

A Study of the English Language Learner (ELL) Program
Wapato High School, Wapato, Washington

A Special Project

Presented to

Dr. Jack McPherson

Heritage University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree of

Master of Education in Professional Studies in Teaching and Learning,

Maria Dolores Flores

Spring, 2008

FACULTY APPROVAL

A Study of the English Language Learner (ELL) Program
Wapato High School, Wapato, Washington

Approved for the Faculty

_____, Faculty Advisor

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this quantitative research study was to determine the extent to which students enrolled in the ELL class at WSH who have used selected instructional strategies have improved their English language skills. To accomplish this purpose, a review of related literature was conducted. Additionally, participating students were administered a pre-test to posttest, and final exam to obtain essential baseline to determine each data students' reading ability and how much English they already knew. Students were subsequently administered a posttest and final exam to measure growth in English language skills over the course of the school year and to formulate related conclusions and recommendations.

Data analyzed supported the hypothesis that English Language Learners that were taught using selected instructional strategies will improve their English Language skills as measured by the CORE Reading Assessment Profile and adapted to measure students' reading levels.

PERMISSION TO STORE

I, Maria Dolores Flores, do hereby irrevocably consent and authorize Heritage University Library to file the attached Special Project entitled, A Study of the English Language Learner (ELL) Program Wapato High School, Wapato, Washington and make such paper available for the use, circulation, and/or reproduction by the Library. The paper may be used at Heritage University Library and all site locations.

I state at this time the contents of this paper are my work and completely original unless properly attributed and/or used with permission.

I understand that after three years the paper will be retired from the Heritage University Library. If I choose, it is my responsibility to retrieve the paper at that time. If the paper is not retrieved, Heritage University may dispose of it.

_____, Author

_____, Date

TABLE OF CONTENTES

	Page
FACULTY APPROVAL	ii
ABSTRACTiii
PERMISSION TO STORE	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER 1	1
Introduction	1
Background for the Project	1
Statement of the Problem	8
Purpose of the Project	9
Delimitations	10
Assumptions	11
Hypothesis	12
Significance of the Project	12
Procedure	13
Definition of Terms	14
Acronyms	15

CHAPTER 2	17
Review of Selected Literature17
Introduction	17
The Stages of Second Language Acquisition	17
The Difference Between ELL, ELL and Monolingual Students	19
English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education in the Secondary Classroom	19
Summary	26
CHAPTER 3	28
Methodology and Treatment of Data	28
Introduction	28
Methodology	29
Participants29
Instruments	30
Design30
Procedure	30
Treatment of the Data	32
Summary	32

CHAPTER 4	33
Analysis of the Data	33
Introduction	33
Description of the Environment	33
Hypothesis	34
Results of the Study	35
Findings	44
Discussion	44
Summary	45
CHAPTER 5	46
Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations	46
Summary	46
Conclusions	47
Recommendations	47
REFERENCES	50

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Background for the Project

According to the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (1997), there were approximately 3.5 million English Language Learners (ELL) enrolled in both public and private schools in the United States, and the number has continued to increase each year. Similarly, each year at Wapato High School (WHS), the number of ELL students has also increased. These students often find themselves unprepared for the new language, the new country, the new culture, the new academic requirement, the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL), and the challenging social climate. These ELLs have enrolled in high school with a wide range of L1 (native language) and L2 (second language) literacy habits and skills. Some have good academic skills. Some students have mastered few or none of these skills.

Adjusting to a new country has presented many students with a variety of environmental problems. Many students have found themselves struggling, because the academic literacy demands of a standards-based curriculum exceeded their level of literacy development. Across the U. S., strong evidence has confirmed that ELLs fared poorly, dropped out of school or finished unprepared for the workforce or post-secondary study. According to

Effective Practices for Hispanic Students in Washington State, “LEP students tend to have lower levels of academic performance in math and reading, higher rates of retention in grade level, and much higher dropout rates than their English-fluent peers” (2003, p. 2).

Due to the high number of ELL students, WHS has struggled to move ahead. The school has been placed on School Improvement Status due to its low WASL scores. Content-area teachers have been given responsibility for teaching English language skills, as well as improving the academic literacy development of all of their students within the context of the content-area classroom. However, many content-area teachers have received little training in how to support ELLs in general or how to support their content-area learning and literacy development. Meltzer & Hamann (2004) stated that “mainstream teachers of ELLs need professional development in the area of second language acquisition and literacy development particularly with reference to how they can most productively respond to ELLs as they gain proficiency with academic English” (p. 29). Teachers and administrators have attended workshops and seminars outside and inside the school district to increase student achievement, and all teachers have received information about math and reading and writing expectations, and have been expected to incorporate this information into content lessons. In particular, the WHS administration has been looking for ways to train teachers in strategies for ELL students by implementing various

types of professional development both in Wapato and at other locations, including teacher workshops and in-class modeling.

