in the United States can be attributed to three common factors. One factor is that legislation and policies often overlook the necessary research and best practices in order to spend less money on educational resources. For example, policies like Proposition 227 and Proposition 203 were developed by people who are not educators or researchers in the field of linguistics or ESL. The second factor is that it has been difficult to assess which ESL programs are the most beneficial for specific groups of ELLs because there have not been enough long-term studies of the programs implemented in a variety of situations. Despite there being mention of program failure and success within much of the research, the studies do not carry as much weight due to the short span of time in which the studies were conducted. The third factor is the way that academic content and English instruction are woven into the lesson plans. In programs for ELLs, English instruction should be

incorporated into the academic content curriculum, but it needs to be done in a way that does not impede the learning of the academic content.

In the research demonstrating successful bilingual, sheltered English immersion, and English immersion programs, the successes of programs can be attributed to factors such as: strong teacher training and development, continued development of the specific programs and targeting the weaknesses of the program, local community and governance support, and programs developed with the input of local community members.

4.1: Bilingual Education Programs

In the search for successful examples of bilingual programs in the United States, the criteria for a successful program is one that incorporates well thought out pedagogy derived from philosophical frameworks that are adapted specifically for academic settings.

Method	Detail
Equitable Interaction	Promotion of positive interactions between and learners. When applied equitably in a classroom with L1 and L2 students this method has enabled both groups of students to perform better academically.
Targeted and Varied Teaching Techniques	Utilization of a variety of teaching techniques that respond to different learning styles. This method enables students with varying language proficiency levels to orient their learning more efficiently to the curriculum.
Student-Centered Teaching and Learning	The program should have a student-centered approach. Reciprocal interaction is preferable to teacher-level cognitive skills. In classrooms with mixed L1 and L2 students, a bilingual program, should encourage students to share their linguistic codes and cultural knowledge with other students.
Sharing Between Learners	Cooperative learning strategies should be encouraged. In a classroom with ethnically and linguistically diverse students, academic achievement improves when students collaborate interdependently on common objective tasks and share work experiences. Additionally, students expectations and attitudes toward each other become more positive.
Language through Common Task Orientation	Language transfer is not always a result of cooperative learning strategies, and attention should be paid to the type of task. Linguistic knowledge transfer will occur when the cooperative learning strategy is focused around a language task that facilitates the students sharing language knowledge.

TABLE 3. PEDAGOGY REPRESENTING SUCCESSFUL BILINGUAL PROGRAMS (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010).

Table 3 above (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010) lists some of the methods that make the pedagogical framework of a bilingual program exceptional and demonstrates that a solid foundation of pedagogy will lead to bilingual programs that use age-appropriate academic content, provide instruction using proven teaching methods, and set attainable goals for ELLs.

4.1.1: Case Study: Hawaiian Language Immersion Program

One example of a successful bilingual program the Hawaiian Language Immersion Program, Ka Papahana Kaiapuni Hawai'i, reveals remarkable successes in academia and pedagogy in bilingual education. Bilingual education in Hawai'i began in the 1970s as a part of the existing Hawai'i Department of Education Asian, European and Pacific Language program (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010).

The main goals of the Hawaiian Language Program are as follows:

1. To create awareness and appreciation of the various aspects of the Hawaiian cultural heritage which still permeate the lifestyles of many people living today in Hawai'i nei (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010).
2. To teach students the basic listening comprehension, reading, speaking and writing skills which will lead to the ability to think and to communicate in the Hawaiian language (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010).

The Hawaiian Language Program emphasizes cultural goals that encourage the idea that a major part of the program is centered on linguistic and cultural revival (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010).

Ka Papahana Kaiapuni Hawai'i was first developed in 1987 as a one-year pilot program in a combination kindergarten/first grade in two schools and then expanded to a K-6 program in four schools by 1989. By 1995, there were 756 K-8 students enrolled in the Hawaiian Language Immersion Program which taught in Hawaiian only until grades five and six when English is introduced as the medium of teaching and learning for one hour per day (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010).

