THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DUAL LANGUAGE AND SHELTERED ENGLISH IMMERSION ESOL PROGRAMS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

by

Thomas R. Meyer

Liberty University

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Liberty University

2017

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DUAL LANGUAGE AND SHELTERED ENGLISH IMMERSION ESOL PROGRAMS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

by Thomas R. Meyer

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

2017

APPROVED BY:

Steven A. McDonald, Ed.D. Committee Chair

Meredith Park, Ed.D. Committee Member

Aixa Perez-Prado, Ph.D. Committee Member

ABSTRACT

During the 2005-2006 school year, 20% of students in the United States spoke a language other than English at home. Projected growth of English Language Learners in the United States is that by 2015 that number will rise to 50%. Research shows that vocabulary development is key to helping young English language learners acquire English mastery, but there is presently no commonly adopted English for Speakers of Other Languages teaching strategy. Dual Language and Sheltered English Immersion are two English for speakers of other languages programs used extensively throughout the United States and exclusively by the school district in this study. Research indicates that both programs have English language learners at the same English proficiency level by fifth grade. However, there is a gap in the research for early elementary, first through third grade English language learners. This study used a causal-comparative design of archival data analyzed by a one-way ANOVA to determine the effectiveness of both programs on early elementary English language learners' reading comprehension as measured by the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test reading assessment. The participants were from seven elementary or K-8 Florida Public Schools in one district. The study showed that there is a statistically significant difference in the two programs with Sheltered English Immersion being more effective than Dual Language.

Keywords: English Language Learner, English for Speakers of Other Languages, Sheltered English Immersion, Dual Language, English Monolingual

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to four very special Godly people who were with me through the entire doctoral journey in either body or Spirit. First, I want to thank the late Dr. Jill Jones who taught her students to always "Run to the Roar!" Dr. Jones was tough, and demanded the most from her students, but we loved her for it. Ironically, she was the one who taught me that excellence is not compromised when she gave me a B when I had a 93.2 average in one of her classes. My wife and I met with Dr. Jones in her office after my last intensive and she asked to be on my committee. Unbelievably, a short-time later she went to be with the Lord, but when I hit the hard-times in the dissertation process I always heard her saying, "Run to the Roar!"

Secondly, I want to thank the late Dr. Connie McDonald who, as my Doctoral Chair, adeptly guided me through the early steps in the dissertation process. She was always kind and nourishing, and left me feeling encouraged. Even when she was in failing health, she did not ever let me down. Dr. Connie McDonald went to be with the Lord partway through my dissertation process, but I thought of the lessons she taught me often as I completed the journey.

Thirdly, I want to thank Dr. Steven McDonald, who during arguably the toughest time of his life, took over the Doctoral Chair responsibilities of his late wife. Thank you, Dr. McDonald for guiding me through the final stages of my doctoral journey. You put your pain to the side to help your wife's students accomplish their dream. Thank you for showing unselfishness, and true Christianity in your time of grief.

Finally, I want to thank my wife, Yolie. You often called me a lifetime student, and you lived my ups and downs, but you stuck with me through the entire journey, praying all the way. After 40 years of marriage I can honestly say I love you more than ever, and I thank God every day that you are my wife. You are a true Prayer Warrior and living example of Christianity.

Acknowledgments

I want to acknowledge the people who gave me the guidance I needed to complete my dissertation. Dr. Amanda Szapkiw, and Dr. Jill Jones who taught EDUC 980. Thank you for providing me the firm foundation for my research. I was greatly affected by the passing of Dr. Jones, and I think of her often, especially when I was writing. I do not think there is a day that goes by that I do not hear, "Run to the Roar!"

I want to acknowledge my original dissertation chair, Dr. Connie McDonald, who worked with me to select my committee. Dr. McDonald kept me on a forward path and was always available to guide me. She helped me get through the prospectus, proposal, and IRB processes. Dr. McDonald went to be with the Lord shortly after I completed my research and had begun data analysis. I want to acknowledge Dr. Steven McDonald who unselfishly stepped in and became my new doctoral chair. Thank you for guiding me to completion.

I also want to acknowledge my committee members, Dr. Meredith Park, and FIU professor, Dr. Aixa Perez-Prado. Thank you both for your help and suggestions as my dissertation evolved over time.

I want to further acknowledge my research consultants. Dr. Scott Watson, thank you for your initial review that made me realize it was not going to be easy. Dr. Jaunine Fouche, thank you for giving me the Chapters 3, 4, and 5 review that made me understand I had a lot still to learn and caused me to really dive in much deeper into my data analysis. Dr. Meredith Park, thank you for adding the research consultant role to your committee member role, and challenging me to improve my study.

Dr. Rebecca Lunde, thank you for your extremely detailed APA edit, and Ms. Alexandra Sarmiento, thank you for your assistance in reviewing my manuscript.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS)

Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD)

Bilingual (BE)

Bilingual School Organization (BISO)

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

DIBELS (The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills)

Dual Language (DL)

Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)

Elementary & Secondary Education Act (ESEA)

English as a Second Language (ESL)

English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)

English Language Development (ELD)

English Language Learner (ELL)

English Language Learners (ELLs)

English Monolingual (EM)

Extended Foreign Language (EFL)

Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT)

Florida Department of Education (FLDOE)

Florida Standards Assessments (FSA)

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Interquartile Range (IQR)

Item Response Theory (IRT)

Learning Disabled (LD)

Limited English Proficient (LEP)

Multicultural Education, Training, and Advocacy, Inc. (META)

National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP)

National Defense of Education Act (NDEA)

Native Language (L1)

No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

Second Language (L2)

Socio-Economic Status (SES)

Specific Learning Disability (SLD)

Sheltered English Immersion (SEI)

Structured English Immersion (SEI-T)

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)

Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE)

Two-Way Bilingual Education (TWBE)

Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

50/50 Bilingual Education (50/50)

90/10 Bilingual Education (90/10)

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Overview

This chapter is divided into five sections that define the study: background, problem statement, purpose statement, significance of the study, and definitions. The background section introduces the data that shows the magnitude of the immigrant population growth, lists several English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) programs, explains the need for early intervention for English Language Learners (ELLs), and lists the reason for the study introducing the independent and dependent variables. The problem statement lists the problem to be studied, the purpose statement defines the reasoning for the study, and the significance of the study lists how the study adds to the knowledge of the field of education. Chapter One concludes with definitions that are used throughout the study.

Background

The past three decades have seen a vast growth in the number of non-English speaking immigrant students in U.S. classrooms. In the 2008-2009 school year, 9.7% of pre-kindergarten-12 grade students were classified as ELLs. In the 2013-3014 school year, the percentage had risen to 10.1% (NCES, 2015).

During the 2005-2006 academic year, approximately 20.4% of the student population, over 10.7 million students, spoke a language other than English at home (KewalRamani, Gilbertson, Fox, & Provasnik, 2007). More than 5 million of these students were enrolled as ELL students in public schools throughout the United States. This was an increase of 84% from 1993 (Gottlieb, 2006) and 162% from 1979 (NCES, 2006).

From 1980 to 2007 there was a 140.4% increase in the total number of people five years of age and older who spoke a language other than English at home. There was a steady

progression each decade with 23, 060,040 in 1980, 31,844,979, in 1990, 46,951,595 in 2000, and 55,444,485 in 2007 (Shin & Kominski, 2010, p. 6). Gray and Fleischman (2005) noted that there is a projected growth of ELLs to where by 2015, 50% of students will speak a language other than English at home.

In the 2013-2014 school year, there were 50.0 million students enrolled in public schools, of which, 70% were pre-kindergarten through eighth grade. Of those 50 million, 4,929,989, or 10.1%, were ELLs (NCES, 2015), while 4,460,956, or 9.3%, were participating in programs for ELLs (NCES, 2015). The percentage of students participating in programs for ELLs has increased from 4,217,026, or 8.8%, in the 2003-2004 school year to 4,460,956, or 9.3%, in the 2013-2014 school year (NCES, 2015).

A 2003 Washington, D. C. national symposium on ELLs projected that one in five children will be Hispanic by 2020, and 40% of the school population will speak English as a second language by 2030 (U.S. Department of Education & National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2003). In 2009, the United States Census projected that the majority of the entire United States population will be ELLs by the year 2030 (DeLozier, 2014; Lee, Lee, & Amaro-Jimenez, 2011). Duran, Roseth, and Hoffman (2015) noted that the 2010 United States Census Bureau projected that the U.S. Latino population will be 133 million by 2050.

One of the biggest challenges that schools face with the projected increase in the student population will be caused by changing demographics. The projection translates to a significant increase in the number of ELL students nationwide, and thus, a much greater need in providing English language instruction to ELLs. The challenge for schools across the United States is how to effectively teach ELLs so that they acquire English while not disrupting the academic growth of English proficient students.

Researchers have attempted to identify the various factors that culminate in English acquisition for ELLs. In a study that compared the scores of kindergarten ELL students in a small, Delaware suburban school district to the national reading score of non-ELL students, the results of the study showed a significant reading gap between the students in the Delaware suburban school district and the national reading score of non-ELL students. The study further showed that early intervention programs improved the academic achievement of the study population (Young, 2009). In a related study examining intervention methods for children at risk for reading disability, it was determined that intervention programs improved student test scores (Ashworth & Pullen, 2015).

The literature shows that there are numerous ESOL instructional programs being used in school systems: Submersion, Immersion, Structured English Immersion (SEI-T), Sheltered English Immersion (SEI), Bilingual (BE), and Maintenance (Brisk, 2006; Kim, Hutchison, & Winsler, 2013; Ovando, 2003). Bilingual instruction is further broken down into subgroups: Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) 90/10 or 50/50, and Dual Language (DL)/Two-way Bilingual Education (TWBE) (Kim et al., 2013; University of Michigan, 2001). In the course of researching ESOL programs, the researcher discovered duplication in some acronyms for ESOL programs and different terms for the same program. Structured English Immersion and Sheltered English Immersion are normally both identified as SEI. For this study, the researcher chose to designate the two programs as SEI-T (Structured English Immersion), consistent with Tong (2006), and SEI (Sheltered English Immersion). The terms DL and TWBE both refer to the same ESOL program. Since DL is the acronym used by the school district in this study, DL is used for the dual language population.

The goal of TBE is to start with a mixture of the student's native language and gradually increase English instruction and decrease native language instruction until the student becomes proficient in English. The goal of DL is to produce two populations of bilingual students, the native English speakers become proficient in the second language while the ELLs become proficient in English. The literature further shows that SEI-T and TBE are commonly used programs (Gonzalez, 2003; Hofstetter, 2004; Ovando, 2003; Pagan, 2005; Tong, 2006) and there are studies comparing the two. Tong's study (2006) noted that there is a gap in the literature for the early grades, specifically first through third grade results and recommended further studies be performed.

Upon determining the need for the study, the researcher contacted the local district and was informed that the only two ESOL programs being used in the district were SEI and DL. The researcher began gathering data on SEI and DL and found that very little data comparing the two programs head-to-head existed.

Stewart (2004) conducted a study that compared three ESOL programs, BE, SEI, and DL ESOL. The findings did not identify that one program was more effective than the other two. Therefore, Stewart recommended further research into the most effective ESOL instruction method be conducted. While Stewart's (2004) study measured three ESOL programs, it still made a head-to-head comparison of DL and SEI, the programs this study will compare. McGee, (2012) also recommended that further research on the academic outcomes of DL and SEI programs be performed.

As a result of the recommendation of other researchers (McGee, 2012; Stewart 2004; Tong 2006), this study was conducted in order to determine which of the two programs, SEI or DL, is the most effective in helping ELLs acquire academic English mastery to pass the third

grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment. The issue is time sensitive because under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), ELLs in Florida are required to take the FCAT reading assessment in English when it is given, even if they have just enrolled in school. However, ELLs may be exempted from taking the FCAT if they have been on a limited English proficiency (LEP) plan for a maximum of one year and the LEP committee agrees (FLDOE, 2015). In addition, the exempt ELL students must be assessed for English proficiency or they will be counted against the school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

ELLs are allowed to have accommodations while taking the FCAT but the accommodation must be something that fits the need of the ELL as determined by the local school and the parents (FLDOE, 2015). ELLs can test in a separate room with an ESOL teacher who speaks their native language proctoring, and they are allowed unlimited testing time, including testing in several short sessions, as-long-as they complete one test session in the same day. The ESOL proctor may provide limited assistance using the student's native language for all directions and for specified portions of tests. The proctor can answer questions about the test directions in the student's native language and specific questions about a prompt or word in a prompt but cannot give any assistance that will help the ELL get the response. For reading and writing passages, the proctor is not allowed to give any assistance. A heritage language/English dictionary that provides word-to-word translation but not definitions is permitted (FLDOE, 2015).

Tong (2006) noted that an English-monolingual population should be included in a study to provide a baseline to measure the ELL populations against. Therefore, the researcher developed research questions that will compare the FCAT reading comprehension results for ELLs taught through the DL program and the FCAT reading comprehension results for ELLs

taught through the SEI program. Both programs were then compared to the FCAT scores of English-monolingual students in the target schools.

Problem Statement

There is no single English language instruction program being used in schools to teach English to ELLs. The researcher found that there was agreement in the literature that by the fifth grade, all ELLs were on the same English mastery level no matter what ESOL program they were taught through (Hofstetter, 2004; Pagan 2005; Tong 2006). According to Jost (2009), "There is little difference in achievement levels between English learners in the elementary grades, the researchers found, regardless of whether the students were taught in dual-language, transitional-bilingual or English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) models" (pp. 1034-1035). However, ELLs up to fifth grade that were taught through a TBE program fell behind ELL students being taught in English-only (SEI-T) classrooms (Tong, 2006). Baker and Jones (1998) found that SEI programs were superior to BE programs in English language attainment.

The necessity to acquire English mastery was identified as time sensitive due to No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements which require ELLs to take high stakes assessments in English (University of Michigan, 2001). The ELL students' scores are included in the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measurement of the school and, as such, can have an adverse effect if the ELLs score poorly.

Tong (2006) noted, "…the amount and the specific language of instruction matters in the development of oral English as a second language" (p. 96). Research found that further inquiry into early ESOL instruction and program needed to be performed to determine the most effective ESOL program (McGee 2012; Stewart, 2004; Tong 2006). Therefore, the current study fills an identified gap in the existing literature.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine if the Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) ESOL program is more effective than the Dual Language (DL) ESOL program in helping first through third grade elementary students acquire academic and social English language mastery. This study was a comparison of SEI and DL ESOL programs for first through third graders. The results were measured by the students' performance on the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) Reading Assessment.

Significance of the Study

There is a demonstrated need to conduct research that will compare how young elementary ELL students, first through third grade, react to different ESOL programs. Through this study, it may be possible to identify if the DL or SEI ESOL program is more effective in helping ELLs to gain mastery of the English language and be prepared for the high stakes third grade assessments mandated by state and federal programs. There is a difference in social and academic English mastery; therefore, the ESOL program that helps ELLs learn English the quickest, and thus helps them pass the state-mandated high stakes assessments, may not be the most effective program for helping the ELLs learn formal English.

The number of projected ELLs entering the U.S. (Albers et al., 2009; DeLozier, 2014; Duran et al., 2015, Lee et al., 2011; Murphy, 2014; Torres, 2015) makes it necessary to have the most effective ESOL program in place across the United States so the students have the best opportunity to learn English quickly. Kim et al. (2013) noted the necessity for ELLs to acquire and master English if they want to be productive members of U.S. society. Having the most effective ESOL program in place will also help native English speakers to not be held back in their learning because their classes are slowed to accommodate ELLs. The benefits of

identifying the most effective ESOL program are that the school district can concentrate resources on developing curriculum and professional development for that one particular ESOL program. Thus, it will be more cost effective for the district in both training and in having to have less intensive reading classes for students needing to retake the FCAT.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study were:

RQ1: Are there differences between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language ESOL program and third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the sheltered English immersion ESOL program?

RQ2: Are there differences between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language ESOL program and the scores of third grade English-monolingual students?

RQ3: Are there differences between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the sheltered English immersion ESOL program and the scores of third grade English-monolingual students?

Definitions

1. *Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards* (AIMS) - The AIMS is a state achievement test that Arizona students must take to demonstrate their command of the state curriculum (Holmberg, 2008).

2. *Bilingual ESOL Program* - A Bilingual ESOL program is a program in which non-English speaking students receive English Instruction in their native language and study from ESOL textbooks (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).
3. *Dual Language (DL) ESOL Program* – DL is also identified as two-way bilingual education. Non-English speaking and native English students learn in both languages. The theory is that instruction in English and the native language of the ELL students in the class will produce bilingual students from both student populations (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).
4. *English Language Learner* (ELL) - English language learners are "Students who are in the process of learning English as a new language" (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005, p. 3).
5. *English for Speakers of Other Languages* (ESOL) - English for speakers of other languages is a term "used to refer to the acquisition of English as a non-native language" (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005, p. 3).
6. *Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test* (FCAT) - The FCAT is the previous State of Florida standardized assessment (Florida Department of Education, 2011).
7. *Florida Standards Assessments* (FSA) - Current State of Florida standardized assessment (Florida Department of Education, 2017).
8. *Heritage Language* (L1) - A heritage language, in the United States, is any language other than English that is spoken by an individual a family, or a community (Heritage Languages in America, 2016).
9. *Individualized Education Program* (IEP) - An IEP is an educational plan designed specifically for a student identified as learning disabled (Special Education Guide, 2016).

10. *Immersion ESOL Program* - An immersion ESOL program is a program in which students learn English in regular English classes using standard Language Arts textbooks, and receiving instruction from teachers trained to use ESOL strategies such as scaffolding and group projects (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).
11. *Language Acquisition* - Language acquisition is the process of second language (L2) literacy development; certain L1 skills and abilities transfer to English literacy (Vogt, Echevarria, & Short, 2010)
12. *Limited English Proficient* (LEP) - Limited English proficient are "Those who are beginners to intermediates in English" (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005 p. 3).
13. *META* - META is the Consent Decree. It ensures that all ELL students receive equal access to education in Florida (Florida Department of Education, 2011, 2017).
14. *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) - NCLB was the "Federal legislation reauthorizing the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) originally passed in 1965 to improve academic performance among lower-achieving, 'economically disadvantaged' students" (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005, p. 19).
15. *Socioeconomic Status* (SES) – "Socioeconomic status is the social standing or class of an individual or group. It is often measured as a combination of education, income and occupation." (American Psychological Association, 2017).
16. *Sheltered English Immersion ESOL Program* - The sheltered English immersion ESOL program has students in classes that are made up of only LEP students. Every student in the class is an ELL but all instruction is given in English (Freeman & Freeman, 1988).