Recent legislation characterized by The No Child Left Behind Act, has affected ELL students, who were required achieve the same academic standards as non-ELL students. Schools have been required to establish a plan to help students succeed in school in “English speaking, reading, writing, and listening proficiency” (Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, p. 11). Teachers and school administrators could no longer look the other way as ELL students fared poorly, dropped out of school or finished unprepared for the workforce or post-secondary study. Because of demographic changes, WHS developed an English Second Language Program (ESLP), recognizing that “ESL students at the post-secondary level often have taken ESL classes to meet institutional standards for English language proficiency before they can become fully matriculated into the academic mainstream” (Jiang-Kuehn, p.653).

The ESLP at Wapato High School has been designed to help welcome students to a new country and to prepare them for such requirements as the WASL, as well as to acculturate them to their new environment, improve their academic literacy development, and teach the new language and keep them on track to graduate. Currently, WHS has a classroom for students who are in the process of acquiring English as a Second Language (ESL), in which they must be given opportunities to demonstrate their growing skills on authentic tasks

and in a non-stressful environment. ELL students receive two hundred minutes of instruction each week.

Many instructional strategies have been used by ELL teachers. These have included Read-Aloud Plus Extension Activities, which involve the teacher reading a text aloud to students while adding visual support. The Reciprocal Teaching strategy has required students to take turns teaching small sections of text. This program has supported student learning in several ways. For example, the use of key vocabulary in explaining concepts has been required. The program has encouraged collaboration in the group in making sure that each student fully understands the lesson. Reciprocal Teaching has proven adaptive for ELL students. Students can draw pictures, point, or read aloud from the text to answer questions. The Dictogloss is a strategy that has improved listening and oral communication skills. The Syntax Surgery strategy has allowed students to see the relationships between elements within a sentence that may be confusing to understand. The imaging strategy has encouraged students to create an image in their minds to support understanding. English instruction has increased as students gain English language competency.

(McCloskey & Stack)

Reading instruction strategies have typically included the five components of reading: vocabulary, phonics awareness, phonics, fluency, and comprehension. The ELL curricula used at WHS has included Visions: The Basic Language and Literacy (VBLL) program, which has provided support

for students with little or no knowledge of written English. Students have progressed from letter recognition and formation and phonics/phonemic awareness to vocabulary building and reading and writing. In Content Levels A, B, and C of the VBLL, students learn and practice skills and strategies to meet grade-level standards and to achieve academic success. The VBLL language development program has supported students at four levels, from pre-literacy until they transition into the mainstream classroom.(Korey & Newman)

Wapato High School has six Spanish monolingual students who have been placed in the appropriate level of ESL. The classroom consisted of students whose English language skills ranged from monolingual Spanish speakers to students who had received about three years of English instruction. Students were pre-tested when the school year started or when they arrived from their home country. Students were also administered a mid-year test at the end of the first semester and (post- tested) at the end of the second semester. During the first classroom period, the teacher worked with five monolingual ELL students who were at Level One in English literacy skills. During the third classroom period, the teacher worked with sixteen ELL students in language arts. During the fifth classroom period, the teacher worked with sixteen ELL students in language arts. These ELLs were taught in English or Spanish, depending on the instructional placement. This meant that students who were beginning to learn English

were provided much support in relating English to Spanish. Students who were placed in a more advanced level of instruction were taught mostly in English. They received help in Spanish only when they did not understand. During the fifth classroom period, students were enrolled in the program called the Rosetta Stone Program. This program has been used to transition students as quickly as possible into English-language instruction. This ESL program has represented a significant cost to the high school, both in terms of financial resources and lost instruction time. However, these costs will be offset by the benefits to students at WHS. The goal of researcher Maria Dolores Flores was to determine if the ELL program at WHS has benefited participating students.

Statement of the Problem

Wapato High School's teachers and administrators have expressed concern over the low WASL scores for all students, including ELL students who have been placed in the ELL program. Low WASL scores have resulted in the school being placed on School Improvement Status (SIS). WHS has a significant Hispanic population which has increased each year. Many incoming ELLs cannot speak, read, or write English well enough to participate in mainstream classes. They have been at risk of failing classes when they were enrolled in the mainstream classroom with their limited English language skills. This problem was noticed by the district administration, which attempted to alleviate this problem. Phrased as a

question, the problem which represented the focus of the present study may be stated as follows: To what extent did students enrolled in the ELL class at WHS improve their English language skills?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative research study was to determine the extent to which students enrolled in the ELL class at WSH who have used selected instructional strategies have improved their English language skills. To accomplish this purpose, a review of related literature was conducted. Additionally, participating students were administered a pre-test, posttest, and final exam to obtain essential baseline to determine each data students' reading ability and how much English they already knew. Students were subsequently administered a posttest and final exam to measure growth in English language skills over the course of the school year and to formulate related conclusions and recommendations.

Delimitations

The present study was conducted in the Wapato School District (WSD) at WHS during the 2007-2008 school year. The study involved six ELL students spanning ninth-through twelfth-grades. Students were instructed using selected ELL strategies. The classroom consisted of students that had received about three years of English language instruction. Students were pre-tested when the year started or when they arrived from their home

country. Students were also administered a mid-year test at the end of the first semester and a posttest at the end of the second semester.