In the early years of program development and implementation, five hindering factors were identified:

1. Lack of translated and/or original printed curriculum materials in the Hawaiian language
2. Necessary experimentation concerning the direction and content of the curriculum
3. Inexperience of some teachers in the teaching methods
4. In the beginning years of the program, all teachers experienced varying levels of difficulty in teaching in the Hawaiian language.
5. Continuous placement of the first cohort of students in the same combination classroom with younger students (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010)

In the initial years, the SAT test scores of the first cohort to complete elementary education in spring 1993 indicated that the Hawaiian Immersion students achieved subpar results in reading and moderately subpar in mathematics; however, there was not another group of similar students to provide a comparison (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010). Despite the setback in reading and mathematics, the students were able to achieve fluency in oral Hawaiian and learned reading, writing, and mathematics through the medium of the Hawaiian language. The report concluded that “there is a continuing need for these teachers to receive in-service training in effective teaching methods and new curriculum” (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010). The report also stated that there was a need for all Hawaiian language immersion (HLI) teachers to receive in-service training and continue learning new methods of assessing student achievement, teacher researcher perspectives in evaluation, and the special problems of assessment in second

language settings (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010). The introduction of Hawaiian immersion education was fast-tracked by both the Board of Education and the Hawai'i Department of Education and presented significant challenges, which were basic concerns such as identifying appropriate sites and the hiring of qualified teachers.

The Hawaiian Language Immersion Program is currently provided for K-12 students and is still a total immersion bilingual program in Hawaiian until fourth grade and partial immersion in Hawaiian and English from fifth grade onwards. According to the Hawai'i Department of Education website: "it is an academic program, delivered through the Hawaiian language, based upon Hawaiian knowledge and cultural practices, attentive to community, family and student goals" (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010).

The philosophical framework and main criteria for success of the Hawaiian Language Immersion Program is currently assisted by the Hawai'i Guidelines for Culturally Healthy and Responsive Learning Environments document (adopted in 2002) developed by the Native Hawaiian Education Council and University of Hawai'i, Hilo includes seven distinct thematic best practices:

1. 'Ike Honua (Value of Place)

Developing a strong understanding of place, and appreciation of the environment and the world at large, and the delicate balance necessary to maintain it for generations to come

2. 'Ike Ho'oko (Value of Applied Achievement)

Measuring success and outcomes of our learning through multiple pathways and formats

3. 'Ike Kuana'ike (Value of Cultural Perspective)

Increasing global understanding by broadening the views and vantage points from which to see and operate in the world

4. 'Ike Maui Lahui (Value of Cultural Identity)

Strengthening and sustaining Native Hawaiian cultural identity through practices that support the learning, understanding, behaviors, and spiritual connections through the use of the Hawaiian language, culture, history, traditions, and values

5. 'Ike Na'auao (Value of Intellect)

Instilling and fostering a lifelong desire to seek knowledge and wisdom, and strengthening the thirst for inquiry and knowing

6. 'Ike Piko'u (Value of Personal Identity)

Promoting personal growth and development, and a love of self, which is internalized and develops into a sense of purpose/role

7. 'Ike Pilina (Value of Relationships)

Enriching our relationships between the people, places, and things that influence our lives through experiences that ground us to our spirituality and connect us to our genealogy, culture, and history through time and place

Within the framework of the 7 thematic best practices, common strengths include a value of the student's culture and home language. The thematic values have proven to be successful for the students in the Hawaiian Language Immersion Program because the students were able to incorporate their own background and personal identities into the language program. If more schools in the U.S. implemented techniques that incorporated an approach of valuing individual students, their cultural values, and linguistic

backgrounds, it would prove beneficial. Devaluing students' home languages and/or cultural beliefs can greatly hinder their academic progress.

The Hawaiian program is well received by the community. Parents try to speak the language in their homes with their children. Another aspect of the program is that a large network of family members is involved in educational activities (e.g., music, storytelling, and excursions) both inside and outside of the classroom.

