

## Chapter 2

### Research to Guide English Language Development Instruction<sup>1</sup>

William Saunders  
UCLA and Pearson Achievement Solutions  
and  
Claude Goldenberg  
Stanford University  
11/19/08

#### Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to synthesize existing research that provides direction for English language development (ELD) instruction. Many sources and resources might guide the direction of ELD instruction, including theory, research, ELD standards, practitioner experience, and published programs. This chapter focuses on research, specifically studies and research syntheses that help identify specific guidelines for effective ELD instruction.

The chapter was developed in concert with the other chapters in this volume that synthesize research related to literacy instruction, sheltered instruction in the content areas (math, science, social studies, and English language arts), and alternative programs that utilize students' primary language. Given these additional resources in the volume, we have focused this chapter specifically on instruction delivered within some portion of the school day that is separate from literacy and other content area (e.g., math, social studies) instruction. This chapter does not attempt to cover research related to educating English Learners (ELs) in general but rather research related to instruction intending—first and foremost—to teach the English language to ELs and thereby advance their knowledge and use of English. Clearly, other coursework and instruction (math, science, social studies, English literacy, PE, art, and music), designed carefully and delivered effectively should also support ELs' acquisition of English; thus the other chapters in this volume are related to this one in important ways. This chapter, however, reports specifically on existing research related to ELD instruction itself.

Readers should note that using existing research to identify effective guidelines for ELD instruction is problematic. There is little research that focuses specifically on K-12 ELD instruction for the population of U.S. students that concerns us in this volume: "English language learners" (formerly, "limited English proficient," or LEP, students). The scarcity of research directly based on the population of interest leads to some interesting questions, such as whether it is better to use research based on different types of students (e.g., adults learning a second language) or to say there is no research on a particular issue (e.g., whether it is effective to teach specific grammatical forms). We address these and other topics in the following pages.

---

<sup>1</sup> Our thanks to Norm Gold, Shelley Spiegel-Coleman, and Elise Trumbull for their very helpful and constructive suggestions on this chapter. All errors or mis-statements remain strictly our own.

In the absence of a comprehensive body of research, the field of second-language teaching (or more specifically in this case, ELD instruction) has been driven forward largely by theory. The result is a large body of accepted practice based on theory that has yet to be fully supported by research. It is probably safe to say that the current, dominant theoretical perspective of teachers is that of “communicative language teaching” (CLT). Two primary tenets of CLT are: 1) The goal of second language education is to develop learners’ communicative competence, and 2) Communication is both a goal and means for developing language (Alcón, 2004, p. 175). From this perspective, second language learning is a social process: Language develops largely as a result of meaningful interaction with others (Long, 1985), much as a first language does (cf., Krashen, 1982). Language use is emphasized more than language knowledge. Acquisition of forms and rules for combining them are seen to be an implicit process not appreciably affected by explicit instruction.

Many current conceptualizations of language learning can be characterized as “cognitive.” They emphasize the processes by which learners construct language knowledge (see, e.g., DeKeyser & Juffs, 2005). Certainly, language learning is both social and cognitive, and all language-learning takes place within a sociocultural context. As Watson-Gegeo (2003) observes, “All activities in which children participate with adults and other children (whether in the family, community, or classroom) are by definition socially organized and embedded in cultural meaning systems” (p. 157).

In this chapter we offer guidelines for practice on the basis of existing research, and for that reason teachers will likely observe that much of the practice they have come to accept as standard--or even exemplary--is not represented. This, of course, does not necessarily mean that teachers are engaged in “wrong” practices but, rather, that the standard wisdom of the field needs to be examined further through the lens of research. Second language acquisition teachers, theorists, and researchers have realized that exposure and interaction might help promote fluency and communicative competence, but they are not sufficient for native-like accuracy (see, most recently, Lyster, 2007). Advanced--ideally to the point of native-like--English proficiency is an important imperative for English learners in the U.S., indeed for any language-minority student whose future and livelihood will be influenced by his or her competence in the dominant social language. We have therefore seen a renewed focus on form as a critical element of second language instruction.<sup>2</sup>

Because of the complexity of the research and the fact that our conclusions will be conditioned on the research that exists, the chapter is organized by categories based on the nature of the evidence we currently have:

- Guidelines for which there is a relatively strong supporting evidence that is directly applicable to ELD instruction.
- Guidelines that are hypotheses emerging from recent research on ELD instruction for English learners.
- Guidelines we think are applicable to ELD instruction but grounded in research that is not about ELD instruction per se (e.g., grouping for reading instruction)

---

<sup>2</sup> We are indebted to Elise Trumbull for suggesting the preceding passage and several other passages throughout this chapter.

The chapter begins with an explanation and discussion of ELD instruction, what it is and what it is not. We then provide a brief description of the research base for ELD instruction in an attempt to answer two questions: What is the research base for ELD instruction? and Why is it so small? Subsequently, we explain and report research related to 14 guidelines relevant to ELD instruction. The 14 guidelines are grouped within the three categories listed above and covered in the same order.

### **What is English Language Development Instruction?**

English Language Development instruction is designed specifically to advance English learners' knowledge and use of English in increasingly sophisticated ways. Within the context of the larger effort to help ELs succeed in school, ELD instruction is designed to help ELs learn and acquire English to a level of proficiency (e.g., Advanced) that maximizes their capacity to engage successfully in academic studies taught in English. To put it another way, ELD instruction is designed to help ELs learn and acquire English to a level of proficiency that minimizes the language barriers they face when engaging in academic studies in mainstream English classrooms. Clearly, one would hope that ELD instruction also helps ELs learn and acquire English in order to maximize their capacity to engage successfully in social interactions with peers and adults inside and outside of school and in other kinds of pursuits requiring English proficiency, such as shopping, banking, accessing news, and locating and using information. However, while there might be multiple goals for ELD instruction (or multiple contexts of English use for which ELD instruction prepares ELs) we would argue that preparation for academic studies taught in English remains the top priority because of its relevance to school success. Helping ELs succeed in academic contexts is no doubt the most challenging goal and most likely the greatest need to emerge in recent EL research.