17. *Structured English Immersion ESOL Program* – ESOL students are placed in general classrooms for all subjects and taught through English, but they are pulled out for English classes where every student is an ELL (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).
18. *Submersion ESOL Program* - Submersion ESOL program is a program in which non-English-speaking students are placed in a "sink or swim" situation in the general school population with no ESOL instruction provided (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).
19. *Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)* - TAKS is the indicator measuring ELL progress in Texas. It is the exit test for high school. (Rossell, 2009)
20. *Transitional Bilingual Education ESOL Program* (TBE) - TBE is a program where ELLs are taught mainly through their native language with English being gradually introduced. Instruction is delivered in one of two ways, 90/10 or 50/50, and all students are ELLs (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010).
21. *Two-Way Bilingual Education ESOL Program* - TWBE is also identified as DL. Non-English speaking and native English students learn in both languages. The theory is that instruction in English and the native language of the ELL students in the class will produce bilingual students from both student populations (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

Chapter Two analyzes the elements that factor into the process of English acquisition by ELL students. Following the introduction, the chapter discusses research findings on various elements that affect ELL students in their effort to acquire English mastery. The chapter begins with a history of ESOL instruction followed by a definition of the different ESOL programs. The chapter continues with a discussion on states rushing ELLs into state-mandated testing. The discussion is followed by a review of a study on how socioeconomic status affects English acquisition by ELLs. The chapter further analyzes articles that focus on early intervention, vocabulary development, and teacher training. It ends with a review of the gap in the literature and a summary by the researcher.

Theoretical Framework

This study is a quantitative analysis of archival, high-stakes test data, and as such, does not monitor the teaching methods of the teachers of the participants. There are numerous learning theories that attempt to identify how children develop their cognitive communication skills and each contributes to language development to some degree. The literature review examines classroom teaching theories that most closely follow Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development and Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development.

Piaget

Piaget did not believe that children develop intellectually because they add more knowledge to what they already know; Piaget believed that children develop a better understanding of what they already know as they grow older. Piaget's theory was that the learning process is a qualitative process, not a quantitative process. Piaget theorized, "A child at

age 7 doesn't just have more information about the world than he did at age 2; there is a fundamental change in how he thinks about the world" (Cherry, 2017, p. 1).

Piaget's theory of cognitive development puts more demand on teachers than some other cognitive theories do. Using Piaget's theory, the teacher has to plan more differentiated instruction and small group instruction in the classroom. Since the theory has students learning as they rethink what they already know and process it, there is more student teaching and interaction. In essence, the teacher acts more as a moderator than instructor. As the students discuss and complete work, the teacher must keep a sharp ear out and correct anything a student misspeaks (McLeod, 2009).

Vygotsky

Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (ZPD) is the distance between the actual developmental level and the potential development level as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers (McLeod, 2012). Vygotsky believed that children learn from direct instruction. Vygotsky also believed that children are directly involved in their own learning but more as sponges taking in what they were taught by the culture around them. Vygotsky also believed that learning was different across cultures and not universal for everyone in all cultures. He felt that social learning preceded development (McLeod, 2014).

In a classroom setting, the teacher is the "giver of knowledge" and the students build on the knowledge that they have. Key components for teachers using Vygotsky's theory are small group instruction and teacher lesson scaffolding, both widely used teaching strategies for ELLs. In small group settings, students discuss what they learn from the teacher and they can build on their knowledge as their peers explain what they learned. Scaffolding allows the teacher to

recover material from previous classes and then go a little deeper into the subject by building on what the students already learned. This theory works well with language development.

Piaget and Vygotsky's theories are different in that Piaget believed children develop cognitively through developing a better knowledge of what they already know verses adding knowledge, and Vygotsky believed that children learn from direct instruction and that there is a gap between potential learning and actual learning. Both theories put a premium on teacher planning and learning environment management, and each has small group instruction as a key learning component. Piaget's theory has the teacher acting more as a moderator than teacher to student teaching and interaction, and Vygotsky's ZPD has the teacher giving direct instruction then allowing the students to discuss what they have learned before scaffolding a new lesson onto the previous lesson. Both theories require the teacher to be actively engaged in student learning and to correct any student mistakes (McLeod, 2009; McLeod, 2014). Teacher engagement and small group instruction are techniques used in the process of language acquisition, and Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development and Vygotsky's ZPD each encompass both and provide the theoretical framework for this study.

Related Literature

Gray and Fleischman (2005) suggested ways to instruct ELLs so that they can acquire English in the shortest amount of time. They noted that classroom management and instructional practices, such as small group instruction, used in non-ELL classrooms were also effective for ELL classrooms. For ELL classrooms, the researchers recommended that teachers keep the language simple, use actions and illustrations to reinforce oral statements and directions, ask for completion not generation, model correct usage and judiciously correct errors, and use visual aids.

Small group instruction provides teachers with the opportunity to work with students in small groups and one-on-one. The thought is that the extra attention gives students the chance to ask questions they may feel uncomfortable voicing in a general class setting, and it also provides them with the opportunity to discuss their work directly with the teacher. Teachers also benefit because they can "read" each student more closely to determine if the student understands the material being taught (Torres, 2015).

Research supports small group instruction as effective for both native English speakers and ELLs (Graves, Gersten, & Haager, 2004; Gunn, Biglan, Smolkowski, & Ary, 2000; Haager & Windmueller, 2001; Kizart-Clark, 2012; Krashen, 2017; Linan-Thompson, Vaughn, Prater, & Cirino 2006; Mcintosh, Graves, & Gersten 2007; Neufeld & Fitzgerald, 2001). Small group instruction is one of the key components for teachers using Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development and Vygotsky's ZPD.

Gerber et al. (2004) conducted a study of at-risk English learners; the setting was not identified. The study population was split in two with one half receiving specific small group intervention and the other using regular small group curriculum. The study evaluated interventions in phonological awareness and word reading and further divided the participants into high-performing, middle performing, and low-performing students. The participants were kindergarten students and each was given a pre-test and a posttest. Both groups made statistically significant gains from the pre-test to the posttest with four populations having a small effect size and two having a medium effect size. The results indicated that individualized instruction helps students to develop their reading and comprehension skills.

Scaffolding was also identified as an effective teaching technique for classroom teachers to use to ensure student understanding and growth and help ELLs acquire English mastery more

quickly (Gray & Fleischman, 2005; Torres, 2015). While it requires more planning time for the teacher, it allows the teacher more flexibility in delivering the curriculum. The technique requires that the teacher determine the curriculum to be taught, assess the knowledge the students have of the individual points of the curriculum, and then determine the order of delivery of the individual concepts of the curriculum. The teacher begins teaching the curriculum, point-by-point in each class. As the students comprehend what they are being taught, the teacher begins instruction of new material that builds on the base of the curriculum they already learned. At the start of each new lesson, the teacher briefly refers to the previous lesson and adds the new material on top of it, or scaffolds onto it.

Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development identifies scaffolding as one of its integral parts. The concept is one of the most beneficial for teachers because it provides a very structured learning environment that relies on the cognitive development of the students (Farr, 2014). Farr (2014) was supported in his belief that scaffolding is an effective instructional approach by Gray and Fleischman (2005), Peregoy and Boyle (2005), and Tobin and McInnes (2008).

History of ESOL Instruction

ESOL instruction in the United States has gone through four different periods: The Permissive Period, the Restrictive Period, the Opportunist Period, and the Dismissive Period (Ovando, 2003). Each period addressed the needs of ELLs in a different manner and often reflected political thinking and public opinion about ELLs during this time period.

Permissive period. The Permissive Period took place from the 1700s to the 1880s and was characterized by many immigrant communities maintaining their native languages with schooling taking place in the native language (L1). The immigrants believed that they could maintain their native culture while participating in the civil life of their new nation. Some

states passed laws making it possible to teach the children through bilingual education. Many schools, both public and private, used bilingual, or native language instruction, during the latter half of the 19th century (Ovando, 2003). The end of the Permissive Period was deemed the dividing point between "Old Immigrants" and "New Immigrants" (Hakuta, 1986).

Restrictive period. The Restrictive Period took place between the 1880s and the 1960s. This time-period represented a change in the attitude of the American government toward immigrants but was also driven by the desire to "civilize" Indians as a military strategy to keep them on their reservations and forced Anglicization on them by sending their children to boarding schools. The action of the government was basically a cultural genocide of the Indians. (Ovando, 2003; Nieto, 2009). The policies did not cause the children to lose their native language but shamed them into using English exclusively (Crawford, 1998; McCarty, 2002; Nieto, 2009).

The American Protective Association was formed in 1887 and began promoting English-only instruction. From 1887 through 1889, an attempt was made to publicly regulate parochial schools in Massachusetts (Ovando, 2003). During this time period, Ohio instituted school attendance requirements. At the same time, some parochial schools in Illinois and Wisconsin who taught their students in German questioned legislation that required schools to teach students in English (Higham, 2002). In addition, the Naturalization Act of 1906 made it mandatory that immigrants had to be able to speak English before they could become U.S. citizens (Nieto, 2009; Ovando, 2003; Perez, 2004).

The ESOL program most used during the Restrictive Period was submersion which was basically a sink or swim situation for ELLs. The students were mainstreamed into English-only

classrooms where they either learned English through assimilation or they failed (Ovando, 2003; University of Michigan, 2001).

Opportunist period. The Opportunist Period took place between the 1960s and 1980s and was the period that gave a push and direction to bilingual education in the United States. It was triggered by the launch of the Russian satellite Sputnik. The Russian accomplishment caused the United States to create the National Defense of Education Act (NDEA) which was signed into law on September 2, 1958. The purpose of the act was to emphasize the teaching of mathematics, science, and foreign language (Ovando, 2003). NDEA did not help non-English speaking students, as it promoted the study of foreign languages by English speaking students and not the study of English by non-English speaking students.

The real beginning of change for non-English speaking students began with the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The next year, 1965, a new Immigration Act revoked the 1906 Naturalization Act that required that immigrants to be able to speak English before they could become U.S. citizens, and the 1924 national origin quota system, which led to an influx of Asian and Hispanic students, and in turn, created a greater need for bilingual instruction (Ovando, 2003).

In 1968, the federal government passed the Bilingual Education Act which was a positive step toward bilingual education, but the wording was ambiguous which allowed school systems to receive funds without using a language other than English (Nieto, 2009; Ovando, 2003). The funds were given in order for schools "to support educational programs, to train teachers and aides, to develop and disseminate instructional materials, and to encourage parental involvement" (Crawford, 1999, p. 40). Even though there was no mention of using non-English languages for instruction, the Bilingual Education Act did eventually lead to the implementation of bilingual instruction. Ovando (2003) noted three factors: The Bilingual

Education Act, community activism, and litigation by Spanish-speaking parents in the Southwest led to the implementation of bilingual and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs across the United States.

The most important legal decision concerning educating non-English speaking students was the 1974 Supreme Court case Lau v. Nichols (1974) (Baker & Jones, 1998; Hakuta, 1986; Lyons, 1990; Mora, 2005; Nieto, 2009; Ovando, 2003; Ovando & Collier, 1998). The court ruled that equal treatment of students did not constitute equal education (Mora, 2005; Nieto, 2009; Ovando, 2003). The Chief Justice wrote, "Under these state-imposed standards there is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education" (Lau v. Nichols, 1974, para. 7).

The ruling was a victory for people who advocated bilingual education. The shortcoming of the decision was that it did not give any specifics as to how instruction should be given (Ovando, 2003). Lau v. Nichols (1974) did lead to congress passing the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 which directed all schools, whether they were receiving federal financial aid or not, to provide equal treatment of all students regardless of their race, sex, or nationality (Ovando, 2003).

The 1981 lawsuit Castaneda v. Pickard (1981) led to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals to establish a three-step test to see if school districts were meeting the requirements for non-English speaking students as established by the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974. First, the school program had to be anchored in sound educational theory. Secondly, the school had to have adequate resources and personnel assigned to the program. Thirdly, the school

program had to not include content areas as math, science, social studies, and language arts, not just language acquisition (Mora, 2005; Ovando, 2003).

The court cases of the Opportunist Period established the need for, and enforcement of, equal educational opportunities of language-minority students. This lead to the development of bilingual programs. The cases did not, however, establish specific programs of instruction which led to a variety of bilingual instructional programs: immersion, structured immersion, bilingual, and maintenance.

Dismissive period. The Dismissive Period of ESOL began in the 1980s and continues to the present day. The Dismissive Period began with a backlash against bilingual education and was marked by political actions that hindered it and pushed toward more English-only instruction. Crawford (1999) noted that President Reagan stated,

> It is wrong and against American concepts to have a bilingual education program that is now openly, admittedly dedicated to preserving their native language and never getting them adequate in English so they can go out into the job market and participate. (p. 53)

The influx of immigrant students during the1980s and 1990s raised a ground-swell of support for English-only instruction. Groups such as U.S. English, English First, and English Only pushed for a return to the submersion program, or "sink or swim" instruction for non-English speaking students. California voters approved Proposition 187 in 1994. The law was designed to reduce social and educational services for undocumented immigrants so that illegal immigration could be curbed (Ovando, 2003).

Further weakening bilingual education, the Reagan Administration allowed Title VII funding for bilingual education to increase funding for English-only instruction from a 4% cap under President Carter to 25%. The shift in funding for English-only programs reflected the

political opposition to educating ELLs through their native languages. In addition, the Lau guidelines for compliance, based on Castaneda v. Pickard, were never published as official regulations (Ovando, 2003). While 25% of Title VII funding was spent on English-only programs under President Reagan, 75% of funding was still concentrated on bilingual programs. Secretary of Education William Bennett believed in a "pluralistic approach" to educating students. He felt local school districts knew the needs of their LEP students and how best to meet them (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988).

The political debate soon revolved around the question of how long non-English speaking students should be taught in their native language. In 1998, California voters passed Proposition 227, a bill that required that students must be taught primarily in English in a SEI-T ESOL program for one year before being transferred into a mainstream class (Jost, 2009; Kim et al., 2013; Mora, 2005). Bilingual education in California was in turmoil throughout the state (Ovando, 2003).

ESOL Programs

The most significant research finding in the current study is that there is no commonly-adopted ESOL teaching program used in the United States. There are presently six programs employed throughout the United States: submersion, immersion, structured immersion, sheltered immersion, bilingual, and maintenance (Brisk, 2006; Kim et al., 2013; Ovando, 2003). All six ESOL programs lead to English acquisition by ELLs, but not all lead to formal English acquisition. The general consensus among educators is that students participating in classes using the SEI-T program acquire formal English faster and more completely (Gonzalez, 2003; Hofstetter, 2004; Pagan, 2005; Tong, 2006).

Submersion program. The submersion program in ESOL is an approach where ELLs are placed as non-English speakers into classes with the general school population where there is no attempt made to teach the student English. This approach assumes that by being placed with English speaking only students, the ELLs will absorb English. Magrath (2016) noted that there is no structure because there really is no program. Submersion is a sink or swim acquisition of English. Typically, submersion students only learn enough English slang to survive.

Immersion program. Immersion program in ESOL works much like submersion with the major difference being that teachers are supposedly trained to tailor their lesson plans to include teaching strategies such as scaffolding and group projects that will help ELLs interact with fellow students who are English proficient. All students use the same language arts textbooks, and the class curriculum makes no provision for ELL students. The approach is that the teacher will scaffold class work and homework in such a way that it will build on previous success the student has had and yet not go beyond the student's potential. The purpose for using group work is so the ELLs will hear formal English modeled by English-speaking students and will copy it. The ESOL student will also have to make an attempt to participate and communicate because there is an individual participation grade for the work. The ELLs are expected to participate in any group verbal class presentation using English.

Peregoy and Boyle (2005) identified immersion programs as bilingual because ELL students transition from their native tongue to English gradually. Peregoy and Boyle (2005) noted that the goal of immersion programs is for ELL students to develop full bilingualism and biliteracy in English. In DL classes, the goal is for native English-speaking students to become proficient in the minority language. The researcher believes that this theory may not hold true

because there is no structure in place to ensure that the ELL students retain their native language.

Structured English immersion program. Structured English Immersion program in ESOL is a variation of the immersion program. There has been confusion about the definition of structured English immersion (Clark, 2009). There are variations of what the specific steps of SEI are, but Clark (2009) wrote that the one constant is a large part of the school day is dedicated to exclusively teaching English language. The students in the program are grouped according to their proficiency level of English. Other studies have defined SEI as English-only instruction with modifications to meet the needs of the second language learner (Combs, Evans, Fletcher, Parra, & Jimenez, 2005; Marlow, 2008; Rossell, 2009).

Clark (2009) continued:

> The English language is the main content of SEI instruction. Academic content plays a supporting, but subordinate, role. The dominant focus is language itself: its rules, uses, forms, and application to daily school and non-school situations and topics. The operant principle is that students must have a strong understanding of the English language before they can be expected to learn grade-level content. (p. 44)

In many schools, ELL students are placed in the general population with ESOL trained teachers for their core courses and then pulled out for one class each day to be taught English using ESOL books, bilingual dictionaries, and specific English lessons by a teacher who speaks their native language. In the pull-out classrooms, ELLs participate in activities that help them develop their mastery of English and reinforce the material they are taught in their regular classroom (Kim et al., 2013; Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). The University of Michigan (2001) noted that the curriculum does not assume that ELLs have prior knowledge of L2. Content is

introduced in a simplified manner so all students can understand and acquire English proficiency. Peregoy and Boyle (2005) pointed out that the goal of structured English immersion is to help students get by during the time they are becoming proficient in English.

The specialized ESOL instruction, along with the class interaction in the general population with ESOL trained teachers, is a widely used ESOL program (Brisk, 2006; (Gonzalez, 2003; Hofstetter, 2004; Pagan, 2005; Tong, 2006). In a study of 72 bilingual education studies by Rossell and Baker (1996), the researchers concluded that SEI programs were superior to TBE programs in 83% of the studies reviewed and equal in the other 17%. TBE was never superior to SEI (Pagan, 2005). Pagan (2005) did point out that the majority of the studies Rossell and Baker reviewed were Canadian studies opening the discussion as to whether the findings could be generalized to other settings. Pagan (2005) noted that the Canadian students in immersion programs were distinctively different than typical ESOL students. They were mostly middle-class, and the ESOL program was viewed as educational enrichment. The students were proficient in their native language and there was never a risk of them losing it.