According to the district web site, the student population in the WSD averaged 23.2 percent Transitional Bilingual; 24.1 percent migrant students, 65.8 percent Hispanic; 25.9 percent Native American; 6.0 percent White; 1.9 percent Asian; and 0.2 percent African-American enrolled in. The special education population was 12.8 percent, while the number of students on the Free/

Reduced lunch program was 23.2 percent (OSPI, 2006).

Assumptions

The researcher (Maria Dolores Flores) believed that given the proper conditions in a classroom or school setting, ELL's could be successful and would give their best effort to learn another language and successfully transition to English-only instruction in content-area classrooms. The researcher further assumed that ELL students were motivated to learn English and to engage with academic texts written in English through reading, writing, listening, speaking, and thinking. The researcher also believed that participating students were capable of and willing to learn English. This approach was consistent with research conducted by Meltzer & Hamann (2004), which asserted that, "Teachers can engage ELLs with content-related

texts, including advanced texts, by using a variety of strategies to activate background knowledge” (p. 21).

Hypothesis

English Language Learner’s that were taught using selected instructional strategies will improve their English language skills as measured by the *CORE Reading Assessment Profile and adapted* to measure students’ reading levels.

Significance of the Project

The present study sought to determine what effect the ESL program at WHS had on participating students learning English who were enrolled and whether these students could successfully transition to English instruction in the mainstream classroom. Because the instruction of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation set higher academic standards for school districts, schools were required to meet minimum levels of performance set forth by the state and to make Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years. These requirements have affected ELL students who were required to achieve the same academic standards as non-ELL students. Wapato High School has 23.2 percent Transitional Bilingual Students who have difficulty understanding learning concepts introduced in mainstream classes. This research study has the potential to provide the WHS administration and the Bilingual Education faculty with data and information needed to demonstrate

the effectiveness of the ELL program, as well as to provide recommendations regarding continuation of this program.

Procedure

Procedures employed in the preset study evolved in several stages as follows:

1. In September, 2007, during fall semester 2007, the writer (Maria Dolores Flores) engaged in conversation with WHS administration and the school district Direct of Bilingual Education to gain insight into the presumed success of the ELL program. At that time, the researcher was encouraged to undertake the present study.

2. The WSD School Bilingual Record Clerk then tested new monolingual, Spanish speaking students to see if they qualified for placement in the ESL program.

3. In September, 2007, the ELL teacher (Maria Dolores Flores) administered a pre-test to determine students' ability and to determine how much English they already knew.

4. Following the pre-test, the ELL teacher selected appropriate reading materials and strategies needed to instruct ELL students.

5. In January, 2008 at the end of the first semester, students were posttested to measure growth over the semester and to determine how much gain in English proficiency they had acquired.

6. At the end of the second, semester April, 2008, students were administered a final test to measure growth over the course of the year and to determine growth in English language skills.
7. During spring semester 2008 essential baseline data were obtained and analyzed, and related inferences, conclusion, and recommendations were formulated.

Definition of Terms Significant terms used in the context of the present study have been defined as follows:

Bilingual: Refers to teachers or students that speak both English and Spanish.

English as a Second Language: Students that demonstrated ability to speak English as a second language.

Limited English Proficiency: Term used to identify students that entered the United States with limited English proficiency.

Monolingual Student: Students who speak only Spanish as their first language.

Native Speaker: People who used a foreign, non-English language as their first language.

Quantitative Research: The collection of numerical data in order to explain, predict and/or control phenomena of interest.

Acronyms

ARI. Assessment Reading Inventory

- AYP. Annual Year Progress
- AS. Alphabet Skills
- BLLP. Basic Language and Literacy Program
- CALP. Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency
- CORE. Consortium on Reading Excellence
- CORS Classroom Observation Rating Schedule
- DEOCR. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights
- ELL. English Language Learners
- ESL. English as a Second Language
- ESLP: English Second Language Program
- ESCB. Embedded Sound of Consonant Blend
- FS. Final Sound
- FSCB. First Sound of a Consonant Blend
- GLE. Grade-Level Equivalent
- IS. Initial sound
- L1. Student's native or primary language
- L2. Student's second language
- NCLB. The No Child Left Behind Act enacted in 2002
0. NON-English Language Skills
- OSPL. Office of Superintendent of Public

Instruction

P. Primer

PP. Pre-primer

RDS. Reading Decoding Skills

SIS. School Improvement Status

SN. Student number

SNLS. Spanish Native Language Speakers

SS. Spelling Skills

SW. Sentences into Words

VBLL: Visions: The Basic Language and Literacy

WASL. Washington Assessment of Student Learning

WHS. Wapato High School

WLPT. Washington Language Proficiency Test

WS. Words into Syllables

WP. Words into phonemes

WSD. Wapato School District

CHAPTER 2

Review of Selected Literature

Introduction

The review of selected literature present in Chapter 2 has been organized to address for the following research topics:

1. The Stages of Second Language Acquisition.
2. The Difference between ELL, ESL, and Monolingual Students.
3. English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education in the Secondary Classroom.
4. Summary.

The preponderance of research cited in Chapter 2 was current within the past five years. Key resources utilized included Education Resources Information

Center (ERIC), the internet and information obtained from a hand-search of selected material was also incorporated.

The Stages of Second Language Acquisition.