English Language Development instruction should not be confused with sheltered instruction (SI) or Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE; see Short & Echevarria, this volume). The primary goal of ELD instruction is learning and acquiring English; in California (the state with which we are most familiar), this means mastering the ELD standards. A secondary goal of ELD instruction can be content-related. In fact, such a secondary content-related goal might actually contribute to the teaching and learning of English (Lyster, 2007). But the primary goal for ELD instruction—as we are attempting to examine it here—is the learning and acquisition of English. If we were to evaluate the effects of ELD instruction, we would look first at the progress students make on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), which assesses ELs' English listening, speaking, reading and writing proficiency. We might also look at performance on the California Standards Tests (CST) for literacy, math and various content areas to determine the extent to which ELD instruction is supporting content area learning; but that would be secondary to evaluating the effects of ELD instruction on English language acquisition.

The primary purpose of sheltered English instruction is teaching skills and knowledge in the content areas, more specifically (in California) the content specified in standards for English language arts, math, science, social studies, physical education, and the arts. A secondary goal for sheltered instruction can and should be promoting language development, particularly what is called "academic language" (see Guideline #10 for more on "academic language"). This is the

essence of sheltered instruction: Where use of the primary language is not possible, instruction is "sheltered" (or adjusted) in order to help ELs learn skills and concepts taught in a language they do not fully comprehend. In so doing, sheltered instruction ideally also supports ongoing learning and acquisition of English, specifically as it pertains to the content areas (math, science, social studies, etc.). But the primary goal of sheltered instruction is academic success for ELs in the content areas. (See Echevarria and Short, this volume, for further description of the distinction between ELD and sheltered instruction, and Dolson and Burnham-Massey, this volume, for an overall depiction of ELD programs).

One very practical consequence of this distinction is that if we were to evaluate the effects of sheltered instruction, we would look first at the progress students make on measures of content area learning, such as the California Standards Tests, specifically the subtests reflecting the content area or course where instruction is sheltered (math, science, Algebra I, etc.). The principal question for sheltered instruction is the extent to which it is helping ELs master the content standards. We might also look at CELDT results to examine the extent to which sheltered instruction is supporting ELs' English acquisition, but that would be secondary to evaluating content area learning.

In truth, the distinctions we are making here might appear somewhat contrived and artificial, since so much of academic content learning is highly language-dependent. It is particularly hard to know where the dividing line is between English *language arts* (content area) and English *language development*. But although the distinction between ELD and sheltered instruction can get blurred, our assumption is that it is better to keep them distinct and for teachers to be clear in their thinking when they are planning, delivering, and evaluating ELD instruction and when they are planning, delivering, and evaluating sheltered instruction. As we discuss below, clarity about objectives contributes to effective instruction. In ELD instruction language is the primary objective and content is the secondary objective. In sheltered instruction content is primary and language is secondary.

### **What is the research base for ELD Instruction? Why is it so small?**

This chapter draws primarily on six syntheses and/or meta-analyses: Ellis (2005), Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, and Christian (2006), Keck, Ibarra-Shea, Tracy-Ventura, and Wa-Mbaleka (2006), Lyster (2007), Norris and Ortega (2000), Russell and Spada (2006). As described in the previous section, we have focused this chapter specifically on research that might inform instruction designed specifically to promote English language development.

Ellis (2005) provides a review of empirical studies and theoretical views; based on his review, he posits ten principles of instructed language learning (see Appendix B). Ellis notes that "...research and theory do not afford a uniform account of how instruction can best facilitate language learning," and he calls these principles "'provisional specifications' that might serve as the basis for language teacher education" (p. 210). From Genesee et al. (2006) we draw mainly from the chapter that reviews oral language research (Chapter 2, Saunders and O'Brien) insofar as English oral language proficiency is an important goal of ELD instruction. Saunders and O'Brien are also very cautious about the conclusions they reach, noting the near-absence of research on the effects of ELD instruction on ELs in the U.S. Keck et al. (2006) present a meta-

analysis of fourteen studies that focused on task-based interaction, another topic we think is relevant to ELD instruction. Lyster (2007) reviews both primary studies and syntheses that focused on the effects of content-based immersion programs. Norris and Ortega (2000) present a meta-analysis of 79 studies that focused on the effectiveness of second language instruction. Russell and Spada (2006) analyzed 15 studies in order to estimate the effectiveness of corrective feedback on the acquisition of L2 grammar. We also draw on a small number of studies relevant to ELD instruction that were published subsequent to these six syntheses and meta-analyses, as well as on other broader syntheses that while not focused specifically on EL populations are applicable to ELD instruction (e.g., Slavin's [1987] review of research on grouping).

Admittedly, the six major syntheses and meta-analyses represent very divergent populations and contexts. Ellis (2005) casts a wide net across the entire field of Second Language Acquisition theory and research (SLA). Genesee et al., (2006), specifically the oral language chapter, synthesize across 50 K-12 studies, all of which were conducted within the U.S., and most of which involved Spanish-speaking ELs. Keck, et al., (2006) address U.S. and international studies involving primarily university-level foreign language contexts and a variety of L1s and L2s (9 of the 14 studies involved university students and 10 of the 14 were foreign language contexts). Russell and Spada (2006) analyze both classroom and laboratory studies involving foreign language, second language, and ESL contexts and populations. Lyster (2007) focuses on studies of immersion, primarily French immersion programs implemented in Canada. And finally, Norris and Ortega (2000) draw upon U.S. and international studies involving primarily college (51 of 79) or adult education contexts (11 of 79); only a minority of the studies in the sample involved K-12 contexts (5 high school, 10 junior high, and 1 elementary). Moreover, only 28% of the studies analyzed by Norris and Ortega involved students learning English as a second language; most of the sample includes studies of foreign language instruction.