The Hawaiian Language Immersion Program is supported in the broader community at the non-governmental, administrative, political, and academic levels. For example, the University of Hawaii-Hilo provides teacher training in Hawaiian language immersion (Kahuawaiola) as well as numerous Hawaiian language courses at many of its campuses.

The Hawaiian bilingual program provides insight into what challenges face a bilingual immersion program. The professors, staff, and personnel in charge of the success of the program depend on the recruitment of local talent and the provision of appropriate training. The curriculum is currently and continuously growing and developing. The program flourishes with the commitment of the broader community stakeholders. It was community stakeholders who instigated the first Hawaiian immersion pilot programs and continue to be a part of the implementation and development of these programs. The Hawaiian program has succeeded because of the continued development of faculty training, parent and community development, and government support (Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010).

4.1.2: Case Study: Structured English Immersion in Arizona

In the process of searching for successful programs in English immersion, one of the most commonly studied program models is Structured English Immersion. The implementation of a specific SEI program was mandated in Arizona during the 2008-2009 school year. The study was conducted during the spring of 2010 and focused on the implementation of the 4-hour English Language Development (ELD) block currently in place throughout the state of Arizona (Rios-Aguilar, González-Canche, & Moll, 2010). The basic theory behind this particular model is that ELL students should be taught in English, so they can navigate academically.

This study investigates a random sample of 65 school districts across the state of Arizona under the 4-hour ELD block policy (Rios-Aguilar et al., 2010). The goal of the study is to understand the positive aspects and the major challenges of implementing the 4-hour ELD block in Arizona. The study aims to answer the following questions:

1. How is the 4-hour ELD block being implemented?
2. What are the benefits of the 4-hour ELD block for students and for schools?
3. What are the concerns about implementing the 4-hour ELD block?

The research team designed a phone survey for English Language Coordinators (ELCs). Sixty-five school districts were randomly selected as potential participants, and 26 agreed to participate in this study (Rios-Aguilar et al., 2010). The district response rate of the study was 40%, and the informants were the ELCs of the district. The ELCs are the individuals most knowledgeable about how the 4-hour ELD block is implemented in their district. The sample of school districts that participated in the study is

representative of the state of Arizona in terms of enrollment patterns. The findings of this study are presented around 4 themes:

1. implementation of the 4-hour ELD block
2. benefits of the 4-hour ELD block
3. concerns about the 4-hour ELD block, and
4. recommendations for improvement

The data collected clearly shows that there is variation in: the types of programs offered to ELL students, grouping criteria, and the everyday academic experiences of ELL students. The data shows that school districts across the state are providing the programs required by the Arizona law. In addition to providing these mandated programs, it was found that about 34% of the sampled school districts are offering specific services/programs (e.g., after-school and summer programs) to support ELL students' English language development, and two-thirds of the schools were either not able or chose not to offer these additional support services (Rios-Aguilar et al., 2010). It was also found that 73% of school districts group ELL students by proficiency in the AZELLA test, and by the ELLs grade level. There is some variation in how students are grouped in seven school districts, particularly those with higher percentages of ELL students. There is also some variation in the type and amount of content-based instruction that ELL students get in a typical school day. Some school districts try to implement as much academic content as possible, but academic content is missing from the ELL student's experience with instruction in science and social sciences (Rios-Aguilar et al., 2010).

Another finding of the study is that all of the school districts are following the state's regulations. However, school districts want to have more flexibility in how the program is operated. This particular finding indicates that a single model of ELD instruction is not needed for every school district in Arizona in order to meet the educational and language needs of their ELL students (Rios-Aguilar et al., 2010). Every district has a different variety of ELLs, and the needs of each district will play a role in what the best practices of the ELD program model will be.

Rios-Aguilar et al. (2010) offer the following recommendations:

1. School districts need to explore alternative models of ELD instruction.
2. The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) needs to question the existing assumptions (i.e., English proficiency can be reached in isolation from English proficient peers, with minimal academic content, and in one year) embedded in the 4-hour block of ELD instruction.
3. ADE needs to assess whether the funding structure of the 4-hour ELD block should be modified.
4. School districts need to monitor progress and effectiveness by looking at multiple indicators (i.e., reclassification, re-entry, and opting-out rates).
5. School districts need to collect various types of data from administrators, leaders, teachers, students and families to learn more about their experiences with the program.
6. School districts need to pay closer attention to the academic content areas that ELL students are missing as a result of the implementation of the 4-hour ELD block.