According to Krashen & Terrel (1983), many people have seen how children learn to speak and understand their first language. Although humans evolve through several stages of development from birth to adulthood, specific knowledge of how humans acquire language remains limited. These authorities identified five levels of language acquisition. During the first level from of zero to six months, the teacher will not hear students speaking English. At the Second level, from six months to one year, students begin using single words or two word responses but have limited comprehension of English. At the third Speech Emergence level from one to three years, students are able to speak using simple sentences. At the fourth Intermediate Fluency level, from three years to five years, students can use sentences of increasing length and complexity. At the fifth Advanced Fluency level, from five to seven years, students have gained an acceptable command of English academic language. Although facility takes at last five to seven years to develop, it can take longer for a student who was not literate in his/her primary language when they enrolled in an American Public School.

The Difference Between ELL, ESL and Monolingual Students.

According to the U. S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (DEOCR,1999) English Language Learner (ELL) referred to a national-origin-minority student who was limited English proficient. This term was preferred over Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) as it highlights accomplishments rather than deficits. The DEOCR has also explained the English as Second Language (ESL) is a program of techniques, methodologies and special curriculum designed to teach ELL students English language skills, which may include listening, speaking, reading, writing, study skills, content vocabulary, and cultural orientation. ESL instruction has typically been presented in English with little use of students' native language or monolingual people who speak only one language.

English as a Second Language and Bilingual

Education in the Secondary Classroom.

Walker et al. (1990) described how student learning improved under two conditions when it was made to seem worthwhile and when the students were expected to be able to read. These researchers investigated how monolingual and bilingual classroom teachers used specific strategies to teach students. For example, instructional processes in secondary bilingual classrooms were studied to determine if secondary bilingual programs provided more opportunities for higher level thinking than in elementary bilingual classrooms. These authorities previously concluded that “instruction in bilingual classrooms tends to focus on low level thinking skills rather than challenging

students” (p. 3). This methodology sought to compare instruction in bilingual (Spanish/English) classrooms with English-only classrooms in all secondary schools in a midurban Texas school district. Classroom observation was used to assess teacher and student behavior using the Classroom Observation Rating Schedule (CORS). Using CORS, researchers were able to measure several major constructs including:

- (a) Classroom Instruction.
- (b) Instructional Activities.
- (c) Instructional Material.
- (d) Instructional Activities.
- (e) Classroom Management.
- (f) Content Focus.
- (g) Teacher Questioning.
- (h) Emphasis on Higher-level Thinking.
- (i) Teacher Feedback.
- (j) Student Engaged Time.
- (k) Small-Group Behavior.
- (l) Classroom Environment.
- (m) Student Interaction (p. 7).

The CORE Reading Assessment Profile was completed after each 45-50 minute observation period. For each item measured there were significant differences between the two groups evaluated. The researchers concluded: Bilingual classrooms are not any more conducive to building communicative competence and higher level thinking than regular classrooms. The one positive finding in this study was that the experimental teachers used significantly more small group work. Small group work is recommended for all language teaching because it allows more opportunities for peer interaction and authentic language use” (p.9).

Hill & Flynn (2006) described the technique of using similarities and differences when teaching ELL students. When teachers use this approach they are helping students “to learn at a deeper level” (p. 101). That is, when students use this technique they are using what they already know and making new connections with what they are learning so that it makes more sense, there-by giving logical support to what they are learning. These researchers offered four suggestions, as paraphrased below, to enhance the technique of using similarities and differences to increase students’ knowledge:

1. Teacher-directed activities can deepen understanding for students and increase their ability to use knowledge. The teacher provides explicit directions on how to see similarities and differences which allow students to have the ability to use their understanding through study and experience linguistically

and nonlinguistically. Some approaches that an instructor teaching ELL's could use to identify similarities and differences include:

- Represent what you say with visuals.
- Use short, simple sentences with clear articulation.
- Include gestures and facial expression.
- Use high-frequency vocabulary and remember
- that nouns are better than pronouns.
- Reduce idiomatic expressions.

2. Students should independently identify similarities and differences to compare and contrast topics they are already familiar with. For example, by using clothes, movies, etc., the teacher can work with students to discover more comparisons and contrasts, and to make better connections between teacher-directed and student-directed activities. Comparing items that are familiar can prove helpful because they are here and now. English Language Learner's context-embedded clues can also benefit ELL's by increasing their vocabulary. When students are familiar with describing items that are related to their background, they are more successful. Their ability to find similarities and differences will

increase their understanding and will increase academic skill levels. Hill & Flynn concluded that the reason many ELL's do not develop strong academic skills was because much of their initial instruction took place in cognitively demanding, context-reduced situations that were inappropriate for the early stages of language acquisitions.

3. When students represent similarities and differences in graphic or symbolic form, their ability to identify and to understand similarities and differences are enhanced. This means ELLs students need a lot of “graphic or symbolic” visual representation. This helps them to make connections and it makes things a lot easier to understand, because the teacher has modeled how to compare and contrast before student write.

4. There are four different forms of identifying similarities and differences: Comparing, classifying, creating analogies, and creating metaphors. In each of these forms, the teacher helps student to perform at their current level of English ability and to build basic vocabulary in different categories. For example, developing color words and words to describe size, shape function. The teacher may also model for students and encourage them to use their vocabulary.