In sum, we have a relatively small body of research to guide the design and delivery of K-12 ELD instruction. Even among the 50 oral language studies synthesized in Genesee, et al., very few focused on the effects of instruction. Many of those 50 studies are relevant to ELD instruction (e.g., language use, peer interaction, rates of proficiency attainment) but few actually focus on instruction explicitly. As mentioned, most of the other research that exists involved college-age and adult learners, primarily studying a foreign language. Even when we consider what we know about instructing language learning beyond a K-12 ELD context, we must recall Ellis' conclusion: "[R]esearch and theory do not afford a uniform account of how instruction can best facilitate language learning" (2005, p. 210). Given the small research base, we have chosen to be inclusive. Rather than rule out studies and meta-analyses involving widely different populations and contexts (e.g., college-age and adult learners), we have chosen to review them, abstract their findings, and then interpret them, as best we can, for their relevance to K-12 ELD instruction.

There is a growing U.S. literature on educating ELs (as reported in other chapters in this volume). However, very few studies from that literature actually examine the effects of instruction on language learning. Much of the research on ELs conducted in the U.S. over the last 25-30 years has focused on programs involving the use of different amounts of students' primary language (see Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, this volume). Indeed, since the *Lau v.*

Nichols decision of 1974, which affirmed that ELs were guaranteed a “meaningful education,” the majority of EL studies conducted in the U.S.—at least those that measured student outcomes—focused primarily on evaluating some form of bilingual or English immersion programs. In many cases, the explicit or implicit intent of many of these studies was to estimate the extent to which programs of a specific design could produce achievement levels among ELs that matched native English-speaking students—typically as measured by nationally-normed, standardized tests of reading and mathematics. Many of the programs involved in these studies included ELD instruction, but the evaluation and research of these programs sought to measure the effects of the program overall, rather than estimate the effects of the ELD instructional component on English language acquisition (see for example, Saunders, 1999).

**Guidelines**

From existing research, we identified guidelines relevant to English language development instruction, and we categorized them based on the nature of the evidence. We begin with practices and guidelines for which there is relatively strong supporting evidence, followed by findings that are emerging hypotheses. We then turn to guidelines applicable to ELD instruction but grounded in research that is not specifically about ELD. Table 1 lists the guidelines.

Table 1. Guidelines organized by level of supporting evidence

<b>Practices or Guidelines for Which There is Relatively Strong Supporting Evidence</b>
1) ELD Instruction is better than no ELD instruction
2) Interactive activities can be productive, but they must be carefully planned and carried out.
<b>Practices or Guidelines Based on Hypotheses Emerging from Recent EL Research</b>
3) A separate, daily block of time should be devoted to ELD Instruction
4) The ELD block can incorporate reading and writing but should emphasize listening and speaking.
5) ELD instruction should explicitly teach elements of English (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, grammar, conventions).
6) ELD instruction should integrate meaning and communication to support explicit teaching of language
7) ELD instruction should provide students with corrective feedback on form.
8) Use of English during ELD instruction should be maximized; L1 should be used strategically
9) Teachers should attend to communication and language learning strategies and incorporate them into ELD instruction.
10) ELD Instruction should emphasize academic language as well as conversational language
11) ELD instruction should continue at least until students reach level 4 (early advanced) and possibly through level 5 (advanced).
<b>Guidelines Applicable to ELD but Grounded in Non-EL Research</b>
12) ELD Instruction should be planned and delivered with specific language objectives in mind.
13) ELs should be carefully grouped for ELD Instruction, not in classrooms segregated by language proficiency, but by language proficiency for specific ELD Instruction.
14) The likelihood of establishing and/or sustaining an effective ELD Instructional program increases when schools and districts make it a priority.

Appendix A includes two tables. Table A1 lists the studies cited for each guideline categorized by the nature of the study: primary study, synthesis, meta-analyses. Table A2 evaluates the evidence cited for each practice or guideline in terms of three factors: population relevance of the available studies, outcome relevance of the available studies, and reliability of the findings from the studies in relation to the number of studies. Ideally, we would want to base policy and practice on a research base containing studies that are high on all three factors, that is, they were conducted on the relevant population (in this case, K-12 English learners in the U.S.), use relevant outcomes (meaningful measures of English language proficiency or development), and are reliable (findings have been replicated over a number of independent studies). It should surprise no one to learn that no such research base exists. We must therefore carefully weigh the evidence we do have and make judgments about its applicability to designing the best possible programs for ELs in California (and the U.S.) Many readers might not agree with the conclusions we reach about each guideline, but we hope that at a minimum they will have a clear understanding of how we weighed the different factors in order to come to the conclusions we believe are most warranted.

### **Guidelines for Which There is Relatively Strong Supporting Evidence**

#### 1) ELD Instruction is better than no ELD instruction

Although existing research does not provide sufficient basis for determining the most effective methods of ELD instruction with total confidence (see guidelines below), there is ample evidence that providing ELD instruction, in some form, is more beneficial than not providing it. It is perhaps difficult for contemporary audiences to conceive, but 25 years ago "Does second language instruction make a difference?" (Long, 1983) was a viable question. A dominant view (then and for sometime after) was Krashen's (1982) "monitor" hypothesis, which proposed that formal instruction is of limited utility for second language acquisition; instead, large amounts of exposure to comprehensible input in authentic communicative contexts is critical: While second language instruction might help learners *learn* some rules, language forms, and the like, Krashen proposed that this type of learning is not very useful for *language acquisition*--that is being able to speak and understand a language in natural conversations and authentic contexts. However, in his review of available studies comparing second language *instruction* to second language *exposure* Long (1983) concluded that indeed instruction aided second language learning. This was true for young as well as older learners and at intermediate and advanced as well as beginning levels. There are certainly benefits to exposure--that is, living, working, and going to school with English speakers (or speakers of a target language)--as well as access to sheltered instruction that seeks to make academic subjects comprehensible. But second language instruction clearly has added benefits.