Table 4 provides basic demographic information about the school districts participating in the study. As shown in Table 5, the school districts that participated in this study have very distinct characteristics. Some are small districts (with one school) and others are large school districts (with 121 schools). The data show that 73% of these school districts did not meet adequate yearly progress (AYP). There are 14% of ELL students enrolled in these school districts. These statistics show that the sample of school districts in this study is representative of the state of Arizona (Rios–Aguilar et al., 2010).

School District	Total Enrollment	AYP 2007	% White	% Hispanic	% Free & Reduced	% ELL
School District A	1440	Met	70%	25%	44%	9%
School District B	122	Met	52%	27%	1%	17%
School District C	1302	Not Met	2%	90%	96%	39%
School District D	5951	Not Met	40%	40%	28%	5%
School District E	3820	Not Met	1%	1%	99%	25%
School District F	24312	Not Met	40%	50%	68%	24%
School District G	1441	Met	70%	25%	34%	14%
School District H	7698	Not Met	40%	55%	60%	11%
School District I	16404	Not Met	55%	38%	40%	10%
School District J	2520	Not Met	NA	NA	77%	13%
School District K	453	Met	65%	25%	34%	14%
School District L	4984	Not Met	15%	68%	74%	23%
School District M	5882	Met	89%	7%	5%	2%
School District N	1046	Not Met	74%	21%	35%	1%
School District O	5022	Not Met	37%	39%	12%	7%
School District P	59327	Not Met	31%	55%	61%	13%
School District Q	1933	Not Met	44%	29%	58%	2%
School District R	1316	Not Met	44%	55%	61%	23%

School District S	26611	Not Met	75%	16%	20%	7%
School District T	5767	Not Met	82%	13%	22%	2%
School District U	271	Not Met	4%	96%	89%	49%
School District V	3088	Met	45%	45%	37%	2%
School District W	8636	Not Met	25%	70%	15%	4%
School District X	3016	Not Met	10%	80%	72%	24%
	0.25	0.25	0.29	0.12	9%	22%
School District Z	2552	Met	60%	35%	57%	18%
Average	7677		44%	43%	46%	14%
Standard Deviation	12528					

TABLE 4. SCHOOL DIVERSITY IN ARIZONA (Ruiz-Aguilar et al., 2010).

Themes	Frequency (No. of times mentioned across all phone surveys)
Implementation	
Variations in implementation	76
State policies	29
Benefits	
Language acquisition	43
More training for teachers	38
ELL students re-entering 4-hour ELD block	14
More attention to ELL students	13
Concerns	
Segregation	87
English proficiency	27
Financial resources	21
Lack of peer role models	17
Duration of the block	14
Time for graduation	9
Recommendations	
More academic content	69
Peer role models	17
Fewer hours	14
More flexibility in implementation	11

TABLE 5. INTERVIEW OF ELCs

The results of the interview and questions with the ELCs are charted based on the number of times each theme is mentioned. The data indicates that there are some perceived benefits of implementing the 4-hour ELD block of ESL instruction: enhanced English language acquisition, additional training for teachers, and more attention to ELL students (Rios-Aguilar et al., 2010).

About 81% of the ELCs mentioned that the 4-hour ELD block provides teachers with continuous opportunities to work on the development of their students' English language proficiency. Additionally, when questioned as to whether the ELD block meets the language needs of ELL students, 84% of school districts mentioned that the 4-hour

ELD block does help ELLs in the acquisition and development of English skills (Rios–Aguilar et al., 2010). Roughly 92% percent of school districts said that a great benefit of the SEI program has been the additional training for teachers. As one ELC stated “the biggest benefit is extensive professional development, extensive training, all that is a benefit for the children” (Rios–Aguilar et al., 2010).