Sheltered English immersion program. Students in the sheltered English immersion ESOL program are in inclusion classrooms. Every student in the class is an ELL but all instruction is given in English. The teacher employs teaching strategies that have been recognized as effective techniques to instruct the students, but the instruction is in English. Through small group instruction, differentiated instruction, and scaffolding, the students are able to gain English mastery. Research indicates that sheltered English immersion is the most successful program for ELL students if one's goal is the highest level of achievement in English that a child is capable of (Bali, 2001; Rossell, 2009; Rossell & Baker, 1996).

The thinking behind having ELLs in an inclusion classroom is that the students do not have the pressure to perform that they have in a general population classroom. Since each student is an ELL, the lack of complete understanding of English by a student does not hold the class back. In addition, the teacher is better prepared to deal with curriculum slowdowns because the teacher is used to dealing with emerging English speakers and does not get frustrated at the class being held back.

The same reasoning holds true for monolingual students in a general classroom. Many get frustrated and stop paying attention when a teacher has to take extended time working with a single ELL student. The teacher may become frustrated, the ELL may become frustrated, the monolingual students may just give up, and the teacher may have the potential for a classroom management problem.

Bilingual programs. Bilingual education programs use two languages for teaching classes, one of which must be English (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). Bilingual ESOL instruction is delivered in one of three ways, 90/10, 50/50, or two-way. The 90/10 and 50/50 TBE classes are made up of only ELLs and the goal is not full bilingualism. In contrast, DL/two-way classes are made up of 50% ELLs and 50% English-monolingual students. The goal of DL/T\two-way is full bilingualism for all students in the class.

Transitional bilingual program. Transitional bilingual program (TBE) in ESOL is a theory that is often successful in English acquisition, but the time table is much more drawn out. Typically started in kindergarten or first grade, ELLs are taught mainly through their native language with English gradually introduced, and the tendency is for the students to continue speaking their native language. Instruction is delivered in one of two ways, 90/10 or 50/50, and all students are ELLs. A designation of 90/10 denotes that 90% of teaching in

kindergarten and first grade are done in the ELL's native language and the other 10% of the day is taught in English. A 50/50 designation denotes that the class begins with the students being taught 50% of the time in the ELL's native language only and 50% of the time in English. The goal of TBE is not full bilingualism, but to have students have enough English mastery to transition into English classrooms, typically in third grade (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010). As the students move through the program, the amount of English instruction increases and the native language instruction decreases. Eventually the language of instruction is the same (University of Michigan, 2001).

Dual language/two-way immersion program. Dual language, also known as two-way, immersion classes are generally made up of 50% native English speakers and 50% ELLs. Instruction is delivered 50/50 which denotes that the class begins with the students being taught 50% of the time in the ELL's native language only and 50% of the time in English only (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010). Abbott (2014) noted that the curriculum covers all courses and is divided into blocks, typically daily, with material taught in English in one block and then retaught in the ELLs' native language the following block. Translation between languages is generally not done, and students are required to meet the same learning and graduation requirements as other students. The concept of DL classes is that by the end of the school year, both groups of students will be bilingual. Research shows that the DL program is effective in helping ELLs attain English mastery (Gonzalez, 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2015).

Maintenance program. Maintenance program in ESOL, also known as developmental bilingual program, works much like the bilingual program in that students are taught in their native language at first and gradually more in English until they become English proficient. The difference in the maintenance program and the bilingual program is that after the students

become English proficient, some of their instruction remains in their native tongue. This instructional practice helps the ELLs retain use of their native language, leaving them bilingual and more culturally aware of their native country.

All six ESOL programs lead to English acquisition by ELLs, but not all lead to formal English acquisition. Crawford (1999) argued that researching which ESOL program is the best to help ELLs gain English mastery is not valuable. Crawford stated,

> The key issue is not finding a program that works for all children and all localities, but rather finding a set of components that works for the children in the community of interest, given the community's goals, demographics, and resources. (para. 21)

The consensus among educators in the 2000-2010 period was that students participating in classes using the structured English immersion ESOL program or transitional bilingual education ESOL program, of which dual language is a part, acquired English mastery faster and more completely. Therefore, many studies concentrated on structured English immersion and transitional bilingual education and did not include submersion, immersion, sheltered immersion, or maintenance (Gonzalez, 2003; Hofstetter, 2004; Pagan, 2005; Sievert, 2007; Tong, 2006). Rossell (2009) stated, "…bilingual education is the least effective program for ELL students if one's goal is achievement in English" (p. 12). Rossell's findings were not surprising because the goal of TBE is not full bilingualism, but to have students have enough English mastery to transition into English classrooms, typically in third grade (Lindholm-Leary & Genesee, 2010).

Researchers have attempted to identify the various factors that culminate in English acquisition by ELLs. In addition to the cognitive skills required for language development, Peregoy and Boyle (2005) identified three trends in education that specifically affect ELLs.

The trends are: academic standards and assessment, high-stakes testing, and education policy specific to English learners.

Academic Standards and Assessment

At all levels of education, standards and assessments have been put in place that determine what students should know at each grade level. They also identify what students need to know in order to be promoted or graduated. ELLs have their own additional standards as well (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).

National Assessment of Education Progress. Developed as a result of the 1983 National Commission on Excellence in Education's *A Nation at Risk,* the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) was developed. NAEP was a nationwide assessment that allowed for the comparison of student results in reading and writing. It was possible to make state comparisons (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). The development of detailed curriculum content descriptions was a result of a push by Congress. Standards documents usually include: (a) content standards, (b) benchmarks, and (c) progress indicators (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). Peregoy and Boyle (2005) continued, "Criteria for achievement are thus built in to the standards" (p. 19).

No Child Left Behind Act. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) was signed into law by President George Bush on January 8, 2002. It was "… a comprehensive federal initiative to improve the educational performance of all students" (Rosenberg, Westling, & McLeskey, 2010, p. 1). Past history showed that students who were economically disadvantaged, spoke a foreign language, or who had disabilities were often not given equal access to a quality education and thus, had a disparity of performance in meeting standards. Typically, schools in poor districts did not receive teaching tools and technology that were up-

to-date with the items in schools in more economically-prosperous districts. Additionally, students with disabilities were excluded from school and district assessments and thus, they were not counted against the school's and district's AYP performance (Cummins, 1984; Klingner & Artiles, 2003; Rosenberg et al., 2010).

Teachers' beliefs and perceptions about children can create educational obstacles, even if teachers are not aware of their own debilitating thoughts (Norman, 2016, p. 22). When combined, the low-income, ELL, and LD students made up a group of students that educators did not go out of their way to teach. "Such teacher perceptions can have a negative impact on student achievement through decreasing expectations, stereotyping, utilizing unfair placement and tracking procedures, and influencing educational opportunities for students" (Norman, 2016, p. 23). They were not expected to do well in school, so often-times they did not receive adequate instructional attention (Norman, 2016). Since there were low expectations for them, they did not expect much from themselves, either. Consequently, their lack of self-worth often led to poor academic performance and low test scores (Cooper, 2015).

NCLB was the federal government's tool for ensuring that all students have equal access to a quality education. While it could not dictate educational policies to the states, the federal government could mandate performance indicators and measure adequate yearly progress (AYP) and withhold funding for states who failed to comply with the components of NCLB. Rosenberg et al. (2010) noted,

> NCLB legislation is based on five core principles: (1) strong accountability for results; (2) expanded flexibility and local control of schools; (3) an emphasis on teaching methods based on scientific research; (4) expanded options for parents, particularly

those whose children attend low-performing schools; and (5) highly qualified teachers. (para. 4)

Race To The Top. In November 2009, the federal government instituted the Race to the Top Program which allocated $4 billion in grants to states who met certain criteria. The program required states to improve based on four specific areas:

(1) Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy;

(2) Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction;

(3) Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and

(4) Turning around our lowest-achieving schools. (Race to the Top Program, 2009, p. 2)

Measurement of state improvement, and thus awarding of the grant money, was based on a 500-point grading system spread over 20 components (Duncan, 2010). The ultimate goal of Race To The Top was to improve teaching and learning so that the United States would be number one in the world in the proportion of students graduating college by 2020 (Race to the Top Program, 2013).

High-Stakes Testing

Research has shown that some states rush ELLs toward English mastery in order to pass the state-mandated assessments associated with the NCLB (Hofstetter, 2004; Murphy, 2014). Hofstetter (2004) explained that NCLB added pressure to educators who help ELL students acquire English mastery simply to pass the high stakes assessments required by NCLB. In Florida, ELLs are required to take the FCAT in English whenever it is given, even if they

enrolled in school the previous week. If an ELL does not participate in FCAT testing, they will be counted in the participation rate calculations and negatively impact the school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)**.** ELL students are allowed to have testing accommodations as determined by local school educators, students, and parents (FLDOE, 2015).

Schools with large numbers of ELLs have a more difficult time in attaining AYP than schools with fewer ELLs because of having a larger number of low-income, low-achieving students. This results in the schools starting off on unequal footing yet being expected to wind up the same (Neill, 2005; Neill & Guisbond, 2004). "The more groups that are counted in the AYP process, the less likely the school is to make AYP - the diversity penalty" (Neill, 2005, p. 1).

Education Policy Specific to English Learners

All students are affected by education policies, but ELLs are affected by additional policies specific to their English proficiency (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). "Federal law requires schools to identify and serve students in need of educational support based on English language proficiency" (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005, p. 21). This promotes English language development while providing meaningful instruction for the academic content for the ELLs. While the requirements were set by the federal government, the type of instructional program to be used was left to the discretion of the local school districts. However, the NCLB Act emphasized English language proficiency; it required English language proficiency and academic content standards and benchmarks to be set by the states (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).

Students who enter school as ELLs are simultaneously required to become proficient in English while they are learning academic content. They are often expected to be on the same level as their monolingual English peers (Leafstedt, Richards, & Gerber, 2004). Callahan (2006)

noted, “The language in recent education policy equates academic achievement with reading proficiency for English Language Learners (ELLs)” (p. 6).

In an attempt to prepare students for mandated assessments, some states became creative with their instruction, rushing ELLs toward English mastery. “In response to federal and state accountability efforts focused on reading, California high schools began to substitute reading intervention programs for English language development (ELD) curricula and instruction” (Callahan, 2006, p. 6). Callahan (2006) went on to note that secondary ELLs are faced with two responsibilities. First, they have to learn enough English to pass classes, and secondly, they have to have enough mastery to pass the state-mandated assessments associated with NCLB. Callahan (2006) noted that academic achievement and English proficiency are not interchangeable; they are interdependent.

META. In August 1990, the results of a lawsuit brought against the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) by Multicultural Education, Training, and Advocacy, Inc. (META) established specific guidelines for the equal access to education for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in Florida. “The legal foundation for the requirements for teaching English language learners (ELLs) in Florida is based on the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) et al. vs. The State Board of Education (SBE) et al. Consent Decree (1990)” (FLDOE, 2011, p. 3). The consent decree mandated six formal “areas of compliance: identification and assessment, personnel, equal access to appropriate programming, equal access to appropriate categorical programs for ELLs, and monitoring issues, and outcome measures” (Simmons, 2008, p. 4).

The consent decree is referred to as META and resulted from a class action lawsuit brought by META against the State of Florida Department of Education alleging that Limited

English Proficient (LEP) students were not receiving equal access to comprehensible instruction, thus violating their civil rights like the students in Lau v. Nichols (Florida Department of Education, 2011). META is the State of Florida's guidelines to ensure it is complying with all laws concerning educating Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. META resulted in the state setting teacher training requirements for all teachers who teach LEP students. The FLDOE also began including ESOL training in all teacher training programs (Florida Department of Education, 2011). Meta "requires basic ESOL teachers or primary English and Language Arts instructors to obtain an ESOL endorsement in which they must complete 300 in-service points or 15 college semester hours" (Simmons, 2008, pp. 8-9). ESOL training requirements for social studies, mathematics, science, and computer literacy teachers called for 60 in-service hours (League of United Latin American Citizens [LULAC] vs. State Board of Education, 1990; Simmons, 2008). Amended in 2003, the consent decree was expanded to require administrators and guidance counselors to take 60 hours of ESOL training (Simmons, 2008). In Florida, one college-level course equates to 60 in-service hours.

Teacher training. The classroom teaching recommendations of Gray and Fleischmann (2005) indicated that there was a need for ESOL certification for classroom teachers. Several states have instituted ESOL instruction training for teachers, but results of studies indicate that there is room for improvement. It appears that ESOL instruction is still a topic that many educators do not take seriously and is still an area where politics play a role. Researchers have attempted to link teacher ESOL training to student language acquisition. "While some states require specific coursework (Arizona, California, Florida, Pennsylvania, and New York) and others make a general reference to the special needs of ELLs (17 states), several states (15) have no requirement whatsoever" (Sampson & Collins, 2012, p. 8). Sampson and Collins added that

teachers are becoming increasing concerned about being held accountable for ELL student scores on standardized tests. They further noted that "Currently, at the various stages of teacher preparation, certification, and evaluation, there is insufficient information on what teachers should know about teaching ELLs" (p. 8).

Arizona. In 2006, the State of Arizona instituted a 15-hour structured English immersion (SEI) endorsement training program for K-12 teachers and administrators. In an effort to determine the effectiveness of the training, a comparison of the results of the English Language Learners' (ELL) Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) reading scores before and after the training was made. Holmberg (2008) stated, "The purpose of the study was to determine if the SEI endorsement was meaningful to K-12 teachers" (p. 34). The research deemed the SEI endorsement a "band aid" and the problem "monumental" (Holmberg, 2008). Holmberg (2008) noted, "The requirement of a 15-hour training is not equitable to the level of support needed for ELL students" (p. 77).

Florida. A study of the efficacy of Florida's ESOL training for teachers found specific problems (Simmons, 2008). Simmons (2008) studied three separate districts and determined that several teachers found the training sessions to be impractical. From interviews, Simmons found that trainers felt that some teachers did not learn enough to benefit the students. Simmons also determined that participants felt that the training material was outdated.

From observations, Simmons (2008) noted that many teachers arrived 40 to 45 minutes late and several left early. Simmons further noted that the sign-in sheet was readily available during the entire training time and on three occasions witnessed teachers signing in, staying 15 minutes, and then leaving. Simmons added that teachers missed sessions without consequences, and in one case, a teacher missed four sessions, again without consequences.

Furthermore, Simmons observed teachers grading papers and talking during the sessions, and instead of maintaining classroom management, the trainers kept teaching by talking over them. His observations led him to conclude that the classes he witnessed only scratched the surface of the subject (Simmons, 2008).

META does not mandate a specific ESOL training method and allows individual districts to develop their own in-service training. The training must cover ESOL curriculum and materials development, cross cultural communication and understanding, applied linguistics, methods of teaching ESOL, and testing and evaluation (Simmons, 2008). Simmons (2008) recommended that "the state consider creating a system of statewide performance standards" (p. 126). Simmons also recommended that ESOL administrators do unannounced walk-throughs with recorded observations. A related study that examined Florida teachers' professional development found that 41% of the respondents teach ELLs, but only 13% had any professional development training on how to present the material to ELLs (Phillips, 2013).

Socioeconomic Status

There is a common belief that socioeconomic status (SES) has a negative effect on English language acquisition because most immigrants are poor when they enter the United States. Many immigrant students are on a free or reduced lunch program which signifies they come from low-income families. This often translates into ELLs attending lower-resourced schools because they live in a disproportionately low-income community (Neill, 2005).

Research has shown that comprehensive instruction can overcome SES. In a 2004 study, D'Angiulli, Seigel, and Maggi noted that schooling and a comprehensive literacy-intensive instructional program started in kindergarten and maintained through later grades can overcome SES and the students can develop word comprehension and reading skills (D'Angiulli et al.,

2004). Perry and McConney (2010) noted that their findings were consistent with other studies that showed that individual students were sensitive to the influence of the combined socioeconomic composition of the school they were attending. Perry and McConney concluded "… that increases in the mean SES of a school are associated with consistent increases in students' academic achievement, and that this relationship is similar for all students regardless of their individual SES" (pp. 1137-1138). Since students from only high-performing schools will be included in the study, SES will be excluded as a variable.

Vocabulary Development

Research has shown that vocabulary development plays a key role in second language acquisition (August, Carlo, Dressler, & Snow, 2005). August et al. (2005) focused on the importance of vocabulary development for pre-school children. They noted, "There is a need for sustained attention to vocabulary development for ELLs" (August et al., 2005, p. 50). "Many studies have shown that English language learners are typically about two years behind average first language students in vocabulary, even by the end of grade six" (Biemiller, 2012, p. 6). Students reading in their first language typically have a vocabulary of 5000-7000 words by the time they entered school (Biemiller & Slonim, 2001).

August et al. (2005) believed that teachers should take advantage of the student's first language by teaching them to make use of their cognate knowledge. Teachers should next help ELLs know the labels for important words, and they should follow their instruction with review and practice (August et al., 2005). This concept is supported by research that shows phonological awareness is a major factor in how ELLs learn English (Calhoon, Otaiba, Greenberg, King, & Avalos, 2006; Leafstedt et al., 2004; Manis, Lindsey, & Bailey 2004).

Further research examined phonological awareness in greater depth and found that it transferred from the students' first language acquisition to their second language acquisition. Thus, research concluded that there is a cross-language relationship (Duran et al., 2015; Manis et al., 2004; Miller et al., 2006). Transfer is an important factor in the acquisition of the second language (August et al., 2005). Miller et al. (2006) further noted that there is a relationship between oral language comprehension and reading comprehension. They also concluded that native language strengths positively influence reading achievement in the second language.

Sibold (2011) recommended that direct instruction is a key in helping ELLs build their vocabulary. Sibold suggested that teachers pronounce the word, have students repeat the word three times, then read the word from the textbook. Next, the teacher explains the word and has the students write the word in a sentence. Sibold (2011) also suggested that teachers develop games around vocabulary words and use graphic organizers to write them in. Torres (2015) recommended that small group instruction be used and noted that students need to use the small group time to engage deeply with the words. Torres suggested that students study how the words are used, how they work, and their importance. Torres noted that small group time allows time for discussion and keeps the students engaged.

Peregoy and Boyle (2005) believed teachers need to create a literacy-rich classroom environment. They recommended that teachers have literacy props that put words in front of students at all times. They noted that word walls should be put in place that allow students to take vocabulary words from the day's assignment and write them down on a piece of paper and place them on the wall. The class then reviews the words daily by reciting them and using them in a sentence. One class used red paper in the form of bricks and actually built a "wall" over the course of a year from their vocabulary words.