Norris and Ortega (2000) revisited this question in their meta-analysis and asked: How effective is L2 instruction overall and relative to exposure and communication with L2 speakers? Norris and Ortega found that focused L2 instruction (designed to teach specific aspects of L2) is more effective than conditions that do not provide focused L2 instruction (including exposure only, minimally focused instruction, minimal exposure). In the studies reviewed by Norris and

Ortega, students who received focused L2 instruction made more than five times the gains that students who did not receive focused L2 instruction made (Norris & Ortega, 2000; p. 468)

Although there are very few studies that have isolated the effects of ELD instruction, studies that compare outcomes for ELs receiving some form of accommodation for limited English proficiency (ELD and/or primary language instruction) to outcomes for ELs simply placed in mainstream classes and receiving no accommodations for their limited English proficiency yield consistent results: The former is more beneficial than the latter (August and Shanahan, this volume; Genesee, et al., 2006; Thomas and Collier, 2002). Even studies of content-based approaches to language learning, where content is taught in L2, find that students learn more language when instruction includes strong elements of language teaching in contrast to approaches where ELs are simply placed in mainstream classes, that is, they simply receive exposure to L2 (see Lyster, 2007; and see Echevarria and Short, this volume).

## 2) Interactive activities can be productive, but they must be carefully planned and carried out.

One might assume that providing ELs with opportunities to interact with more proficient ELs and with native or fluent English speakers would be beneficial because such opportunities would provide ELs with models of proficient or at least more proficient English language speakers. But as Saunders and O'Brien (in Genesee et al., 2006) found in their synthesis of studies that focused on oral English language outcomes, creating such opportunities and producing actual gains in proficiency involves more than simply pairing ELs with native English speakers or more proficient ELs. For instance, it may be assumed that in situations where the language input is slightly beyond ELs' level of understanding, they will work with their conversational partners to negotiate for meaning (cf., Long, 1996, cited in Foster & Ohta, 2005). However, a recent study showed that young adult second language learners (who were observed for long stretches of time during shared classroom activities) focused more on "supportive and friendly discourse" than on negotiation of meaning or efforts to elicit "comprehensible input" (Foster & Ohta, 2005). In such cases, it is fair to ask whether any language proficiency gains are likely to occur. If interactive activities are to benefit ELs, careful consideration must be given to the following:

- design of the tasks students engage in,
- the training of the more proficient English speakers who interact with ELs, and
- the language proficiency of the ELs themselves (August, 1987; Johnson, 1983; Peck, 1987).

If careful attention is not paid to these factors, such interactive activities tend not to yield language-learning opportunities at all (Cathcart-Strong, 1986; Jacob, Rottenberg, Patrick, & Wheeler, 1996). Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, Collins, and Scarcella (2007) drew a similar conclusion based on their review of EL studies that focused on reading outcomes: Interactive activities that effectively mix ELs and more proficient ELs or native English speakers typically involve carefully structured tasks.

This guideline regarding interactive activities is supported by research on older L2 learners. Keck, Ibarra-Shea, Tracy-Ventura, and Wa-Mbaleka (2006) conducted a meta-analysis of 14 studies carried out in high school (n = 2), university (n = 10), and adult school institutions (n = 2) and in foreign language (n = 10) and second language (n = 4) contexts. The pivotal



feature in their analysis is the nature of the interactive tasks. Although several research questions could not be definitively answered, due mainly to the small number of studies and complexities related to control and comparison groups, the overall finding and the task components examined are relevant to K-12 ELD instruction. The overall finding is that treatments with interactive tasks produced a significant and substantial effect on language learning outcomes. Most of the studies tested hypotheses about whether interactive tasks produced stronger effects on the targeted language form, compared to not using interactive tasks. As such, most studies did not include a true control group that received no treatment. Instead the typical comparison group received a treatment without the interactive task and or without certain features designed to prompt learners to use the targeted language form as part of their interaction. Keck et al.'s findings can thus be interpreted to indicate that interactive tasks intentionally designed to produce learner use of the targeted language objective help second language learners accomplish the objective.

Keck et al. (2006) examined two critical features of interactive tasks: essentialness and output. Essentialness has to do with the extent to which the targeted language form is essential to the task the group is trying to complete: Does successful completion of the task require or is it at least facilitated by correct oral comprehension or production of the meaning of certain target words (e.g., modes of transportation: cars, trucks, trains, etc.) or language constructions (e.g., if-then, before-after)? Keck et al. found that tasks whose successful completion either required or was facilitated by accurate use of the targeted language form produced stronger learning outcomes than tasks that didn't require or weren't facilitated by correct use of the language form. Interestingly, tasks that required and tasks that were facilitated by accurate use produced fairly similar effects on immediate posttest; however, tasks that required accurate use produced much stronger effects on delayed posttests than tasks that were facilitated by accurate use. In other words, learning outcomes were stronger when learners had to learn language forms or rules that were necessary for successful completion of a group task. A second analysis with the same studies focused on interactive tasks that required attempts to actually produce the language form, for example, tasks that required students to produce oral utterances using the target words (e.g., modes of transportation: cars, trucks, trains, etc.) or the target construction (e.g., an if-then construction). Interactive tasks that required learners to attempt to produce the language target--in contrast to tasks that did not require learners to produce the language target--more consistently yielded stronger effects, both on immediate and delayed posttests.

Reviewing five quasi-experimental studies involving students ages 7-14, Lyster (2004a) concluded that a) to be effective in supporting language development, interactive tasks need to be designed so that learners must *use* targeted language forms in order to communicate successfully and b) students' ability to make use of a task to improve their language is dependent upon their level of language skill vis-à-vis the target of instruction.