Hill & Flynn concluded that “identifying similarities and differences allows ELL's rich opportunities to develop their second language” (p. 109). The ELL teacher needs to take time to first teach students verbal skills before moving them into written forms of comparing and contrasting items.

Scholastic Website included an article entitled “5 Surefire Strategies for Developing Reading Fluency,” by Lisa Blau. This authority wrote about fluency, which consisted of five strategies for developing reading fluency. This report showed that 45 percent of all fourth graders tested in the United States are not fluent readers. “One definition of fluency is the ability to read aloud expressively and with understanding” (p.1).

The Modeling Fluent Reading program has been used to promote phrased reading in class and to enlist reading tutors to help second through fifth-graders make progress in reading. Modeling Fluent Reading emphasized reading with aloud expression aloud to the students. Doing this has exposed students to a variety of genres such as poetry, folk and fairy tales. Following a good model to read-aloud, the teacher will question students about they are reading. Doing repeated reading in class means having students practice reading. Rereading short passages aloud is one of the best ways to promote fluency. Promoting phrased reading in class has involved reading phrases seamlessly, as opposed to word-by-word. The poems are one of the reading strategies used to help students read phrases better. Enlisting the help of a tutor has also provided support for nonfluent readers. Tutors may be parents, volunteers, or older students, who can provide positive feedback when the reader reads well, and by rereading passages when he/she struggles. Organizing a reader’s theater in class has allowed for reading of scripts. This has proven one of the best ways to

promote fluency because it focuses on interpreting the script rather than memorizing (p. 1-3).

Summary

The review of selected literature present in Chapter 2 supported the following research themes:

1. Human language acquisition evolves through several stages of development, from birth to adulthood.
2. English Language Learner (ELL) refers a national-origin-minority students who is limited English proficient, whereas English as a Second Language (ESL) is a special curriculum designed to teach ELL students English Language skills.
3. The secondary ELL teacher needs to take time to first teach students verbal skills before moving them into written forms of comparing and contrasting items.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology and Treatment of Data

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative research study was to determine the extent to which students enrolled in the ELL class at WSH who have used selected instructional strategies have improved their English language skills. To accomplish this purpose, a review of related literature was conducted. Additionally, participating students were administered a pre-test, posttest, and final exam to obtain essential baseline to determine each data students' reading ability and how much English they already knew. Students were subsequently administered a posttest and final exam to measure growth in English language skills over the course of the school year and to formulate related conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter 3 contains a description of the methodology employed in the study. Information describing the participants, instruments and design used, procedures, and treatment of the data, a summary was also provided.

Methodology

The present quantitative research study involved collecting numerical data to determine the extent to which students enrolled in an ELL class at Wapato High

School used selected instructional strategies to improve their English Language skills. The study involved WHS students who were in the process of acquiring English as a Second Language. The Consortium on Reading Excellence (CORE) Reading Assessment Profile was used to allow students to demonstrate their language skills. This assessment method uses multiple tests to measure students' reading levels. The research was conducted during the 2007-2008 school year.

Participants

Participants involved in the study included six monolingual, Spanish speaking students. The sample population included three females and three males enrolled in the researcher's Spanish Native Language Speakers (SNLS) 9th, 10th, and 11th grade classes at WHS. One girl from grade 9, one girl and three boys from 10th grade and one girl from grade 11 participated. The classroom consisted of ELL students whose English language skills were minimal. All students were of Hispanic background who came from Mexico.

Instruments

Data were collected and analyzed using scores gathered from the CORE Reading Assessment Profile. This Assessment was used to measure students' English language proficiency and to ensure proper reading-level placement. This profile also provided valuable feedback for teachers needed to refine curricular and instructional approaches.

Design

The design of the study focused on the reading scores students earned on the CORE Reading Assessment Profile. *The researcher* used pre-test and a posttest to measure the extent to which students' grade-levels in English language proficiency showed improvement. English language skills assessed included phonological awareness, decoding and word attack, and comprehension.

Procedure

During fall semester 2007, the writer (Maria Dolores Flores) engaged in conversation with WHS administration and the school district Director of Bilingual Education to gain insight into the presumed effectiveness of the ELL program. At that time, the researcher was encouraged to undertake the present study. The WSD School Bilingual Records Clerk tested new monolingual Spanish speaking students to determine whether they qualified for placement in the ESL program. In September, 2007, the ELL teacher (Maria Dolores Flores) administered a pre-test to determine students' reading ability and to determine how much English they already knew. Following the pre-test, the ELL teacher selected appropriate reading materials and strategies needed to instruct ELL students. In January, 2008, at the end of the first semester, students were posttested to measure growth over the semester and to measure any gains in English proficiency. At the end of the second semester April, 2008, students were administered a final exam to measure growth over the course of the year and to determine growth in English language skills.

Treatment of the Data

Data obtained for purposes of analysis included pre-and posttest scores which measured specific language skills critical to successful reading. English language skills assessed included phonological awareness, decoding and word attack and comprehension. Results were then analyzed by comparing pre and posttest results to measure determine if the extent of English language improvement.