In response to the question about how the 4-hour block meets the language needs of students, all school districts mentioned that one of the most important benefits of the 4-hour ELD block is that it has brought more attention to the language needs of ELL students (Rios–Aguilar et al., 2010). The ELCs stated that before the implementation of the 4-hour ELD block, there was no real structure for the instruction of ELLs, and the progress of ELLs was not monitored. According to 66% of ELCs, ELLs now have time dedicated to the learning of the English language (Rios–Aguilar et al., 2010).

Approximately, 15% of ELCs mentioned that the 4-hour ELD block resulted in an increase in reclassification rates (i.e., more ELLs achieving higher English proficiency levels) (Rios–Aguilar et al., 2010).

4.1.3: Case Study: The SIOP Model in Northern New Jersey School Districts

This study examines the effects of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model on the effect of academic language performance of middle and high school ELLs. Takenaka (2019) addressed the growing concerns with the achievement gap between ELLs and native English speakers, which is demonstrated in the results of the accountability measure, which tests students (grades 3-8) in math and reading. The accountability measure is an aspect of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation. In the study, there is a comparison district and a treatment district.

The districts in this study are from northern New Jersey. Due to its proximity to a large city, the districts in northern New Jersey tend to have a variety of ELLs, both from primary and secondary migration families. Primary migration families tend to come from one location prior to settling in northern New Jersey, whereas, secondary migration families migrate to one country or multiple countries prior to settling in the northern area of New Jersey (Takenaka, 2019). Both high school and middle school teachers participated in the study.

Takenaka (2019) sought to find out whether ELLs in one district with teachers who received professional development in the SIOP model would show significantly higher achievement in reading, writing, and oral proficiency in English on a standardized measure than ELLs in a comparable district with teachers who had no SIOP professional development. Takenaka (2019) also wanted to know if teachers would be able to implement high levels of the SIOP model during a sustained professional development program after 1 year or after 2 years.

In the treatment district, two separate cohorts of teachers were involved. Cohort 1 began in the first academic year of the study (2004-2005), and 35 teachers from this cohort remained in the study for a period of 2 years. Cohort 2 joined in the second academic year (2005-2006), and 23 teachers participated. The treatment teachers taught mathematics, science, social studies language arts, ESL, special education, and technology. The comparison district did not have cohort groups because there was not any SIOP professional development involved. However, there was a small amount of teacher turnover—Twenty-three teachers participated in the first year and 22 in the second year. The comparison teachers taught mathematics, science, social studies, and

ESL. In both districts, approximately half of the teachers taught at the high school level and the other half at middle school. Most of the teachers were female and White. In the study, all the teachers had a wide range of experience, although in both districts more than half were veteran teachers with 10 or more years of experience. Staff turnover was very low in both districts (see Table 6).

Teaching experience	Treatment Cohort 1	Treatment Cohort 2	Comparison
1 year experience or less	10%	12%	6%
2-3 years	15%	12%	0%
4-9 years	23%	12%	18%
10-19 years	31%	44%	53%
20 years or more	21%	20%	24%

TABLE 6. COMPARISON DISTRICT COHORTS

In order to examine the impact of the SIOP model on the students' English language development, the students' IPT scores for the Reading, Oral Language tests and the Total English proficiency scores are evaluated after each year (Takenaka, 2019). The state-mandated IPT tests are administered in March or April of each year by trained district personnel who specialize in testing procedures and analysis of test results.

An analysis of the data on teacher implementation of SIOP features in the two districts under study shows that treat teachers receiving professional development incorporated more features of sheltered instruction than the program without any intervention (comparison teachers). After 1 year of professional development in the district with the intervention of the SIOP model the student achievement results are as follows:

1. In year one at the treatment site, 56% of Cohort 1 and 74% of Cohort 2 reached a high level of academic success. After 2 years, 71% of Cohort 1 reached a high level of academic success (Takenaka, 2019).
2. In the first year at the comparison site, 5% of the students achieved a high level of academic success. In the second year, 17% of the students reached a high level of academic achievement (Takenaka, 2019).

