

Major Sources of Data and Analyses Cited in the Chapter

Table A1: Practices and Guidelines: Studies, Syntheses, and Meta-Analyses Cited

Practices and Guidelines	Studies	Syntheses	Meta-Analyses
For Which There is Evidence from EL Research			
1) Providing ELD instruction is better than not providing it.	Thomas and Collier (2002)	Genesee, et al. (2006) Long (1983)	Norris and Ortega (2000)
2) Interactive activities can be productive, but they must be carefully planned and carried out.	August (1987), Johnson (1983), Peck (1987), Cathcart-Strong (1986), Jacob et al. (1996)	Studies listed to the left are synthesized in Genesee, et al. (2006) Lyster (2004a).	Keck et al. (2006) Gerten et al. (2007)
Based on Hypotheses Emerging from Recent EL Research			
3) Use a separate, daily block of time for ELD instruction.	Saunders, et al. (2006), O'Brien (2007)		
4) The ELD block can incorporate reading and writing but should emphasize listening and speaking. <i>Importance of English oral language proficiency.</i>	Carlisle et al. (1999), Chesterfield et al. (1983), Chesterfield & Chesterfield (1985a), Garcia-Vázquez et al. (1997), Goldstein et al. (1993), Lindholm (1987), Saville-Troike (1984), Strong (1983), Strong (1984), Rodriguez-Brown (1987), Royer & Carlo (1991), Snow, et al. (1987), Ulibarri et al. (1981)	Studies listed to the left are synthesized in Genesee, et al. (2006)	
<i>Studies of ELD instruction.</i>	Saunders, et al. (2006). O'Brien (2007)		
5) ELD instruction should teach elements of English explicitly (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, grammar, function).		Genesee, et al. (2006)	Norris and Ortega (2000) August and Shanghai, this volume
6) ELD instruction should integrate meaning to support language learning and explicit teaching of language.	O'Brien (2007)	Lyster (2007)	Norris and Ortega (2000)
7) ELD instruction should provide students with corrective feedback on form.	Ammar & Spada (2006), Ellis, Lowen, & Erlam (2006), Lyster (2004b), Lyster & Mori (2006), Lyster & Ranta (1997)	Studies listed to the left are synthesized in Lyster (2007)	Russell and Spada (2006)
8) Maximize the use of English during ELD instruction, and use L1 only for strategic purposes.	Chesterfield & Chesterfield (1985b), Chesterfield et al. (1983), Malave (1989), Milk (1982), Pease-Alvarez & Winsler (1994)	Studies listed to the left are synthesized in Genesee, et al. (2006)	
9) Teachers should attend to communication and language learning strategies and incorporate them into ELD instruction.	Chesterfield & Chesterfield (1985a), O'Malley et al. (1985), and Carrier (2003)	With the exception of Carrier (2003), studies listed to the left are synthesized in Genesee, et al. (2006)	
10) ELD Instruction should emphasize academic language as well as conversational language.	Hakuta, Butler, & Witt (2000), Howard et al. (2003), Lindholm-Leary (2001), Medina	Studies listed to the left are synthesized in Genesee, et al.	

<p>11) ELD Instruction should continue at least until students reach level 4 (advanced intermediate) and possibly through level 5 (advanced).</p>	<p>& Escamilla (1992), Thomas & Collier (2002), Westlander & Stephany (1983)</p>	<p>(2006)</p>
<p>Note: The studies reviewed for Guidelines/Practices #8 and #9 document the plateau effect for English oral language proficiency, from which the hypotheses emerges: ELD instruction should emphasize academic language, and ELD instruction should continue through level 4 and possibly 5. There are no studies that actually test these hypotheses...</p>		
<p>Applicable to ELD but Grounded in Non-EL Research</p>		
<p>12) ELD Instruction should be planned and delivered with specific language objectives in mind.</p>		<p>DuChastel and Merrill (1973), Duell (1974), Gage and Berliner (1975), Slavin (2000)</p>
<p>13) Group ELs carefully for ELD Instruction, not in classrooms segregated by language proficiency, but grouped by language proficiency for specific ELD Instruction.</p>		<p>Slavin (1987, 1989)</p>
<p>14) The likelihood of establishing and/or sustaining an effective ELD Instructional program increases when schools and districts make it a priority.</p>	<p>Goldenberg (2004), Good & Brophy (1986), McDougall et al. (2007), Parrish et al. (2006)</p>	<p>Edmonds (1979), Fullan (2007), Joyce & Showers (1983), Wang et al. (1993)</p>

Note: Underlined citations indicate analyses that support the practice or guideline for ELs from another domain (e.g., literacy instruction).

Table A2: Guidelines: Assessments of Relevance and Reliability.