Summary

Chapter 3 provided a description of the research methodology employed in the study, participants, instruments used, research design, and procedure utilized. Details concerning treatment of the data obtained and analyzed were also presented.

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of the Data

Introduction

The present quantitative research study sought to determine the extent to which students enrolled in the researcher's Spanish Native Language Speakers (SNLS) class at Wapato High School (WHS) improved their English Language

skills. Pre-tests, posttests, and a final exam administered from September 2007, to April 2008, provided essential baseline data to determine progress of participating students.

Description of the Environment

Conducted at WHS in Wapato, Washington, the study included three females and three males enrolled in the researcher's ELL (i.e. SNLS) 9th, 10th, and 11th grade classes. One girl from grade 9, one girl and three boys from 10th grade and one girl from grade 11 participated. The classroom consisted of ELL students whose English language skills were minimal. All students were of Hispanic background who came from Mexico.

Hypothesis

English Language Learners that were taught using selected instructional strategies will improve their English language skills as measured by the CORE Reading Assessment Profile and adapted to measure students' reading levels.

Results of the Study

As indicated in Table I-A, all six participating students scored a Grade-Level Equivalent (GLE) of "0" (Non-English speaking) on the CORE Reading Assessment Profile pre-test for *phoneme deletion*, administered in September, 2007. These clearly evidenced an absence of English language skills of these students from Hispanics background who came from Mexico.

However, Table 1-A, has also illustrated that at the end of the first semester, January, 2008, all six students had made progress in phoneme deletion. Two students were now performing at kindergarten GLE and three students had now reached 2nd GLE.

Finally, Table 1-A, indicated that over the course of the entire school year, from September 2007 to April 2008, five of six students (i.e., 83.4 %) had reached the 3rd GLE in phoneme deletion.

Table 1-A

CORE Reading Assessment Profile, Pre-and Posttest Results, Phonological Awareness (Phoneme Deletion)

SN	Pre-Test GLE (Phoneme Deletion) September, 2007					Posttest GLE (Phoneme Deletion) January, 2008					Final Exam GLE (Phoneme Deletion) April, 2008				
	IS	FS	FSCB	ESC B	GLE	IS	FS	FSCB	ESC B	GLE	IS	FS	FSCB	ESC B	GLE
1	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	2	1st	5	4	5	5	3rd
2	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	0	1st	5	5	4	4	3rd
3	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	K	5	4	2	2	2nd
4	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	K	5	5	3	3	3rd
5	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	1	2nd	5	5	2	2	3rd
6	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	1	1st	5	5	1	1	3rd

CODE KEY:

SN = Student Number

IS = Initial Sound

FS = Final Sound

FSCB = First Sound of a Consonant Blend

ESCB = Embedded Sound of Consonant Blend

GLE = Grade-Level Equivalent (Phonological Awareness/
Phoneme Deletion):

0 = Non-English Language Skills

1-6 = GLE Grade K

7-10 = GLE 1st grade

11-14 = GLE 2nd grade

15-20 = GLE 3rd grade

Table 1-B

CORE Reading Assessment Profile Pre-and Posttest Results Phonological Awareness(Phonological Segmentation)

SN	Pre-Test GLE (Phonological Segmentation) September, 2007				Posttest GLE (Phonological Segmentation) January, 2008				Final Exam GLE (Phonological Segmentation) April, 2008			
	S W	W S	WP	GLE	SW	W S	W P	GLE	SW	W S	WP	GLE
1	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	K	5	5	1	1 st
2	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	K	5	2	1	1 st
3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	K	5	5	2	1 st
4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	K	3	1	1	K
5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	K	1	1	1	K
6	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	K	5	3	1	1 st

CODE KEY:**SN** = Student Number**SW** = sentences into words**WS** = words into syllables**WP** = words into phonemes**GLE**= Grade-Level Equivalent(Phonological Segmentation)

0 = Non-English Language Skills

1-6 = GLE Grade K

7-10 = GLE 1st grade11-14 = GLE 2nd grade15-20 = GLE 3rd grade

As shown in Table 1-B on the CORE Reading Assessment Profile pre-test for *phonological segmentation*, all six participants (100%) demonstrated improvement over the course of the year, from scores of “0” (Non-English speaking) on the September 2007, pre-test. Final exam scores recorded in April 2008 indicated three (3) students had advanced to kindergarten GLE, and three (3) students were performing at 1st GLE.

Results of the three Decoding and Word Attack exams illustrated in Tables 2 A, B, and C (i.e. CORE Phonics Survey; San Diego Quick Assessment of Reading Ability, and Fry Oral Reading Test) are mastery test. Table 2 has provided a summary of student pretest, posttest, and final grade results for each of these exams.

As indicated in Table 2-A, all six students scored an “O” (Non-English language) on the CORE Phonics Survey which focused on Alphabet Skill (AS), Reading Decoding

Skills (RDS), and Spelling Skills (SS). Again, these low pre-test scores reflected students limited English language ability resulting from their immigrant background.