The results of student performance on the IPT exam (SIOP implementation) show that, in general, the students in the SIOP treatment program performed better on the IPT test in the Writing, Reading, and Oral Language parts of the test.

	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Comparison					
Baseline: IPT_Writ_PL	176	2.00	5.00	4.16	0.94
Year 1: IPT_Writ_PL	169	1.00	5.00	4.04	1.16
Year 2: IPT_Writ_PL	168	1.00	5.00	4.02	1.13
Treatment					
Baseline: IPT_Writ_PL	386	1.00	5.00	4.06	1.08
Year 1: IPT_Writ_PL	278	1.00	5.00	4.16	0.94
Year 2: IPT_Writ_PL	267	1.00	5.00	4.32	0.83

TABLE 7. COMPARISON AND TREATMENT SITE IPT SCORES

In Table 7 above, the comparison students (students without the SIOP program) started out with a slightly higher performance on the IPT Writing proficiency level in the starting year. However, by year 1 and 2, the students in the SIOP program (treatment) had higher mean scores versus the comparison students. By Year 2, this difference was

statistically significantly higher, reversing the small achievement gap that had existed at the start.

Results also show the trend that the treatment students' average mean score in writing began below the comparison group in the baseline year, and then slightly exceeded it in Year 1, and then surpassed it by Year 2 of the study (Takenaka, 2019)

This study shows that the group with the implementation of the SIOP program model has a significantly better average in writing, oral language proficiency, and total English proficiency.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

In the analysis of the literature on ESL programs, the research benefits not only educators and school officials, but also policymakers in the evaluation of why specific ESL programs are beneficial in some cases, and other times not. Factors such as student diversity, lack of resources, limited research into effective program implementation, and insufficient instructor training play a role in the inadequacies of ESL program implementation. Likewise, the success of certain ESL programs can be attributed to components such as extensive instructor training and development, continued support and development of the specific ESL programs, improvement of the weaknesses of a program, local community and governance support, and programs developed with direct input from the local community members.

In this thesis, the methods of ESL instruction and how they best support English language learners have been evaluated. The analysis of the three case studies within the research has provided insight into what makes certain implementations effective, and what makes the programs less successful. Bilingual education, sheltered English immersion, and English immersion are most effective when teachers are provided with professional development and extensive training, district testing results are evaluated, and the testing results determine, in part, the district's curriculum and ESL program implementation. Due to the diverse populations of ELLs in the United States, it can be difficult to implement adequate programs. Many school districts lack the necessary resources to handle the needs of different levels of English proficiency and or native language backgrounds.

The first chapter begins by introducing the topic, and states the importance of the study as well as discussing the number of ELLs in the United States. In 2018, it was recorded that there are about 4.8 million students in schools who are considered to be ELLs. The high number of ELLs in the United States affects the learning outcomes for ELLs and it can also affect the policies put in place for all students. Another major issue with the ESL program implementations is that educational policies are often set in place without careful consideration of the highly diverse student needs in the United States.

In order to understand the need for examination of ESL instructional programming within the United States, I investigated the 3 commonly used frameworks for teaching ELLs. Bilingual education programs will present students with instruction in their native language and English. Sheltered English Instruction is an instructional approach, which is often used with ELLs above the beginner level as the students develop grade-level appropriate content-area knowledge, in order to increase academic skills, and to improve English proficiency. English immersion is a type of ESL program, which provides the student with a full day of English-only instruction, and students are placed in classes with both native English speakers and other ELLs.

In chapter 4, I discussed three separate examples of ESL program implementations. The examination of sheltered English immersion focused on a case study, which tracked the implementation of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model instruction and how it affected academic language performance in middle and high school ELLs. The students in the SIOP program outperformed the ELLs who were not in the SIOP program model. The case study in Arizona identifying a commonly used English immersion program, known as SEI has been successful because

of its state-wide support, annual professional development of the instructors and staff, the evaluation of student success on English proficiency tests. The study identified issues that stem from a vastly diverse population of students in the school districts in Arizona.