Guidelines	Population relevance of the available studies	Outcome relevance of available studies	Reliability of findings (# of studies)
For Which There is Evidence from EL Research			
1) Providing ELD Instruction is better than not providing it.	** Medium. includes K-12 in Long (1983), Thomas and Collier (2002) and Genesee et al. (2006).	** Medium. Includes proficiency measures in those listed under population relevance. Could not rate higher given the distinctly discrete measures that characterize the numerous studies in Norris and Ortega (2000).	*** High. Includes all studies listed under population relevance, plus the 79 studies from Norris and Ortega (2000) meta-analysis.
2) Interactive activities can be productive, but they must be carefully planned and carried out.	** Medium. Six K-8 studies with U.S. EL populations, and five studies of students ages 7-14 in immersion programs. Unfortunately no 9-12 studies.	** Medium. Most of the studies included measures of language proficiency or language use within tasks.	*** High. All studies listed under population relevance plus 14 studies of mostly college and adult populations from the Keck et al. (2006) metaanalysis, all converging on same finding.
Based on Hypotheses Emerging from Recent EL Research			
3) Use a separate, daily block of time for ELD Instruction.	* Low. Saunders et al. (2006) focuses on Kindergarten and O'Brien (2007) focuses on grade 1 with U.S. EL populations, but the 2 studies cover only a very small portion of the K-12 grade span.	*** High. Both studies include measures of English language proficiency: CELDT and Woodcock-Johnson.	* Low. Only two studies
4) The ELD block can incorporate reading and writing but should emphasize listening and speaking. <i>Importance of English oral proficiency</i> <i>Studies of ELD instruction.</i>	** Medium. 12 studies, all of which involve U.S. EL populations spanning mostly grades K-6. Unfortunately only 2 include studies in grades 8-12.	*** High. All 12 studies use measures of English language proficiency.	** Medium. Sufficient number of studies producing consistent results at least across grades 1-6.
5) ELD instruction should teach elements of English explicitly (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, grammar, function).	* Low. Saunders et al. (2006) focuses on Kindergarten and O'Brien (2007) focuses on grade 1 with U.S. EL populations, but the 2 studies cover only a very small portion of the K-12 grade span. * Low. Very few studies in the Norris and Ortega meta-analysis are K-12, U.S. EL population.	*** High. Both studies include measures of English language proficiency: CELDT and Woodcock-Johnson. * Low. Very few of the studies in the Norris and Ortega meta-analysis used broader measures of language proficiency but rather discrete measures of the language skill taught.	* Low. Only two studies exist that demonstrate the effects of an ELD block.
6) ELD instruction should integrate meaning to support language learning and explicit teaching of language.	* Low. O'Brien (2007) integrates meaning to support language learning and explicit teaching of language but focuses only on grade 1. Very few studies in the Norris and Ortega meta-analysis and studies reviewed by Lyster include K-12, U.S. EL populations.	** Medium. O'Brien (2007) measured language proficiency (CELDT), and many of the French immersion studies reviewed by Lyster measured multiple aspects of proficiency and communicative competence. Very few of the studies in the Norris and Ortega meta-analysis used broader measures of language proficiency.	*** High. Based on 79 studies from Norris and Ortega (2000) and also similar findings found for reading (Genesee et al, 2006 and Shanahan and August, this volume). ** Medium. With college age and adults, Norris and Ortega (2000) found similar effect sizes for integration of meaning (focus on form) and its absence (focus on forms). Based on his review of studies of Immersion contexts, Lyster (2007) concluded that integrating meaning via the study of content positively contributes to language learning but also has some limitations.

Table A2: Guidelines: Assessments of Relevance and Reliability Continued...