Krashen's (2017) comprehension hypothesis stated that language is acquired when the learner understands what is read or heard. Krashen (2017) believed that concentrating on grammar rules and structure first actually slows language acquisition. Krashen (2017) did agree with small group instruction but believed that "hearing interesting stories (Story listening) and pleasure reading are more efficient than 'study,' that is, more language is acquired per unit time" (pp. 1-2). Krashen (2017) believed that "When comprehensible input-based methods are compared to methods that demand the conscious learning of grammar, comprehensible input methods have never lost" (p. 1). Krashen (2017) noted that language acquisition is different from language learning and conscious adherence to grammar rules hinders communication. Krashen (2004) recommended delaying teaching grammar rules until the student is at an advanced level. Krashen (2004) stated, "I would first give acquisition a chance, and then use conscious knowledge to fill in some of the gaps. Grammar, thus, is not excluded. It is, however, no longer the star player but has only a supporting role" (p. 23).

Early Intervention

The first eight years of life are the foundational years for a person's academic success. This translates to the child's learning from birth to third grade. There are programs such as pre-school to help children five years and under prepare for kindergarten. These programs can assist immigrant students can bridge the achievement gap between themselves and non-immigrant students as they prepare for kindergarten (Takanishi, 2004). Bilingual preschool programs can close the Hispanic-White reading achievement gap in the early school years by one-fifth to one-third (Duran et al., 2015). Takanishi (2004) noted that there are three factors for children entering kindergarten that predict their third grade academic success: (a) good health, (b) cognitive and literacy skills, and (c) motivation to learn and engage in classrooms. Takanishi

further noted that a child's third grade academic achievement is important because it is an important predictor of the child's future educational success. Improving the reading success of the growing number of ELLs in U.S. schools requires the consideration of supplemental, early-reading interventions that work in conjunction with the student's core reading program (Vadasy, Nelson, & Sanders, 2011).

In a study that compared the scores of Kindergarten ELL and non-ELL students in a small Delaware suburban school district, the results of the study showed a significant reading gap. The results confirmed the findings of numerous previous studies (Gay, Mills, Geoffrey, & Airasian, 2006; Lennon, 1999; Stewart, S., 2007) that the achievement gap was typically between 20% and 40% (Young, 2009). For the two years prior to the study, Young (2009) noted that the reading gap between ELL and non-ELL kindergarten students in Delaware was approximately 35% in 2006 and 25% in 2007, which was in line with the findings of previous studies.

After obtaining the initial results, Young (2009) introduced a three-tiered intervention based on the results of the state-mandated use of DIBELS (The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) assessment. DIBELS is a series of one-minute assessments that identifies kindergarten students who are high-risk for "delayed development or academic failure" (Young, 2009, p. 15). The teachers used the results of DIBELS to determine which tier each student needed to be on and structured their instruction to meet the academic needs of each student. They used DIBELS three times during the year so they could monitor the vocabulary development of each student and adjust their instruction as necessary. The finding of the study was that early intervention programs improved the academic achievement of the study population (Young, 2009).

Labeling ELLs as Learning Disabled

The result of rushing ELLs into state mandated testing has resulted in many ELLs being labeled as LD (Shelton, 2007). Once labeled as LD, the students' test scores do not count against a school's AYP so schools tend to quickly identify ELLs as LD. This practice has resulted in a disproportionate number of ELLs being labeled as students with learning disabilities due to evaluations being made by school personnel instead of medical professionals (Gottlieb, Alter, Gottlieb, & Wishner, 1994; Klingner & Artiles, 2003; Shelton, 2007). Research shows that ELL students are frequently misidentified as LD when they actually have a language acquisition deficiency (Haager, 2007; Rinaldi & Samson, 2008; Samson & Lesaux, 2009; Scott, Hauerwas, & Brown, 2014). There has been a great tendency by counselors, teachers, and administrators to test students in English before they have acquired English proficiency, then labeling them learning disabled when they do not score high (Fernandez & Inserrs, 2013). If they are going to continue being the people making the decisions on whether an ELL is labelled LD or not, counselors, teachers, and administrators should be trained to properly evaluate ELLs. They should then verify their evaluation by triangulating their findings before labelling an ELL as LD.

McCardle, Mele-McCarthy, and Leos (2005) noted that testing accommodations need to be studied because ELLs often need accommodations when taking state-mandated assessments. The researchers further noted that not all accommodations listed on the students' Individualized Education Program (IEP) are permitted during state-mandated assessments. The question that must be answered is, "When is an ELL ready to be tested in English?" Ortiz (1997) noted that the test can answer that question of language proficiency has not been developed. Ideally, ELLs should be given an adequate amount of time to master English before they are tested for learning disabilities using English as the testing language (Cummins, 1984; Klingner & Artiles 2003).

However, the State of Florida-mandated assessments do not allow the time because ELLs are tested in English the first year they are in the school system. "Students identified as culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) represent an ever-increasing percentage of the U.S. student population, with English language learners (ELLs) comprising the fastest growing subgroup" (Sullivan, 2011, p. 317). In many instances, lack of English proficiency is the problem, not a learning disability.

McCardle et al. (2005) continued by noting that there are new advances in technology that need to be studied. Some of the new technology, like neurobiology and neuroimaging, was mentioned as potential tools to help with identifying ELL students with learning disabilities. The researchers felt that the new technology would help with ESOL instruction as well.

Neurobiology. "Biology's efforts in neurobiology are geared towards understanding how the remarkable diversity in neuronal cell types and their connections are established and how changes in neurons and their connections underlie learning and thinking" (MIT, 2017, p. 1). McCardle et al. (2005) noted that the neurobiological factors that relate to successful reading acquisition, or reading disability identification, are similar for ELLs and English-monolingual students. They further noted that neurobiology offers the opportunity to understand how students develop reading and language skills. They concluded, "Therefore, it [neurobiology] also holds great promise for use in elucidating the neuroanatomical and neurophysiological correlates of language and learning in ELLs" (p. 71).

Neuroimaging. Research shows that neuroimaging may be one of the tools that will help medical professionals understand reading development and reading disability in ELLs. If neuroimaging proves effective, it can take the burden of labeling struggling ELL readers as learning disabled off of administrators, counselors, and teachers. A recent study noted

neuroimaging has been conducted in the past on mainly monolingual speakers of English. The authors noted that neuroimaging can be useful in assessing the efficacy of different approaches to the teaching of reading to ELLs (Pugh, Sandak, Frost, Moore, & Menel, 2005).

Research concurs that there is an overrepresentation of ELLs labeled as students with learning disabilities and there is no way to accurately identify them individually (Ortiz, 1997; Shelton, 2007). It is not always possible to specifically identify the special education services required by ELLs but it does not apply to the majority of ELLs (DeLozier, 2014; Sullivan, 2011). Therefore, ELLs labeled as LD will not be included in the study groups because doing so could affect the validity of the study.

Additional Research

Additional studies comparing various ESOL programs proved, in most cases, that there is no statistically significance between the programs. Two studies comparing BE and SEI students' results came to the same conclusion. In a study that examined a Spanish-English bilingual program for K-5 grade students, Hofstetter (2004) noted, "For decades, research on the effects of bilingual education programs has yielded often conflicting findings …" (p. 357). Hofstetter went on to explain that bilingual ELL students were compared to structured English immersion ELL students on the California state-mandated tests. After four years in the program, research showed that bilingual and structured immersion program students scored virtually the same on the state mandated assessments (Hofstetter, 2004).

In a related study that compared Hispanic-speaking students in SEI ESOL programs in California and BE ESOL programs in Texas, Sievert (2007) hypothesized that since SEI ESOL programs immerse ELL students in English faster than BE ESOL programs, SEI students would score higher on the fourth grade National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading

assessment. The study found that neither program had a statistically significant greater impact on the reading ability of ELL students (Sievert, 2007). Changing the ESOL programs being studied did not tend to change the results. In a study that compared the effectiveness SEI-T and TWBE ESOL programs, research showed that by the end of fifth grade, the students in both programs had the same academic mastery of reading and math on tests administered in English (Pagan, 2005).

A related quantitative study comparing the third-grade reading scores of TBE ELLs and DL program ELLs in the Chicago Public Schools system found that no statistically significance difference existed. Lopez (2016) theorized that DL students would outperform the TBE students, but the study did not support her theory. In fact, the TBE ELLs slightly outperformed the DL ELLs (Lopez, 2016). The finding of Pagan (2005) and Sievert (2007) concurred with Hofstetter's (2004) earlier findings.

One study in New York City comparing DL and TBE programs did produce a result showing DL was modestly more effective than TBE in helping ELLs acquire English mastery (Murphy, 2014). The study was flawed because it used EL SOL (El Sistema de la Observación de la Lecto-Escritura) as the assessment instrument. EL SOL is an informal instrument, administered in Spanish, that employs a pre-test and post-test as well as a teacher judgement of student ability to perform specified tasks. Teacher judgement makes the study subjective as teacher experience alone could affect the findings (Murphy, 2014).

A California qualitative study analyzing parental attitudes and Hispanic students' perceived self-efficacy of students in a SEI versus DL found the test results on the state-mandated CRT for both populations were so similar that the researcher could not make any determination about either program's effectiveness on English acquisition by the students

(McGee, 2012). In McGee's (2012) conclusion, the researcher recommended further testing to determine if there is a statistically significant difference in the two programs. One phenomenon the study identified was the retention of the students' native Spanish language. McGee found that the SEI students were able to communicate socially in Spanish but had a difficult time with academic Spanish. The dual language students did not experience the same problem. The researcher theorized that this result was caused because the DL students were exposed to academic Spanish in the classroom daily through core subject instruction. This was in contrast to the SEI students who were immersed daily in English because their core subjects were taught only in English. Thus, they did not hear or speak academic Spanish (McGee, 2012). Cummins (2016) noted that there is a distinction between social and academic language that is accepted across academia. The distinction reinforces McGee's findings of the difference in the SEI students' social and academic Spanish communication abilities.

Adding a third ESOL program to a study and making a three-way comparison had no impact on the results. A quantitative study conducted in Texas compared the effectiveness of three ESOL programs: TBE, SEI, and DL, on the third-grade reading scores on the TAKS assessment (Stewart, 2004). The DL study population had a larger percentage of students passing the TAKS. However, the mean scores showed no significantly significant difference between any of the three ESOL programs (Stewart, 2004).

An additional study in Texas compared the third grade TAKS reading scores of two ESOL programs, TBE and DL, and an English-monolingual study population. The results for two population comparisons, TBE and DL ELLs and DL and EM students, showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the TAKS scores (Trejo, 2015). The final two comparisons in the study did show a statistically significant difference in the TAKS scores of the

populations. English-speaking students in the DL program outscored EM students, and within the DL program, English-speaking students outscored the Spanish-speaking ELLs (Trejo, 2015). The results indicate that the DL program helps ELL acquire English mastery and it also increases the English mastery of EM students as well.

In an attempt to further define the bilingual ESOL program, a study was performed on an ESOL program that the Bakersfield California City school district instituted (Gonzalez, 2003). The study was a new TWBE program that used two different models. One program used the 90/10 model, with instruction starting in kindergarten in Spanish 90% of the time and English 10% of the time and gradually changing to 50/50 by fifth grade, and the other program used a 50/50 model the entire time. It was expected that the students would increase their cognitive abilities, achieve academically, and be completely bi-literate. A quantitative and qualitative study of two DL programs was conducted, and Gonzalez (2003) noted, "This study analyzed the inputs and processes provided to two models of dual language instruction, as well as the outputs of both models" (p. 7). The results of the study indicated that both models achieved the goals of increased cognitive ability, academic achievement, and bi-literacy. The study concluded that DL, or TWBE immersion, is a viable ESOL strategy for ELLs (Gonzalez, 2003). Lindholm-Leary (2015) noted, "Research is consistent across numerous studies in a variety of communities and with students from different backgrounds that students in dual language programs achieve at similar or higher levels compared to their peers in English mainstream" (p. 6).

Gap in the Literature

Although the studies of McGee (2012), Stewart (2004), and Tong (2006) were each designed with different and sometimes overlapping ESOL programs as their foundation, each noted that further research needs to be conducted on the effectiveness of the different ESOL

programs in helping ELLs acquire English mastery. Tong's (2006) study noted that there is a gap in the literature for the early first through third grade results and recommended further studies be performed. Tong also recommended testing an English-monolingual population to set a baseline for measuring the ESOL programs' effectiveness.

Stewart (2004) noted,

> The data presented in this study indicate a need for further research on successful language programs and teaching techniques for ELL students in Texas. Further investigation into the success of a higher number of two-way immersion or dual language programs with a larger sample is needed. (p. 96)

Stewart continued, "This study did not answer what language program best serves ELL students in Texas. Instead, it provided information, based on third grade TAKS reading passing rates for ELL students, to help educators make appropriate language program decisions" (p. 97). McGee (2012) noted, "Other questions for research involve the academic outcomes of the language programs" (p. 178).

The first two years of the ELLs' schooling are critical in their development of oral English fluency, and the foundation for their English acquisition is vocabulary attainment. Students reading in their first language typically had a vocabulary of 5000-7000 words by the time they entered school (Biemiller & Slonim, 2001). Biemiller (2012) noted:

> By the end of grade two, children's vocabulary already differs a great deal. English speaking children whose vocabulary is in the lowest 25 percent know an average of 4000 root word meanings. Children with average vocabulary know about 6000 root word meanings. Children in the highest 25 percent vocabulary group know an average of 8000 root word meanings. (p. 2)

Biemiller (2012) added, "Many studies have shown that English language learners are typically about two years behind average first language students in vocabulary, even by the end of grade six" (p. 6). These numbers line up with August et al. (2005), Calhoon et al. (2006), Leafstedt et al. (2004), and Manis et al., (2004). As the ELLs progress through their respective school years, English acquisition will continue as they interact in the general school population and as they use English in other classes. But research shows that the speed and amount of formal English acquisition needs to be studied further (McGee, 2012; Stewart, 2004; Tong, 2006).

Summary

The review of literature clearly shows that vocabulary development and early intervention programs can overcome cultural factors like SES and school policies that could hinder ELLs from acquiring English mastery. Research indicated that most ELLs were at the same English mastery level by grade five no matter which ESOL program they were taught through (Gonzalez, 2003; Hofstetter, 2004; Pagan, 2005; Sievert, 2007; Tong, 2006). Tong (2006) noted, "… most of the studies reported that ELLs reached native-like proficiency in L2 oral language (including vocabulary and listening comprehension) by the end of 5th grade" (pp. 18-19). Tong continued, "… there is an approximately equal gain each year in terms of English oral proficiency among Spanish-speaking ELLs, regardless of program type, namely two-way immersion, ESL, or English-only" (p. 20). The literature indicated that there is a great need to do further research concerning ESOL instruction in early kindergarten through third grade students.

The projection made in the Gray and Fleischman (2005) article that 50% of students in the United States in 2015 will speak a language other than English at home points to the urgency for additional research. The U.S. Department of Education & National Institute Child Health

and Human Development's 2003 projection that by the year 2030, 40% of the school population will speak English as a second language, and the 2010 United States Census Bureau projection that the U.S. Latino population will be 133 million by 2050 confirms the urgency for additional research. Since third graders must pass the FCAT reading assessment to be promoted, the researcher believes that the educational community needs to determine which ESOL program serves the needs of K thru 3 ELLs the best. Once determined, curriculum and instructional policies should be written for that program that will fill the needs of ELLs and thus speed their English language development and acquisition. Additionally, once the curriculum and instructional policies are in place, greater emphasis can be placed on in-service teacher training through a uniformed teacher ESOL training program. This will ensure that districts follow a standardized approach to preparing all teachers to instruct ELLs.

The researcher further believes that even though NCLB and Race to the Top have been effective in providing equal access to a quality education for ELLs, they should not be rushed into standardized high-stakes testing. English language mastery must be the first step for ELLs when they enter school in the United States. To do so, ELLs must be taught using the most effective ESOL program.

The development of one ESOL curriculum and a uniformed professional development program for teachers will allow the district to concentrate resources, both people and money, on only one ESOL program. This will be more cost effective for the district. Also, theoretically, using the most effective ESOL program will reduce the number of students that have to retake the state- and federally-mandated high stakes assessments. This in turn will reduce the number of intensive reading classes, which will reduce the number of teachers needed. The reduction in teachers will result in reduced payroll expenses for the district.

Older ELL students entering the United States with no English language knowledge will benefit from the findings of this study. Just as the first grade ELL students start English language acquisition with no previous knowledge of English and are taught through the ESOL program deemed most effective by this study, older ELL students would be taught using the same program so they can acquire English and be able to pass state-mandated achievement tests.

Chapter Two reviewed the literature related to the study. It began examining the conceptual or theoretical framework of the study which were Piaget's theory of cognitive development and Vygotsky's ZPD. The chapter continued by discussing teaching techniques for helping ELLs gain English mastery, then discussed the four periods in ESOL history and detailed six ESOL programs. Next, trends in education and legal rulings concerning ELLs were discussed, followed by a review of how ELLs might be labeled as LD and how SES might affect English acquisition. A review of educational studies on vocabulary development and the effects of early intervention for ELLs followed, and then a review of various specific studies of ESOL programs were discussed.

Chapter Three will cover the study design and identification of the variables. The research questions and hypotheses will be discussed, followed by the identification of the participants and setting of the study, including an explanation the ESOL programs used in the target district. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of the instrumentation, procedures for data collection, and data analysis.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

Overview

This chapter will begin with an explanation of the design of the study and why the design was chosen. The researcher will then list the independent and dependent variables of the study. The threats to validity of the district ESOL programs, the research questions, and hypotheses, which set the foundation of the study, are then explained. The most important elements for replication of the study are explained next: the participants and setting of the study, the instrumentation used, and the exact procedures that were employed. The chapter concludes with how the data were analyzed and assumptions that were made for the analysis.

Design

This study used a quantitative, causal-comparative design utilizing archival data. There were two separate measurements that were analyzed in this study. The first measurement was a comparison of the means of each independent variable, and the second was a comparison of the pass/fail percentage of the three different study populations, dual language, sheltered English immersion, and English monolingual, which were the independent variables.