### **Guidelines Based on Hypotheses Emerging from Recent EL Research**

#### **3) A separate, daily block of time should be devoted to ELD Instruction.**

Two studies provide guidance on the important question of whether there is any advantage to ELD instruction being provided during a separate time of the school day, as typically happens with reading, math, etc. Saunders, Foorman, and Carlson (2006) found small

positive, but significant, effects on oral language proficiency among Spanish-speaking kindergarteners who received ELD instruction during a separate block of time. In comparison to kindergarteners whose teachers integrated ELD instruction within their larger language arts block, kindergarteners from ELD block classrooms made greater gains on end of year measures of English oral language proficiency and also word identification (see Guideline #4 for discussion of word identification effects). The study included more than 1200 students from 85 classrooms and 35 schools located in Southern California and Texas. Students were in different types of language programs, including both bilingual and English immersion. In both bilingual and English immersion programs, some teachers used a separate block of time and others integrated ELD into their language arts block. In both the bilingual and English immersion classrooms 58% had a separate block of time for ELD; 42% did not. The positive effects of an ELD block emerged in both English immersion and bilingual education programs. Even in the English immersion classrooms, where instruction was delivered almost exclusively in English, ELs provided with a separate ELD instructional block outperformed ELs whose teachers tried to integrate ELD within the language arts block.

What explains this effect? It is hard to know for sure. Saunders et al. (2006) also found that most of the ELD block time was devoted not to systematic, explicit vocabulary and language teaching but rather to oral English language *activities*, such as sharing personal experiences, identifying and naming colors, describing picture cards, naming the children in the class, and sing-alongs. Saunders et al. (2006) conjecture that while outcomes were significant, the magnitude of the effects may have been small because of the lack of explicit language teaching. In other words, establishing a separate block of time for ELD instruction is probably beneficial—perhaps in part because it helps teachers focus on English language itself and promotes both listening and speaking in English—but the size of the benefit might have more to do with what teachers actually do within the ELD block.

A recent doctoral dissertation is also relevant to the question of whether a separate ELD block is beneficial for ELs' oral language development. O'Brien (2007) conducted a study designed to (a) evaluate the effects of an ELD instructional program on oral language outcomes among first grade Spanish-speaking ELs, and (b) identify instructional practices associated with positive outcomes. The study included 9 classrooms representing three conditions: 1) Classrooms with a separate ELD block taught by teachers delivering the ELD program being evaluated; 2) classrooms with a separate ELD block taught by teachers delivering ELD derived from various components the individual teachers culled from published sources, and 3) classrooms without a separate ELD block taught by teachers who were integrating ELD during their language arts time (where they used a published reading program). The three conditions were evaluated based on beginning of first grade and beginning of second grade California English Language Development Test (CELDT) listening and speaking scores.

Students in all three conditions made statistically significant gains over the year. But the gains were not equivalent. Students in Condition 2 (separate ELD block using materials teachers themselves pulled together), on average, scored higher than students in Condition 3 (ELD integrated with language arts), although the difference was not statistically significant. Students in Condition 1 (separate ELD block using the ELD program being evaluated), however, scored significantly higher than students in Conditions 2 and 3. The study also examined videotaped

lessons from each condition to identify instructional features that distinguished the three conditions from one another in order to provide an account of the CELDT results. Among other distinguishing features, Condition 1 was unique in that lessons involved attention to grammar (e.g., using prepositions), function (e.g., asking and responding to questions), and vocabulary (e.g., geography terms, such as map, ocean, continent, world). On average, teachers in Condition 1 spent 52% of lesson time in teacher-led interactive tasks that focused on grammar, language function, and content-related vocabulary. Teachers in Conditions 2 and 3 spent no time whatsoever on grammar or language function. The vast majority of lesson time in Conditions 2 and 3 were devoted to either discrete vocabulary (Condition 2: 86%) or content-related vocabulary (Condition 3: 84%).

These results support the conjecture of Saunders et al. (2006) that more attention to explicit language teaching (e.g., grammar and function) will make dedicated time for ELD instruction even more productive in terms of improved oral language development (See Guideline #5 for further discussion).

4) The ELD block can incorporate reading and writing but should emphasize listening and speaking.

As described in this volume, programs for ELs should include literacy instruction (see August and Shanahan, this volume); sheltered content area instruction (see Echevarria and Short, this volume); where possible, L1 support or instruction (see Genesee and Lindholm-Leary, this volume); and explicit ELD instruction (see Snow and Katz as well as Dutro and Kinsella, this volume). Within such a comprehensive program, it would seem most beneficial to emphasize speaking and listening during ELD instruction. Although we would hope that speaking and listening are emphasized in other parts of the instructional day, the textual demands of literacy and content area instruction no doubt need to be given priority during those instruction times. It is likely that time allotted for ELD is the one opportunity to give speaking and listening priority. There are two sources of evidence that support this guideline as a promising hypothesis. First, there is evidence about the importance of oral language proficiency. Second, two studies support an emphasis on listening and speaking during ELD instruction.

The importance of English oral language proficiency for ELs is well established in the research literature. With increasing English oral proficiency, ELs are more likely to use English, and more frequent use of English tends to be correlated with subsequent gains in English oral proficiency (Chesterfield, Chesterfield, Hayes-Latimer, & Chávez, 1983; Saviile-Troiike, 1984). In addition, with increasing oral proficiency in English, ELs are more likely to interact and establish relationships with native English-speaking peers, providing them with increasing opportunities to use English (Strong, 1983, 1984). With increasing English oral proficiency, ELs also tend to use more complex language learning strategies, specifically strategies that allow them to monitor their own language use and the language use of others and thereby to interact more effectively with others (Chesterfield & Chesterfield, 1985a). Finally, as ELs' oral English proficiency develops, they demonstrate a wider range of language skills, including skills associated with more academic uses of language, specifically higher level question forms (Lindholm, 1987; Rodriguez-Brown, 1987) and the capacity to define what words mean (Carlisle, Beeman, Davis, & Spharim, 1999; Snow, Cancino, Gonzalez, & Shriberg, 1987).