Guidelines	Population relevance of the available studies	Outcome relevance of available studies	Reliability of findings (# of studies)
7) ELD instruction should provide students with corrective feedback on form.	<p>* Low. Only one of the studies reviewed by Lyster (2006) includes a relevant population: Ammar & Spada (2006), Grade 6 ESL. Others are adult or French immersion. Russell & Spada (2006) do not report the age or grade of the subjects in the studies they meta-analyzed.</p>	<p>* Low. Two of the three studies reviewed by Lyster (2006) measured multiple aspects of proficiency (Ammar & Spada, 2006, and Lyster, 2004). Unfortunately, Russell & Spada do not report the nature of the measures used in the studies they meta-analyzed.</p>	<p>** High. All 15 studies meta-analyzed by Russell and Spada (2006) favored corrective feedback over no corrective feedback; 10 of the 15 studies produced high effect sizes.</p>
8) Maximize the use of English during ELD instruction, and use L1 only for strategic purposes..	<p>* Low. The five studies reviewed all include U.S. EL populations but include only on preK-4th grade contexts, and not specifically ELD instructional contexts but more generally classroom context studies</p>	<p>* Low. Only one of the studies actually measured English proficiency. The other four measured language choice of teacher and students—which is relevant to the guideline/practice as a mediating variable (more English use) but not actually an outcome variable (higher proficiency).</p>	<p>* Low. Five studies all found that the dominant language of the classroom influence students language choices, but only one study documented a positive relationship between English language use and increases in English proficiency.</p>
9) Teachers should attend to communication and language learning strategies and incorporate them into ELD instruction.	<p>* Low. Both studies include U.S. EL populations but covered only portions of the K-12 span: preK-1 (Chesterfield and Chesterfield, 1985a) and high school (O'Malley et al., 1985; Carrier, 2003).</p>	<p>* Low. Chesterfield and Chesterfield (1985a) document the hierarchical nature of strategies which is relevant; but only O'Malley et al. (1985) and Carrier (2003) measured facets of proficiency as outcomes of the teaching of strategies.</p>	<p>* Low. Only two studies demonstrates positive effects of teaching language learning strategies (O'Malley et al., 1985; Carrier, 2003).</p>
10) ELD Instruction should emphasize academic language as well as conversational language	<p>** Medium. All six studies include U.S. EL populations; however, five of the six include K-5 students and only one includes secondary students—H.S.</p>	<p>** Medium. All include measures of English language proficiency, albeit, oral English proficiency.</p>	<p>** Medium. All six studies support the finding for K-5 students and oral proficiency that ELs tend to plateau and progress is slower moving from levels 3 to 4 and 5; only one study demonstrates the same for secondary level students.</p>
11) ELD Instruction should continue at least until students reach level 4 (advanced intermediate) and possibly through level 5 (advanced).	<p>Note: The studies reviewed for Guidelines/Practices #8 and #9 document the plateau effect for English oral language proficiency, from which the hypotheses emerges: ELD instruction should emphasize academic language, and ELD instruction should continue through level 4 and possibly 5. There are no studies that actually test these hypotheses.</p>		
Applicable to ELD but Grounded in Non-EL Research			
12) ELD Instruction should be planned and delivered with specific language objectives in mind	<p>* Low. Most of the syntheses are based on studies of non-EL populations, or non K-12 EL population.</p>	<p>* Low. None of the studies or syntheses cited focused on English language proficiency.</p>	<p>** Medium. A large number of studies in the four syntheses and one meta-analysis but they produce mixed results that generally favor the use of objectives but not definitively.</p>
13) Group ELs carefully for ELD Instruction, not in classrooms segregated by language proficiency, but grouped by language proficiency for specific ELD Instruction.	<p>* Low. All syntheses are based on studies of non-EL populations</p>	<p>* Low. None of the studies or syntheses cited focused on English language proficiency.</p>	<p>** Medium. Two syntheses of several studies.</p>
14) The likelihood of establishing and/or sustaining an effective ELD Instructional	<p>** Medium. Most syntheses are based on studies of non-EL populations; three studies</p>	<p>* Low. None of the studies or syntheses cited focused on English language proficiency.</p>	<p>*** High. Large number of syntheses and studies included in the synthesis producing</p>

<p>program increases when schools and districts make it a priority.</p>	<p>include U.S. EL populations (Goldenberg, 2004; McDougall et al., 2007; Parish et al., 2006)</p>		<p>fairly consistent results.</p>
---	--	--	-----------------------------------

Population: K-12 ELs; Outcomes: Progress through ELD levels, or at least achievement along dimensions that map on (e.g. vocabulary, use of syntax, listening comprehension); Reliability of findings: Sufficient # of studies to provide some degree of confidence; * to *** = low to high in relevance or reliability
 The sources we drew from and why: 1) Primary studies; 2) Meta-analyses and syntheses (We've been involved in and we've not been involved in). 3) Must have outcomes... empirically link some instructional feature and ELD outcome it plausibly produced.

Ellis's (2005) Principles of Instructed Language Learning

- Principle 1: Instruction needs to ensure that learners develop both a rich repertoire of formulaic expressions and a rule-based competence.
- Principle 2: Instruction needs to ensure that learners focus predominantly on meaning.
- Principle 3: Instruction needs to ensure that learners also focus on form.
- Principle 4: Instruction needs to be predominantly directed at developing implicit knowledge of the L2 while not neglecting explicit knowledge.
- Principle 5: Instruction needs to take into account the learner's 'built-in syllabus'.
- Principle 6: Successful instructed language learning requires extensive L2 input.
- Principle 7: Successful instructed language learning also requires opportunities for output.
- Principle 8: The opportunity to interact in the L2 is central to developing L2 proficiency.
- Principle 9: Instruction needs to take account of individual differences in learners.
- Principle 10: In assessing learners' L2 proficiency it is important to examine free as well as controlled production.