A causal-comparative, or ex post facto, design was chosen to compare the scores of three English instruction programs, two ESOL programs, DL and SEI, and one English-monolingual program. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) noted:

> Causal-comparative research is a type of nonexperimental investigation in which researchers seek to identify cause-and-effect relationships.by forming groups of individuals in whom the independent variable is present or absent-or presents at several levels-and then determining whether the groups differ on the dependent variable. (p. 306)

The three instructional programs were the independent variables, and the dependent variable was the 2014 third grade FCAT reading scores. This study was a retrospective causal-comparative study because the effects of the independent variables used data that were already completed. In addition, the groups remained static because the data were archival and there was no participant movement between groups during the course of the study.

Identification of Variables

The independent variable in the study was the ESOL instruction program the participants had been taught through for their first three years of English instruction, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014. The independent variable was divided into two sub-levels: (1) DL ESOL program and (2) SEI ESOL program. In addition, a third study population, EM students, was analyzed and used as a baseline for the study as recommended by Tong (2006).

The dependent variable in this study was the 2014 third grade FCAT reading assessment score for each student. The students take the FCAT reading assessment each year, but the only year that they are required to pass in order to be promoted is third grade. Tenth grade students are required to pass the FCAT reading assessment to graduate. The gap in the literature showed that additional research needed to be performed on kindergarten through early elementary students. For the purposes of this study, the researcher analyzed third grade results.

This study took place in the final year the FCAT was used. It was replaced by the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) but the data for the 2015 FSA was deemed not reliable for this study because it was being developed and tweaked as the 2015 school year progressed, and the 2016 FSA had not been administered at the time the data were gathered. It is important to note that the FCAT reading score, the dependent variable, was the actual measuring tool and was not

being tested itself. The study results should be the same no matter which high stakes assessment is in use as the dependent variable.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study were:

RQ1: Are there differences between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language ESOL program and third grade English Language Learners taught exclusively through the sheltered English immersion ESOL program?

RQ2: Are there differences between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language ESOL program and the scores of third grade English-monolingual students?

RQ3: Are there differences between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the sheltered English immersion ESOL program and the scores of third grade English-monolingual students?

Hypotheses

$H_0$1: There will be no statistically significant difference between the scores of ELL students taught through the dual language (DL) ESOL program and the scores of ELL students taught through the sheltered English immersion (SEI) ESOL program on the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment.

$H_0$2: There will be no statistically significant difference between the percentage of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language (DL) ESOL

program and the percentage of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the sheltered English immersion (SEI) ESOL program passing the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment.

$H_0$3: There will be no statistically significant difference between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of ELL students taught through the dual language (DL) ESOL program and the scores of English-monolingual (EM) students.

$H_0$4: There will be no statistically significant difference between the percentage of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language (DL) ESOL program and the percentage of third grade English-monolingual (EM) students passing the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment.

$H_0$5: There will be no statistically significant difference between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of ELL students taught through the sheltered English immersion (SEI) ESOL program and the scores of English-monolingual students.

$H_0$6: There will be no statistically significant difference between the percentage of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) ESOL program and the percentage of third grade English-monolingual (EM) students passing the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment.

Participants and Setting

This study took place in a school district in Florida. There were three third grade study populations totaling 206 students. The study populations were drawn from seven elementary or K-8 schools.

Participants

The participants in this study were 54 third grade ELL students who had been taught English from first through third grade during the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 only through the DL ESOL program and 76 third grade ELL students who had been taught English from first through third grade during the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 only through the SEI ESOL program. A third study group of 76 monolingual, English-speaking students were identified so data were collected and analyzed to establish a baseline for measurement, as recommended by Tong (2006) and to answer research questions two and three. A power analysis for a one-way ANOVA with three groups was conducted in G*Power to determine a sufficient sample size using an alpha of 0.05, a power of 0.80, and a medium effect size ($f = 0.25$) (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009). Based on the aforementioned assumptions, the desired sample size was 159. With a sample size of 206, this study was within power parameters.

Setting

The Florida school district studied uses two programs identified as dual language, an extended foreign language (EFL) program and a bilingual school organization (BISO) program. The BISO program is the program that meets the typical DL definition for ESOL instruction, and there are seven elementary schools in the district that employ it. Every student in the seven schools, both English speakers and ELLs, are taught in dual-language classroom using a 60/40 (English/Spanish) distribution (MDCPS, 2017). For this study, the BISO schools were used because they use a dual language program that most closely fits the dual language ESOL program definition identified in the review of literature.

BISO. Classrooms in the BISO schools are inclusion classrooms and are made-up of both ELL and EM students. All subjects, including core subjects, are taught in both languages, English and Spanish. Research shows that most DL programs in the United States instruct students using a 50% English and 50% second language model. The school district studied instructs students using a 60% English and 40% Spanish model. The researcher questioned the district bilingual department staff as to why 60/40 was used and was told that the first DL school in the nation was Coral Way Elementary in 1963, and the 60/40 model is the formula that was used. Since it proved successful, the district chose not to change it, even though 50/50 is now the formula used in most DL schools across the nation.

Sheltered English immersion. The State of Florida ranks ESOL students based on how they score on The Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA). The assessment was given from May 2008 to May 2015 and measured ELLs' English proficiency. The CELLA was designed to provide accountability for ELLs as required by NCLB (FLDOE, 2017a). The students are classified as ESOL Level 1, ESOL Level 2, ESOL Level 3, ESOL Level 4, or ESOL Level 5 (FLDOE, 2014a). Level 5 students are transferred out of the ESOL program but are monitored for two years after leaving the program.

ESOL Level 1 and ESOL Level 2 SEI students are taught in inclusion classrooms. Each student in the class is an ELL, and they are taught English and all core subjects in English in the class. The design is intended to ease the pressure on the ELLs because they will not try to "keep up" with their English-speaking peers in a general classroom setting like structured English immersion students do. In addition, their teacher is an ESOL-certified teacher. ESOL Level 3 and ESOL Level 4 students still receive English instruction but are placed in general population

classrooms where their core subject instruction is taught in English and teachers use ESOL strategies such as small group instruction, peer instruction, and scaffolding.

The setting for this study was seven elementary or K-8 schools in one public school district in Florida. Each school employed one ESOL program: DL or SEI and had been identified as FCAT "A" schools for each of the previous three school years, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014.

The original intent was for the researcher to work with one school that used one ESOL program to see if a study population could be identified then add additional schools, if necessary, until a minimum of 53 participants for each study population could be found. The researcher worked with the administration of one K-8 school to identify all third grade ESOL students from the 2013-2014 school year who had received first through third grade ESOL instruction through the school in the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 school years. Students who had transferred in from other schools and students who were identified as learning disabled were not a part of the study population. The researcher obtained the 2014 third grade FCAT reading scores of 77 SEI ESOL students. Since the school also had students who were EM, the researcher obtained the scores of 76 students who met the criteria for the EM study population.

Obtaining the DL ESOL population provided a bigger challenge. There were only seven schools in the geographical location that used the DL ESOL program, and one failed to meet all of the study criteria. Since there were so many schools to get data from, the researcher worked with the research department of the district, and the district provided the data required for the study. There were only 57 total students in all six schools of the DL schools combined who fit the study criteria, so that is the population the researcher used.

Instrumentation

The first through third grade class rosters were the means used to determine the independent variable. They identified who the participants were and through which ESOL program they were taught. The FCAT results were the dependent variable and identified the total points earned by each participant. The researcher received the rosters without any student-identifying information after they were stripped of that information by the school or district personnel. The researcher was able to determine the mean score for each participant group. He then used a one-way ANOVA and performed a causal comparative analysis of the mean score of the DL ESOL program population, the SEI ESOL program population, and the EM program population. The results determined the effectiveness of the each ESOL program and compared them to the baseline EM study population. The researcher was also able to determine the independence of the independent variables by using a chi-square test on the percentage of students in each study population who passed the FCAT.

The independent variable had a high degree of validity because the information used to put the students in the proper research participant group was the actual student records. The dependent variable also had a high degree of validity because the mean scores used for the group comparison were the actual State of Florida mandated standardized FCAT assessment scores of the participants. The Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) publication, *Assessment & Accountability Briefing Book,* noted, "Internal consistency reliabilities for the FCAT are reported using two methods: Cronbach's Alpha and Item Response Theory (IRT) marginal reliabilities (FLDOE, 2007, p. 37). The FLDOE further added that the FCAT measured student achievement compared to the Sunshine State Standards, and "The types of validity evidence are often grouped

into these three interrelated categories: (a) content-related evidence, (b) criterion-related evidence, (c) construct-related evidence" (FLDOE, 2007, p. 40).

Procedures

The researcher submitted an Institutional Review Board (IRB) application to the Liberty University IRB to gain approval for the study, which was to compare the structured English immersion and transitional bilingual ESOL programs. After receiving Liberty University IRB approval, the researcher submitted an IRB packet to the local school system IRB. Once the district approval was obtained, the researcher contacted the ESOL coordinator for the district and discovered that local school district no longer used the two ESOL programs approved in the study. The researcher then had to rewrite chapters one and two of the study and begin the approval process for a second time. The researcher submitted a new IRB packet to the Liberty University IRB to gain approval for the study, which was to compare the sheltered English immersion and dual language ESOL programs.

After receiving Liberty University IRB approval, the researcher submitted a revised IRB packet to the Miami-Dade County Public School System IRB. Once district approval was obtained, the researcher studied testing data from the Florida Department of Education and identified the target elementary FCAT "A" schools. The researcher then contacted the administration of the schools and attempted to arrange a meeting with the principal. The only principal to reply was the principal of the school using the sheltered English immersion program.

At the meeting with the principal, the researcher defined the study goals and parameters of the study and sought the principal's assistance. The researcher was given the email contact information for the assistant principal that the principal charged with the responsibility for

supplying the data. After explaining the parameters of the study via email, the researcher had to wait for the data to be gathered and delivered.

When the data were ready, the contact person forwarded the potential study participants' third grade FCAT reading assessment scores on an Excel spreadsheet. There were two Excel sheets, one with 77 SEI students and one with 76 English-monolingual students. The potential study members were identified by the ESOL program, or English instruction program, abbreviation, and a number, i.e. SEI 1, SEI 2, EM 1, EM 2, etc. Since the sample size was more than the 53 needed to ensure power per the G*Power test, only one school was needed for the SEI and EM populations. The researcher never knew the potential and eventual study members' identities.

Obtaining the DL ESOL population provided a bigger challenge. There were seven schools in the district that used the DL ESOL program, but only six schools fit the parameters of the study. The researcher attempted to contact the principals of the six schools, but only one principal replied, and that was to recommend that the district be contacted for the requested data. The researcher contacted the assessment, research, and data analysis department of the district for assistance, and the director of research services supplied the data for the DL potential population. There were only a small number of students in each school that met the study criteria, and it took combining data from all six schools to produce a potential study population of 57 students. An Excel spreadsheet listing the third grade FCAT reading scores of the 57 students was prepared and delivered to the researcher. The potential study participants were listed as DL 1, DL 2, etc., and the researcher never knew the identity of the students in the study population.

Data Analysis

The study was an ex post facto study using archival data. The study compared the means of the independent variables and the pass/fail percentage of the three different study populations, DL, SEI, and EM, which were the independent variables. That required two separate statistical tests. Null hypotheses one, three, and five were based on the mean scores of the three study populations, and null hypotheses two, four, and six were based on the pass/fail percentages of the study populations.

"Analysis of Variance (abbreviated ANOVA) is a statistical procedure that compares the amount of between-groups variance in individuals' scores with the amount of with-in groups variances" (Gall et al., 2007, p. 318). The researcher found that the best statistical test to measure the means of three or more populations to see if there is a statistically significant difference was a one-way ANOVA. The one-way ANOVA tests the null hypothesis by determining if there is a statistically significant difference between the means of any of the populations. Specifically, if the difference in the means is $p < .05$, the null hypothesis was accepted. The ANOVA determines if any of the populations are statistically significantly different. If there is a statistically significant difference, a post hoc test has to be run to determine which populations they are (Test That Your Data Meets Important Assumptions, 2013).

The best test to use to compare pass/fail percentages is a chi-square test. "The chi-square (x^2) test is a nonparametric statistical test to determine whether research data in the form of frequency counts are distributed differently for different samples" (Gall et al., 2007, p. 324). The chi-square test determines whether the variables are independent, and determines if the null

hypothesis can be rejected. If the analysis has a significance of $p < .05$, the results show a statistically significant difference and the null hypothesis is rejected (Ling, 2008).

The FCAT reading scores of the participants listed on the excel spread sheets from the 2013-2014 school year were the instrument for the dependent variable. Analysis of the data took place after the researcher received the results of the actual FCAT. Upon receipt of the data, the researcher analyzed each study population of DL, SEI, and EM and removed all outliers. DL had three outliers, SEI had one outlier, and EM had no outliers. That left study populations of DL ($n = 54$), SEI ($n = 76$), and EM ($n = 76$).

The researcher next accessed the 2014 third grade FCAT Reading Assessment results from the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE). The passing score for the 2014 third grade FCAT Reading Assessment was 198. The State of Florida had a 57% passing rate and a mean score of 200. MDCPS had a 56% passing rate and a mean score of 199 (FLDOE, 2014a).

In order to perform an ANOVA on a group of data and for it to be valid, six assumptions must be met. The first assumption required for using an ANOVA is that the dependent variable, FCAT Score, is measured in equal intervals. The second assumption is that the independent variable, English instruction program, consists of three categorical, independent groups. The third assumption is that the independent variable, language of instruction, is observed independently. The fourth assumption is that all outliers were removed prior to the ANOVA being run. The fifth assumption is that the dependent variable, FCAT Score, is approximately normally distributed for each category of the independent variable. The sixth assumption is that there is homogeneity of variances (Test That Your Data Meets Important Assumptions, 2013). All assumptions were met and the researcher ran a one-way ANOVA using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 24 (Field, 2006) on the three study populations. The alpha for determining significant

difference was $p < .05$. After determining that there was a statistically significant difference in the means of the populations, $p = .000$ (see Table 2), the researcher then ran a post hoc test in IBM SPSS Statistics Version 24 (Field, 2006) that verified the validity of the one-way ANOVA (see Table 3).

The researcher next needed to compare the pass/fail percentages of the three study populations, DL, SEI, and EM. The best test to analyze categorical data is a chi-square test for independence. A chi-square test for independence tests the null hypothesis and whether the two populations are independent of each other. The alpha is $p < .05$ (Ling, 2008). The researcher ran a chi-Square test for independence using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 24 (Field, 2006) on each population relationship, DL/SEI, DL/EM, and SEI/EM, in order to analyze the pass/fail percentage difference on the 2014 third grade FCAT Reading Assessment of the two ESOL programs in this study, DL and SEI. Then the results of each ESOL program were analyzed against the EM baseline population results.

Chapter Three discussed the design of the study and identified the variables. The chapter then restated the research questions and hypotheses and identified the participants and setting of the study, explaining the ESOL programs used in the target district. The chapter next discussed the instrumentation, procedures for collecting data, and how the data would be analyzed. Chapter Four will analyze the findings of the study. The chapter will restate the research questions and null hypotheses, and then detail the final study populations. The researcher will explain the parameters of the statistical test used and the results will be displayed in table format. The chapter will conclude with a restatement of the hypotheses and the results of the data analysis for each research question and hypothesis.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Overview

The chapter begins with a restatement of the research questions for the study followed by the null hypotheses. The descriptive statistics lists the details of each study population and explains how outliers were removed and the final study populations determined. The researcher next explains the parameters of the statistical test used and the results are displayed in table format. The chapter concludes with a restatement of the hypotheses and the results of the findings.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study are:

RQ1: Are there differences between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language ESOL program and third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the sheltered English immersion ESOL program?

RQ2: Are there differences between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language ESOL program and the scores of third grade English-monolingual students?

RQ3: Are there differences between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the sheltered English immersion ESOL program and the scores of third grade English-monolingual students?

Null Hypotheses

$H_0$1: There will be no statistically significant difference between the scores of ELL students taught through the dual language (DL) ESOL program and the scores of ELL students taught through the sheltered English immersion (SEI) ESOL program on the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment.

$H_0$2: There will be no statistically significant difference between the percentage of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language (DL) ESOL program and the percentage of third grade English Language Learners taught exclusively through the sheltered English immersion (SEI) ESOL program passing the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment.

$H_0$3: There will be no statistically significant difference between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of ELL students taught through the dual language (DL) ESOL program and the scores of English-monolingual (EM) students.

$H_0$4: There will be no statistically significant difference between the percentage of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language (DL) ESOL program and the percentage of third grade English-monolingual (EM) students passing the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment.

$H_0$5: There will be no statistically significant difference between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of ELL students taught through the sheltered English immersion (SEI) ESOL program and the scores of English-monolingual students.

$H_0$6: There will be no statistically significant difference between the percentage of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the sheltered English immersion (SEI) ESOL program and the percentage of third grade English-monolingual (EM) students passing the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment.

Descriptive Statistics

There were three English language instruction programs examined in this study, which were the independent variables, DL, SEI, EM, and one dependent variable, the third grade FCAT Reading score. There were originally 76 EM students, 77 SEI students, and 57 DL students (see Appendices A, B, and C). The English-monolingual student population FCAT scores were used as a baseline to compare the two ESOL programs' results to as recommended by Tong (2006).

Using the mathematical formulas Q1 – 1.5 (IQR) and Q3 + 1.5 (IQR) for determining outliers, the researcher ran the statistical analysis of the three sets of independent variables. Step one was to determine the mean of the entire set of numbers. This then allowed the researcher to determine the low quartile score (Q1) and high quartile score (Q3) for each set of data. The low quartile score (Q1) was subtracted from the high quartile score (Q3) to determine the interquartile range (IQR).

> "The "interquartile range", abbreviated "IQR" … is IQR = $Q_3 – Q_1$. The IQR can be used as a measure of how spread-out the values are. Statistics assumes that your values are clustered around some central value. The IQR tells how spread out the "middle" values are; it can also be used to tell when some of the other values are "too far" from the central value. These "too far away" points are called "outliers", because they "lie outside" the range in which we expect them" (Stapel, 2014, p. 1).

The researcher performed the mathematical test for outliers and determined that the parameters for the English-monolingual program students were 164 to 264. The original population of 76 students had scores that ranged from 175 to 260 which meant that there were no outliers. The final English-monolingual program study population had 76 students who fell into the population range of 164 to 264 with actual scores that ranged from 175 to 260 (see Appendix A). The mean of the EM population was 214.3289 (see Table 1).

