

EFFECTIVE READING COMPREHENSION STRATEGIES FOR ENGLISH
LANGUAGE LEARNERS' ACHIEVEMENT IN TENNESSEE

A DISSERTATION

Presented to

The Faculty of the Education Department

Carson-Newman University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

By

Jessica Leigh Overstreet Bartlett

May 2017



Dissertation Approval

Student Name/ CNU ID:

Jessica Bartlett, 0275705

Dissertation Title:

EFFECTIVE READING COMPREHENSION STRATEGIES
FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNER'S ACHIEVEMENT IN TENNESSEE

This dissertation has been approved and accepted by the faculty of the Education Department, Carson-Newman University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree, Doctor of Education.

Dissertation Committee:

Signatures: (Print or Type and Sign)

Dissertation Chair: Dr. P. Mark Taylor

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "P. Mark Taylor".

Content Member: Dr. Mark Brock

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mark Brock".

Content Member: Dr. Jodi Green

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jodi Green, Ed.D.".

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

Date: 3/31/2017

Copyright © 2017 by Jessica Leigh Overstreet Bartlett

All rights reserved

I hereby grant permission to the Education Department, Carson-Newman University, to reproduce this research, in part or in full, for professional purposes, with the understanding that it no case will it be for financial profit to any person or institution.

Jessica Leigh Overstreet Bartlett
May 5, 2017

Abstract

Effective Reading Comprehension Strategies for English Language Learner's achievement in Tennessee

Jessica Leigh Overstreet Bartlett
School of Education, Carson Newman University
May 2017

Although there is copious amounts of literature concerning reading comprehension on student achievement, too little focuses on specific reading comprehension strategies and their effect on the achievement of English Language Learners (ELLs). This study analyzed both student achievement data and teacher self reported data, including their knowledge, use, and teacher perception of strategy effectiveness, to determine the relationship between reading comprehension instructional strategies and the achievement of ELLs in order to make recommendations regarding best practices. The quantitative data for this study was collected via Likert survey along with assessment data gathered from student's running record and was analyzed through Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Sample teacher observation data was also collected to ensure fidelity of instructional strategy.

Acknowledgements

Dr. P. Mark Taylor words cannot express the amount of gratitude I have for you and your guidance throughout this whole journey. Any successes are directly linked to your mathematical and analytical skills. Thank you for all you do.

Thank you, Dr. Mark Brock, for your support during this long journey. I am glad you were on my dissertation committee.

Dr. Jodi Green, thank you for your insights and for being a part of my dissertation committee.

Dr. Andy Rines, thank you so much for all of your help, advice, and words of encouragement during this process. I truly could not have done it without you.

To the amazing group of professors I have had the pleasure and honor to learn from at Carson-Newman, I thank you all.

Special thanks to Mrs. Michelle Darnell, Ms. Tiffany Hyde, Dr. Emily Hollingsworth, and Ms. Julie Alsup, without your support this would not have been possible.

Finally for the faculty and staff of Robertson County Schools, thank you all for your support and encouragement always.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my family.

To my son Justin Bartlett who has been with me everyday throughout this long journey, thank you for your patience and understanding through the years. I cannot express what it has meant to me and how much I love you.

To my sisters Tammy Dorsett and Phyllis Shoemake who have been my second mothers, cheerleaders, and sometimes therapist without you none of this would have been possible. Thank you for always being there to guide and cheer me on when I needed it. I love you both.

And finally to my parents Lee Jr. and Barbara Overtstreet I miss you everyday and wish that you were here to see me reach the finish line. I wish that I could thank you for all the sacrifices you made. I love you.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	v
Acknowledgments.....	vi
Dedication.....	vii
List of Tables and Figures.....	ix
1. Introduction	
Background Concerns	1
Significance of the Study.....	3
Background Research.....	4
Statement of the Problem	6
Research Questions.....	7
Nature of the Study.....	7
Theoretical Framework.....	7
Definition of Terms.....	9
Assumptions and Limitations.....	10
Conclusion.....	11
Organization of Document	13

2. Review of Literature

Who are English language learners and how do they learn?	16
Legal Implications.....	19
Learning Theories.....	25
Behaviorism	25
Cognitivism	27
Constructivism.....	28
Brain Based Research.....	29
Multiple Intelligences.....	37
Culturally Responsive Pedagogy	40
Reading Comprehension Strategies.....	43
Instructional Strategies.....	46
Effective Use.....	49
Summary.....	50

3. Methodology

Research Design and Approach	53
Fidelity of Implementation	55
Context, Setting, Sample	56
Research Participants	57
Instrumentation, Materials, Data Collection, and Analysis.....	58
Response Rate.....	60
Issues of Validity	61
Issues of Reliability	61
Participants Rights and Ethical Protection.....	62

4. Analysis of Data

Research Questions	64
Data Collection	65
Independent Variables	65
Dependent Variables	66
Control Variables	66
Analysis	66
Descriptive Statistics: Survey Items.....	68
Comparison Ratings: Instructional Strategies	71
Descriptive Statistics: ELL Achievement Scores	71
Inferential Statistics: Mixed Model ANOVAs.....	76

Survey Analysis: Open-Ended Questions.....	79
Conclusions.....	81
5. Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations	
Research Design	84
Sample and Population.....	85
Summary of Findings	85
Limitations.....	87
Recommendations.....	88
Recommendations for Future Research.....	90
Conclusions.....	91
List of References and Appendices	
References.....	93
Appendix A.....	104
Appendix B.....	106
Appendix C.....	109
List of Tables	
Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics: Survey Questions by Strategy.....	69
Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics: Running Record Scores by Survey Item.....	73-75

Table 4.3 Inferential Statistics: Mixed-Model ANOVAs.....	78
Table 4.4 Open-Ended Questions: Strategies Not Included.....	80
Table 4.5 Open-Ended Questions: Alternate Assessments.....	81

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“Learning another language is not only learning different words for the same things, but learning another way to think about things”.

Flora Lewis

“Without language, one cannot talk to people and understand them; one cannot share their hopes and aspirations, grasp their history, appreciate their poetry, or savor their songs”.

Nelson Mandela

Background Concerns

The face of education has changed dramatically over the last decade. Educators are always learning and educational practices are always evolving as time goes by, just as today’s students learn and evolve. Ten years ago a classroom may have contained one English Language Learner (ELL) or students from another country or culture. Today that number has exploded (Fast Facts, 2015). According to the National Center for Educational Statistics this trend is forecasted to continue over the next few years (2015). Teachers are experiencing increasingly diverse learners within the classroom. Though education is experiencing an upswing in the number of teachers focusing on the English language population, schools are still struggling to meet the needs of these students. It is critical that the needs of the increasingly diverse and linguistically challenging classrooms are met (McGee, Haworth, and Macintyre, 2015). The

average English language teacher has approximately thirty minutes to one hour per day with students. Sometimes these teachers are fortunate to have a small group of no more than 6 or 8 students total, but more often than not they have a large group of 15 to 20 (York-Barr, Ghere, and Sommerness, 2007). Even with smaller groups it is difficult to address the diverse needs of all.

Many ELL students are not reaching their achievement goals (Ed Week, 2011). According to the National Research Council (1998), ELL students who are not proficient in English cannot be adequately measured regarding their knowledge on content areas being assessed. In addition to assessment reliability there are negative consequences resulting from inaccurate assessment data, which can lead to incorrect placements and/ or modifications and accommodations for ELLs (Gandara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly, and Callahan, 2003). They are:

- Positive changes to assessment date cannot accurately account for content knowledge when they it may reflect gains in language acquisition.
- Consistently low achievement scores may be inaccurately considered in ELLs need for remedial education or special education considerations.

These students often have mastered the content in their native language but are unable to reflect this knowledge in English.

ELLs who do not meet language proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, and writing will often fall behind their native speaking peers. In order to improve and accurately assess these students in specific content areas they must be proficient in reading and comprehension (Rader-Brown, and Howley, 2014). In

previously conducted research there have been recommendations of instructional strategies to use for reading comprehension of ELL students have been suggested; however, very few studies have investigated the effectiveness of these strategies. This study will add to the previous research and address the problem of “many ELL students are not reaching their achievement goals” (Perez, 2008). ELLs face overwhelming expectations in the task of learning grade-level content and acquiring language skills simultaneously. It is important for these students to learn English rapidly in order to meet educational goals. Literature for the best practices for the instruction of reading and reading comprehension among ELLs is limited and indicators show that further research is necessary in this area. This study attempted to form recommendations for creating a meaningful learning community and improving ELLs reading comprehension through effective instructional strategies.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of specific reading strategies on English language learner’s achievement. English language learners face many challenges in the classroom. One major challenge that stands out is the testing requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). According to NCLB students must pass a state achievement test based on content knowledge. These tests are standardized and rely heavily on linguistic proficiency. Due to their reliance on reading and comprehension proficiency, English language learners have historically underperformed. Furthermore, states

must be held accountable for ELLs instructional performance. At the national level, ELLs are among the lowest performing subgroups in state assessments (NCLB, 2001). It is important to investigate the best instructional strategies for improving the Academic Yearly Progress (AYP) of ELL students. Unfortunately, NCLB provides a “one size fits all” approach to assessment and does not allow for the time and resources to address the needs of this rapidly growing population.

NCLB identified ELL students as Limited English Proficient (LEP). These students’ grade range includes K – 12 and be enrolled in a public or private elementary or secondary school. For this study, the researcher used the term “English Language Learner” (ELL) rather than Limited English Proficient (LEP) for consistency between state and federal terminology. The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE, 2016) defines an ELL student as any K - 12 students who have been identified as having limited language proficiency in the areas of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Upon entering a Tennessee-based school, parents or guardians of students are issued a Home Language Survey (HLS), which identifies the student’s home language as well as instances of bilingualism, along with, and students’ primary or L1 language. Any student who indicates an L1 language other than English will be assessed via the WIDA Access Placement Test (W-APT) in the areas of reading, writing, speaking, and listening in order to determine the student's language proficiency and instructional needs. This process is mandated by NCLB. With the emphasis on testing and the requirements of NCLB, schools and districts are focusing on improving

instructional practices for ELLs and other diverse learners. Due to the rigors of testing requirements, NCLB places limitations on the instructional focus of these students.

Background Research

Literature for this research-included peer reviewed journals and research, which examined and reported English Language Learners and other similar diverse learners learning process and achievement. According to Perez (2008), ELLs require more specialized instructional programs and additional resources to meet their varied needs. For most districts and schools this can be an overwhelming challenge as these students must also continue to meet state and federal performance measurements and requirements such as the Academic Performance Index (API), Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), and content and learning standards/objectives. For students who do not meet the indicators for adequate language proficiency, such as native speakers, this can be difficult and can affect achievement goals adversely. Perez (2008), also suggested that in order to accurately assess these students, states and school districts must create better indicators of academic performance of its ELLs in addition to the creation of alternative approaches and meeting the academic needs of these students.

ELL students must be administered all state and federal assessments outlined for their content and grade areas at multiple intervals throughout the year, as this will provide multiple data points necessary to track and assess students growth and achievement as well as areas of need. However, ELLs are

only assessed once a year for language proficiency and achievement in the areas of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. For ELL students in middle Tennessee this is completed through the WIDA Access 2.0 examination administered during the second semester. This testing schedule creates difficulties in tracking student progress and determining language needs and achievement. It is for this reason that it is important that assessments for ELLs include more formative rather than solely summative assessment.

In a 2008 study McBride highlighted the need for moving away from summative assessments in favor of formative assessment for our diverse learners. While summative assessments are important it is also important to use formative assessments so that educators can gain a clearer picture of their students needs and development so that they may adjust instruction of these students accordingly. This is an ongoing process throughout the year and teachers must take into account students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds and proficiency.

Understanding how ELLs learn and grow is critical to their instruction and academic progress (Zhang and Stephens, 2013). Though there are numerous reports of researchers investigating ELLs and others examining strategies to produce improvement in reading achievement there is not enough research on the best practices and strategies for teachers working to increase reading comprehension among their rapidly growing population of ELL students.

Statement of the Problem

Students who are identified as ELLs require instruction in English as a second language in addition instruction in grade level content addressing state and national standards. ELLs are experiencing narrow academic achievement in reading. While student literacy is of primary concern for educators, ELL students are experiencing low literacy scores due to low performance in reading and reading comprehension. Limited numbers of ELLs are meeting their reading comprehension goals. It is important to address the need to improve reading among ELLs. Past research has examined the intricacy of how ELLs learn and are taught reading comprehension strategies. Unfortunately, past research has not adequately addressed the problem, left gaps, and failed to produce significant improvement in this student population.

The purpose of this study was to examine specific reading instructional strategies in relation to ELLs located in Middle Tennessee schools. Additionally this study attempted to fill in voids left by previous research and existing literature on the effective reading comprehension strategies and the achievement of ELLs. The purpose of this research was to develop recommendations for improving reading comprehension achievement among ELLs.

Research Questions

Research questions of this study focus on the reading comprehension achievement of English language learners and its relationship to the effectiveness of reading comprehension instructional strategies.

1. What impact has specific reading comprehension instructional strategies had on English language learners' reading comprehension achievement?
2. How does teacher knowledge of instructional strategies compare with use and perceived effectiveness?

Nature of the Study

There are many strategies that are employed by teachers throughout the United States to improve reading comprehension among ELL. Depending upon the region and current trends, this can vary from state to state and teacher to teacher. While many of these strategies have been shown to be effective, many others have not. This study focused on strategies being employed for use with Tennessee's growing number of diverse learners, specifically such as our English language learners. This study employed a teacher self-reported Likert survey to determine the knowledge/use of each strategy as well as teacher perceptions of effectiveness. Survey results for each strategy were compared via ANOVA to student Running Record assessment data to determine correlation.

Theoretical Framework

This study's theoretical framework for this study focuses on culturally responsive pedagogy. Though this pedagogy benefits all students to some degree, it is especially beneficial for diverse learners such as ELLs. Banks (2012), states that achievement of diverse learners will increase with the inclusion of the students cultural and language backgrounds into instruction. For this study, the

three prevailing learning theories used as a guide for both the study and researcher focused on the student as an individual as well as their cultural and linguistic backgrounds. These theories included culturally responsive pedagogy; brain based learning theories, and multiple intelligences.