The bilingual educational case study identified that the best bilingual programs are built upon a well thought out pedagogy, stemming from philosophical frameworks, which are adapted specifically for academic settings. In the bilingual education case study example in Hawaii, the program has been successful due the continued development of new ways to improve faculty and instructor training, parent and community development, and government support for the program.

Each of the 3 case studies discussed (i.e., Hawaiian Language Immersion Program, SIOP implementation in New Jersey and Structured English Immersion (SEI) in Arizona) rely on careful planning in order to best suit the greatest number of students' academic needs, and each of the programs are evaluated after each school year.

After analyzing the literature of successful ESL programming in the United States, it can be said that a large majority of ESL programs do not meet the requirements of ELLs because the programs are not always implemented based on careful research of the particular needs of ELLs. Another major pitfall in the implementation of ESL programming is that resources are not always made available for the development of ESL programs, and even when the resources are available, they do not always meet the needs of most ELLs. Another finding is that policymakers do not necessarily have enough training in the field of educational and ELL pedagogy in order to ensure that the educational policies are keeping up with the growing needs of a diverse student population. It would be in the best interest of all states in the United States, and U.S

Territories to mandate a yearly check of not only the testing results of ELLs, but also teacher training and the effect program models can have on the development of English proficiency. If an issue with ELL proficiency arises in a district, that district could be investigated in order to provide the most efficient and necessary resources to best serve all students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, M., & Jones, K. (2006). Unmasking the Myths of Structured English Immersion: Why We Still Need Bilingual Educators, Native Language Instruction, and Incorporation of Home Culture. *The Radical Teacher*, (75), 16-21.
- Aguirre-Muñoz, Z., Park, J., Amabisca, A., & Boscardin, C. K. (2008). Developing teacher capacity for serving ELLs' writing instructional needs: A case for systemic functional linguistics. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 31(1), 295-322.
- ASHA Leader*, 21(6), 15.
- ASHA. Language Switching May Give Bilingual Children Problem-Solving Boost. (2018, April 12).
- Alba A. Ortiz & Maria E. Fránquiz (2019) Co-editors' introduction: Challenges to the success of English learners in the context of language instruction educational programs, *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42:1, 1-5, DOI: 10.1080/15235882.2019.1598213
- Aly, A. K., & Faten, A. Z. (2017). The impact of sheltered instruction observation protocol model on student teachers' teaching skills and self-efficacy. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(4), 704-714
- Baker, K. (1998). Structured English Immersion. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(3)199.
- Bangs, E.T. (2000). Who Should Decide What is Best for California's LEP Students? Proposition 227, Structural Equal Protection, and Local Decision- Making Power. *Berkeley La Raza Law Journal*, 11/12(2/1), 113.
- Barrow, L., & Markman-Pithers, L. (2016). Supporting Young English Learners in the United States. *Future of Children*, 26(2),159-183.

- Batalova, J., & Zong, J. (2017, March 8). Language Diversity and English Proficiency in the United States.
- Clark, K. (2009). The Case for Structured English Immersion. *National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition*.
- Cole, M. W. (2013). Rompiendo el silencio: Meta-analysis of the effectiveness of peer-mediated learning at improving language outcomes for ELLs. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36(2), 146-166. Developing ELL Programs: Glossary. (2018, September 26).
- Colorín Colorado. (2015, December 1). A Chronology of Federal Law and Policy Impacting Language Minority Students.
- Council for Exceptional Children. (2014, March). Differentiating Between Language Acquisition and Learning Disabilities with English Language Learners.
- Crosnoe, R., & Turley, R. N. L. (2011). K-12 educational outcomes of immigrant youth. Developing ELL Programs: Glossary. (2018, September 26).
- Dijk, M., Kroesbergen, E. H., Blom, E., & Leseman, P. P. M. (2018). Bilingualism and Creativity: Towards a Situated Cognition Approach. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 53(2), 178–188. doi: 10.1002/jocb.238
- Flood, J., & Lapp, D. (1996). Literacy instruction for students acquiring English: Moving beyond the immersion debate. *Reading Teacher*, 50(4), 356.
- Gamez, Perla B; Levine, Susan C. (2013). Oral language skills of Spanish-speaking English language learners: The impact of high-quality native language exposure. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 34(4), 673-696.