The researcher next performed the mathematical test for outliers and determined that the parameters for the sheltered English immersion program students were 167 to 255. The original population of 77 students had scores that ranged from 177 to 260 which meant that there was one outlier. The final sheltered English immersion program study population had 76 students who fell into the population range of 167 to 255 with actual scores that ranged from 177 to 248 (see Appendix B). The mean of the SEI population was 210.2368 (see Table 1).

For the final study population, the researcher performed the mathematical test for outliers and determined that parameters for the dual language program students were 147.75 to 229.75. The original population of 57 students had scores that ranged from 140 to 233 which meant that there were three outliers. The final dual language program study population had 54 students who fell into the population range of 147.75 to 229.75 with actual scores that ranged from 161 to 229 (see Appendix C). The mean of the DL population was 189.2963 (see Table 1).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

		N	*M*	SD	SE
Dual Language		54	189.2963	14.75796	2.00830
Sheltered English Immersion		76	210.2368	14.40080	1.65189
English Monolingual		76	214.3289	18.62714	2.13668
Total		206	206.2573	19.10298	1.33097
Model	Fixed Effects			16.17633	7.37718
	Random Effects				7.37718

Results

To determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the means of three or more independent groups, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. To perform a one-way ANOVA, and for it to be valid, six assumptions must be met (Test That Your Data Meets Important Assumptions, 2013).

Results of Assumptions before ANOVA

The first assumption is that the dependent variable, FCAT Score, was measured in equal intervals. The intervals on the FCAT Score is numerical and measured in full points from 140 to 302 (FLDOE, 2014a) (see Appendices A, B, and C).

The second assumption was that the independent variable, English instruction program, consists of three categorical, independent groups. The programs that were measured were English monolingual, sheltered English immersion, and dual language (see Appendices A, B, & C).

The third assumption is that the independent variable, language of instruction, was observed independently. Each independent variable, English monolingual, sheltered English immersion, and dual language, was measured independently and had a unique student study population. No student was in more than one group (see Appendices A, B, and C).

The fourth assumption is that all outliers were removed prior to the ANOVA being run. The researcher ran the numerical tests that determined if there were any outliers in the study populations. The English-monolingual population had no outliers, the Sheltered English Immersion program had one outlier (260), and the Dual Language program had 3 outliers (140, 140, & 233) (see Appendices A, B, and C).

The fifth assumption is that the dependent variable, FCAT Score was approximately normally distributed for each category of the independent variable. The dependent variable was approximately normally distributed for each category of the independent variable (see Table 1).

The English instruction programs had a significant effect on the FCAT reading results at the $p < .05$ level for the three populations, $F(2,203) = 41.444$, $p = .000$ (see Table 2)

Table 2

ANOVA Three English Instruction Programs

FCAT Score

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	21689.592	2	10844.796	41.444	.000
Within Groups	53119.772	203	261.674		
Total	74809.364	205			

Post Hoc Test

The sixth assumption assumes that there is homogeneity of variances which assumes similar variance of groups. The ANOVA utilizes the *F* statistic, which is robust to the assumption, as long as group sizes are equal (The Assumption of Homogeneity of Variance, 2016).

Homogeneous Subsets

When an ANOVA shows that there is a statistically significant difference, a test that shows homogeneity of variance must be done. The most commonly used test is Levene's Test for equality of variances. Levene's test uses an ANOVA to compare absolute values. The *p* value is .05 and a value of $p < .05$ indicates the results are not valid (Statistics Solutions, 2016). The ANOVA analysis had homogeneity of variance. The *p* value of .071 is greater than .05 which means that the results are valid (see Table 3).

Table 3

Test of Homogeneity of Variances for FCAT Scores

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2.673	2	203	.071

This study had six null hypotheses, three that required measuring the means of the independent variables, and three that required comparing the passing percentage of the independent variables. A one-way ANOVA was the best statistical test to compare the means of three or more study populations (Creech, 2017; Gall et al., 2007). Chi-square was the best statistical test to use to compare the passing percentage of the study populations (Gall et al., 2007; Statistic Solutions, 2017).

The six assumptions required to ensure that an ANOVA was the best statistical tool to use were met. Therefore, a one-way ANOVA was performed on the data (see Table 2).

Table 4

Multiple Comparisons of Dependent Variable (FCAT score)

					95% Confidence Interval	
(I) ESOL Program	(J) ESOL Program	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
DL	SEI	-20.94055*	2.87904	.000	-27.7381	-14.1430
	EM	-25.03265*	2.87904	.000	-31.8302	-18.2351
SEI	DL	20.94055*	2.87904	.000	14.1430	27.7381
	EM	-4.09211	2.62415	.266	-10.2878	2.1036
EM	DL	25.03265*	2.87904	.000	18.2351	31.8302
	SEI	4.09211	2.62415	.266	-2.1036	10.2878

Notes. SEI = sheltered English immersion, EM = English monolingual, DL = dual language.
*The mean difference is significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Hypotheses

$H_0$1: There will be no statistically significant difference between the scores of ELL students taught through the dual language (DL) ESOL program and the scores of ELL students taught through the sheltered English immersion (SEI) ESOL program on the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment.

A one-way ANOVA was run with the alpha for determining significant difference $p < .05$. The statistical analysis determined a p-value of 0.00, so there was a statistically significant difference in the scores of the DL and SEI populations. The results matched the ANOVA results for RQ1 and thus, the null hypothesis was rejected (see Table 4).

$H_0$2: There will be no statistically significant difference between the percentage of third grade English Language Learners taught exclusively through the Dual Language ESOL program and the percentage of third grade English Language Learners taught exclusively through the Sheltered English Immersion ESOL program passing the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment.

A chi square test of independence was run on the DL and SEI populations with the alpha for determining significant difference $p < .05$. The DL population was 54 students with 16, or 29.6% passing with a score of higher than 198 and 38, or 70.4%, failing with a score of less than 198. The SEI population was 76 students with 61, or 80.3%, passing with a score of great than 198 and 15, or 19.7%, failing with a score of less than 198 (see Table 5). The statistical analysis determined a *p*-value of 0.00, so there was a statistically significant difference in the passing percentage of the DL and SEI populations, $\chi^2(1, N = 130) = 33.517, p = .000$ (see Table 6). SEI students outperformed the DL students on the 2014 third grade FCAT Reading Assessment. Cramer's V = .508 which large effect size for RQ1 (see Table 7). Therefore, this study rejected the null hypothesis. The results matched the ANOVA results for RQ1 and thus, the null hypothesis was rejected (see Table 2).

Table 5

Chi-Square Language Program Grade Crosstabulation

		Grade		
		Pass	Fail	Total
Language Program	DL Count	16	38	54
	% Within Program	29.6%	70.4%	100%
	SEI	61	15	76
	% Within Program	80.3%	19.7%	100%
Total		77	53	130

Notes. DL= dual language, SEI = sheltered English immersion

Table 6

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Sig (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson chi-square	33.517[a]	1	.000		
Continuity correction[b]	31.453	1	.000		
Likelihood ratio	34.628	1	.000		
Fisher's exact test				.000	.000
Linear-by-linear Association	33.259	1	.000		
N of valid cases	130				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.02.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table 7

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.508	.000
	Cramer's V	.508	.000
N of Valid Cases		130	

$H_0$3: There will be no statistically significant difference between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of ELL students taught through the dual language ESOL program (DL) and the scores of English-monolingual students.

A one-way ANOVA was run with the alpha for determining significant difference $p < .05$. The statistical analysis determined a *p*-value of 0.00, so there was a statistically significant difference in the scores of the DL and EM populations. The results matched the ANOVA results for RQ2 and thus, the null hypothesis was rejected (see Table 4).

$H_0$4: There will be no statistically significant difference between the percentage of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language ESOL program and the percentage of third grade English-monolingual students passing the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment.

A chi-square test of Independence was run on the DL and EM populations with the alpha for determining significant difference $p < .05$. The DL population was 54 students with 16, or 29.6%, passing with a score of greater than 198 and 38, or 70.4%, failing with a score of less than 198. The EM population was 76 students with 60, or 78.9%, passing with a score of greater than 198 and 15, or 21.1%, failing with a score of less than 198 (see Table 8). The statistical analysis determined a *p*-value of 0.00, so there was a statistically significant difference in the passing percentage of the DL and EM populations, $\chi^2(1, N = 130) = 31.619$, $p = .000$ (see Table 9). EM students outperformed the DL students on the 2014 third grade FCAT Reading Assessment. Cramer's V = .493 is a medium effect size for RQ2 (see Table 10). Therefore, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis. The results matched the ANOVA results for RQ2 and thus, the null hypothesis was rejected (see Table 2).

Table 8

Chi-Square Language Program Grade Crosstabulation

		Grade		
		Pass	Fail	Total
Language Program	Dual Language Count	16	38	54
	% Within Program	29.6%	70.4%	100%
	English Monolingual	60	16	76
	% Within Program	78.9%	21.1%	100%
Total		76	54	130

Table 9

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson chi-square	31.619[a]	1	.000		
Continuity correction[b]	29.621	1	.000		
Likelihood ratio	32.619	1	.000		
Fisher's exact test				.000	.000
Linear-by-linear Association	31.376	1	.000		
N of valid cases	130				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.43.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table 10

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.493	.000
	Cramer's V	.493	.000
N of Valid Cases		130	

H_05: There will be no statistically significant difference between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of ELL students taught through the SEI ESOL program and the scores of EM students.

A one-way ANOVA was run with the alpha for determining significant difference $p < .05$. The statistical analysis determined a *p*-value of 0.266, so there was no statistically significant difference in the scores of the SEI and EM populations. Therefore, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis (see Table 4).

$H_0$6: There will be no statistically significant difference between the percentage of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the sheltered English immersion ESOL program and the percentage of third grade, English-monolingual students passing the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment.

A chi-square test of independence was run on the SEI and EM populations with the alpha for determining significant difference $p < .05$. The SEI population was 76 students with 61, or 80.3%, passing with a score of greater than 198 and 15, or 19.7%, failing with a score of less than 198. The EM population was 76 students with 60, or 78.9%, passing with a score of greater than 198 and 15, or 21.1%, failing with a score of less than 198 (see Table 11). The statistical analysis determined a *p*-value of .840, so there was no statistically significant difference in the passing percentage of the SEI and EM populations, $\chi^2(1, N = 152) = .041$, $p = .840$ (see Table 12). SEI students outperformed the EM students on the 2014 third grade FCAT reading assessment. Cramer's V = .016 which is a small effect size for RQ3 (see Table 13). Therefore, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis. The results matched the ANOVA results for RQ3 and thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Table 2).

Table 11

Chi-Square Language Program Grade Crosstabulation

		Grade		
		Pass	Fail	Total
Language Program	SEI Count	61	15	76
	% Within Program	80.3%	19.7%	100%
	EM	60	16	76
	% Within Program	78.9%	21.1%	100%
Total		121	31	152

Notes. SE = sheltered English immersion, EM = English monolingual

Table 12

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson chi-square	.041[a]	1	.840		
Continuity correction[b]	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood ratio	.041	1	.840		
Fisher's exact test				1.000	.500
Linear-by-linear Association	.040	1	.841		
N of valid cases	152				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.50.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table 13

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by nominal	Phi	.016	.840
	Cramer's V	.016	.840
N of valid cases		152	

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

Overview

The chapter will start with a review of the purpose of the study and the findings in reference to the research questions. The implications of the results will be discussed followed by the limitations of the study and recommendations for future research. The chapter will end with a final discussion and the researcher's ultimate interpretation of the results of the study.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine if the sheltered English immersion (SEI) ESOL program is more effective than the dual language (DL) ESOL program in helping first through third grade elementary students gain academic and social English language mastery. The importance of making the determination was the requirement that third grade students must pass the state-mandated FCAT reading assessment to be promoted to the fourth grade. The researcher entered this study with the clear hypothesis that the sheltered English immersion ESOL program was better than the dual language ESOL program in preparing ELLs for the state-mandated high stakes testing. The natural comparison was to analyze the mean scores of the two ESOL programs, but it was also important to analyze the pass/fail percentage of each study population against the other. Conceivably, the study populations could be statistically equal, but the percentage of students passing the FCAT could be low. Thus, passing percentage of the study populations was a valid indicator of the effectiveness of the ESOL programs. The researcher also followed Tong's (2006) recommendation to use an English-monolingual study population as a baseline for measuring the ESOL programs' effectiveness. Since it was necessary to measure the mean score and passing percentage of each population, two hypotheses had to be developed for each research question.

The research showed that DL was a viable ESOL program but was mixed on the effectiveness of the program (Gonzalez, 2003; Lindholm-Leary, 2015). Some of the research studies showed that DL was equal to SEI (McGee, 2012; Sievert, 2007; Stewart, 2004). Other studies concluded that DL students lag behind SEI students (Baker & Jones, 1998; Rossell & Baker, 1996; Tong, 2006).

Since the research was not conclusive, the researcher arrived at the hypothesis based on the research that showed that DL students lag behind SEI students on test scores in their early elementary school years. This made sense to the researcher because the class has 50% ELLs and 50% English-monolingual students and he presumed that there would be several students from each population that had difficult time learning a second language. The researcher predicted that two languages taught in one classroom would present more chances for the class to fall behind the curriculum schedule and thus not progress as quickly as the SEI ELLs.

Research showed that a student's SES often played a part in English acquisition with lower SES students typically not performing as well as higher SES students. However, research also showed that students tend to perform to the aggregate score of a school with lower SES students scoring higher in higher scoring schools (Perry & McConney, 2010). Based on the research showing lower SES students scoring higher in high scoring schools, the researcher chose to only include schools in the study that had been designated as FCAT A schools for each of the three years the students in the study had been in first, second, and third grades. Although the effects of SES on the students' performance could not be measured, this was the best way to minimize any effect SES might have had on the study.

Research shows that there is an overrepresentation of ELLs labelled as LD (Gottlieb et al., 1994; Klingner & Artiles, 2003; Scott et al., 2014; Shelton, 2007). In many cases, ELLs

labelled as LD are not LD; they have a language acquisition challenge. Since it was impossible to determine from archived data if the students were truly LD, the researcher chose to eliminate LD student scores from the study. By doing so, the population scores were truly measuring the independent variable and a threat to validity was removed.

The researcher formulated his research questions based around his hypotheses and developed the following research questions:

RQ1: Are there differences between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language ESOL program and third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the sheltered English immersion ESOL program?

RQ2: Are there differences between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the dual language ESOL program and the scores of third grade English-monolingual students?

RQ3: Are there differences between the third grade Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) reading assessment scores of third grade English language learners taught exclusively through the sheltered English immersion ESOL program and the scores of third grade English-monolingual students?

After obtaining the data, the researcher studied statistical tests and determined that a one-way ANOVA was the best statistical test to perform on three independent study populations to determine their means and their statistical relationship (Gall et al., 2007). He also determined that a Chi-square test of independence was the best test to use to compare the pass/fail percentage of my three study populations, DL, SEI, and EM (Ling, 2008).

For the ANOVA, there were six assumptions that had to be met for the test to be valid. (Test That Your Data Meets Important Assumptions, 2013). All assumptions were met.

Based on the research, two null hypotheses for Research Question One were developed. The null hypotheses were that there would be no statistically significant difference in the FCAT Reading scores and passing percentage of the two ESOL populations, DL and SEI. The researcher expected SEI students' scores to be higher than DL students' scores and the student passing percentage of SEI students to be higher that the passing percentage of DL students. The alpha for both hypotheses was $p < .05$.

The one-way ANOVA determined that there was a statistically significant difference in the outcome of the testing of the two groups. The findings were $F(2,203) = 41.444$, $p = .000$ (see Table 2). The Post Hoc Tukey HSD test showed that the mean score for DL ESOL students (M = 189.2963, SD = 14.75796) was significantly different from the SEI ESOL students (M = 210.2368, SD = 14.40080) (see Table 4).

In addition, a chi-square test of independence determined that there was a statistically significant difference in the percentage of students in the two ESOL populations, DL and SEI, who passed the third grade FCAT reading assessment. The findings were $\chi^2(1, 130) = 33.517$, p =.000 (see Table 5). Therefore, the two null hypotheses for RQ1 were each rejected.

Based on Tong's (2006) recommendation that an English-monolingual population be assessed, to set a baseline for the study, the researcher formulated Research Questions Two and Three. Research Question Two was developed to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the scores and passing percentage of DL ESOL students and EM students. The two null hypotheses for Research Question Two were based on the researcher's assumption that students who already spoke English as their first language would easily outscore their ELL

counterparts. The hypotheses stated that there would be no statistically significant difference in the student scores and passing percentage of the DL ESOL program students and the EM students. The alpha for both hypotheses was $p < .05$.

The one-way ANOVA determined that there was a statistically significant difference in the outcome of the testing of the two groups. The findings were $F(2,203) = 41.444$, $p = .000$ (see Table 2). The Post Hoc Tukey HSD test showed that the mean score for DL ESOL students ($M = 189.2963$, SD = 14.75796) was significantly different from the EM students ($M = 214.3289$, SD = 18.62714) (see Table 1).

In addition, a chi-square test of independence determined that there was a statistically significant difference in the percentage of students in the two study populations, DL and EM, who passed the third grade FCAT reading assessment. The findings were $\chi^2(1, N = 130) = 31.619$, $p = .000$ (See Table 9). Therefore, the two null hypotheses for RQ2 were each rejected.

Research Question Three was developed to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the scores of SEI ESOL students and EM students. The two null hypotheses for Research Question Three were based on the researcher's assumption that students who already spoke English as their first language would easily outscore their ELL counterparts. The hypotheses stated that there would be no statistically significant difference in the student scores and passing percentage of the SEI ESOL program students and the EM students. The alpha for both hypotheses was $p < .05$.

The one-way ANOVA determined that there was no statistically significant difference in the outcome of the testing of the two groups. The findings were $F(2,203) = 41.444$, $p = .000$ (see Table 2. The Post Hoc Tukey HSD test showed that the mean score for SEI ESOL students ($M =$

210.2368, SD = 14.40080) was not significantly different than the EM students (M = 214.3289, SD = 18.62714) (see Table 1).

In addition, a chi-square test of independence determined that there was no statistically significant difference in the percentage of students in the two study populations, SEI and EM, who passed the third grade FCAT reading assessment. The findings were $\chi^2(1, N = 152) = .041$, p =.840 (see Table 12). The English-monolingual students scored higher than the Sheltered English Immersion ESOL program students on the FCAT Reading assessment, but the SEI population had a higher passing percentage than the EM population. Both results did not have a statistically significance difference. Therefore, the researcher failed to reject the two null hypotheses for RQ3.