These three learning theories work together and have a significant impact on how ELLs learn and grow. Caine and Caine (1991) stated that the brain learns and grows through its experiences. It uses these experiences to make connections and develop understanding of information and learning processes. This means that the best instructional settings and instruction for ELLs include opportunities to learn through multiple vernaculars, such as auditory, visual, emotional, and tactile, according to the student's learning style and modalities.

This primary learning theory and guide for this study is Culturally Responsive Pedagogy. Recently there has been more and more research into the benefits of using the student's cultural and linguistic backgrounds in instruction and learning. Gay (2000) defines culturally responsive instruction as using the student's own cultural knowledge/background, prior experiences, and learning styles to capitalize on the student's strengths and make the learning process more meaningful and relevant to the student. Furthermore, Gay has stated that there are four main characteristics, which define culturally responsive instruction.

- First, instruction acknowledges the student's cultural backgrounds and different ethnicity. It recognizes that both affect the student's overall disposition, attitude, and approach to learning.

- Next, it builds bridges of meaning between the students' home and school life experiences, as well as their academic abstractions and socioeconomic realities.
- It employs and implements multiple varieties of instructional strategies that are connected to the students' individual learning style.
- Lastly, it incorporates resources, materials and multicultural information into each content and learning areas taught.

The use of these characteristics by teachers and schools will improve the overall achievement of diverse learners. Gay (2000) believes that a student's culture is a strong influence on learning but the student's attitude, values, and behavior as well. This influence is carried over into the student's growth and learning processes. Ignoring a student cultural background can lead to underachievement.

Definition of Terms

Operational definitions for this study will include the meaning and description of commonly used terms within this study. These definitions will be used throughout the study and will be used to guide the reader, provide the needed information necessary to understanding current data and terms, as well as expand on important literature.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) is any student within grades K-12 who is identified through state selected assessment who is in the development stages of language proficiency in the areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

English as a Second Language (ESL) is the study of the English language by non-native speakers or those identified as limited English proficient or an English language learner.

English Language Learner (ELL) is any student in grades K-12 who based on assessment data does not meet set language proficiency levels in listening, speaking, reading, and writing for unaided participation in the general education classroom. In Tennessee, students entering the school system as a newcomer or beginning kindergartener and/or whose home language is anything other than English will be assessed via the WIDA Access Placement Test (W-APT) for language proficiency and language instructional needs.

Academic Performance Index (API) scores range from 200 to 1000 and will reflect a school, or subgroups, academic performance on yearly state mandated standardized academic achievement tests. Its goal is to measure a schools, students, or districts academic performance by a measurement of met AYP or not met AYP.

Running Record is a tool used by teachers to identify patterns in student reading behaviors including reading comprehension and to assess and identify reading strategies used and needed.

Assumptions and Limitations

This study is limited in scope to the selection of participants located in two Middle Tennessee elementary schools. Other assumptions and limitations inherent are:

1. This is a quantitative study that is conducted within a specific Middle Tennessee school district. It is limited to the number of participants within these two schools who meet the criteria of inclusion. The criteria outlined for inclusion-included teachers in grades 1-2 who possess ELLs in their classrooms, or teachers who are considered ESL teachers within kindergarten through second.
2. Limitation of participants to a single school district and number of schools included in the study creates limited data generalizability.
3. Validity and reliability of this study may be potentially compromised by participant comfort levels in expressing true answers due to fear of reprisals from a colleague or supervisor due to potential confidentiality breaches.
4. Self-reported surveys often assume that participants fully understand the questions being asked and respond accordingly and accurately.
5. Teacher level of autonomy in incorporation of instructional strategies may influence survey results due to district curriculum requirements. Instructional strategies not included in study may prove effective as well in ESL instruction.

6. This study's focus is on instructional strategies and excludes reading strategies that may also prove effective in other studies.
7. This study assumes all reported assessment and achievement data is accurately reported and recorded. This study is limited to the type of data collected within the chosen district and recognizes that other assessments can provide additional academic measurements for ELL achievement.

Conclusion

Education and student demographics have changed dramatically over the last few decades. Diverse learners now make up a large percentage of student populations in schools. Educators, schools, and districts are struggling to meet the needs of ELLs and other subgroups. Research has made significant inroads in investigating how these students learn and in the development of effective instructional strategies. However, low ELL student achievement data suggests more extensive research is needed in this area.

The introduction of NCLB mandates that all students take and pass state assessments. This includes subgroups such as ELLs. Furthermore, these students are required to pass these state assessments within the same range of scores earned by their native speaking peers. Many argue that state standardized tests do not reflect the academic abilities of ELL students. These assessments are developed for native speakers and do not take student language proficiency into account. Just as many researchers argue against standardized test for ELLs, others argue that all students must be accountable and conform to assessment policies

and practices. However, individuals on both sides of the argument agree that more specialized ELL assessments are needed for these students.

Effective strategies and best practices for ELLs are critical for the achievement and success of these students. Reading comprehension is one area in which ELLs and other diverse learners often struggle, and addressing these areas will benefit ELLs in all other content areas as well. In order for these students and schools to be successful and improve in the area of reading and reading comprehension, the establishment of best practices and implementation of instructional strategies must be designed to reflect and address these students' academic needs.

There are many programs in place to address the needs of students identified as ELLs. These ESL programs can be administered in a variety of ways and methods. Three common methods for ESL instruction include:

- Push-In- this method includes an ESL instructor to push into the regular instructional setting to assist students in English language acquisition.
- Pull Out- This method involves an ESL instructor pulling students from the regular education classroom for ESL instruction.
- Dual Certified- In this method, ELLs will receive ESL instruction in their regular classroom from a dual-certified teacher.

August and Shanahan (2006) stated that whatever the method used, the key to a successful ESL program is research-based language acquisitions that includes instructional supports designed for ELLs and educators who are trained

and receive ongoing professional development in the area of ESL. This study expanded on this topic and addressed the need for effective reading comprehension strategies.

Organization of the Document

The second chapter of this study will cover a detailed review of peer-reviewed literature regarding how ELLs learn, key learning theories, and effective reading comprehension instructional strategies to increase reading achievement in ELLs. This chapter will also consider key legal implications and outlined the importance of using a culturally responsive pedagogy.

The third chapter describes this study's methodology, a quantitative approach that was used to determine the correlation between reading strategies and reading achievement for ELLs. Furthermore this chapter detailed data collection and participant criteria and inclusion.

The fourth chapter presents the research methods used for data collection, as well as examining and analyzing the research findings and data.

The fifth chapter includes the interpretation of findings, as well as recommendations for best practices in increasing the achievement of ELL's reading comprehension. Also included are recommendations concerning further research.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Teachers and students face many challenges every day. Addressing the needs of our increasingly diverse student population is just one of these challenges and a paramount concern for all. Ten years ago a classroom may have contained one English language learner (ELL) or student from another country or culture. Today that number has exploded (Fast Facts, 2015). According to the National Center for Educational Statistics this trend is forecasted to continue over the next few years (NCES, 2015). According to the Tennessee State Report Card (n.d.), teachers are now experiencing an in increasingly large number of diverse learners within their classrooms many classified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) (State Report Card - TN.Gov, n.d.). Though education is experiencing an upswing in the number of teachers focusing on the English language population, schools are still struggling to meet the needs of these students. There is an extensive amount of literature focused on improving reading fluency and comprehension among ESL students. However, the execution of improving the reading fluency and comprehension of these students is insufficient to meet students' needs. It is critical that the needs of our increasingly diverse and linguistically challenging classrooms are being met (McGee, Haworth, and Macintyre, 2015).

According to the Tennessee Department of Education (n.d.), English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers average approximately thirty minutes to an hour a day with students, depending on the student's language proficiency scores on

either the WIDA Access Placement Test (W-APT) for learners entering the United States school system or the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) for continuing learners grades K – 12. ESL teachers are sometimes fortunate to have a small group of no more than six or eight total students, but more often than not these teachers are responsible for a large group of 15- 20 (York-Barr, Ghore, and Sommers, 2007). Even with smaller groups it is often difficult to address the diverse needs of each student. This increases the critical need for these students to receive the most effective instruction in both their general education classrooms as well as within their ESL service time.

According to reported achievement data, many ELL students are not reaching their reading achievement goals (Ed Week, 2011). Unfortunately, due to language proficiency levels it is often difficult to accurately assess these students in specific content areas. Standardized tests are generally created in a “one size fits all” approach to assessment for all students. In order to effectively assess their knowledge in the testable domains ELL students must be proficient in reading fluency and comprehension in order to be accurately assessed (Rader-Brown, and Howley, 2014). With the establishment of educational reforms such as No Child Left Behind (2001), focus has shifted to the academic accountability of all students included in subgroups.

This literature review will consider research appearing in peer-reviewed journals and other published research in the area of education and more specifically English language learners reading fluency and comprehension. There will be three main goals. The first goal is to establish a clear understanding of

how our ELL students learn and develop reading strategies for growth and achievement. The second goal is to develop a model for generating local teacher leaders through effective use of instructional strategies. Lastly, its purpose is to import theoretical aspects of learning to guide and outline the researcher's study of effects of reading strategies on ELL student's achievement and how the results of the study can further research into this critical area of learning.

Who are English language learners and how do they learn?

ELLs are identified as those with limited English proficiency (LEP). ELL students are diverse and include students from different cultural and geographic locations as well as different language and academic needs (Colorin Colorado, n.d.). These are students for whom their L1, or primary language, is any language other than English. These students are typically from non-English speaking families, however, they may also come from English-only or multi-language households. Whatever the background ELL students are unable to communicate or learn effectively in their L2, or secondary language. These students will require additional or modified instruction in both core academics and English language instruction. There is no set profile of an ELL student or set response for meeting their needs and educational goals (National Council of Teachers of English, n.d.).

ELL students are the fastest growing segment within the United States student population. In Academic Year 2012-2013, it was estimated that 9.2% or 4.4 million students in the United States were identified as English language learners (NCES, 2015). These numbers are predicted to rise in the coming years. While originally ELL students could be found in a small number of U.S. schools,

they are now located in most states. Schools located in urban areas typically have higher concentrations of ELL students.

Just like their native English-speaking counterparts, ELL students learn at different rates and have various learning styles. For ELL student's, language proficiency will fall into one of five stages of second language acquisition (Colorin Colorado, n.d.). ELL students will progress through these five stages of linguistic proficiency. Each of these stages is developmental and contains levels of building vocabulary banks accessible to the ELL student. The length of each stage varies according to the individual student. These stages include:

- Level I Pre-Production: This is known as an ELL students' silent period. Students in this stage will possess around 500 receptive language words. They may parrot what others say but, have no productive language of their own. Students at this stage can copy from the board and will benefit from having a bilingual buddy when possible.
- Stage II Early Production: This stage will typically last about six months. Students in this stage will begin to develop their productive language and will have an average active vocabulary of 1,000 words.
- Stage III Speech Emergence: Students at this stage can communicate in simple sentences and phrases. Their vocabulary has now reached around 3,000 words.
- Stage IV Intermediate Fluency: Students now have a vocabulary of more than 6,000 words and can use complex sentences when speaking, reading,

and writing. These students use strategies from their L1 language to increase their understanding and production in their L2 language.

- Stage V Advanced Fluency: Students will spend anywhere between four and 10 years in this stage of language development. In this stage they will speak with near native fluency and will continue to develop their cognitive academic language. Students will also continue to need teacher support during this time.

Though a student may speak with near native fluency in their L2 language, these students are not considered to be proficient and must receive English language instruction from a certified English as a second language teacher (ESL) (Colorin Colorado, n.d.). When working with ELL students, ESL teachers will cover not only vocabulary but also incorporate domains of instruction. These domains are reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

Under Title III of NCLB, states are required to assess the level of language proficiency of students identified as English language learners (English Learners (EL) Assessment - TN.Gov, n.d.). Tennessee recently transitioned to the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) for the assessment of ELL students' language proficiency and growth. Use of the data from WIDA Access will drive decisions for service, participation, and monitoring (WIDA, n.d.). For English language learner identification, Tennessee outlines that students who respond with any language other than English on their Home Language Survey (HLS) will be assessed via the WIDA Access Placement Test (W-APT). Students who score as limited English proficient will receive ESL services. Students who

score above 5.0 in both literacy and composite scores will be reclassified to transition one status and will be monitored. Students will be monitored for a period of two years. During this time they will not be assessed via WIDA Access. At the end of two years, students will be classified as former English language learners.

Legal Implications

Brown v. Board of Education

The landmark Supreme Court case of 1954 declared that state laws requiring the segregation of public schools were unconstitutional (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954). Though primarily concerned with the separation of African American students the decision handed down impacted those of Asian, Hispanic, and Native American descent who were often segregated as well. The Supreme Court's decision stated that the segregation of students was inherently unequal and violated the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution and should be rectified with haste.

Plyler v. Doe

In *Plyler v. Doe* (1982), the Supreme Court ruled that undocumented children and young adults have the same rights as documented children and young adults to a quality and meaningful education in United States public schools. Additionally students identified as homeless are to be enrolled immediately under the McKinney-Vento Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. § 11301 *est. seq.*). Furthermore, undocumented students must attend school until they reach a legally mandated age. This landmark case enabled undocumented student's access to an education

that had not previously been available. Schools may not deny admission to a student at any time on the basis of status, or demonstrate any act designed to discriminate or intimidate parents or students in the disclosure of status or in prevention of access to education. This is further supported by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) which prohibits schools from disclosing any information to outside sources.

Bilingual Education Act of 1968

The Bilingual Education Act (BEA) of 1968 was the inaugural legislative act recognized that specifically addressed the needs of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students. Though addressing the needs of all non-English speakers, the BEA was primarily spearheaded by Spanish speakers in the United States. Though some states had policies in place to address the needs of these students, the BEA was the first to address it on a national level. With its establishment, the BEA provided federal funds to schools to for the establishment and maintenance of programs to address the needs of their students identified as Limited English Proficient. The BEA was amended at several points between 1974 and its reauthorization in 1994, before being replaced by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2002 (Colorin Colorado, n.d.).

Lau v. Nichols

Lau v. Nichols (1974) reached the Supreme Court and is considered to be one of the most important cases impacting the education of ELL students. The suit was initiated by non-English speaking Chinese students against the San Francisco Unified School District. In the suit, students claimed that the district failed to

provide adequate English language instruction or instructional procedures to more than 1,800 students. Students claimed that they were placed within mainstream classrooms to “sink or swim,” though the district argued that that they were within the law by providing students with equal treatment to that of other students within the district. By failing to provide these students with a meaningful opportunity within the classroom, the school district violated article 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which bans any discrimination based on the grounds of race, color, or national origin in any program that receives federal funds.