Table 2-A

Decoding and Word Attack Skills, CORE Phonics Survey, Pre-test, Posttest, and Final Exam Results

S N	Pre-Test Scores CORE Phonics Survey September, 2007			Posttest Scores CORE Phonics Survey January, 2008			Final Scores CORE Phonics Survey April, 2008		
	AS	RDS	SS	AS	RDS	SS	AS	RDS	SS
	85/85	94/94	20/20	85/85	94/94	20/20	85/85	94/94	20/20
1	0	0	0	40	69	7	81	80	9
2	0	0	0	35	62	9	77	71	12
3	0	0	0	55	45	6	80	62	12
4	0	0	0	75	55	13	85	69	15
5	0	0	0	65	67	6	79	72	9
6	0	0	0	55	55	9	74	65	13

CODE KEY: CORE Phonics Survey

SN = Student Number

0 = Non-English Language Skills

AS = Alphabet Skills, 85 possible points

RDS = Reading Decoding Skills, 90 possible points

SS = Spelling Skills, 20 Possible Points

What Scores Mean; A student who misses *two or more items* would benefit for more direct instruction in the indicated element.

Table 2-B**Decoding and word Attack Skills, San Diego Quick Assessment of Reading Ability, Pre-Test, Posttest and Final Exam Results**

S N	Pre-Test GLE September, 2007					Posttest GLE January, 2008					Final Exam GLE April, 2008				
	PP	P	1st	2nd	3 rd	PP	P	1st	2nd	3 rd	PP	P	1st	2nd	3 rd
1	0	0	0						2nd					Ind.	
2	0	0	0				P						Ind.		
3	0	0	0				P							Ind.	
4	0	0	0			PP							Ind.		
5	0	0	0					1st						Ind.	
6	0	0	0					1st						Ind.	

CODE KEY:**SN = Student Number****PP = Pre-primer****P = Primer****GLE: Reading Ability**

1 Error Independent Level, Grade Level 3 and above

2 Errors Instructional Level, Grade Level 2

3 Errors, Frustration Level, Grade Level 1

0 = Non-English Language Skills

Table 2-C**Decoding and word Attack Skills, Fry Oral Reading Test, Pre-Test, Posttest and Final Exam Results**

S N	Pre-Test GLE September, 2007					Posttest GLE January, 2008					Final GLE April, 2008				
	1-A	1-B	2-A	2-B	3 rd	1-A	1-B	2-A	2-B	3 rd	1-A	1-B	2-A	2-B	3 rd
1						Ind								Ind	
2						Ind					Ind				
3						Ind						Ind			
4						Ind								Ind	
5						Ind								Ind	
6						Ind							Ind		

CODE KEY:

SN = Student Number

1-A and 1-B = First Grade**2-A and 2-b = Second Grade****3rd = Third Grade****GLE:** Reading Ability

1 Error Independent Level, Grade Level 3 and above

2 Errors Instructional Level, Grade Level 2

3 Errors, Frustration Level, Grade Level 1

0 = Non-English Language Skills

Table 2-A also indicated that all student posttest scores for AS, RDS, had improved as follows: of 85 possible points, students scores ranged from 35-75; of 90 possible RDS points, students scores were in the 45-69 ranged, and, of 20 possible SS points, student scores of 6-13 were recorded.

Data presented in Table 2-A also detail progress made by the six participants over the 9-month school year as follows: of 85 possible as points, the range of student scores improved to 74-81; RDS scores (90 possible points) improved to 71-80; and, SS scores (20 possible points) improved to 9-15.

Similar to results reported in Table 1, Table 2-A confirmed that all six participating students (100%) improved their literacy skills in the areas of AS, RDS, and SS.

Table 2-B has provided a summary of student performance on the San Diego Quick Assessment or Reading Ability. Significantly, from pre-test (September, 2007) to final exam (April, 2008) all six participating students (100 %) progressed from “0” (Non-English Language) to an “Independent” level of reading ability. Specifically, four students had now reached Grade-Level 2, and two students were reading at Grade-Level 1.

As indicated in Table 2-C, all six participants (100 %) progressed from a non-English language level on the pre-test, to an independent reading level when the final exam was administered 8 months later (i.e., April, 2008). Three students were then reading at Grade-Level 2-B; and, three students were reading at Grade-Level 1-A, 1-B, or 2-A.

Table 3 has provided a summary of participants CORE Reading Assessment Profile *Comprehension* scores, from September 2007 pre-test to Final exam, April 2008. From pre-test scores of “0” (Non-English Speaking), through the January, 2007 posttest and final exam administered in April 2008, five (5) participating students (83.4%) made significant progress in comprehension and were reading at or above grade level (i.e., 1st, 2nd, or 3rd GLE). Only one (1) student (16.6%) was reading below grade level.