Implications

The implications of this study were exactly what the researcher expected them to be. He fully expected the SEI ELL students to outperform the DL ELL students in testing, especially given the fact that SEI ELLs are in inclusion classrooms for ESOL Levels 1 and 2. Following Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (ZPD) theory, the researcher felt that the students would acquire English mastery quicker because of the teacher imparting the lessons through modeling, scaffolding, small group instruction and other ESOL strategies, while being the authority in the room. He also believed that with the inclusion classroom that the teacher would have a better "read" on each student's progress, which would allow for more defined differentiated instruction. This in turn would speed up the English acquisition of the entire class since individual students would not be slowing the class down.

In the case of the sheltered English immersion ESOL program students being outscored by their English-monolingual peers, the researcher was not surprised at all. The populations

were equal in size with 76 students in each program, and the mean scores were within 4.1 of each other. The results were EM 214.3289 and SEI 210.2368. What the researcher found interesting was that the percentage of SEI students in the study population passing the 2014 third grade FCAT, 80.3%, was higher than the percentage of EM students in the study population passing the 2014 third grade FCAT, 78.9%. In actual numbers, it was only one a student difference, but the SEI population had another student who scored so high that the score was an outlier of the population. It is also important to note that the SEI and EM population attended the same school. Both populations easily outperformed the state and district students. The state mean score was 200 and the district mean score was 199. The score required for passing was 198. The state passing percentage was 57% and the district was 56% (FLDOE, 2014a).

The DL study population scores raise several questions because the schools in the study were all rated as "A" schools, which means they were high performing schools. "A" schools were used because research shows that students tend to perform up to the aggregate of the school's performance (Perry & McConney, 2010). It is important to note that there were seven schools in the district that used the DL ESOL program. Only six of the schools were graded as "A" for the three-year time period leading up to the 2014 FCAT. The DL study population had to be drawn from all six schools because the number of students who met the study criteria was low at each individual location. The DL population had a mean score of 189.2963 (see Table 1), which was below the district mean score of 199 and state mean score of 200. In addition, the study population had a passing percentage of 29.6 (see Table 8), compared to the district percentage of 57% and state passing percentage of 56% (FLDOE, 2014a).

The obvious question is, "How did a school earn an "A" with such low scores? The answer is that the school scored high based on the non-study participants. The 54 students

studied were the combined total of all the students who met the study criteria, that is not LD and in the same ESOL program for all three years leading up to the 2014 FCAT reading assessment. This means that all of the other students in the six schools, with the possible exception of LD students, had been exposed to other ESOL instruction programs during their first or second grade years before they enrolled in their DL school. The study population was a true DL population.

Limitations

The study was limited in that it had a small sample size from a limited number of schools, and the results are based strictly on Hispanic students. Additionally, there were internal threats to validity that were identified and isolated from the study.

Students who had been identified as having a learning disability were excluded from the study because research shows that there is an overrepresentation of ELLs being labeled LD because in many school districts school administrators, counselors, and teachers make the determination rather than medical professionals. In many instances, lack of English proficiency is the problem, not a learning disability (Klingner & Artiles, 2003; Shelton, 2007). Because of the inconsistency in identifying if ELL students actually have a learning disability or have a language deficiency, it was impossible to single-out and measure the LD-labeled ELLs' language acquisition growth through a specific ESOL program versus their language acquisition due to them learning how to deal with their learning disability. Complicating the determination of what affects English acquisition by LD students is that they are sometimes isolated from the general student population and other times they are placed in inclusion classrooms

The criteria for participants being chosen for this study was that they had been in the same school being taught through the same ESOL strategy from first through third grade in the school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014. Students who had not received the same

ESOL strategy from first through third grade were excluded from the study population. The inconsistency of instruction could have skewed the results. Since this study focused on specific ESOL programs, it was vital that study populations had no student who had been given ESOL training through a different ESOL program because it was impossible to measure the effect of each ESOL program on their language acquisition. This ensured that their exposure to English instruction could be attributed to only one ESOL program, thus giving more validity to this study.

Additional internal threats to validity could be the culture and socio-economic status (SES) of the participants. Using archival data made it impossible to measure the effects of SES on the populations' scores. To minimize these factors, the study was conducted in schools identified as FCAT "A" schools for the three years of the participants' first through third grade ESOL instruction, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014.

There were eight assessment-based criteria that the State of Florida used to determine a school's grade. The eight criteria fell into three categories: "The percent of students scoring at satisfactory levels, the weighted percent of students making learning gains, and the weighted percent of learning gains for the lowest performing 25%" (FLDOE, 2014b, p. 10). The state grading model had a potential of 800 points, of which 400 came from testing reading, math, writing, and science. Learning gains for all students offered an additional 200 points and learning gains for the lowest performing 25% offered another 200 points. For a school to be an "A" school, it had to score a minimum of 525 points with at least 95% of its students tested (FLDOE, 2014b)

Perry and McConney (2010) noted, "It is well established in the research literature that socioeconomically disadvantaged students and schools do less well on standardized measures of

academic achievement compared with their more advantaged peers" (p. 1137). The researchers went on to explain that their study found that students of low SES standing placed in higher SES schools had higher scores than their peers in low SES schools. Perry and McConney (2010) concluded, "Our findings are consistent with other studies that have found that all students are sensitive to the influence of the aggregated socioeconomic composition of their school" (p. 1158). Since the data in this study was archival and the students not identifiable, there was no way for the researcher to analyze possible effects of SES on the data. By choosing high performing schools, schools that received the highest state grade of "A" during the three years the students in the study populations were in first, second, and third grades, the assumption was made that student aggregated achievement had lessened cultural and SES effects as much as possible.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of this study offer researchers the opportunity for future research in different areas. Due to having to get data from the district and not from the individual schools, the one population that the researcher could not define, and thus study, was the native English-speaking students in the DL schools. Since the EM students in the SEI school had a higher mean score than the SEI ESOL program students, it would be interesting to compare the performance of the native English-speaking students in the DL schools to the performance of the ELL students in the DL schools.

Secondly, since the study populations were relative small and consisted of only Spanish-speaking ELLs, the opportunity exists to compare separate student populations by native language e.g. Creole, Spanish, Vietnamese, Russian, Chinese. The same study can be replicated

and the researcher can perform an in-depth analysis of English Language acquisition across cultures.

In addition, since the FCAT was replaced in 2015 by the Florida Standards Assessments, which are more difficult and require a higher score to pass, a study could be conducted on the same student study populations and an analysis could be performed as to how ELL ESOL students are faring under the new state requirements.

Finally, the researcher believes that more research into ESOL teacher certification and what makes an effective ESOL teacher needs to be studied. Various studies in the literature review mentioned the importance of early grade ELL teaching techniques, teacher ESOL certification, and teacher attitudes concerning teaching ELLs.

Summary

The researcher became an educator in 2007 after 37 years in business. He had heard some of the controversy over California's proposition 227, and firmly agreed that, "If they are in our country, they need to speak English." As an uninformed citizen, he had no idea of what he was supporting. He just assumed that you placed the non-English speaking students into English speaking classrooms and they would learn English; in other words, submersion.

Then, the researcher became a teacher and witnessed the reality of what ELLs face in school. He began as a substitute teacher in a high school and saw how the submersion program works face-to-face. He had students who were two weeks into the country sitting in front of a computer in a business class who did not even know how to turn it on. He had students whose English mastery was, "Mester, Batruum" (Mister, bathroom).

The researcher now teaches in a school of approximately 3,330 students that is 94.5% Hispanic. Many parents of his students do not speak English at all, so his students speak Spanish

at home and have no exposure to English. When he reads essays, it is clear to him that many students "think" Spanish when they write English. The Spanish language flips words i.e. casablanca - house white for white house. In the same way, many Spanish students flip their phrases i.e. used and new, maintain and attain, etc. Now that the researcher gets the opportunity of working with students from different cultures, he has a very different perspective on the obstacles ELLs face.

This study did conclude that SEI is a better program than DL in helping first through third grade students pass the state-mandated reading assessment. But after completing this study, the researcher is not sure that the ESOL program is the answer to English acquisition for ELLs. Throughout the literature review, the researcher found varying results, many conflicting, for head-to-head ESOL program comparisons. Some noted that ESOL programs that prepared ELLs for state-mandated testing did not necessarily lead to formal English acquisition. Several studies mentioned teacher instruction techniques, teacher ESOL certification, and teacher attitudes about teaching ELLs, and each mentioned that teacher influence on the students' English acquisition could not be measured.

Teachers are the heart and soul of education, but most educational studies focus on final results and student data and place little emphasis on teacher influence on those results. The researcher believes that teachers greatly affect student outcomes and it is time that their influence be measured. At the conclusion of this study, the researcher came away believing that the solution to helping ELLs gain English mastery lies more in the teacher than the ESOL program. Therefore, the researcher believes that future research needs to focus more on the teacher and teaching techniques, and less on the ESOL program.

REFERENCES

Abbott, S. (2014, August 26). Hidden curriculum. In S. Abbott (Ed.), *The glossary of education reform.* Retrieved from http://edglossary.org/hidden-curriculum

Albers, C. A., Hoffman, A. J., & Lundahl, A. A. (2009). Journal coverage of issues related to English language learners across student-service professions. *School Psychology Review, 38*(1), 121-134.

Ashworth, K. E., & Pullen, P. C. (2015). Comparing regression discontinuity and multivariate analyses of variance examining the effects of a vocabulary intervention for students at risk for reading disability. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 38*(3), 131-144. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0731948714555020

Assessment and ELLs

uwf.edu/ncate/fdoe/Fdoe/Exhibits/ESOLTrainingModules/AssessmentandElls.pptx

August, D., Carlo, M., Dressler, C., & Snow, C. (2005). The critical role of vocabulary development for English language learners. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *20*(1), 50-57.

Baker, C., & Jones, S. P. (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Bali, Valentina. 2001. "'Sink or Swim': What happened to California's bilingual students after proposition 227?" *State Politics and Policy Quarterly, 1*(3): 295-317.

Biemiller, A. (2012, April 13). *The influence of vocabulary on reading acquisition*. Retrieved from http://literacyencyclopedia.ca/index.php?fa=items

Biemiller, A., & Slonim, N. (2001). Estimating root word vocabulary growth in normative and advantaged populations: Evidence for a common sequence of vocabulary acquisition. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *93,* 498-520.

Brisk, M. E. (2006). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. New Albany, MS: Routledge.

Calhoon, M. B., Al Otaiba, S., Greenberg, D., King, A., & Avalos, A. (2006). Improving reading skills in predominantly Hispanic title I first-grade classrooms: The promise of peer-assisted learning strategies. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *21*(4), 261-272.

Callahan, R. M. (2006). The intersection of accountability and language: Can reading intervention replace English language development? *Bilingual Research Journal*, *30*(1), 1-21.

Castaneda v. Pickard, 648 F.2d 989 (1981)

Cherry, K. (2017, February 17). The 4 stages of cognitive development in children. Retrieved from https://www.verywell.com/piagets-stages-of-cognitive-development-2795457

Clark, K. (2009). The case for structured English immersion. *Educational Leadership*, *66*(7), 42-46. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el200904_clark.pdf

Combs, M. C., Evans, C., Fletcher, T., Parra, E., & Jimenez, A. (2005). Bilingualism for the children: Implementing a dual-language program in an English-only state. *Educational Policy*, *19*, 701-728.

Cooper, C. L. (2015). *Students at risk: The impacts of self-efficacy and risk factors on academic achievement* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Arlington, TX: The University of Texas at Arlington.

Crawford, J. (1998). Anatomy of the English-Only Movement: Social and Ideological Sources of Language Restrictionism in the United States. In: Kibbee, D.A. (Ed.) 1998. Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights. Selected Proceedings of the Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights Conference, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, March 1996. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice*. (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Education Services.

Creech, S. (2017, January 1). Statistics help for your dissertation. Retrieved from http://www.statisticallysignificantconsulting.com/

Cummins, J. (1984). Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2016), Reflections on Cummins (1980), "The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue." *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(1), 940-944. doi:10.1002/tesq.339

Dadeschools.net. (2017). Retrieved from http://bilingual.dadeschools.net/BEWL/programs.asp

D'Angiulli, A., Siegel, L. S., & Maggi, S. (2004). Literacy, instruction, SES, and word-reading achievement in English-language learners and children with English as a first language: A longitudinal study. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *19*(4), 202-213.

DeLozier, C. K. (2014). *A phenomenological investigation of instructional practices of general education teachers for English language learners* (Doctoral dissertation). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (1534599771)

Digest of Education Statistics. (2015, December). Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_204.20.asp

Digest of Education Statistics (2015, December). Retrieved May 05, 2017, from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_204.27.asp

Duncan, A. (2010, January 25). [Web log message]. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/blog/2010/01/race-to-the-top-–integrity-and-transparency-drive-the-process/

Duran, L., Roseth, C. J., & Hoffman, P. (2015). Effects of transitional bilingual education on Spanish-speaking preschoolser' literacy and language development: Year 2 results. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 36*(4), 921-951.

Farr, T. (2014, June 18). An introduction to using Vygotsky scaffolding in the classroom [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://blog.udemy.com/vygotsky-scaffolding/

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*, 1149-1160.

Fernandez, N., & Inserra, A. (2013). Disproportionate classification of ESL students in U.S. special education. *Tesl-ej,17*(2). Retrieved from http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume17/ej66/ej66a1/

Field, A. P. (2006). Discovering statistics using spss. (2 ed.). London, England

Florida Department of Education. (2007). Assessment and accountability briefing book. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7478/urlt/briefingbook07web.pdf

Florida Department of Education. (2011). Technical assistance for teacher preparation: Meeting the needs of English language learners (ELL) in Florida. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7719/urlt/0071749-mnellf.pdf

Florida Department of Education. (2014a). FCAT 2.0 Reading and Mathematics grade 3 Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/5668/urlt/0066935-2014fcat20_media_gr3v4.pdf

Florida Department of Education. (2014b). 2014 Guide to calculating school grades. Retrieved from http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/pdf/1314/SchoolGradesCalcGuide2014.pdf

Florida Department of Education. (2015). Accommodations for Florida's statewide student assessments. Retrieved from: http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7690/urlt/statewideassessmentaccommodations.pdf accommodations

Florida Department of Education. (2017a). Cella. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/assessments/k-12-student-assessment/history-of-fls-statewide-assessment/cella/

Florida Department of Education. (2017b). Consent Decree. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/academics/eng-language-learners/consent-decree.stml

Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (1988). Sheltered English instruction. ERIC Digest. Retrieved from https://www.ericdigests.org/pre-9210/English.htm

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and applications.* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Gerber, M., Jimenez, T., Leafstedt, J., Villaruz, J., Richards, C., & English, J. (2004). English reading effects of small-group intensive intervention in Spanish for K-1 English

learners. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 19*(4), 239-251. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5826.2004.00109.x

Gonzalez, M. (2003). *An input-throughput-output analysis of a two-way immersion language program: The case of California's largest elementary school district* (Doctoral dissertation). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (Publication No. AAT 3093542)

Gottlieb, M. (2006). Assessing English language learners: Bridges from language proficiency to academic achievement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press/Sage.

Gottlieb, J., Alter, M., Gottlieb, B. W., & Wishner, J. (1994). Special education in urban America: It's not justifiable for many. *The Journal of Special Education, 27*(4), 453-465. doi:10.1177/002246699402700401l6

Graves, A., Gersten, R., & Haager, D. (2004). Literacy instruction in multiple-language first-grade classrooms: Linking student outcomes to observed instructional practice. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 19*, 262-272.

Gray, T., & Fleischman, S. (2005). Research matters / Successful strategies for English language learners. *Educational Leadership*, *62*(4), 84-85.

Gunn, B., Biglan, A., Smolkowski, K., & Ary, D. (2000). The efficacy of supplemental instruction in decoding skills for Hispanic and non-Hispanic students in early elementary school. *The Journal of Special Education, 34*(2), 90-103. doi:10.1177/002246690003400204

Haager D. (2007). Promises and cautions regarding using response to intervention with English language learners. Learning Disability Quarterly, 30, 213–218. doi:10.2307/30035565

Haager, D., & Windmueller, M. P. (2001). Early reading intervention for English language learners at-risk for learning disabilities: Student and teacher outcomes in an urban school. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 24*(4), 235. doi:10.2307/1511113

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. New York: Basic Books.

Heritage languages in America. (2016). Retrieved September 19, 2017, from http://www.cal.org/heritage/research/faqs.html

Higham, J. (2002). *Strangers in the land: patterns of American nativism, 1860-1925*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.00398.0001.001

Hofstetter, C. H. (2004). Effects of a transitional bilingual education program: Findings, issues, and next steps. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *28*(3), 355-377.

Holmberg, M. A. (2008). *Relation of the structured English immersion endorsement with Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards reading outcomes with limited English proficient students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Scottsdale, AZ: Northcentral University. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (Publication No. AAT 3321216)

Jost, K. (2009). Bilingual education vs. English immersion: Which is better for students with limited English? *CQ Researcher, 19*(43). Retrieved from http://library.cqpress.com/cqresearcher/document.php?id=cqresrre2009121100

KewalRamani, A., Gilbertson, L., Fox, M., and Provasnik, S. (2007). Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic minorities (NCES 2007-039). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S.

Kim, Y. K., Hutchison, L. A., & Winsler, A. (2013). Bilingual education in the United States: An historical overview and examination of two-way immersion. *Educational Review, 67*(2), 1-17.

Kizart-Clark, C. (2012). *Does small group instruction raise student achievement.* (Order No. 3546657, Capella University). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 51. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1266893939?accountid=12085. (1266893939)

Klingner, J. K., & Artiles, A. (2003). When should bilingual students be in special education? *Educational Leadership*, *61*(2), 66-71.

Krashen, S. D. (2017). The case for comprehensible input. *Language Magazine*. Retrieved from https://www.languagemagazine.com/2017/07/case-for-comprehension/

Krashen, S. D. (2004). Applying the comprehension hypothesis: Some suggestions [Abstract]. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching,1*, 21-29. Retrieved from http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/articles/2004_applying_the_comprehension_hypothesis_krashen.pdf

Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 5637 (1974).

League of United Latin American Citizens [LULAC] vs. State Board of Education, (1990).