The Supreme Court found in favor of the students, thus clarifying and expanding the rights of all LEP students located within the United States. The Court based its opinion in part on the students’ language being an integral part of their national origin. In writing the Court’s decision, Justice William Douglas stated that, “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. We know that those who do not understand English are certain to find their classroom experiences wholly incomprehensible and in no way meaningful”. As a recipient of federal funds the San Francisco Unified School District must assure that all students receive a meaningful education regardless of race, color, or national origin. This decision has influenced many decisions since its origin and continues to be the benchmark of ELL student’s treatment (Developing ELL Programs: Lau v. Nichols, n.d.).

Soon after the court's decision regarding *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) was handed down this ruling was coded into federal law via the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 (EEOA). Lau was incorporated into section 1703(f) which states that "No state shall deny educational opportunities to an individual on account of his or her race, color, sex, or national origin by the failure of an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instructional programs (Developing ELL Programs: *Lau v. Nichols*, n.d.)".

No Child Left Behind Act

On January 8, 2002 No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) was signed into law by President George W. Bush. This act alters the role of the federal government in regards to K - 12 education. Its purpose was to create national accountability standards that each state must adhere to based upon the success of each of its students (Klein, 2015). This act placed the responsibility of a student's success directly on the state and schools. To aid states and schools with adherence to these standards, NCLB included a major provision known as "adequate yearly progress," or AYP. AYP is an annual measure of student participation and achievement on statewide assessments and must be reported. NCLB contained four basic educational reform principals, which were stronger accountability for results, increased flexibility and local control, expanded options for parents, and an emphasis on teaching methods that have been proven to work. NCLB helped change the face of education and emphasized the academic performance of

schools subgroups such as the ELL population (No Child Left Behind-ED.gov,n.d.).

Title III NCLB Act (2002), also known as the “English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act,” ensures that students that have been identified as limited English proficient receive instruction to meet academic standards. This section (§ 3102(1)) of NCLB contains nine main purposes:

- Ensure that all LEP students attain English proficiency, develop English proficiency, and meet the same academic achievement required of all students.
- To assist all LEP students in achieving high levels in core academics in order to meet the challenging state academic content and achievement requirements set for all students.
- Development of high-quality language instruction educational programs designed to assist in teaching LEP students.
- To develop and enhance state and local educational agencies in the preparation of LEP students entrance into all English instructional settings.
- To assist state and local educational agencies in the establishment, implementation, and maintenance of programs targeting the language acquisition of LEP students.
- To promote parental and community involvement and participation of programs for the communities of LEP students.

- To streamline language instruction into a program carried out through federal grants addressing the needs of LEP students in the development of proficiency in English.
- To hold state and local educational agencies accountable for the increase in English proficiency and core academic content by requiring demonstrated improvements and AYP of LEP students.
- To provide state and local educational agencies with the flexibility to implement language instruction programs based on scientifically based research on teaching LEP students that they believe to be the most effective for teaching English.

Currently, NCLB regulations exempt ELL students entering into United States schools from taking reading on state standardized test for the first 12 months of enrollment. Currently, students are not exempt from taking the math or science portions of standardized tests. However, state and local educational agencies are allowed to exclude those scores from their AYP reports (U.S. Department of Education, 2010c.). In addition to the requirements concerning state standardized tests, each state must assess the level of English proficiency and content knowledge of their ELL students.

Learning Theories

Learning theories are conceptual frameworks, which are used to explain how we absorb, process, and retain information. There are many types of learning theories such as cognitive, behaviorism, constructivism, and brain-based learning theory. Behaviorist and cognitivist theories explain learning through prediction,

and observation, while brain-based learning theories basis relies on neuroscience (Willingham, Hughes, and Dobolyi, 2015).

Behaviorism

Behaviorism focuses on objectively observable behavior which ascertains that learning is the acquisition of new behavior (Moore, 2011). Behaviorists determined that conditioning is a universal learning process. This process is divided into two separate areas which impact behavioral patterns in different ways.

- Classical Conditioning - occurs when a natural reflex responds to a stimulus. Pavlov's observations of dog's salivating when presented with food is an example of classic conditioning. Behaviorists state that people are biologically programmed to react in set ways in response to stimuli.
- Behavioral or Operant Conditioning - occurs when a response to a stimulus is reinforced. This conditioning is a feedback system which reinforces the desired behavior when stimuli occurs thus ensuring the response is probable in the future. Behaviorist B.F. Skinner used this type of reinforcement technique when training pigeons to dance and bowl a ball.

Detractors of Behaviorism claim that it discounts allowances of different learning styles and mental processes, as well as other occurrences of learning.

However, Behaviorism is adaptable and easily understood. For educators, Behaviorism's positive and negative reinforcement techniques are easily implemented and effective. Implications for ELL students also include the assumption that students respond automatically to environmental factors or stimulus. Behaviorism theory assumes that students, such as those that do not

speaking English as their first language, began as a blank slate that may be influenced and developed through positive and negative reinforcement.

Audiolingualism is based upon this theory and is a method of second language instruction where the learner responds directly to a provided stimulus by repeating, thus forming a new behavior. Audiolingualism and other behaviorism-based strategies define learning as a change in behavior. Behaviorism precedes the Cognitivist view (Castagnaro, 2006).

Cognitivism

Cognitivism was developed around the 1950's in response to the behaviorist theory movement (Yilmaz, 2011). Unlike behavioral theory, cognitive theory focuses on the learners as information processors, as well on internal mental processes, such as perception, thinking, memory, knowing, and problem solving. Cognitivists identify knowledge as schema, and learning as the change which occurs within the schemata (Cook, 2015). Three principles are important to learning based on Cognitivism. These principles are meaningful learning, organization, and elaboration of instruction.

Albert Bandura's social learning theory bridges Behaviorism with cognitivist theories. Bandura posits that learning occurs through observation, imitation, and modeling, and further concludes that human behavior is a continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioral, and environmental influences (Bandura, 1977).

Cognitivist learning activities include scaffolding, explicit class vocabulary, analysis and discussion of language and topics, inductive approaches,

and review of information. This theory places students as active participants in their learning process. Students use their own personal understanding and background to process new content and information that they encounter. This is especially critical for ELL students, who often lack the needed background and contextual connections needed for the acquisition of new knowledge and learning. For these students, instruction must include connections to their cultures and backgrounds in order to activate their prior knowledge in their first language and build the needed connections necessary for learning (Canagarajah, 2006).

Constructivism

Constructivism is a philosophy of learning which is built from the premise that reflection upon experiences constructs our understanding (Krahenbuhl, 2016). It states that learning is the process of adjusting our mental models to accommodate our new experiences and learning. Constructivism has four guiding principles.

- Learning is a search for meaning.
- Meaning requires understanding the whole as well as the parts.
- In order to teach well, we must understand the mental models used to support students' perceptions.
- The purpose of learning is to construct his/her own meaning.

Constructivism calls for curriculum that is more customized to a student's prior knowledge and involves more hands on learning. This learning theory values the student's prior knowledge, an embedded context, cooperative group work, and integrates language, content, and the learning process together. Instruction

includes making connections and fostering new understanding (Mvududu and Thiel-Burgess, 2012). Teaching strategies should be targeted to student responses and encourage students to analyze, interpret, and predict new information. Teachers promote student learning through open-ended questions, collaboration, and discussion. Like Cognitivism, Constructivism relies on the student's background knowledge in order to further student learning.

Constructivism relies on the impact that ELL students' culture and background has on their growth and learning (Mvududu and Thiel-Burgess, 2012). Students use their experiences and backgrounds to contextualize new information in order to make it relevant, thus facilitating further learning. Constructivism implies that information and knowledge must be relevant to the students' cultural identity, prior knowledge, and understanding. ELL students must be invested in the material being taught in order to be active participants in their learning. Educators must facilitate this through the inclusion of the student's culture and background in instruction thus making students feel invested and feel successful.

Brain Based Research

According to the Tennessee Department of Education (n.d.), in the 2014-2015 school year, Tennessee was home to more than 45,000 identified English language learners. This number is predicted to increase rapidly in the coming years. Therefore, according to Lombardi (2008), it is essential that students' educational needs are met by addressing these needs through the full range of teaching options available such as auditory, visual, and kinesthetic approaches which complement brain compatible learning. Teachers are now able to draw

upon recent Brain-based research developed for other learners to address the needs of their growing population of diverse learners, such as ELL students. This should be used to augment multicultural strategies, addressing student's learning styles, and diverse needs. Furthermore, teachers who are equipped with a variety of teaching approaches and strategies can tap into the best brain compatible learning for their students' achievement (Lombardi, 2008).

Brain-Based Learning has developed from research centered on neurology and cognitive science. These techniques are used to enhance teaching and learning by discovering how the brain is naturally inclined to learn (Connell, 2009).

Jensen (2000) explains that as Brain-Based Learning teachers combine Research-based strategies and interventions, their students learn through their connections. ELL students make these connections to their own cultural backgrounds and experiences. These connections are often emotional in nature and students' brains will attach these emotions to events and thoughts that will aid in forming patterns of meaning and connections for learning. Emotions trigger memories that strengthen the connections necessary for learning (Jensen, 2000). Gardner's (1983) theory of multiple intelligences taught educators all over the world how human brains are actually connected to learning.

Levine's (2003) framework for learning is the basis for why children often struggle in school. Though his work is primarily focused on native speakers, the neurodevelopment constructs can be applied to ELL best practices in instruction. Through using brain based approaches to learning, such as interactive activities, using graphic organizers, activating prior knowledge, and collaboration, educators

encourage and motivate ELLs to actively participate in their L2 acquisition.

Allowing ELL students to paraphrase, summarize, and create visual and graphic representations encourages the formation of connections and associations. The use of lists, graphs, tables, organizers, and story maps assists students, such as ELLs, in organization and processing of information with aids in the facilitation of comprehension and retention. Other activities to aid ELL students may include collaborative discussion during read-aloud, explicitly taught vocabulary, turn and talk, visuals, audio-visuals, and kinesthetic activities including total physical response. Collaborative discussions play a vital role in the growth of ELL students' listening and speaking areas of language acquisition (Levine, 2003).

Levine (2003) suggests ten key ideas concerning learning:

- Observation is a key to learning.
- Each student has both strengths and weaknesses.
- Labels are barriers that only impede student learning.
- Assisting students in the identification of their potential should be priority.
- No one can be good at everything.
- Students should be provided the opportunities to talk about the own learning. This should include behavior, attention, and linguistic challenges.
- Focus on reinforcement and students interest.
- Students have both a right and a need to know and discuss their strengths and weaknesses.
- Despite their age or stage, student's brains can be modified.

- Being a non-native speaker is not a disability, though many are mislabeled as learning disabled.

The neurological research into brain based learning has produced many research based practices and strategies over the years in education (Edelenbosch, Kupper, Krabbendam, and Broerse, 2015). Caine and Caine (1990), forerunners into brain based learning, developed the following 12 principles.

- The human brain is a complex system capable of performing multiple tasks simultaneously, such as thoughts, emotions, imagination, and predispositions. These interact concurrently with health and general growth of social and cultural knowledge. For education and ELL students specifically, educators should engage the brain as a whole by orchestrating changing activities and strategies throughout the day which address individual learning style and encourage student learning and increased knowledge.
- Learning is a natural process, much like breathing. It is possible to encourage or discourage it. Educators must engage the whole student within the learning process.
- The search for meaning is basic to the human brain and inherent to survival. The human brain automatically endeavors to make sense of what it knows and what it is learning so that it may assign purpose and meaning. For students, this means that educators must provide students with a safe and stable environment, while also engaging their curiosity and need for

exploration. Educators must challenge students through a rich and complex environment.

- The search for meaning occurs through “patterning”. The human brain is always searching for patterns to facilitate understanding. Encouraging the use of graphic organizers, predictive strategies, and think-pair-share encourages the brain to use these patterns to encourage new learning.
- Emotions are critical for the function of patterning. It was concluded that our emotions are directly linked to what we learn and that they both operate synchronously and cannot be separated. In any lesson a student's thoughts, emotions, and life experiences must be taken into account. It is important to consider this and provide the appropriate environment using strategies designed to engage and motivate student growth and learning.
- Every brain simultaneously perceives and creates parts and wholes. Both the left and the right hemisphere of the brain will both work interactively, and introspectively undeterred by the activity in which it is engaged.
- Learning involves both focused attention and peripheral perception. The brain absorbs information it is directly aware of along with that which is located in its periphery. For students, especially ELLs, this means that teachers must organize lessons so that the materials located outside the lessons' focus are targeted to what students are learning, such as visual and auditory cues, which are critical for language acquisition in ELL students. These materials may include charts, illustrations, art, photographs, and music.

- Learning always involves conscious and unconscious processes. The human brain can learn more than it can understand consciously. Furthermore, what we perceive in our periphery, such as experiences and sensory cues, enters the brain without awareness and will act unconsciously. This means that much of the information received is stored until it is needed in the consciousness and will emerge to influence, motivate, or facilitate decisions and learning. For students, this indicates the need for teachers to encourage more active processing by their students. Teachers may incorporate reflections, metacognitive activities, and thinking stems to guide and encourage students to elaborate on their thoughts, ideas, and skills.
- Humans have two types of memory; spatial memory and memory systems devoted to rote memory. The brain processes memory differently for spatial and rote memory. The memory systems located in the brain must have practice with each type in order to function effectively. While educators address the processes surrounding rote memory through activities such as memorizing facts, and spelling; they must also address the processes for transference of learning. By addressing ELL students' cultural and personal backgrounds in order to foster connections, educators are also triggering this type of transference. Additionally organizing learning activities into meaningful parts, addressing students learning styles and multiple intelligences will aid in developing these processes.

- The brain understands and remembers best when facts and skills are embedded in natural spatial memory. For native English speakers, language is learned through a series of natural occurrences and interactions, such as social interactions that aid in vocabulary and language development. This type of embedding of learning is an essential element to Brain-based learning theories and is complex due to its dependence on previously discussed principles. ESL instruction must include activities and experiences that engage the senses and immerse the students in a complex and interactive environment using multiple learning strategies and modalities.
- Learning is enhanced by challenge and inhibited by threat. According to Hart (1983), the brain will learn when it is challenged, but will shut down when threatened. ELL students need an academic environment that is safe, welcoming, and challenging. Classroom challenges provided to ELL students must be appropriate for their language acquisition stage and must encourage students to seek and understand their own learning. Educators can facilitate this environment through integrating students' culture, views, and values into instruction in order to motivate and engage (Tinajero, 2001).
- Each brain is unique. While all brains begin with the same processes and systems, which includes basic sense and emotions, each is different in their integration. As humans learn and grow the structure will change, making it even more individualized. Educators must be multifaceted and

embrace their students multiple learning styles, capabilities, and intelligences to encourage their students growth, learning and to address their diverse needs. Teachers must embrace ELLs' different needs and alternative approaches to learning.