- Gass, S. and Madden, C. (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, pp. 235-256.
New York: Newbury House.
- Global Migration Map: Origins and Destinations, 1990-2017. (2018, February 28).
- Haas, E., & Gort, M. (2009). Demanding more: Legal standards and best practices for English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 32(2), 115-135.
- Hirschman, C. (2014). Immigration to the United States: Recent Trends and Future Prospects.
- Hommel, B., Colzato, L. S., Fischer, R., & Christoffels, I. K. (2011). Bilingualism and creativity: benefits in convergent thinking come with losses in divergent thinking. *Frontiers in psychology*, 2, 273.
- Kaufman, P., & Bradbury, D. (1992, August) Characteristics of At-Risk Students in NELS:88.
- Kharkhurin, A. V. (2008). The effect of linguistic proficiency, age of second language acquisition, and length of exposure to a new cultural environment on bilinguals' divergent thinking. *Bilingualism*, 11(2), 225-243.
- Lara-Alecio, R., Tong, F., Beverly, J. I., & Mathes, P. (2009). Teachers' pedagogical differences during ESL block among bilingual and English-immersion kindergarten classrooms in a randomized trial study. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 32(1), 77-100.
- Lyster R., & Ballinger, S. (2011). Content-based language teaching: Convergent concerns across divergent contexts. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(3), 279-288.
- MacSwan, J., Thompson, M. S., Rolstad, K., McAlister, K., & Lobo, G. (2017). Three

- theories of the effects of language education programs: An empirical evaluation of bilingual and English-only policies. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 218-240.
- Mize, K., & Dantas-Whitney, M. (2007). English language development in K-12 settings: Principles, cautions, and effective models. *ORTESOL Journal*, 25, 17-24.
- Nakamoto, Jonathan; Lindsey, Kim A; Manis, Franklin R. (2012) Development of reading skills from K-3 in Spanish-speaking English language learners following three programs of instruction. (2012). *Reading and Writing*, 25(2), 537-567.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) U.S. Department of Education. (2015).
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) U.S. Department of Education. (2018).
- Pacific Policy Research Center. (2010). *Successful Bilingual and Immersion Education Models/Programs*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Research & Evaluation Division.
- Pascopella, A. (2011). Successful Strategies for English Language Learners. *District Administration*, 47(2), 29-44.
- Reynolds-Young, D., & Hood, S. (2014). Balancing content & language in the english language development classroom. *ORTESOL Journal*, 31, 33-43.
- Rios-Aguilar, C., González, Canche, M., & Moll, L. C. (2010). Implementing^[P]_[SEP] Structured English Immersion in Arizona: Benefits, Costs, Challenges, and Opportunities. The Civil Rights Project.
- Rossell, C. (2004). Teaching English Through English. *Educational Leadership*, 62(4), 32–36.

- Scanlan, M. (2007). An Asset-Based Approach to Linguistic Diversity. *Education Faculty Research and Publications*, 7(3).
- Short, D., Fidelman, C., & Louguit, M. (2012). Developing Academic Language in English Language Learners Through Sheltered Instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(2), 334-361.
- Stephens, C., & Johnson, D.C. (2015). ‘Good teaching for all students?’: sheltered instruction programming in Washington state language policy. *Language & Education: An International Journal*, 29(1), 31-45.
- Swain, M. (1985) Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development.
- Takenaka, A. (2019, July 19). Secondary Migration: Who Re-Migrates and Why These Migrants Matter.
- Tamer, M. (2014, December 11). The Education of Immigrant Children. U.S. Immigration Trends. (2019, October 18).
- The Education Alliance. Brown University. (2019).
- Wiley, T. G., Lee, J. S., & Rumberger, R. W. (2009). *The education of language minority immigrants in the United States*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.