Several studies have documented a positive relationship between English oral proficiency and English reading achievement (Carlisle et al., 1999; Garcia-Vázquez, Vazquez, Lopez, & Ward, 1997; Goldstein, Harris, & Klein, 1993; Royer & Carlo, 1991; Saville-Troike, 1984; Snow et al., 1987; Ulibarri, Spencer, & Rivas, 1981). This relationship has been established across Grades 1-9 and is based on various measures of oral proficiency and standardized measures of reading achievement. Moreover, the relationship between English oral proficiency and English reading achievement is stronger for measures that are associated with more academic aspects of oral language proficiency. For example, the number of different words ELs use during an interview correlates more strongly with reading achievement than the total number of words they use ( $r = .63$  and  $r = .40$ , respectively; Saville-Troike, 1984). The relationship between English oral proficiency and English literacy seems to strengthen substantially across the grades, arguably because both are similarly influenced by schooling and both are indicative of academic success. For example, in one study (Snow et al., 1987), correlations between English reading achievement and quality measures of ELs' word definitions goes from .16 in grade 2 to .50 in grade 5.

Two studies provide evidence suggesting that devoting more instructional time to listening and speaking yields significantly higher levels of oral language proficiency. The Saunders et al. (2006) kindergarten study discussed above indicated that more time spent on English oral language instruction leads to stronger oral language outcomes without compromising literacy outcomes. Recall that the study found small but positive and significant effects on English oral proficiency and also English word identification. On average, teachers with an ELD block devoted 57% of their ELD time to instructional activities that focused exclusively on oral language (without text) and 32% to 39% on instructional activities that involved some form of reading or writing of text (average daily time allotment for ELD = 37 to 40 minutes). This evidence is only suggestive of proportions of time that should be devoted to listening and speaking within the ELD block because the study did not include a true comparison group, for example, a sample of classrooms with an ELD block that devoted a majority of time to reading and minority of time to oral language. The comparison group in this study included classrooms in which ELD was reportedly embedded within the larger language arts block.

Results from O'Brien (2007) also suggest that an emphasis on listening and speaking during the ELD block might be beneficial. Although a relatively small-scale study, O'Brien (2007) allows for more direct comparisons of what teachers did in the two conditions that involved an explicit ELD block. Condition 1 included two teachers who were implementing a specific program that was being evaluated and that was designed to emphasize speaking, listening, and specific language objectives. Condition 2 included 4 teachers who were carefully selected to represent conscientious and fully credentialed (CLAD) teachers who consistently delivered a daily block of ELD instruction using published materials each teacher culled from various sources. As described earlier, students in Condition 1 scored significantly higher than students in Conditions 2 and 3 (which contained no separate ELD block) on CELDT listening and speaking measures at the beginning of second grade. Instruction in Condition 1 focused at least half the time on grammar and language functions, which were completely absent from instruction in Condition 2. Moreover, teachers in Condition 1 carried out this focus on grammar and language functions almost exclusively through listening and speaking tasks: 96% of the ELD

block was devoted to listening and speaking, as opposed to tasks that involved some form of reading or writing or some other type of activity. Teachers in Conditions 2 devoted only 55% of the ELD block to listening and speaking, with the remaining time devoted to tasks involving reading, writing, or something else.

5) ELD instruction should explicitly teach elements of English (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, grammar, conventions).

In an informative recent review, Spada and Lightbown (2008) have pointed out that exposure to a second language in meaning-based school programs designed to promote second language learning (e.g., content-based second language instruction) can lead to the development of comprehension skills, oral fluency, self-confidence, and communicative abilities in a second language. However, second language learners can still experience difficulties with pronunciation and morphological, syntactic, and pragmatic features (Spada & Lightbown, 2008). Spada and Lightbown conclude that explicit instructional attention to these features (referred to as "forms" in the second language literature) is likely to facilitate students' second language learning in a way that solely relying on meaning- and communication-oriented instruction alone will not.

The essential body of evidence on teaching language elements explicitly is Norris and Ortega (2000). We discussed earlier the limitations of this meta-analysis in terms of its applicability to K-12 ELD contexts: Of their sample of 79 studies, 78% involved college-age or adult learners, while only 6% involved high school, 13% middle or junior high school, and 1%--just one study--involved elementary school. Moreover, most (59%) were conducted in foreign language instructional contexts, and fewer than a third (29%) were conducted in second language instructional contexts. Despite a lack of relevant research among ELs in grades K-12, however, findings from the Norris and Ortega analyses should not be dismissed or ignored. Within these primarily college and adult level foreign language contexts, explicit instruction consistently produced stronger results than implicit instruction. Here, explicit instruction means either (a) instructors present or explain a language element (a rule or a form) to the students then provide opportunities for them to study or practice the element with many examples (Norris and Ortega call this an "deductive" approach), or (b) instructors engage students in tasks containing many examples of a particular form or rule then direct students' attention to the language element so that students arrive at the rule by themselves or with the teacher's guidance (called "inductive"). Explicit instruction included both approaches to studying features of the second language. Instructional treatments were classified as implicit in cases where instructors did not present or explain the language element and did not direct students' attention to the language target. On average, explicit instructional approaches were more than twice as effective--in terms of student learning--as implicit approaches, that is, where teachers did not draw students' attention to targeted language features.