Caine and Caine (1990) state that there are three interactive elements necessary to brain based learning: relaxed alertness, immersion, and active processing, and that the overall objective is to move away from the rote memorization of the past and instead move toward meaningful whole brain learning.

Relaxed alertness is the stage where external learning activities meet the brain's need for challenge and its search for meaning. For ELL students, an optimal environment would be a relaxed and one with minimal threat. This allows students to grow more confident in their language proficiency and become at ease with themselves. Immersion of students into experiences is important to learning as a whole. It is the students' sense of the experience that will determine their degree of learning. Integration of subjects so that they overlap instead of remaining separate will create meaningful learning experiences. Active processing puts the students in charge of consolidation and internalizing of learning that is personally meaningful to the student. This can be meaningful to each student on an individual basis. This can be accomplished through questioning and reflection. For ELL students, it is important for teachers to aid students in the development of thinking skills through metacognitive activities and targeted instruction (Caine and Caine, 1990).

With the increasing population of ELL students and diverse learners in the United States, formidable challenges for educators have developed (Connell, 2009). By understanding how the brain works and learns, educators may examine the implications of instructional design, administration, evaluation, the role of the school in the community, and teacher education (Caine and Caine, 1990). Brain based learning theories confirm that student growth and learning is greatly elevated when instruction contains research-based learning strategies (Connell, 2009). Marzano (2003) confirmed that brain-based learning is effective in the instruction of regular education students, as well as ELL and other diverse learners. Furthermore, research supports the inclusion by teachers of aspects of brain-based learning into instruction. These aspects may include multiple intelligences, learning styles, and emotional intelligences into their classroom and homework assignments. This is especially important for ELL students who learn better through visual, tactile, emotional, or auditory occurrences (Caine and Caine, 1990).

Multiple Intelligences

Gardner (1983) challenged previous theories concerning brain immutability with his work on multiple intelligences. He theorized the connections that the brain has with learning, and through his work he was able to deepen the understanding educators possessed about learning around the world. Multiple intelligence theory began a movement in American education with educators striving to understand brain-based learning, multiple intelligences, and finding different ways to meet the needs of their increasingly diverse student

population (Connell, 2009). Drawing from research in neuropsychology, Gardner ascertained that there are eight criterion for behavior considered to be intelligence. This theory is significant because each of the eight intelligences have physiological locations within the brain. These intelligences are part of the human genetic make-up, and Gardner claims that some level of each intelligence is manifested universally independent of education and cultural support. He asserts that there is no central intelligence, but rather eight separate pieces that make up the whole person. The eight intelligences are labeled spatial/visual, musical/rhythmic, kinesthetic/bodily, interpersonal/social, intrapersonal/introspective, logical/mathematical, naturalistic, and linguistic/verbal. Each intelligence is part of the whole person and is able to emote itself at anytime. These intelligences will grow and develop with time and age. Instructional practices should include components that address each of the eight intelligences for the benefit of each student (Gardner, 1991).

The theory of multiple intelligences has become a cornerstone of ESL instruction. Addressing the learning modalities of ELL students is important to their long term growth, development, and ultimate success. Instruction of these diverse students should include multiple components to address each modality; while making up a comprehensive and organic lesson as a whole. Using different methodologies and activities to reach these diverse students will serve the whole student rather than an individual part. Using thematic and interdisciplinary instruction provides ELL students with opportunities for cooperative learning and activities to inspire a deeper understanding (Abdorrezza & Divsar, 2011).

In response to criticism of Gardner's theory, Guild (1997) stated that multiple intelligences, learning styles, and Brain-based learning each had relevance to instruction. Though these theories were separate and distinct from each other, they had many areas that overlapped. The use of each of these theories in an instructional setting allows for focus on the unique qualities of the learner as an individual. A comprehensive approach incorporating of multiple intelligences, learning styles, and brain based learning theories includes six areas of overlap:

- Each theory is learner and learning centered. The learner and his/ her growth and development are the dominant focus of instruction.
- The teacher is a reflective practitioner. Educators must understand and reflect upon the theories and be a reflective practitioner in their instruction. This is accomplished through study, reflection, and application.
- The student is a reflective practitioner. Students are active partners in their own learning and the learning process.
- The whole person is educated. Focus on the learner's social, emotional, cultural, and physical life is as important to the learner as the academic. Personalized instruction is important to the learner's success.
- The curriculum has substance, depth, and quality. Curriculum is not standardized and contains various methodologies and strategies to address student needs.
- Each theory promotes diversity. It is the cornerstone of each of these theories that individuals are unique and have unique learning process.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

Gollnick (2008) states that by the year 2020 50% of all students in the United States will be diverse learners. It is critical that teachers know and understand a student's culture in order for the student to learn and grow. By knowing and understanding a student's culture teachers can effectively use strategies that will help students' learn and exceed their goals. Banks (2012) found that a large number of teachers focused on content integration when approaching multiculturalism in their curriculum and subsequently developed the five dimensions of multicultural education. These dimensions are content integration, knowledge construction, equity pedagogy, prejudice reduction, and empowering school and social culture and structure. These five dimensions work towards empowering students as individuals as well as cultural groups.

Researchers such as Au (2001), Tharp (1994), Ladson-Billings (2001) have focused concern upon the increasing population of low-income students classified in minority ethnic groups low school achievement. Furthermore, these researchers developed culturally responsive pedagogy to aid educators in addressing the needs of these students. Teachers who employ this method address student learning through the use of the students own culture as a vehicle for learning (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Gay (2000) furthered this through a more global approach beyond a student's race, and asserts that culturally responsive teaching should include knowledge of the student's culture, prior experiences, and performance style to customize their learning in order to maximize effectiveness. Studies have shown that an English language learner's achievement is directly

affected by culturally responsive pedagogy, brain based learning, and their multiple intelligences (Caine and Caine, 1991). Researchers have found that the use of brain based learning and culturally sympathetic instructional practices lead to significant student achievement.

Gay (2010) stated that it is essential that a teacher understands a student's background as much as the content they teach. A student's background knowledge and culture are needed to make learning more relevant to the student, in order to increase motivation and engagement. Cultural knowledge is defined as the dynamic system of social values, cognitive codes, behavioral standard worldwide views, and beliefs. ESL instruction should specifically address student's cultural background to aid in connection to prior knowledge, as well as to drive instruction and assessment of these students. Academic achievement of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds academic achievement would be improved if educators would design instruction to address and be responsive to their students' cultures, in addition to ensuring classrooms are structured and transforming polices transformed to enhance learning for all students.

Gay's (2000) five components to culturally responsive teaching include: developing a cultural diversity knowledge base, designing culturally relevant curricula, demonstration of cultural caring and building of a cultural learning community, effective cross cultural communication, and delivering culturally responsive instruction. These components are necessary for educators to work effectively within a diverse classroom such as ESL classrooms. Educators must be

responsive and critically conscious of their own cultural socialization and its effect on their perception of other cultures and ethnic groups. Further reflection and analyzing of their own cultural values, assumptions, beliefs and how it affects their instructions is important when addressing learners needs as well.

Educators that are self-aware are better equipped in the identification of their learners' own cultural components and behaviors in order to better target their instruction to their student's needs. Areas of importance include learner's values, communication styles, learning styles, contributions, social problems, and levels of ethnic identity development and affiliation (Rychly and Graves, 2012).

Use of culturally responsive teaching encompasses many characteristics which aid in the success of school's diverse populations. Effective instruction contains opportunities for learners, specifically ELL students, to connect knowledge and skills to their own background knowledge and frames of reference. This allows for more meaningful learning and connections for these students, which will aid in the development of skills such as reading comprehension (Jones and Mixon, 2015).

Reading Comprehension Strategies

Use of instructional strategies aids educators in facilitating the growth and development of their learners. It is important when teaching ELL students that educators employ research based practices (Linan-Thompson and Vaughn, 2007). The goal for all reading instruction is for students to read for understanding and growth of vocabulary and knowledge. Reading comprehension is the culminating point where learners have reached the point where they are no longer learning to

read, rather than reading to learn. Learners used the skills acquired when learning to read in order to facilitate learning through comprehension. Studies have shown that reading comprehension will aid ELL students in vocabulary development. Furthermore, reading comprehension falls under the umbrella of active processing and requires intentional and thoughtful interaction between the learner and text (Jones and Mixon, 2015). Some researchers have stated that students do not need to be fluent readers in order to develop reading comprehension skills. However, Snow, Burns, and Griffin (1998) suggested that ELL students be allowed to develop reading fluency skills within their L1 language in order to facilitate comprehension. When instructing ELL students in reading comprehension, care should be taken to anticipate and address literal and figurative language barriers beforehand. ELL students must simultaneously work toward their English language goals while developing vocabulary and literacy skills, as well as working at grade level (Beem and Quirk, 2012).

Proficiency in decoding, encoding, and phonemic awareness are necessary, but not exclusive, to an ELL student's success in comprehension and writing (Linan-Thompson and Vaughn, 2007). Instruction of academic language and vocabulary, along with effective reading strategies aimed at comprehension, are necessary components for success. Effective ESL instruction includes routines, embedded redundancy in lessons, and provides explicit discussion of vocabulary and structure, including metacognitive activities.

August and Shanahan (2006) asserted that reading comprehension is critical for the long-term achievement of ELL students. According to Shanahan et

al. (2010) this is true for not only students' academic and professional futures, but for their social areas of life Furthermore, "good readers use many forms of thinking and analyzing text as they read" (Shanahan et al., 2010, p. 16). There is little research and literature into best practices effective for reading comprehension instruction with ELL students, nor have there been any clear explanations or examples given regarding benefits to ELL students (August and Shanahan, 2006).

Shanahan et al. (2010) states a strategy is the intentional application applied before during and after reading. Teaching ELL students these strategies and how best to apply them during reading will enhance their reading and understanding while compensating for deficits or difficulties. There are six overall strategies that have been identified as effective for use with ELL students. These strategies are:

- Activating Prior Knowledge/Predicting
- Questioning
- Visualization
- Self-Monitoring
- Inferences
- Summarizing/Re-tell

The application of these strategies has many different methods of occurrence. For the purpose of this study, strategies and methods will include total physical response, explicitly taught vocabulary, graphic organizers, KWL charts, interactive word walls, schema stories, and student self-monitoring.

Garcia (1991) states that often ELL students understand much more than they are capable of orally expressing due to low language proficiency in their L2 language. Vocabulary building has been identified as an essential action in the instruction of ELL students. Also, the relationship present between a student's background knowledge and instructional content can strongly influence his/her comprehension and achievement. Educators must provide a culturally responsive environment where students are able to draw on prior background knowledge in order to make connections to the new content. As background knowledge is critical for students' comprehension, it is essential that educators provide a student with the appropriate background knowledge when content is unfamiliar.

With today's student population becoming more diversified it is essential that all teachers possess the necessary knowledge needed in the instructions of ELL students. It is no longer only the ESL teacher's responsibility to ensure students' growth and achievement. It is important to provide accommodations for ELL students, such as visual cues, physical cues, activating prior knowledge, summarizing, targeted vocabulary, and allowing non-verbal responses (Goldenberg, 2006).

For ELL students, vocabulary is essential to comprehension. ELL students must build their vocabulary for language proficiency and reading skills development (Tinajero, 2001). Without sufficient vocabulary, students, especially ELLs', reading fluency will stall and comprehension will decrease. Unknown vocabulary may also cause misunderstanding, and in some cases, change the

meaning of a text. Tinajero (2001) and Beck et al. (2002) stated that vocabulary must be taught directly and allow for opportunities for student use.

Instructional Strategies

Total Physical Response (TPR) is based on the premise that the brain is biologically programmed to acquire any natural language. This strategy uses action responses and physical movement to introduce language. Educators that employ this strategy will give students commands and will model the command multiple times before students' response. This strategy reduces student stress levels and builds confidence in student for whom verbal responses are more challenging. Furthermore, second language acquisition is a mirror to first language acquisition and is acquired through physical responses to stimuli and commands. This basis indicates that there is a pathway to the learning process through these motions that triggers students' emotions, which in turn activates memory, facilitating new and further learning and understanding. ELL students respond well to TPR as the reliance of background knowledge is diminished. TPR uses physical activity to promote understanding of content and vocabulary. With the importance of vocabulary acquisition to comprehension and language proficiency development, TPR allows ELLs opportunities to actively build their vocabulary through physical movement (Asher and Adamski, 1993).

Interactive word walls are customized to capture the student's attention and address academic needs (Gunning, 2005). Use of interactive word walls allows for students to recognize, analyze, and utilize words for academic content and reading fluency. The goal of interactive word walls will shift from educator to

educator and content areas. These goals may include building of vocabulary skills and facilitation of word analysis. Brabham and Villaume (2001) stated that while there are various goals and purposes of word walls, they each contain a collection of words that are developmentally appropriate, words that are selected for specific instructional purposes and walls that are cumulative and provide conversational scaffolds. Word wall use should be incorporated into instruction and should allow students to demonstrate understanding of these words.

Schema Stories are used to activate and use related schema in order to construct meaning based on connecting prior knowledge and experiences. By facilitating connections to student's prior knowledge, ELL students are more likely to comprehend selected texts by sequencing the beginning, middle, and ending of a story.

Student Self-monitoring improves reading comprehension by teaching students metacognition and fluency. This strategy teaches students to take charge of their own learning through self-reflection and to identify problems and solutions in order to better understanding. Students ask themselves questions about the text to facilitate comprehension of the text (Pearson-Casanova,1998).

KWL charts encourage student understanding by listing what students know about a topic, generate questions based on what they want to know, and after reading, answer the question of what they learned. This strategy engages students to connect prior knowledge with the text, as well as integrate, organize, and summarize knowledge from a text. The ultimate goal for a KWL chart is to access and activate student's background knowledge, so they may make

inferences, and develop reading proficiency and comprehension. Use of this strategy encourages students to make associations, make predictions, generate questions, and generate mental imagery. Secondly, this strategy will allow students to build absent prior knowledge by previewing through whole group discussion the text or topic (Fisher, Frey, and Williams, 2002).