Findings

An analysis of data presented in Tables 1,2, and 3 has provided a convincing argument from which the researcher concluded that the hypothesis of the study was supported (i.e., ELL’s taught using selected instructional strategies will improve their English

Table 3

CORE Reading Assessment Profile, Comprehension, Pre-Test, Posttest, and Final Exam Scores, 2007-2008

S N	Pre-Test Scores Comprehension September, 2007					Posttest Scores Comprehension January, 2008					Final Exam Scores Comprehension April, 2008				
	1st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	GRAD E	1st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	GRADE	1st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	GRADE
1	0				BELO W	2				BELOW	4				1st
2	0				BELO W	0				BELOW	2				BELOW
3	0				BELO W	5				1st			23		3rd
4	0				BELO W	4				1st		11			2nd
5	0				BELO W	3				BELOW		8			2nd
6	0				BELO W	2				BELOW		9			2nd

CODE KEY:

1st = Grade 1

2nd = Grade 2

3rd = Grade 3

4th = Grade 4

What Score Mean; Comprehension

0 = Non English Language Skills

1-4 Grade 1 and below

5-8 Grade 2, Early

9-14 Grade 2, Mastery

15-20 Grade 3, Early

21-25 Grade 3, Mastery

language skills as measured by the CORE Reading Assessment Profile and adapted to measure students' reading levels.)

Discussion

Data produced by the study corroborated the researcher's belief that ELL students needed to learn vowels, consonant relationships, and alphabet letter recognition sounds. Additionally, they must learn to use the five components of reading, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. These literacy skills are essential for providing foundation for long-term academic outcomes and success in the classroom.

The researcher concluded that The Basic Language and Literacy Program (BLLP) taught in combination with the CORE Reading Assessment Profile were of great benefit to the beginning reader. The writer will continue providing intensive phonemic awareness instruction until students reach third or fourth reading GLE necessary for success in later mainstream reading and other academic disciplines.

Summary

Chapter 4 included a discussion of the environment, hypothesis, results of the study, findings, and discussion. Data analyzed supported the hypothesis that English Language Learners taught using selected instructional strategies will improve their English Language skills as measured by the CORE Reading Assessment Profile and adapted to measure students' reading levels.

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this quantitative research study was to determine the extent to which students enrolled in the ELL class at WSH who have used selected instructional strategies have improved their English language skills. To accomplish this purpose, a review of related literature was conducted. Additionally, participating students were administered a pre-test, posttest, and final exam to obtain essential baseline to determine each data students' reading ability and how much English they already knew. Students were subsequently

administered a posttest and final exam to measure growth in English language skills over the course of the school year and to formulate related conclusions and recommendations.

Conclusions

From the review of selected literature presented in Chapter 2 and analysis of data reported in Chapter 4, the following conclusions were reached:

1. Human language acquisition evolves through several stages of development, from birth to adulthood.
2. English Language Learner (ELL) refers a national-origin-minority student who is limited English proficient, whereas English as a Second Language (ESL) is a special curriculum designed to teach ELL students English Language skills.
3. The secondary ELL teacher needs to take time to first teach students verbal skills before moving them into written forms of comparing and contrasting items.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions cited above, the following recommendations have been suggested:

1. Educators responsible for English language instruction sure understand the human language acquisition evolves through several stages of development, from birth to adulthood.

2. Educators responsible for teaching ELL students English language skills should carefully distinguish between ESL and ELL instructional strategies when designing ELL curricula.
3. Before moving ELL students into written forms of comparing and contrasting items, the secondary ELL teacher should take time to first teach students verbal skills.
4. To improve ELL students' English language skills, secondary ELL teachers are encouraged to use selected instructional strategies which may be adapted for use with the CORE Reading Assessment Profile to measure students reading skills and grade-level equivalency.
5. Other educators seeking information relatives to ELL instruction may wish to utilize in informant presented in this study or, they may wish to undertake further research more suited to their unique needs.

REFERENCE

Abedi, J. (2004, January/February). *The No Child Left Behind Act and English Language Learners: Assessment and Accountability Issues*. Retrieved from <http://businessmajors.about>

Herrell, A. L., & Jordan, M. (2008). *50 Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners* (Third Edition ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Hill, J. D., & Flynn, K. M. (2006). *Classroom Instruction that works with English Language Learners* (Rev. ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org>

Kendall, J., & Khuon, Outey (2005). *Making Sense: Small-Group Comprehension Lessons for English Language Learners*. Retrieved from <http://www.stenhouse.com>

Korey, J. O'S, & Newman, Ch. (2006). *Visions Literacy*Language*Literature*Content*. Boston, MA: Thomson Heinle.

Meltzer, J., & Hamann, E. T. (2004). *Meeting the Literacy Development Needs of Adolescent English Language Learners Through Content Area Learning* (Rev. ed.). Providence, RI: The Education Alliance Brown University.

Gutlohn, L (Ed.).(1999). *Assessing reading: Multiple measures for kindergarten through eighth grade*. Navato, California: Consortium of reading Excellence.

U.S. Department Of Education Office For Civil Rights

(1999). Program for English Language Learners.

Resource Materials for Planning and Self-Assessments,

1-48.

Walker, J. F., & Waxman, Hersholt C. (n.d.). *Instructional Processes in Secondary Bilingual Classrooms*. Retrieved September 30, 2007, from

<http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/symposia/third/defelix.htm>

Young, S. (2005, October). *Adolescent Learners in Adult ESL Classes*. Retrieved from CAELA Center for Adult English Language Acquisition Web site:

http://www.cal.org/caela/printer.php?printRefURL=http%3A//www.cal.org/caela/esl_res...