This finding is important and applicable to K-12 ELD instruction, but with some cautions. We have already noted the limitations of this research for our purposes: it was largely conducted with college and adult students. In addition, the great majority of the studies were of short duration. The average "treatment" lasted just over four hours and was more laboratory-like than long-term, classroom-like--which of course would be more relevant for drawing conclusions about what should happen in classrooms (as opposed to laboratory settings). Moreover, most of

the studies were quite narrow in scope, i.e., teaching a specific feature of language (for example, verb tense, adverb placement, relative pronouns, or wh- questions) then measuring the extent to which students learned that feature. Thus, whereas we can conclude that the most effective way to help older L2 learners learn a language form or rule is to teach it explicitly, we do not know empirically whether a semester or a year or multiple years of such instruction on a scope and sequence of language forms and rules would actually produce higher levels of L2 proficiency in young L2 learners than some other approach sustained over time. These cautions notwithstanding, the best available information points to the value of teaching language explicitly. Although analogies between language instruction and literacy instruction have limited utility, we would note that similar findings are emerging about the value of explicit instruction in relationship to the teaching of English reading skills and strategies to ELs (see August and Shanahan, this volume; and Genesee et al., 2006).

Explicit instruction is often associated with direct instruction. Indeed, direct instruction is, by definition, explicit. However, it is not the only form of explicit instruction. Most models of direct instruction (see Slavin, 2006) typically involve an explanation, demonstration or presentation of the concept or skill in the early part of the lesson, followed by various forms of practice, feedback, and assessment. As such, direct instruction generally takes a deductive approach to teaching and learning--teachers teach students a skill or concept then provide numerous examples followed by having students practice its application. In the Norris and Ortega analysis, studies classified as explicit included not just deductive approaches but inductive as well. In other words, explicit instruction also included approaches where learners received a certain amount of experience with a language form (e.g., possessives or interrogatives) then were directed to attend to the form or to focus on deriving the underlying rule or nature of the form. Students were guided in "inducing" the rule or form rather than having been taught it directly before applying it. It would thus not be accurate to interpret the Norris and Ortega "explicitness" finding as recommending only a direct instruction approach, as direct instruction is typically defined. The key point in their finding is that instruction that explicitly focuses students' attention on the targeted language element, or form, produces higher levels of second language learning than instruction that does not. This matter of focusing the learners' attention is a central concept in Ellis' (2005) principles of instructed language learning (see also Lyster, 2007; Nassaji and Fotos, 2004).

6) ELD instruction should integrate meaning and communication to support explicit teaching of language.

Meaning obviously plays a central role in language use. We use language to express and comprehend meaningful communication with others and to help build understandings for ourselves. Meaning also plays a central role in language learning insofar as being able to express and comprehend meaningful communication in the language being learned probably motivates and compels language learning. Although there is little controversy about the role of meaning and communication in language use--and by *communication* we mean both receiving and sending messages-- in language use, their role in language *instruction* is more complicated. Should authentic, meaningful communication drive instruction, that is, should it be assigned top priority in second language instruction? Or, alternatively, should explicit teaching of language forms drive instruction? Research on second language learning and acquisition has advanced

over the last two decades in coming to understand that instructed language learning must involve meaning and communication, but it also must direct students' attention to elements and functions of the language being learned. No doubt the interplay between meaning making and conscious attention to language vary for different aspects of language, levels of L2 proficiency, the age of the learner, the learner's first language, and other factors (Lightbown & Spada, 2008). Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient empirical evidence to understand this dynamic interplay fully, although Lightbown & Spada (2008) offer a number of useful hypotheses for second language educators.

We constructed the wording of the guideline based on our review of the literature relative to the focus of this chapter: *ELD instruction should integrate meaning and communication to support explicit teaching of language*. Communicating meaning and providing explicit teaching are both important. However, we propose that communication and meaning should support explicit teaching of language, not necessarily drive ELD instruction. In the explanation of Guideline #4 (*ELD instruction should incorporate reading and writing but should emphasize listening and speaking*), we argued that ELD instruction might be the one instructional block in the day wherein oral language, as opposed to reading and writing, could be afforded greater priority. We make a similar argument here for integrating meaning to support explicit teaching of the language rather than making meaning the driver of ELD instruction. The ELD block (or course) is likely the one portion of the day when explicit teaching of English can be afforded greater priority, insofar as the remainder of the instructional day will, ideally, have other content-specific objectives or communicative functions.

Lyster's review (2007) of primarily second-language immersion studies provides one source of evidence supporting the importance of incorporating meaning and communication in language learning contexts, but also the need to better understand how best to balance meaning and communication with explicit language teaching. Drawing primarily from French immersion studies (K-12 and older), Lyster notes both the success and limitations demonstrated in such programs: Students instructed through carefully designed programs that immerse students in content study and language study consistently produce levels of second-language proficiency that exceed the levels achieved by students who study a second language simply as one more school subject. The content emphasis of the French immersion studies Lyster reviews are examples of consciously incorporating communicating meaning—in this case, the meaning and communication associated with studying academic content. But Lyster also highlights another set of findings from French immersion studies: “What emerges from these studies is that immersion students are second language speakers who are relatively fluent and effective communicators, but non-targetlike in terms of grammatical structure and non-idiomatic in the lexical choices and pragmatic expression—in comparison to native speakers of the same age” (p. 16). Lyster concludes that language immersion programs are likely to improve language learning by using enhanced instructional approaches that “counterbalance” content and form, that is, by more strategically and systematically teaching and helping students explicitly attend to language forms without compromising the effects of content-based, meaning-oriented pedagogy.

In his principles of instructed language learning (see Appendix 2), derived from his review of both the theoretical and empirical literature, Ellis (2005) emphasizes both meaning and form (principles 2 and 3, respectively, of 10 principles) but clearly places more emphasis on

meaning: "Instruction needs to ensure that learners focus predominantly on meaning" (Principle 2) and "Instruction needs to ensure that learners *also* focus on form" (Principle 3; pp. 211-12; emphasis added). In his discussion of meaning, Ellis draws a distinction between "semantic" meaning--where teacher and students focus on the meanings of words and constructions in the target language--and "pragmatic" meaning--where the target language is used as vehicle for communication; not the object of study per se. "Pragmatic meaning," in other words, is where learners "view the L2 as a tool for communicating and to function as communicators" (pp. 211-212). Although both types of meaning in second language acquisition are important, Ellis says, "arguably ... it is pragmatic meaning that is crucial to language learning" (p.211).