Graphic organizers like KWL charts allow for the organization of information into more manageable parts. Parveen and Rajan (2013) stated that using graphic organizers in instruction helps students to identify a text's main ideas, key detail, facts, opinions, comparisons, and contradictions in order to facilitate understanding and comprehension.

Marzano and Pickering (2005) outlined the need for building a student's academic vocabulary and its close link to success in reading comprehension. Marzano (2003) developed six steps for building students' academic vocabulary. They are:

- The teacher provides a description, explanation, or example of the term.
- Linguistic- Students restate the description, explain, or give example in their own words.
- Non-linguistic- Students construct a picture, pictograph, symbolic, representation, or act them out.
- The teacher extends and refines understanding of the word by engaging students in activities that help them add to their knowledge of the terms in vocabulary notebooks.

- Periodically ask students to discuss the terms with one another.
- Involve students in games that enable them to play with the terms and reinforce word knowledge.

Effective Use

Ladson-Billings (2001) outlined three distinctive characteristics of educators who effectively create a context in which all learners are successful.

These characteristics include:

- Focus on individual learner's academic achievement.
- Develop student's cultural competence.
- Develop a sense of sociopolitical consciousness.

When teaching, educators must consider the whole when designing instruction. August and Hakuta (1998) stated that educators must focus on several key instructional principles rather than attempting to implement one program to address each ELL student's needs. By using several different techniques, educators are able to implement more differentiated instruction customized to the needs of their students. Teachers who demonstrate effective differentiated instruction target their instruction to the learning styles and modalities of their students through customization of vocabulary and structure. Teacher knowledge and competence is necessary for increasing the achievement of ELL students in meeting the curriculum standards and demands for their appropriate grade level.

Summary

English language learners are rapidly becoming the majority in many public schools in the United States. According to TDOE, this is especially true for

Tennessee schools, which have shown an increase from 4.1% in the 2012-2013 school year to 4.6% in the 2013-2014 school year. The percent of students identified as limited English proficient is predicted to steadily increase over the next five years. For ELL students, the processes of learning and achievement can be complex and challenging. Knowing how these students learn and what learning strategies to use in addressing their needs, multiple intelligences, and learning modalities is critical to not only to the learning and growth of these students but also their achievement in all areas of education. ELL students not only have to keep up with their peers in regard to grade-level and academic content, but simultaneously learn the necessary components of their L2 language essential for language proficiency. Literacy is fundamentally critical for students, especially ELL students, and it is necessary for achievement in all academic content areas (Helfrich and Bash, 2011).

The research literature has identified many common needs of ELL students and their most common learning processes. This research allows for educators to learn valuable strategies and demonstrates a link between reading achievement and the overall achievement of ELL students. However, there is not sufficient research regarding best instructional practices for increasing the overall achievement of this growing subgroup (Rader-Brown and Howley, 2014). Lombardi (2008) stated that in order for ELL students to learn, they must be instructed in an environment which they feel is safe, non-threatening, consistent, and encouraging for them. Further literature supported best practices in the instruction of ELL students and stated that, the ultimate goal is increasing overall

achievement of ELL students through their achievement in reading comprehension (Casanava, 1998). The problems many ELL students are currently facing are low literacy achievement and reading comprehension on achievement tests, such as Running Records. The validity of research into increasing the overall achievement of ELL students through reading comprehension and understanding merits value. This is further verified through the low achievement of ELLs on state mandated assessments (State Report Card- Tn.Gov, n.d.).

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to further contribute to ongoing research into the effective use and key instructional strategies aligned to reading comprehension and increasing the achievement of ELLs. This study also addresses any issues arising from the low reading comprehension achievement of ELL students, or any deficits, in current research regarding reading comprehension and instructional strategies by strengthening current research and providing educators with a clear and precise instructional guides for instructional improvements and increasing the reading comprehension of ELLs. All students benefit from strong reading skills and strategies, which in turn benefits all content areas (Brown, 2007). Reading comprehension was selected as this study's primary measurement in determining ELL achievement. Due to the continuing lack of improvements of ELLs in this area and the inconsistency of current research, the need for further research and exploration is indicated. This chapter will include the research design, collection methods, setting, samples, and the data collection and analysis of this study. This chapter will also address issues related to reliability and validity of the study.

Research Design and Approach

A quantitative method was selected due to the existing relationship between collected teacher survey data and ELL assessment data. This quantitative research is an analytic study investigating effective instructional strategies and their relationship to reading comprehension achievement among ELLs. This study

provides statistical evidence of a relationship between the independent variables, which are instructional strategies, and the dependent variables, or assessment data. Consenting teachers surveyed for this study included teachers from two elementary schools located in Middle Tennessee. The teachers surveyed included grades first through second in order to identify the instructional strategies being utilized, as well as the teacher's depth of knowledge. Additionally this survey ascertained and effectively calculated teacher's perception of the instructional strategies and their improvement on the reading achievements of ELL students. The overall goal was to determine if there was a relationship between the instructional strategy being used in the classroom and the overall reading achievement data for ELLs as reported by the assessment data.

Surveys were issued to teacher participants at the selected sample schools. All surveys were completed between January 13, 2017 and February 3, 2017 . The surveys included questions regarding the teacher use of instructional strategies used within his or her classrooms and their perceived effectiveness. The surveys were issued to the participants via Survey Monkey to protect anonymity and confidentiality of the participants.

Analysis of survey results was compared to assessment data gathered from Running Records. Assessment data included data received from both surveyed site schools for grades 1-2 for the testing period ending January 2017. Non-ELL student's assessment data were also obtained for comparison and to show a composite average for both ELL students and their peers.

Average proficiency scores were compared to teacher survey data by Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine the relationship between the reported strategy and student achievement. An ANOVA is the statistical method for analyzing variations in sets of observations divided into distinct components (Drummond, & Vowler, 2012). Students and teacher identity indicators remained anonymous throughout the study. These data sources allowed the researcher to ascertain which strategies provide the best practices for increasing achievement in ELL students. This approach augmented this study's agenda and purpose in addition to addressing the study's research questions.

- What relationship exists between the two data points?
- How accurate is the estimate of the relationship?

Fidelity of Implementation

Effective implementation of instructional strategies as intended is important for validity and reliability of the strategies in fostering student success (Vig, Taylor, Star, and Chao, 2014). In order to reduce instructional errors associated with the implementation of reading strategies and to ensure fidelity of the strategies implementation, as well as the study's survey results, a sample set of teacher participants was asked to allow a fidelity check observation. Observers included ESL instructors, and instructional coaches. The observation tool used was a locally approved and implemented observation fidelity check form.

Context, Setting, and Sample

The locations included in this study are two Middle Tennessee elementary schools in the Mid Cumberland region. Schools within this district underwent a redistricting with implementation in the 2015-2016 school year. Changes in grades served and student population affected each school's population located within the district. The research sample sites for this study were selected due to the population of English language learners (ELL) and differing title one distinction. The sample schools will be referred to as schools R1 and R2.

School R1 is a title one elementary school serving grades K-2. Current enrollment for school R1 lists enrollment at approximately 339 students. According to school demographics indicated on Tennessee Department of Education's state report card for the 2014-2015 school year, school R1's reported enrollment at 555 students. Of these students, 33.7% identified as limited English proficient, 90.1% economically disadvantaged, and 16.2% students with disabilities. School R1 has recently introduced a new reading initiative and focused their school's overall mission and vision on improving the reading and literacy skills of the student population. With a focus on reading, school R1 has redesigned how it approaches reading, instruction, and the utilization of teacher professional development.

School R2 is a non-titled school that serves grades K-3. ELL students were introduced to R2's student population in the 2015-2016 school year. This subgroups numbers are expected to continue to grow in the next five years. According to school demographics reported on the Tennessee Department of

Education's state report card for the 2014-2015 school year, school R2's reported enrollment at 369 students of which 2% are identified as limited English proficient, 45.3% economically disadvantaged, and 14.9% students with disabilities.

Research Participants

In order to ascertain Middle Tennessee's teachers' knowledge and use of pre-determined reading comprehension instructional strategies, a Likert scale survey was utilized. Survey participants included teachers in grades 1-2 within two elementary schools in Middle Tennessee whose classrooms contain ELL students. This survey provided data to determine teacher's use of reading comprehension strategies with ELL students by asking questions based on the following criterion:

- Teacher's knowledge and use of each individual strategy.
- Teacher perception of each strategy's effectiveness with ELL achievement.

Teachers at schools R1 and R2 were invited to participate in this study. Criterion for participation in this study included instruction in grades K-2 with ELLs, or ESL instructors. No monetary rewards or inducements were offered for participation. There were 17 participants from school R1 and 10 participants from school R2.

Permission was obtained from the appropriate administrators at the sample schools. A letter of consent is (see Appendix A) included in this study's documentation. Additionally, to the site principal's consent will also be obtained at the district level.

Instrumentation, Materials, Data Collection, and Analysis

Instrumentation for this study's research design includes a teacher self reported Likert scale survey (see Appendix) and collected student achievement data with emphasis on reading comprehension. All data was collected by the end of February 2017. A Likert scale is defined as a psychometric scale used in survey research opportunities. Likert scales are used to scale answers to corresponding degrees of measurement. For example I believe that students should receive more time in their guided reading groups: 1= Strongly agree, 2= Agree, 3= Disagree, 4= Strongly disagree. This study's survey will ascertain teacher knowledge and use and will ask teachers to first respond to questions regarding knowledge of instructional strategies the use of strategies in instruction. Questions regarding to teachers perception of effectiveness will complete the survey. Survey results and student achievement data will address the following research questions.

1. What impact has specific reading comprehension instructional strategies had on ELLs reading comprehension achievement?
2. How does teacher knowledge of instructional strategies compare with use and perceived effectiveness?

Indicators on the teacher self-reported survey were designed to address the above research questions. Survey results were compared to the reported student apprehension and overall literacy. Instructional strategies included on the self-reported survey were identified through examination of peer-reviewed literature of best practices for improving reading comprehension. The self-reported survey

will include selections on a five-point scale. This Likert survey is measuring knowledge/use of instructional strategies as well as teacher perceptions.

As a teacher I have knowledge of the following:

Low knowledge	I know very little about this topic.
Some knowledge	I know something, but not much about this topic.
Moderate knowledge	I am confident in my knowledge of this topic, but could learn more.
Good knowledge	I have above average knowledge about this topic.
High knowledge	I have a great amount about this topic and can provide instruction for its use.

In my role as a teacher I use the following:

Low use	I almost never use this strategy during the week.
Some use	I occasionally use this strategy during the week.
Moderate use	I sometimes use this strategy during this week.
Moderately high use	I use this strategy more than others during the week.
High use	I use this strategy frequently during the week.

Part A of the teacher self-reported survey ascertained the teacher's knowledge and use regarding reading comprehension instructional strategies.

Instructional strategies included in the study are as follows:

- Total physical response
- Explicitly taught vocabulary
- Graphic organizers
- Interactive word wall

- Schema stories
- KWL
- Student self monitoring

Part B of the teacher self-reported survey involves determining teacher perceptions regarding the survey reading comprehension instructional strategies and their effect on the achievement of ELLs. This survey included two open-ended questions that addressed additional information regarding related information to the study's topic.

This study's second data point was collected student achievement data as obtained from Running Records. This data allowed the researcher to calculate the average assessment score for students. Data were also used in determination of relationship between the reading comprehension instructional strategies used and the reported achievement data.

This study's analysis determined if a relationship exists between knowledge and use of instructional strategies and achievement data and if there is a negative or positive relationship existing between teacher perception and achievement data. This analysis produced data regarding the instructional strategies (independent variables) impact on the collected achievement data (dependent variables).

Response Rate

The quality of the teacher self-reported survey is determined through the response rate. This rate is determined through the number of teachers who completed the survey divided by the total number of participants. The percentage of responses is the determined response rate. Low response rates may indicate a

level of bias while a high response rate may indicate the surveys is non-bias. This study's response rate was based on the thirty-four invited teacher participants.

Issues of Validity

Insuring the validity of this study and its primary calculated measurements was addressed through research methodology. Moreover, this study was critically reviewed by a doctoral dissertation committee as well as peers within the field of education. Survey questions will also be reviewed and analyzed to certify the questions measured correlate to the intention and purpose of answering the proposed research questions.

Validity issues that may arise from this study include representativeness of the data. It is suggested to ensure survey validity that at least 60% of the surveys be completed and collected in order to meet the minimum criteria for validity. Another area of concern is the relatively small beginning sample size. In order to address the above concerns, the researcher utilized extreme caution in forming generalizations in reporting of the results and recommendations. This issue could be further avoided through the incorporation of a larger sample size, which would reduce both Type I and Type II errors.

Issues of Reliability

Reliability is defined as the extent that the survey yields similar results on subsequent attempts at repetition. In regard to reliability and survey data, there are two types of reliability, including random error and measurement error. Random errors occur in every study and are unpredictable in nature. This type of error can be reduced by ensuring the use of accurate sampling techniques, selecting a larger

sample size, and sampling participants representative of the study's topic, focus, and nature. Measurement errors, or errors whose concern is on how well an instrument performs within the given population. Data was collected via Survey Monkey and was inputted into the chosen data program for this study. This study's teacher self-reported survey was designed to evoke consistent responses from the invited participants.

Participants' Rights and Ethical Protection

All consideration to participant's rights, and ethical concerns were addressed and prioritized and protected in three ways. Attention was first given to protecting participant identification. This was addressed through the use of pseudonyms in any public documentation. Release documentation will include surveys, student assessment data, dissertation, and presentations. Next, teacher participants signed off on a consent form stating their approval for survey use. Lastly, teacher participants will also signed off on acknowledgment of their option to withdraw permission at anytime from the study. Furthermore, access to information and data was restricted to the researcher and dissertation committee members. Any data collected will be held for a period of one year before being purged. This study met approval standards with the district, sites, and university Internal Review Board for Human Subjects before participant's consent was obtained or student assessment data was collected. This included, but was not limited to, all data obtained in the course of the study such as teacher self-reported surveys and student assessment data.