Leafstedt, J. M., Richards, C. R., & Gerber, M. M. (2004). Effectiveness of explicit phonological-awareness instruction for at-risk English learners. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *19*(4), 252-261.

Lee, J., Lee, Y., & Amaro-Jiménez, C. (2011). Teaching English language learners (ELLs) Mathematics in early childhood. *Childhood Education, 87*(4), 253-260.

Linan-Thompson, S., Vaughn, S., Prater, K., & Cirino, P. T. (2006). The response to intervention of English language learners at risk for reading problems. *Journal of Learning Disabilities,39*(5), 390-398. doi:10.1177/00222194060390050201

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2015). Student outcomes in dual language programs. *AERA,* 1-7. Retrieved from http://www.lindholm-leary.com/resources/Presentations/2015AERA_Symp_KLL.pdf

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Genesee, F. (2010). Alternative educational programs for English language learners. In *Research on English language learners* (pp. 323-382). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press.

Ling. (2008). Tutorial: Pearson's Chi-square Test for Independence. Retrieved from http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~clight/chisquared.htm

Lopez, S. P. (2016). *A quantitative comparison of the reading achievement of English learners in dual language and transitional bilingual programs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Chicago, IL: National Louis University. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.nl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1169&context=diss

Lyons, J. J. (1990). The past and future directions of federal bilingual-education policy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *508*, 66-80.

Magrath, D. (2016, April 27). MultiBrief: The differences among ESL program models — Part I. Retrieved October 08, 2017, from http://exclusive.multibriefs.com/content/the-differences-among-esl-program-models/education

Manis, F. R., Lindsey, K. A., & Bailey, C. E. (2004). Development of reading in grades k-2 in Spanish-speaking English-language learners. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *19*(4), 214-224.

Marlow, K. (2008). *Closing the achievement gap for English Language Learners: A comparison of language arts/ESOL and one-way developmental bilingual* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Orlando, FL: University of Central Florida.

McCardle, P., Mele-McCarthy, J., & Leos, K. (2005). English language learners and learning disabilities: Research agenda and implications for practice. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *20*(1), 68-78.

McCarty, T.L. (2002). Between possibility and constraint: Indigenous language education, planning, and policy in the US. In: Tollefson, J.W. (Ed.) (2002). Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

McGee, E. A. (2012). Sheltered English immersion vs. two-way bilingual education: A case study comparison of parental attitudes and Hispanic students' perceived self-efficacy (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.

McIntosh, A. S., Graves, A., & Gersten, R. (2007). The effects of response to intervention on literacy development in multiple-language settings. *Learning Disability Quarterly,30*(3), 197. doi:10.2307/30035564

McLeod, S. (2009, updated 2015). Jean Piaget. *Simply Psychology.* Retrieved from www.simplypsychology.org/piaget.html

McLeod, S. (2012). Zone of proximal development. *Simply Psychology*. Retrieved from http://www.simplypsychology.org/Zone-of-Proximal-Development.html

McLeod, S. A. (2014). Lev Vygotsky. *Simply Psychology*. Retrieved from www.simplypsychology.org/vygotsky.html

Miller, J. F., Heilmann, J., Nockerts, A., Iglesias, A., Fabiano, L., & Francis, D. J. (2006). Oral language and reading in bilingual children. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *21*(1), 30-43.

MIT Department of Biology. (2017). *Neurobiology.* Retrieved from https://biology.mit.edu/research/neurobiology

Mora, J. K. (2005, January 26). *Legal history of bilingual education*. Retrieved from http://www.moramodules.com/Pages/HistoryBE.htm

Murphy, A. F. (2014). The effect of dual-language and transitional-bilingual education instructional models on Spanish proficiency for English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(2), 182-194. doi:10.1080/15235882.2014.934971

National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). The condition of education-2006. Washington, DC: Schneider.

Neill, M. (2005). Assessment of ELL students under NCLB: Problems and solutions1 [Editorial]. Retrieved from http://www.fairtest.org/sites/default/files/NCLB_and_assessing_bilingual_students.pdf

Neill, M., & Guisbond, G. (2004). *Failing our children*. Cambridge, MA: FairTest. Retrieved from http://www.fairtest.org/Failing_Our_Children_Report.html

Neufeld, P., & Fitzgerald, J. (2001). Early English reading development: Latino English learners in the "low" reading group. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 36, 64-109.

Nieto, D. (2009). A brief history of bilingual education in the United States. *Perspectives on Urban Education*, *Spring*, 61-72.

Norman, P. C. (2016). *Teacher Attitudes and Perceptions of Low and High Socioeconomic Status Students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Logan, UT: Utah State University.

Ortiz, A. A. (1997). Learning disabilities occurring concomitantly with linguistic differences. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 30,* 321-332.

Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *27*(1), 1-24.

Ovando, C. J., & Collier, V. P. (1998). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural connected thought*. (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Pagan, C. R. (2005). *English learners' academic achievement in a two-way versus a structured English immersion program* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York: Columbia University. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. Publication No. AAT 3175715

Peregoy, S., & Boyle, O. (2005). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL: A resource book for teaching k-12 English learners*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Perez, B. (2004). *Becoming biliterate: A study of two-way bilingual immersion education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Perry, L., & McConney, A. (2010). Does the SES of the school matter? An examination of socioeconomic status and student achievement using PISA 2003. *Teachers College Record, 112*(4), 1137-1162.

Phillips, J. J. (2013). *Why should I go? Florida teachers' perceptions of value in ELL professional development* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Orlando, FL: Florida State University.

Pugh, K. R., Sandak, R., Frost, S. J., Moore, D., & Menel, W.E. (2005). Examining reading development and reading disability in English language learners: Potential contributions from functional neuroimaging. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *20*(1).

Race to the top assessment program executive summary. (2009). Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf

Race to the top: College affordability and completion. (2013). Retrieved August 14, 2016, from https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget13/justifications/t-rtt.pdf

Rinaldi C., & Samson J. (2008). English language learners and response to intervention: Referral considerations. *TEACHING Exceptional Children, 40*(5), 6–14.

Rosenberg, M. S., Westling, D. L., & McLeskey, J. (2010, July 20). *No child left behind*. Retrieved from http://www.education.com/reference/article/no-child-left-behind-NCLB/

Rossell, C. (2009). Does bilingual education work? The case in Texas. Retrieved from http://www.texaspolicy.com/center/education-policy/reports/does-bilingual-education-work

Rossell, C., & Baker, K. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *30*, 7-74.

Samson J. F., Lesaux N. K. (2009). Language-minority learners in special education: Rates and predictors of identification for services. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 42*, 148–162. doi:10.1177/0022219408326221

Sampson, J. F., & Collins, B. A. (2012, April). Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English language learners applying research to policy and practice for teacher effectiveness. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535608.pdf

Scott, A. N., Hauerwas, L. B., & Brown, R. D. (2014). State policy and guidance for identifying learning disabilities in culturally and linguistically diverse students. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *37*, 172-185.

Shelton, L. (2007). *Caught in the middle: Overrepresentation of middle school second language learners in special education*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Los Angeles, CA: University of California. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (Publication No. AAT 3295262)

Shin, H. B., & Kominski, R. (2010). *Language use in the United States, 2007*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau.

Sibold, C. (2011). Building English language learners' academic vocabulary strategies & tips. *Multicultural Education, 18*(2), 24-28. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ951842.

Sievert, J. (2007). *Evaluation of structured English immersion and bilingual education on reading skills of limited English proficient students in California and Texas*. (Master's thesis), Retrieved from https://digital.library.txstate.edu/handle/10877

Simmons, R. D. (2008). *The efficacy of Florida's approach to in-service English speakers of other languages*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI no. 3347370)

Socioeconomic Status. (2017). Retrieved October 08, 2017, from http://www.apa.org/topics/socioeconomic-status/

Stapel, E. (2014). Box-and-whisker plots: Interquartile ranges and outliers. Retrieved from http://www.purplemath.com/modules/boxwhisk3.htm

Stewart, S. K. (2004). *A comparison of three programs serving third grade English language learners in Texas* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Nacogdoches, TX: Stephen F. Austin State University.

Stewner-Manzanares, G. (1988). The Bilingual Education Act: Twenty years later. Retrieved July 31, 2017, from http://www.ncela.us/files/rcd/BE021037/Fall88_6.pdf

Sullivan, A. L. (2011). Disproportionality in special education identification and placement of English language learners. *Exceptional Children*. *77*(3), 317-334.

Takanishi, R. (2004). Leveling the playing field: Supporting immigrant children from birth to eight. *The Future of Children*, *14*(2), 60-79.

Test that your data meets important assumptions. (2013). Retrieved November 23, 2016, from https://statistics.laerd.com/features-assumptions.php

The assumption of homogeneity of variance. (2016). Retrieved January 22, 2017, from http://www.statisticssolutions.com/the-assumption-of-homogeneity-of-variance/php

The individualized education program process in special education. (2016). Retrieved March 15, 2017, from http://www.specialeducationguide.com/pre-k-12/individualized-education-programs-iep/the-iep-process-explained/

Tobin, R., & McInnes, A. (2008). Accommodating differences: Variations in differentiated literacy instruction in Grade 2/3 classrooms. *Literacy, 42*(1). doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9345.2008.00470.x

Tong, F. (2006). *Oral English development and its impact on emergent reading achievement: A comparative study of transitional bilingual and structured English immersion models* (Doctoral dissertation). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (Publication No. AAT 3296556)

Torres, M. E. (2015). *The effects of explicit vocabulary instruction on the vocabulary development of English language learners in kindergarten* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Scottsdale, AZ: Northcentral University.

Trejo, M. A. (2015). *Implications for dual language administrative leadership: a Comparison of the English reading achievement of third grade students among three instructional programs in a rural school district* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). College Station, TX: Texas A&M University.

University of Michigan. (2001). Alternatives to bilingual education. Retrieved from University of Michigan Web site: http://www.umich.edu/~ac213/studentprojects05/be/alternatives.html

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary, *National Symposium on Learning Disabilities in English Language Learners, October 14-15, 2003: Symposium Summary*, Washington, D.C., 2004.

Vadasy, P. F., Nelson, J. R., & Sanders, E. A. (2011). Longer term effects of a tier 2 kindergarten vocabulary intervention for English learners. *Remedial and Special Education, 34*(2), 91-101. doi:10.1177/0741932511420739

Vogt, M., Echevarria, J., & Short, D. (2010). *The SIOP model for teaching English-language arts to English learners.* Boston: Pearson.

Young, M. C. (2009). *A comparative study of English language learners and non-English language learners' in a school district in Delaware; performance in national standardized achievement tests of reading assessment: Dynamic indicators of basic early literacy skills (DIBELS)* (Doctoral dissertation). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (Publication No. AAT 3345108)

Appendix A

Table A1

2014 Third Grade FCAT Raw Reading Scores English Monolingual Students Including Outliers

175	197	205	215	225	236
177	197	208	215	225	236
177	197	208	215	225	236
182	199	209	217	226	237
189	199	210	217	226	237
189	201	210	217	227	238
190	202	210	220	228	244
191	202	212	220	229	248
192	202	212	222	229	250
193	203	212	223	229	260
195	204	212	223	232	260
195	205	214	223	232	
196	205	214	224	233	

Q1 201.5 - 201.5 – 1.5(25) = 201.5 – 37.5 = 164

Q3 226.5 – 226 + 1.5 (25) = 226.5 + 37.5 = 264

Range 164 to 264 – No Outliers

- Original Population 76 Students

– Final Population 76 Students

Appendix B

Table B1

2014 Third Grade FCAT Raw Reading Scores Sheltered English Immersion Students Including Outliers

177	195	206	212	219	227	
181	196	206	213	219	227	
185	198	206	213	220	228	
185	199	206	213	221	228	
186	199	207	213	222	228	
189	200	207	214	222	229	
190	200	208	214	222	229	
190	200	209	215	223	230	
190	200	210	215	223	233	
192	201	211	215	224	234	
194	202	211	217	225	248	
195	203	211	218	225	260	(Outlier)
195	204	212	218	226		

Q1 185200: 200 – 1.5(22) = 200 – 33 = 167

Q3 222186: 222 + 1.5(22) = 222 + 33 = 255 Range 167 to 255 - One Outlier – 260

- Original Population 77 Students

- Final Population 76 Students

Appendix C

Table C1

2014 Third Grade FCAT Raw Reading Scores Dual Language Students including Outliers

	140	(Outlier)	176	182	191	198	210	
	140	(Outlier)	176	182	192	198	210	
	161		178	183	192	199	213	
	164		178	183	193	199	216	
	165		179	183	193	199	221	
	169		179	184	194	199	229	
	170		179	186	195	203	233	(Outlier)
	170		182	186	195	203		
	170		182	188	196	203		
	172		182	189	197	206		

Q1 178.5: 178.5 – 1.5(20.5) = 178.5 – 30.75 = 147.75

Q3 199: 199 + 1.5(20.5) = 199 + 30.75 = 229.75

Range 147.75 to 229.75 - Three Outliers – 140, 140, 233

- Original Population 57 Students

– Final Population 54 Students

Appendix D

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

April 29, 2015

Thomas R. Meyer

IRB Application 2184: The Effectiveness of Dual Language and Sheltered English Immersion ESOL Programs: A Comparative Study

Dear Thomas,

The Liberty University Institutional Review Board has reviewed your application in accordance with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations and finds your study does not classify as human subjects research. This means you may begin your research with the data safeguarding methods mentioned in your approved application.

Your study does not classify as human subjects research because it does not involve the collection of private information from individuals.

Please note that this decision only applies to your current research application, and that any changes to your protocol must be reported to the Liberty IRB for verification of continued non-human subjects research status. You may report these changes by submitting a new application to the IRB and referencing the above IRB Application number.

If you have any questions about this determination, or need assistance in identifying whether possible changes to your protocol would change your application's status, please email us at irb@liberty.edu.

Sincerely,

Fernando Garzon, Psy.D. *Professor, IRB Chair* **Counseling**

LIBERTY
UNIVERSITY.

Liberty University | Training Champions for Christ since 1971

Appendix E

April 20, 2015 **Revised**

Mr. Thomas Meyer

Dear Mr. Meyer:

I am pleased to inform you that the Research Review Committee (RRC) of the Miami-Dade County Public Schools (MDCPS) has granted you approval for your request to conduct the study: "THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DUAL LANGUAGE AND SHELTERED ENGLISH IMMERSION ESOL PROGRAMS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY" in order to fulfill the requirement of your dissertation at Liberty University.

The approval is granted with the same conditions as those listed in your previous approval letter dated September 16, 2014. Specifically:

1. Participation in this study is at the discretion of the principal of the targeted schools.

Please note that even with the approval of the RRC, it is still the responsibility of the Principal as the gatekeeper of the school to decide whether to participate or not. As stated in the Board rule, "… the principal of the individual school has the privilege of deciding if RRC-approved research will be conducted within his /her school."

A copy of this approval letter must be presented/and or shared with the Principal of each targeted school.

2. The participation of all subjects (such as students, faculty, or staff) is **voluntary.**

3. The anonymity and/or confidentiality of all subjects must be assured.

4. The study will involve the **voluntary** participation of approximately 300 students in 3rd grade at four M-DCPS
schools, including K-8 Center. No students' identifying information can be shared with the researcher.

5. Disruption of the school's routine by the data collection activities of the study must be kept at a minimum. Data collection activities must not interfere with the district's testing schedule.

6. ALL research activities must be conducted with the knowledge and approval of each Principal. All efforts should be made to minimize any negative impact on the learning environment.

7. The researcher must submit a copy of the "Full IRB Approval" letter before starting the data collection process.

I am pleased to inform you that the Research Review Committee (RRC) of the Miami-Dade County Public Schools (MDCPS) has granted you approval for your request to conduct the study: "THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DUAL LANGUAGE AND SHELTERED ENGLISH IMMERSION ESOL PROGRAMS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY" in order to fulfill the requirement of your dissertation at Liberty University.

The approval is granted with the same conditions as those listed in your previous approval letter dated September 16, 2014. Specifically:

1. Participation in this study is at the discretion of the principal of the targeted schools.

Please note that even with the approval of the RRC, it is still the responsibility of the Principal as the gatekeeper of the school to decide whether to participate or not. As stated in the Board rule, "… the principal of the individual school has the privilege of deciding if RRC-approved research will be conducted within his /her school."

A copy of this approval letter must be presented/and or shared with the Principal of each targeted school.

2. The participation of all subjects (such as students, faculty, or staff) is voluntary.

3. The anonymity and/or confidentiality of all subjects must be assured.

4. The study will involve the voluntary participation of approximately 300 students in 3rd grade at four M-DCPS
schools, including Bob Graham K-8 Center. No students' identifying information can be shared with the researcher.

5. Disruption of the school's routine by the data collection activities of the study must be kept at a minimum. Data collection activities must not interfere with the district's testing schedule.

6. ALL research activities must be conducted with the knowledge and approval of each Principal. All efforts should be made to minimize any negative impact on the learning environment.

7. The researcher must submit a copy of the "Full IRB Approval" letter before starting the data collection process.

It should be emphasized that the approval of the Research Review Committee does not constitute an endorsement of the study. It is simply a permission to request the voluntary cooperation in the study of individuals associated with MDCPS.

It is your responsibility to ensure that appropriate procedures are followed in requesting an individual's cooperation, and that all aspects of the study are conducted in a professional manner. With regard to the latter, make certain that all documents and instruments distributed within MDCPS as a part of the study are carefully edited.

The approval number for your study is 2000. This number should be used in all communications to clearly identify the study as approved by the Research Review Committee. The approval expires on 06/30/2016. During the approval period, the study must adhere to the design, procedures and instruments which were submitted to the Research Review Committee.

Finally, as indicated in your application, please submit to the RRC an abstract of the research findings by July 2016.

If there are any changes in the study as it relates to MDCPS, the RRC must be notified in writing. Substantial changes may necessitate resubmission of the request. Failure to notify me of such a change may result in the cancellation of the approval.

If you have any questions, please call me. On behalf of the Research Review Committee, I want to wish you every success with your study.

Sincerely,

Tarek Chebbi, Ed. D. Chairperson
Research Review Committee

Cc: Principal, K-8 Education Center

APPROVAL NUMBER: 2000 APPROVAL EXPIRES: 06/23/2016

Note: The researcher named in this letter of approval will be solely responsible and strictly accountable for any deviation from or failure to follow the research study as approved by the RRC. M-DCPS will NOT be held responsible for any claim and/or damage resulting from conducting this study.