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter provides a detailed description of this study's data collection procedures, an analysis of the survey data and student assessment data. This quantitative method of data analysis described in this chapter showed the presence of patterns and significant relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between the targeted reading comprehension instructional strategies and the impact on ELL's running record assessment data. It analyzed the relationships shown between the self-reported instructional strategies, and the domains, knowledge, use, perceived effectiveness and student achievement data through running record assessment data.

Survey research focused on effective reading comprehension instructional strategies reviewed in the literature. Data obtained from surveys was based on the self-reported responses from teachers based on their knowledge and use of the selected strategies used in the classroom. The independent variables were the self-reported instructional strategies in this analysis. Dependent variables included running record assessment data from scores reported during the August 2016 and the January 2017 assessment windows. Independent variables were analyzed in relation to the dependent variables in order to determine if a relationship between the variables can explain any gain or loss in the running recorded scores of ELLs.

The surveys' two open-ended questions were included to drive any strategies being used that were not included in the surveyed strategies. These questions granted the teachers the opportunity to provide a clearer picture of classroom instructional practices. This served to also deepen the researchers' knowledge and understanding, as well as develop alternate strategies for increasing the reading comprehension among ELL students that was not identified in the literature.

Research Questions

This study's main goals were to analyze data in order to determine if a relationship existed between reading comprehension instructional strategies and reading comprehension achievement. The research questions used to guide this study, data collection, and presentation of analysis were developed through the researcher's examination of literature relative to how students learn, how ELLs develop second language skills, and what factors contribute to their success in the area of reading comprehension. While research showed the questions were answered based on the data selected for this study to the extent allowable by the study's limitations, further research revealed alternatives suitable for increasing ELL achievement.

1. What impact have specific reading comprehension instructional strategies had on English language learners' reading comprehension achievement?
2. How does teacher knowledge of instructional strategies compare with use and perceived effectiveness?

Data Collection

This study examined the relationship between teacher reported survey data about instructional strategies in reading comprehension for ELLs and achievement. ELL students' running-record scores from grades 1-2 during the 2016-2017 school year were used as the performance measure for this study. For the teacher self-reported survey data, a Likert-scale survey was used for the quantitative data collection process.

Independent Variables

Classroom teachers in 1st and 2nd grades, at both participating schools, whose student classroom population included ELLs, were issued the study's Likert scale survey. Teachers at both R1 and R2 were asked to complete the survey on a voluntary basis. The administrators at both participating schools collected surveys. The surveys included both knowledge and use components for each researched and surveyed instructional strategy. This determined the level of teacher understanding and classroom use with their ELL students, as well as teachers' perceived effectiveness of each strategy in relation to student achievement in reading comprehension. Survey questions were based on researched literature surrounding student learning and reading strategies identified as effective in furthering student achievement for ELLs in the area of reading comprehension.

Dependent Variables

Student assessment data collected included running record data from August 2016 and January 2017. Data was obtained from the instructional coaches at each participating school. Running Records assesses student fluency and reading comprehension levels.

Control Variables

A variety of factors can influence student achievement scores. These factors may include individual, classroom, and school occurrences. Control variable examples may include student prior achievement, student demographics, teacher demographics, school demographics, classroom level variables, teacher experience, and training. These variables were not included within the study. However future inclusion could offer a deeper understanding of what impacts ELL achievement.

Analyses

For this study, the researcher hypothesized that a relationship was present between the independent and dependent variables. The researcher sought to explore the relationship between these variables in order to improve reading comprehension achievement for ELL students. The survey and assessment data used was programmed into a statistical program for analysis. For this study, the researcher chose to use Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

The teacher self-reported surveys were created to effectively ascertain the degree level of teacher participant's knowledge and use of this study's identified strategies, as well as their level of perceived effectiveness in positively impacting the reading comprehensions scores of ELL students. Strategies included within the survey were selected to include approaches that have previously been identified as effective through research regarding the support and success of ELLs and other diverse learners. These tactics included selections based on culturally responsive pedagogy, brain based learning, and the theory of multiple intelligences.

This survey consisted of eight questions based on a five-point scale for each. The significance of each point was either 1 for low, 2 for some, 3 for moderate, 4 for moderately high, and 5 for high. These questions sought to determine the level of teacher's knowledge, use, and perceived effectiveness of each approach. Additionally, there were two open-ended questions regarding any strategies not mentioned in the survey, as well as the teacher's opinion regarding the best way to assess reading comprehension for ELLs.

Beginning with the teacher's self-reported surveys, these within subjects ANOVAs compared results from the knowledge, use, and effectiveness rankings for each of the seven instructional strategies.

This type of analysis allowed the researcher to determine the statistical significance of the data. An ANOVA is useful in determining the difference and significance of the responses gathered from surveys, such as Likert surveys,

between the respondent groups. This statistical technique can be employed for the description of large and varied data sets consisting of two or more groups.

The analysis of this study's teacher self-reported survey responses provided the researcher with the necessary data identifying the level of significance, as well as the impact of the surveyed reading comprehension instructional strategies on ELL students' reading comprehension achievement.

The following section contains descriptive statistics, including a summary of response frequencies for the survey statements regarding the knowledge, use, and perceived effectiveness of each of the surveyed instructional strategies included on the Likert-Scale survey. Descriptive statistics allow the researcher to summarize variable averages and standard deviations. The self-reported survey questions utilized in this study were divided into three groups – knowledge, use, and perceived effectiveness. The reported responses to the collected surveys were used to address both research questions posed in this study.

Descriptive Statistics: Quantitative Survey Items

The purpose for this study was to ascertain if the level of knowledge and use and perceived effectiveness of each of the surveyed reading comprehension instructional strategies among a group of 1st grade and 2nd grade teachers had any impact on the ELL students' reading comprehension achievement. After collecting the completed surveys at both school R1 and R2, results were entered into SPSS for analysis. In response to the study's small sample size and small response size within the five point scale, it was determined that responses

receiving a 4 or 5 would be considered high, and responses receiving 1, 2, or 3 would be low. Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics Responses to survey questions listed by instructional strategy.

Table 4.1

Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Survey Questions by Instructional Strategy

Instructional Strategy	Knowledge		Use		Effectiveness	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Total Physical Response	3.81	0.8136	3.619	0.9735	4.476	0.8136
Interactive Word Wall	3.909	0.9211	3.273	1.1	4.636	0.5811
Explicitly Taught Vocabulary	4.136	0.9409	4.045	0.8	4.591	0.5903
Schema Stories	3.864	1.0821	3.455	1.1	4.318	0.8387
Student Self-Monitoring	3.409	0.7964	3.136	0.9	3.909	0.9715
K-W-L Charts	4.182	0.795	3.318	1.1	4.318	0.8387
Graphic Organizers	4.364	0.7895	4.091	0.8	4.682	0.4767

As indicated in table 4.1, the majority of the teachers surveyed for this study indicated at least a moderate level of knowledge and use of each of the surveyed strategies. However, most teacher participants reported a high perception of effectiveness for each of the strategies surveyed in regard to ELL students' reading comprehension achievement.

Survey responses were grouped in a manner that allowed the researcher to determine the frequencies of the participant responses. Though teacher participants reported a high perception of effectiveness in regard to each of the

surveyed instructional strategies, teachers expressed that the most perceived effective strategy in increasing reading comprehension of ELL students was the use of graphic organizers. Conversely, the strategy perceived to be the least effective was the incorporation of student self-monitoring.

Survey responses were recorded of the teacher participant's knowledge, use, and perceived effectiveness was recorded using a five-point Likert survey scale. This scale consisted of the following levels: 5=high, 4=moderately high, 3=moderate, 2=some, 1=low. Analysis of the reported survey responses showed that teachers' average knowledge of the surveyed strategies was consistently moderate to moderately high, while their reported average use was moderate.

Response regarding perceived effectiveness averaged moderately high, with the one exception being student self-monitoring which had a mean of 3.909. These findings indicate a gap in teacher participant's knowledge and use in comparison to their perceived effectiveness.

Comparison Ratings: Instructional Strategies

Subsequently, an ANOVA was run in order to compare the knowledge, use, and effectiveness rating of each surveyed instructional strategy. If a significance of less than .05 was revealed, a paired sample T-test was used to compare the three ratings two at a time in order to determine if any were significant. Each of the survey strategies showed significance when analyzed in this manner.

Descriptive Statistics: ELL Achievement Scores

Running record data from ELL students located in sample schools R1 and R2 were obtained on two different occasions. Only ELL students in grades 1-2 were included in this study's population. Descriptive statistics totals of student running record data indicates that ELL students located within both school R1 and R2 demonstrated significant growth from August 2016 to January 2017. Each strategy and group, knowledge, use, and perceived effectiveness were compared to student running record data from August 2016 and again for January 2017 for grades 1-2 to scrutinize the effects of these strategies on student achievement. This was conducted via mixed-model ANOVAs.

When the main effect for the Likert item was significant, the researcher used estimated marginal means for the two groups low and high. For this study's data knowledge of Explicitly Taught Vocabulary's, the main effect was .004. Estimated marginal means for this strategy and group show low=17.30 and high=8.731.

Table 4.2

Descriptive Statistics for each Set of Running Records by Survey Item

Item	Running Records							
	August 1st Grade		January 1st Grade		August 2nd Grade		January 2nd Grade	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
K-Total Physical Response								
Low	3.33	3.57	10.00	5.83	17.33	9.11	20.00	9.11
High	1.89	2.03	10.22	7.79	11.11	7.27	15.00	9.64
U-Total Physical Response								
Low	2.50	3.51	11.88	6.20	14.75	8.41	18.38	8.98
High	2.70	2.54	8.70	7.03	13.80	9.20	16.80	10.25
E-Total Physical Response								
Low	1.00	1.41	7.00	28.28	9.00	1.41	17.00	4.24
High	2.57	3.16	10.07	6.92	14.29	9.24	16.93	10.58
K-Interactive Word Wall								
Low	4.57	2.94	13.14	6.54	20.00	6.11	24.86	3.24
High	1.36	2.20	8.18	6.29	10.55	8.09	12.82	9.15
U-Interactive Word Wall								
Low	4.22	2.86	13.78	6.34	20.89	4.01	23.22	4.35
High	1.00	2.00	6.44	4.93	7.56	6.44	11.78	9.87
E-Interactive Word Wall								
Low	6.00		13.00		24.00		28.00	
High	2.31	2.94	9.31	6.54	13.63	8.79	16.69	9.64
K-Explicitly Taught Vocabulary								
Low	6.20	2.28	15.00	5.96	22.00	2.83	26.00	2.83
High	1.23	1.69	8.23	6.13	11.23	8.22	14.23	9.08

(table continues)

Table 4.2 (cont.)

Descriptive Statistics for each Set of Running Records by Survey Item

Item	Running Records							
	August 1st Grade		January 1st Grade		August 2nd Grade		January 2nd Grade	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
U-Explicitly Taught Vocabulary								
Low	3.75	2.63	12.75	4.57	19.00	4.16	24.00	0.00
High	2.29	3.00	9.36	7.12	12.86	9.16	15.64	10.01
E-Explicitly Taught Vocabulary								
Low	6.00		13.00		24.00		28.00	
High	2.31	2.94	9.31	6.54	13.63	8.79	16.69	9.64
K-Schema Stories								
Low	2.40	2.61	10.20	4.82	16.40	7.54	20.40	5.73
High	2.69	3.12	10.08	7.44	13.38	9.13	16.38	10.53
U-Schema Stories								
Low	1.86	2.34	9.43	4.89	13.86	8.42	14.45	9.14
High	3.09	3.24	10.55	7.80	18.29	8.67	17.00	10.31
E-Schema Stories								
Low	3.50	3.54	9.00	5.66	24.00	0.00	26.00	2.83
High	2.40	3.02	9.60	6.66	12.93	8.64	16.20	9.77
K-Student Self Monitoring								
Low	1.54	1.98	8.85	6.34	13.15	8.43	16.31	8.90
High	5.40	3.29	13.40	7.09	17.00	9.43	20.60	11.22
U-Student Self Monitoring								
Low	2.00	2.24	9.53	6.14	13.80	7.98	17.00	8.49
High	5.67	4.51	13.00	10.00	16.33	13.28	20.00	15.62

(table continues)

Table 4.2 (cont.)

Descriptive Statistics for each Set of Running Records by Survey Item

Item	Running Records							
	August 1st Grade		January 1st Grade		August 2nd Grade		January 2nd Grade	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
E-Student Self Monitoring								
Low	2.43	2.299	11.57	4.894	18.57	6.188	22.86	3.805
High	2.6	3.502	8.1	7.156	11.2	9.473	13.5	10.886
K-KWL Charts								
Low	2.00	2.83	9.40	6.91	15.60	7.80	16.80	8.20
High	2.85	3.02	10.38	6.85	13.69	9.15	17.77	10.20
U-KWL Charts								
Low	2.50	2.55	11.10	6.10	17.20	6.41	19.90	6.81
High	2.75	3.50	8.88	7.57	10.50	9.94	14.50	11.80
E-KWL Charts								
Low	3.00	4.24	10.00	4.24	24.00	0.00	22.00	8.49
High	2.47	2.97	9.47	6.74	12.93	8.64	16.73	9.98
K-Graphic Organizers								
Low	1.75	2.87	8.25	3.40	21.00	6.00	21.00	6.00
High	2.86	2.98	10.64	7.37	12.29	8.40	16.50	10.19
U-Graphic Organizers								
Low	2.20	2.68	10.80	6.14	18.40	5.55	20.00	4.00
High	2.77	3.09	9.85	7.09	12.62	9.21	16.54	10.85
E-Graphic Organizers								
High	2.53	2.98	9.53	6.40	14.24	8.88	17.35	9.73

Low= Response of Low, Some, or Moderate

High= Response of Moderately High or High

Table 4.2 the teachers' recorded responses indicated higher perceived effectiveness versus knowledge and use. In the case of perceived effectiveness for Graphic Organizers, there were no low responses, which precluded the researcher from running a comparison for effects.

Inferential Statistics: Mixed-Model ANOVAs

For this study, the researcher employed a mixed-model ANOVA using an SPSS program. This method of analysis was selected in order to determine the relationship between the independent variables (instructional strategies) and the dependent variables (running record scores). It was determined for this study that running record data would be collected as the representation of student reading comprehension achievement data. Running Records assessment determines a student's fluency level, as well as his/her level of reading comprehension. Student's expected levels are K=1-3, 1=4-16, 2=17-22, 3=23-25, 4= 26-28, and 5=29-31. Students within these grades are expected to score within these running record levels in order to be considered proficient in fluency and comprehension.

Through the analysis of the teacher participant's knowledge, use, and perceived effectiveness, it was determined that ELL student achievement scores were positively impacted. Numerous teacher participants reported at least moderate knowledge and use of the surveyed strategies. Consequently, the researcher was unable to target the survey strategy that impacted student achievement the most.

Table 4.3

Inferential Statistics from Mixed-Model ANOVAs

Item	Achievement		Response		Interaction	
	F^a	p	F^a	p	F^b	p
K-Total Physical Response	37.24	0.00	1.15	0.30*	2.04	0.12*
U-Total Physical Response	33.79	0.00	0.40	0.75*	0.21	0.654*
E-Total Physical Response	13.16	0.00	0.43	0.74*	0.24	0.629*
K- Interactive Word Wall	44.40	0.00	3.88	0.02	9.05	0.008**
U- Interactive Word Wall	44.25	0.00	5.44	0.00	18.73	0.001
E- Interactive Word Wall	11.55	0.00	0.75	0.53*	1.27	0.278**
K- Explicitly Taught Vocabulary	36.32	0.00	1.87	0.15*	10.99	0.004**
U- Explicitly Taught Vocabulary	31.54	0.00	1.38	0.26*	2.02	0.175**
E- Explicitly Taught Vocabulary	11.55	0.00	0.75	0.53*	1.27	0.278**
K- Schema Stories	31.64	0.00	0.76	0.52*	0.27	0.613**
U- Schema Stories	32.96	0.00	0.26	0.85*	0.02	0.894**
E- Schema Stories	28.86	0.00	3.39	0.03	1.28	0.275**
K- Student Self-Monitoring	26.73	0.00	0.02	1.00*	1.68	0.213**
U- Student Self-Monitoring	17.64	0.00	0.03	0.99*	0.64	0.435**
E- Student Self-Monitoring	43.38	0.00	4.17	0.01	2.89	0.11*
K- KWL Charts	27.89	0.00	0.33	0.80*	0.00	0.948**
U- KWL Charts	35.32	0.00	2.22	0.10*	1.48	0.242**
E- KWL Charts	22.28	0.00	2.25	0.10*	0.83	0.377**
K- Graphic Organizers	40.10	0.00	4.76	0.01	0.46	0.506**
U- Graphic Organizers	33.58	0.00	1.37	0.27*	0.53	0.477**
E- Graphic Organizers	33.41	0.00				

K = Knowledge, U = Use, E = Effectiveness.

^a $df = 3, 48$. ^b $df = 1, 16$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$.

Survey Analysis: Open-Ended Questions

This section analyzed any repeated strategies not included in this study's surveyed strategies from the two surveyed open-ended questions included on the teacher self-reported survey. The following questions were as follows:

9. Please list any strategies NOT mentioned in this survey you feel are effective for the increase of reading comprehension achievement among English language learners.

10. In your opinion, what is the best way to assess the reading comprehension of English language learners?

Below table 4.4 shows many strategies that were not included in this study those teachers at both sample schools use in their daily instruction of all students within first and second grade. These strategies were also substantiated through research and have been identified as effective strategies for use with ELL students.

Table 4.4

Open-Ended Questions: Strategies Not Included

School R2	School R2
Realia	Modeling
Turn and Talk	Think Pair Share
Re-Tell	Games
Visuals	Partner Reading
Peer Interaction	Language Experience
Journaling	Front Loading the Story
Games	Realia
Listening to the Story	Think Aloud

Table 4.5 displays alternate methods teachers within sample schools test their ELL students. Teachers at both sample schools concluded that it was necessary to employ a variety of methods to accurately assess the proficiency and achievement of ELL students. Teachers indicated that teacher observations were the most effective method of gathering student data during everyday activities.

Table 4.5

Open-Ended Questions: Alternate Assessments

School R2	School R2
Sight Words	Teacher Observations
Teacher Observations	Alternate Answering
Graphic Organizers	Re-Telling
Draw and Label	Draw and Label
Re-Telling	Home Language Testing
Running Records	Use of Picture Answers

Teacher participants were asked to rate their knowledge and use of each of the surveyed reading comprehension instructional strategies with their ELL students. The researcher used the mixed-model ANOVA analysis to determine to what extent the seven surveyed instructional strategies explained a statistically significant portion of variability in student reading comprehension achievement scores between August 2016 and January 2017. Though teacher perceived effectiveness averaged higher than knowledge and use in ranking no strategy average below moderate.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECCOMENDATIONS

Introduction

Although numerous studies have examined reading comprehension and ELL students, research focusing on specific strategies and their effects on ELL student achievement have been limited. There have been many studies completed that have examined reading comprehension and ELL students. The research surrounding specific strategies and their effect on the achievement data of ELLs has been limited. Numerous previous studies have focused on initial vocabulary development or the developmental states of ELL students. For this study, the researcher used research-based instructional strategies to investigate the impacted outcome data for ELLs' reading comprehension. This chapter includes the presentation of key findings, conclusions, recommendations, implications, limitations, as well as practical applications and future research.

Research Questions

1. What impact has specific reading comprehension instructional strategies had on English language learners' reading comprehension achievement?

This research question was investigated through the use of a teacher self-reported Likert scale survey. This Likert scale included items addressing seven targeted instructional strategies used for reading comprehension for all students, especially ELL students.

The results of the teacher self-reported surveys were used in comparison to ELL student running record assessment data gathered from 1st and 2nd grade ELL students within the study's sample schools during the August 2016 and January 2017 testing windows. The researcher sought to determine if a relationship existed between the teacher-reported use of the instructional reading comprehension strategies and the student achievement data.

2. How does teacher knowledge of instructional strategies compare with use and perceived effectiveness?

This research question was again addressed through the use of the teacher self-reported Likert survey.

This analysis allowed the researcher to determine how the teacher's knowledge affects the use and perceived effectiveness of the instructional strategy, as well as its impact on ELL students' reading comprehension assessment data.

Research Design

A mixed-methods approach was selected for this study. The research data obtained for analysis included student running record data, which was collected by both sample school's instructional coaches in August 2016 and again in January 2017, as well as responses collected from teacher self-reported surveys. Teacher self-reported responses were recorded through a Likert survey using a five-point scale. The survey included levels 1-5 for teacher knowledge, use, and

perceived effectiveness for each of the seven surveyed reading comprehension instructional strategies. The survey also included two open-ended questions regarding strategies not included on the survey, teacher perceptions on effective alternate assessment strategies for ELL students.

Sample and Population

Teachers in Grades 1-2 with an ELL student population voluntarily participated in this study. School R1 is a Title 1 school and serves grades K-2, and school R2 is a non-titled school and serves grades K-3. This district was chosen for the study due to high ELL student enrollment. Additionally, the two sample schools were representative of both high ELL student enrollment and increased ELL student enrollment.

Research participants were asked to complete a voluntary survey. Teachers who wished to allow fidelity checks to be conducted within their classrooms were asked to submit their names to the researcher. These teachers allowed a district instructional coach to observe their small and whole groups during Reading. It was found that the teachers sampled at both schools adhered to the fidelity of the strategy being taught.

Summary of Findings

This study's quantitative analysis offers insight into the complexity of reading and learning from the perspective of a second-language learner. This

study addressed issues that are critical if the achievement gap between ELLs and English-only students is to be closed.

For this study, the researcher concentrated on teacher knowledge, use, and perceived effectiveness of reading comprehension strategies and their approach to the teaching and development of successful ELLs. Upon analysis of the self-reported surveys and the student reading comprehension data collected at two lower elementary schools in middle Tennessee, it can be stated that there is a positive outcome in regard to the use and employment of reading comprehension strategies and ELL students' reading comprehension achievement data. This conclusion is consistent with similar studies conducted in the past by other researchers.

Surveyed instructional strategies were each selected due to their reinforcement of ELL students' language acquisition and proficiency. This allows ELL students to make critically necessary connections and activate prior knowledge, which are essential for promoting reading comprehension achievement. The findings from the survey were statistically significant in increasing the average students' achievement scores when used together. This finding suggests that teachers should employ systematic strategy instruction rather than only one strategy. Analysis of the research data addressed this study's research questions. Results show interactions, however, not all of the independent variables were significant. One of the seven strategies, use of the interactive word wall, showed statistical significance.

Limitations

Student demographics and other variables, such as home, school climate, and individual student motivation, could affect student achievement. Student achievement scores could also be impacted by background knowledge, life experiences, individual teaching styles, and non-surveyed strategies. Other limitations include background knowledge, life experiences, individual teaching styles, and un-surveyed strategies may also impact student achievement scores.

Small sample size also impacted this study. Sample schools were chosen for this study due to their unique demographics. The first school, R1, is a Title 1 school with both a significant ELL population and a previous history of high ELL enrollment. School R2 is not a Title 1 school, and ELL enrollment is minimal.

Studies conducted with a larger sample size, which include more ELL students, will provide a more accurate global picture of ELL reading comprehension achievement. A replicable study that includes a larger sample population of ELL students and teacher participants would be recommended for accuracy and globalization. This study's small sample size may have affected the power of the statistical analysis and lessened its generalizability. However, it did accurately answer the research questions. This study did not feature a comparable control group, which would have been utilized to assess students who received only the specific intervention strategies compared to students who did not receive these strategies.

Recommendations

Recommendations based on the findings from this study can be made in the areas of practice, training, and future research. These recommendations are to assist teacher, and administrators in furthering ELL student reading comprehension achievement as well as English-only students. In order to improve ELL student achievement, it is recommended that teachers should employ both a variety of reading comprehension instructional strategies and a variety of teaching techniques that focus on the cultural background of students and their individual learning styles.

General recommendations for increasing reading comprehension achievement among ELL students include targeted and specialized professional development, increased instructional time, adequate materials, and equitable assessments. Administrators should provide teachers with resources, support, and meaningful feedback. Additionally, administrators should conduct accountable teacher observations.

According to the response rankings from the teacher participants' survey data, teachers ranked the surveyed instructional strategies higher in perceived effectiveness than their corresponding knowledge and use rankings. This finding indicates the need for more specialized professional development opportunities. These opportunities may include ELL training or focused sessions on reading strategy and vocabulary. Past studies have included recommendations that quality professional development provides teachers with the needed strategies for

meeting the varied needs of both students and teachers (Herman & Aquire-Munoz, 2003; Herman, Goldschmidt & Swigert, 2003). This study's findings suggest that more emphasis should be placed on the specialized needs of students and teachers at the research school. Therefore, professional development opportunities addressing those needs should be included regularly.

When students are actively engaged in learning, academic achievement is enhanced. This suggests that there is a common relationship between increased time in which students are engaged in academic tasks and improved student achievement.

Further recommendations include adequate materials, resources, and alternate assessments for ELL students. Educators today are faced with a variety of challenges and are held accountable to both state and federal mandates, including high stakes testing for all. Alternate testing is recommended for some ELL students (i.e. newcomers), and should be at the discretion of the general education and ELL teacher.

Implementation of effective instructional strategies for ELL students within schools, especially those with higher ELL populations, is further recommended. The findings from this study's data analysis support teachers and administrator's incorporation of some of the instructional strategies into the curriculum, policies, and future dialogue on how educators can better serve ELL students.

Future Research

The results of this study prompt further discussion, reflection, and inquiry on the unanswered questions about future reading comprehension achievement of ELLs. Additional studies focused on reading comprehension instructional strategies that assist ELL students should involve larger sample sizes based throughout the United States. These studies should also include further exploration into the process of language acquisition for ELL students.

Studies should further investigate which instructional strategies are most effective for the larger populations. Numerous instructional strategies that have been deemed effective for ELL students could be further researched to determine if these strategies are also effective for other student populations. In addition to research investigating effective instructional strategies, incorporation of multiple research methods for better understanding of the problem would provide more accuracy to these studies.

Studies specific to primary and secondary-age students would provide a more representative sample and minimize study limitations. Due to the primary-age focus on phonics and word recognition, little to no research exists for students of this age for comprehension achievement.

Conclusions

It can be concluded that the seven strategies analyzed in this study impact the achievement scores of ELL students. Thus, these strategies merit

consideration. This study focused on the relationship between reading comprehension strategies and the reading comprehension of ELL students in two Middle Tennessee lower elementary schools. However, only seven strategies were scrutinized in this study. Other strategies, which have proven to be effective, may positively impact ELL achievement scores and narrow the learning gap between these students and their English-only counterparts.

This researcher chose this particular area to investigate based on a connection to ELL students and a passion to provide recommendations for addressing the needs of those students. The findings generated from this study increased the researcher's desire to investigate the best instructional practices for all students that struggle with reading comprehension, including ELLs. Although instructional strategies are important, teachers are more critical components to student success. Teachers have the ability to make learning meaningful for their students on a personal level that motivates and inspires. Teachers who utilize these strategies and employ them in an engaging manner are often the most successful. Without these teachers, the strategies are ineffective. Teachers must use these strategies in engaging manners, such as modeling in order to instill them within their students. This will improve reading comprehension and help these students become independent readers.

Effective teachers have a cultural understanding of their students and deliver culturally responsive instruction for the success of their students. Continuous improvement of ELL instruction should be a priority for schools that

possess not only high ELL populations, but for those that support lower ELL populations as well. This level of commitment requires that all administrators and teachers strive to improve ELL achievement within their schools and beyond for the ELL students. Though this study was limited in its size and scope, it has demonstrated that teacher knowledge and use of specific instructional strategies is meaningful to classroom learning for ELLs.

References

- Albers, C. A., & Hoffman, A. (2012). Using flashcard drill methods and self-graphing procedures to improve the reading performance of English language learners. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 28*(4), 367-388. doi:10.1080/15377903.2012.731365
- Asher, J. J., & Adamski, C. (1993). *Learning another language through actions*. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.
- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1998). *Improving schools for language-minority children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Au, K. H. (2001). Culturally responsive instruction as a dimension of new literacies. *Reading Online, 5*(1), 1-11.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. (2012). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Bolos, N. (2012). Successful strategies for teaching reading to middle grades English language learners. *Middle School Journal, 44*(2), 14-20. doi:10.1080/00940771.2012.11461843
- Brabham, E., & Villaume, S. (2001). Building walls of words. *The Reading Teacher, 54*(7), 700-702.
- Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483(1954).

- Brown, C. L. (2007). Content-based ESL instruction and curriculum. *Academic Exchange*, 1114-1119.
- Caine, R. N., & Caine, G. (1990). Understanding a Brain-based approach to learning and teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 48(2), 66-70.
- Caine, R. N., & Caine, G. (1991). *Making connections: Teaching and the human brain*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). TESOL at forty: What are the issues? *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 9. doi:10.2307/40264509
- Casanave, C. P. (1988). Comprehension monitoring in ESL reading: A neglected essential. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(2), 283.
doi:10.2307/3586937
- Castagnaro, P. J. (2006). Audiolingual Method and Behaviorism: From Misunderstanding to Myth. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 519-526.
doi:10.1093/applin/aml023
- Castagnaro, P. J. (2006). Audiolingual method and behaviorism: From misunderstanding to myth. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 519-526.
doi:10.1093/applin/aml023
- Committee on the Prevention of Reading Difficulties in Young Children. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

- Connell, J. D. (2009). The global aspects of brain-based learning. *Educational Horizons*, 88(1), 28-39.
- Cook, V. (2015). Discussing the language and thought of motion in second language speakers. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(S1), 154-164. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2015.12184.x
- Crawford, L., Schmeister, M., & Biggs, A. (2008). Impact of intensive professional development on teachers' use of sheltered instruction with students who are English language learners. *Journal of In-Service Education*, 34(3), 327-342. doi:10.1080/13674580801950816
- Daniel, S., & Percy, M. M. (2014). Expanding roles: Teacher educators' perspectives on educating English learners. *Action in Teacher Education*, 36(2), 100-116. doi:10.1080/01626620.2013.864575
- Department of Education Home - TN.Gov. (2016). Retrieved from <https://www.tn.gov/education>
- Developing ELL Programs: Lau v. Nichols*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ell/lau.html>
- Developing ELL Programs: Lau v. Nichols. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ell/lau.html>
- Drummond, G. B., & Vowler, S. L. (2012). Analysis of variance: variably complex. *AJP: Advances in Physiology Education*, 36(2), 85-88. doi:10.1152/advan.00025.2012

Edelenbosch, R., Kupper, F., Krabbendam, L., & Broerse, J. E. (2015). Brain-Based Learning and Educational Neuroscience: Boundary Work.

Mind, Brain, and Education, 9(1), 40-49. doi:10.1111/mbe.12066

Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, 20 U.S.C. §1701.

ELL Laws & Regulations | Colorín Colorado. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<http://www.colorincolorado.org/ell-basics/ell-policy-research/ell-laws-regulations>

English Learner (EL) Assessments - TN.Gov. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<https://tn.gov/education/topic/english-learner-assessments>

English-Language Learners - Education Week. (2011, June 16).

Retrieved July 1, 2016, from

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/english-language-learners/>

English-Language Learners - Education Week. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/english-language-learners/>

Fast Facts. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=96>

Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, 20 U.S.C. §1232g, 34 CFR Part 99.

Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Williams, D. (2002). Seven literacy strategies that work. *Educational Leadership*, 60(3), 70-73.

- Garcia, G. E. (1991). Factors influencing the English reading test performance of Spanish-speaking Hispanic children. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 26(4), 371. doi:10.2307/747894
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1991). *The unschooled mind: How children think and how schools should teach*. New York: BasicBooks.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does and does not say. *American Educator*, 32(2), 8-44.
- Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn, P. C. (2013). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Guild, P. (1997). Where do learning theories overlap? *Educational Leadership*, 55(1), 30-31.
- Gunning, T. G. (2005). *Creating literacy instruction for all students*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gándara, P., Rumberger, R., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Callahan, R. (2003). English learners in California schools: Unequal resources, unequal outcomes. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 11, 36. doi:10.14507/epaa.v11n36.2003
- Hart, L. A. (1983). *Human brain and human learning*. New York: Longman.

- Helfrich, S. R., & Bosh, A. J. (2011). Teaching English language learners: Strategies for overcoming barriers. *The Educational Forum*, 75(3), 260-270. doi:10.1080/00131725.2011.578459
- Home | Colorín Colorado. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.colorincolorado.org/>
- Home | U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/>
- Jensen, E. (2000). Brain-based reality check. *Educational Leadership*, 57(7), 76-80.
- Jones, K., & Mixon, J. R. (2015). Six easy and beneficial strategies for an inter-culturally responsive classroom. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 1-6.
- Klein, A. (2015, April 10). No Child Left Behind Overview: Definitions, Requirements, Criticisms, and More - Education Week. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/no-child-left-behind-overview-definition-summary.html>
- Krahenbuhl, K. S. (2016). Student-centered education and constructivism: challenges, concerns, and clarity for teachers. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 89(3), 97-105. doi:10.1080/00098655.2016.1191311
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, 34(3), 159-165.
doi:10.1080/00405849509543675
- Levine, M. D. (2002). *A mind at a time*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Linan-Thompson, S., & Vaughn, S. (2007). *Research-based methods of reading instruction for English language learners, grades K-4*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lombardi, J. (2008). Beyond learning styles: Brain-based research and English language learners. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 81(5), 219-222.
doi:10.3200/tchs.81.5.219-222
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. (2005). *Building academic vocabulary: Teacher's manual*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McBride, A. (2008). *Addressing achievement gaps: The language acquisition and educational achievement of English-language learners*. Princeton, NJ: ETS Policy Information Center.

- McGee, A., Haworth, P., & MacIntyre, L. (2014). Leadership practices to support teaching and learning for English language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, *49*(1), 92-114. doi:10.1002/tesq.162
- McKinney-Vento Assistance Act of 2001, 42 U.S.C. §11301.
- Moore, J. (2011). Behaviorism. *Psychological Record*, *61*(3), 449-463.
- Mvududu, N. H., & Thiel-Burgess, J. (2012). Constructivism in practice: The case for English language learners. *International Journal of Education*, *4*(3). doi:10.5296/ije.v4i3.2223
- National Academy of Sciences. (1998). Retrieved August 16, 2016, from <http://www.nasonline.org/>
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Home Page, a part of the U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/>
- National Council of Teachers of English - Homepage. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/>
- National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth (U.S.), August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- No Child Left Behind - ED.gov. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml>

- Pearson Casanova, C. (1998). Comprehension monitoring in ESL reading: A neglected essential. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(2), 283-302.
- Perez, M. (2008). *Answering the knock of opportunity: Addressing the data needs for California's English language learners*. American Institutes for Research.
- Quirk, M., & Beem, S. (2012). Examining the relations between reading fluency and reading comprehension for English language learners. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(6), 539-553. doi:10.1002/pits.21616
- Rader-Brown, L., & Howley, A. (2014). Predictors of the instructional strategies that elementary school teachers use with English language learners. *Teachers College Record*, 116(5).
- Rychly, L., & Graves, E. (2012). Teacher characteristics for culturally responsive pedagogy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 14(1), 44-49. doi:10.1080/15210960.2012.646853
- Rychly, L., & Graves, E. (2012). Teacher characteristics for culturally responsive pedagogy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 14(1), 44-49.
- Sam D, P., & Rajan, P. (2013). Using graphic organizers to improve reading comprehension skills for the middle school ESL students. *English Language Teaching*, 6(2). doi:10.5539/elt.v6n2p155
- Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). *Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade*. Washington, D.C.:

U.S. Dept. of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

State Report Card - TN.Gov. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<https://www.tn.gov/education/topic/report-card>

Sutherland, K., & Asher, J. J. (1978). Learning another language through actions: The complete teacher's guidebook. *TESOL Quarterly*, 12(2), 204. doi:10.2307/3585610

Tahriri, A., & Divsar, H. (2011). EFL learners' self-perceived strategy use across various intelligence types: A case study. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 15(1), 115-138.

Tharp, Roland G., 1930-2015. (1994). *Effective instructional conversation in Native American classrooms*. Santa Cruz, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, University of California.

Tinajero, J. (2001). *Strategies to support ELLs in mainstream classrooms*.

Retrieved from Macmillan website:

https://www.macmillanmh.com/connectED/mkt/HTMLFiles/pdf/josefina_tinajero.pdf

Vig, R., Taylor, M. W., Star, J. R., & Chao, T. (2014). *Assessing implementation fidelity: Challenges as seen through the lens of two experimental studies*. Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness.

WIDA. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.wida.us/>

Willingham, D. T., Hughes, E. M., & Dobolyi, D. G. (2015). The scientific status of learning styles theories. *Teaching of Psychology, 42*(3), 266-271.

Yilmaz, K. (2011). The cognitive perspective on learning: Its theoretical underpinnings and implications for classroom practices. *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies Issues and Ideas, 84*(5), 204-212.

York-Barr, J., Ghere, G., & Sommerness, J. (2007). Collaborative teaching to increase ELL student learning: A three-year urban elementary case study. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 12*(3), 301-335. doi:10.1080/10824660701601290

Zhang, S., & Stephens, V. (2013). Learning to teach English language learners in Mainstreamed Secondary Classroom. *Teacher Education and Practice, 26*(1), 99-116.

Appendix A – Consent Form

Consent Form – Participants of Doctoral Dissertation Research
in partial fulfillment for the Doctorate of Education Degree at Carson-Newman
University

Jessica Leigh Overstreet Bartlett – Candidate for Ed.D.

Topic-Effective Reading Comprehension Strategies for English Language
Learners' Achievement in Tennessee

Purpose of Research

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the impact of specific reading
comprehension instructional strategies on the reading comprehension
achievement of English language learners.

Consent

Dear Teacher Participant,

My name is Jessica Bartlett, and I am a ESL teacher here in Robertson County. I am currently working towards my educational doctorate in curriculum design and instruction at Carson Newman University. As part of my final studies I am completing an action research dissertation. The title of my dissertation is Effective Reading Comprehension Strategies for English Language Learners' Achievement in Tennessee.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the strategy being implemented and the achievement of the English Language Learner. Furthermore, this study seeks to ascertain the level of knowledge, use, and perceived effectiveness from its teacher participants regarding this study's identified strategies.

Consent has been obtained from both administrators and the Robertson County Board of Education for this study. Participation in this research will include a brief survey regarding common Reading comprehension strategies and your knowledge, use, and perceived effectiveness. This survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete and will be entirely voluntary and anonymous. Survey results and participation is confidential. All rights and privacy will be maintained.

In addition to survey participation this researcher is asking for volunteers for strategy implementation fidelity checks. These fidelity checks will be for a onetime observation

and will be completed by an instructional coach from within the county. Again all results and participation in these fidelity checks will remain confidential.

If you would not like to participate in the survey or fidelity checks this will not affect you in any way. There are no alternative procedures except to choose not to participate in the study.

Participation in this research is again voluntary. You may refuse to participate. You can also withdraw at anytime with no repercussions. If you quit or refuse to participate, the benefits or treatment to which you are otherwise entitled will not be affected.

If you have any research related questions you may contact me at Jessica.bartlett@rcstn.net or 615-772-8119. I am conducting this research under the supervision of Dr. P. Mark Taylor at Carson Newman University. You may reach him at ptaylor@cn.edu.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Jessica Bartlett

Appendix B – Statistical Survey

Knowledge/Use and Perception Survey

The survey is anonymous to protect your responses to each question. Do not write your name on the survey. No one will be able to identify you or your answers, and no one will know whether or not you participated in the study.

The five-point **Knowledge Scale** should be interpreted as follows: In my role as a teacher I have knowledge of the following.

- 1 Low knowledge:** I know very little about this topic.
- 2 Some knowledge:** I know something, but not much about this topic.
- 3 Moderate knowledge:** I know something about this topic but I could learn more.
- 4 Good knowledge:** I feel I know more than the average teacher about this topic.
- 5 High knowledge:** I know a great deal about this topic.

The five-point **Use Scale** should be interpreted as follows: In my role as a teacher I use the following.

- 1 Low use:** I almost never use this component during the week.
- 2 Some use:** I occasionally use this component during the week.
- 3 Moderate Use:** I sometimes use this component during the week.
- 4 Moderately High Use:** I use this component more than others during the week.
- 5 High Use:** I use this component very frequently during the week.

Instructional Strategy	Scale	Rating				
1. Total Physical Response (TPR). Students are actively and physically engaged in activities to help them better understand vocabulary and other concepts.	Knowledge	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
	Use	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
2. Interactive Word Wall. Teachers create several word walls as students encounter words from a variety of oral and written sources that include the words of their peers, teachers, books, and labeled pictures.	Knowledge	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
	Use	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
3. Explicitly Taught Vocabulary. Student's use of academic vocabulary is closely linked to their success in Reading comprehension. Marzano's six steps for building academic vocabulary have been proven effective in building students known vocabulary bank.	Knowledge	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
	Use	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
4. Schema Stories. Students use their prior knowledge and experiences to comprehend meaning and develop an understanding of story grammar as they put chunks of a story into proper sequence (beginning, middle, and end).	Knowledge	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
	Use	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
5. Student Self-Monitoring. Students are provided with activities, which allow them to self-reflect, identify problems, and follow a course of correction when necessary in order to improve reading comprehension.	Knowledge	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
	Use	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
6. The K-W-L Chart. Students list what they Know about a topic, generate a list of questions about what they Want to know, and finally discuss what they have Learned.	Knowledge	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
	Use	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					

7. Graphic Organizers. Students can organize information into more manageable parts. This organization allows students to effectively identify a text's main idea, key details, facts, and allows for students opinions, comparisons, and contradictions of the text.	Knowledge	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
	Use	1 low	2	3	4	5 high
	Scale					
8. Do you think these are effective strategies for increasing reading comprehension among English Language Learners?						
Total Physical Response (TPR)	Scale	1 low	2	3	4	5 High
Interactive Word Wall	Scale	1 low	2	3	4	5 High
Explicitly Taught Vocabulary	Scale	1 low	2	3	4	5 High
Schema Stories	Scale	1 low	2	3	4	5 High
Student Self-Monitoring	Scale	1 low	2	3	4	5 High
The K-W-L Chart	Scale	1 low	2	3	4	5 High
Graphic Organizer	Scale	1 low	2	3	4	5 High

Please feel free to write in this space if you do not have enough room to respond to questions 9 & 10.

9. Please list any strategies NOT mentioned in this survey you feel are effective for the increase of reading comprehension achievement among English Language Learners.
10. In your opinion, what is the best way to assess the reading comprehension of English Language Learners?
11. This study also requires sample fidelity checks of strategy implementation. If you are willing to allow an observer into your classroom please indicate here or email jessica.bartlett@rcstn.net .

Thank you for your time, attention, and participation! I know that your time is a precious commodity.

Appendix C- Proposal Defense Form