Findings from Norris and Ortega's (2000) meta-analysis provide an interest contrast to Ellis's (2005) principles. Norris and Ortega found significant, positive effects for instructional treatments that (a) focused on form and integrated meaning and (b) focused solely on forms without integration of meaning: "...the current state of empirical findings indicates that explicit instruction is more effective than implicit instruction and that focus on form [which integrates communication and meaning] and a focus on forms [which does not integrate communication and meaning] are equally effective." Norris and Ortega's analyses suggest that explicit instruction on language forms is central to language learning. Incorporating meaning would contribute to language learning only to the extent that students are provided with explicit presentations and explanations on the "rule-governed nature of L2 structures" (p. 483), whether through inductive or deductive approaches (both were represented in Norris and Ortega's sample, as previously discussed).

The contrast between Ellis's analysis and Norris and Ortega's findings raises the following question: If instruction needs to ensure that learners focus predominantly on meaning but also on form, why didn't the effects of treatments that focused on form and integrated meaning produce stronger results than those focused solely on form? One possibility is that Ellis' strong emphasis on meaning might be less critical for adult learners. Recall most of the studies in the Norris and Ortega meta-analysis involved university students and adults. Recall also that Ellis' principles are intended as a set of general principles for language pedagogy ("provisional specifications"), applicable to language learners of all ages. It is quite likely that university students and adults are more likely to engage in instructional activities (both lessons and drills) that don't integrate meaning. Norris and Ortega classified treatments that integrate meaning when learners had the opportunity to engage with meaning-focused tasks prior to the introduction of the language form, or when treatments were designed specifically around the naturalness of the instructional tasks relative to the language form. At least for older populations, we can conclude that such integration of meaning neither significantly contributes to nor detracts from the learning of discrete language elements. Another possibility is that the nature of the studies in the Norris and Ortega meta-analysis do not provide a good test of the role of meaning. The vast majority of the studies were very focused, short-term tests of particular methods applied to the teaching of discrete language elements and involving the measurement of primarily just those discrete elements that were taught, rather than broader measures of language proficiency. Perhaps integrating meaning is less critical when the focus of that which is being taught and tested is very discrete.



The O'Brien (2007) study discussed earlier in this chapter is the only one with which we are familiar that explicitly tested the proposition underlying this guideline, which is that meaning and communication can serve to support explicit teaching of language during ELD instruction. This study was conducted with young ELs in U.S. classrooms, so its population relevance is extremely high. As previously reported, all three conditions in the study involved meaning and meaning-making, primarily by focusing on content, concepts, and vocabulary that students were studying in their English language arts units and reading selections. However, the meaning or meaning-making aspects of the lessons from Condition 1 were utilized to support the learning of the language elements. No such connection existed for Conditions 2 or 3. (See Guidelines 3 and 4 for further description of the conditions.) One-year oral proficiency gains for the first graders in the study were significantly greater for students in Condition 1 than they were in Conditions 2 and 3.

For example, in Condition 1 there was clearly a targeted language form (Where did XX sail? XX sailed to YY), and the teacher's modeling and explanation about how to use the form and the practice students engaged in were supported by at least three dimensions that involved meaning and meaning-making: First, the lesson was broadly contextualized by the story students had read (about a character that sailed to different parts of the world). Second, the lesson was contextualized by a map of the world and a figurine students held and maneuvered as they constructed their responses (Max sailed to Europe.). Third, students eventually took over the role of asking one another the general question (Where did Max sail?), and the respondent could construct his/her own answer, choosing the location on the map (to which they had Max sail) and uttering the corresponding response.

The caveat here with the illustration from Condition 1 is that we do not know empirically the unique effects of those three meaning dimensions (story, map/figurine, and interactions) separate from the focus on form (Where- question and response). Moreover, neither of the two other conditions provides a contrast that would allow us to conjecture about the contribution of the meaning dimensions to the focus on form: Both had their own meaning dimensions but neither focused on form. At best then, we can hypothesize that these meaning dimensions contribute to language learning and explicit language teaching. Unlike the older learners in many of the Norris and Ortega studies, where meaning seemed not to make significant contribution to explicit language teaching, perhaps integrating meaning is more important and beneficial for younger learners.

#### 7) ELD instruction should provide students with corrective feedback on form.

Providing ELs with feedback on form is probably not a matter of whether but how best to do it. During ELD instruction wherein the primary objective is studying and learning language corrective feedback can be beneficial. Russell and Spada (2006) conducted a meta-analysis on fifteen experimental and quasi-experimental studies that examined the effects of corrective feedback specifically on grammar. The studies include a mixture of Foreign Language, Second Language, and ESL contexts some of which were conducted in classrooms and some were conducted under laboratory conditions. Unfortunately, Russell and Spada do not report the age or grade of the students involved in the studies, which makes it difficult to gauge the relevance of their findings to K-12, ELD contexts. That limitation notwithstanding, all fifteen studies

involved (1) a treatment group that received some form of grammar-focused corrective feedback, (2) a comparison group that did not receive corrective feedback, and (c) a measure of language learning. In all fifteen studies, the treatment group out performed the comparison group, and in most cases (10 of 15) effects were large ( $> .8$ ). The sample of studies varied in terms of other important instructional factors: Was feedback explicit or implicit? Was feedback provided by teacher or peer? Did feedback focus on oral or written production? Was feedback general or specific? The number studies that focused on any one of these instructional factors was too small to analyze quantitatively, but Russell and Spada's categorization of studies by these factors provides some insight into the various questions researchers are pursuing to better understand how best to deliver corrective feedback.

Lyster (2007) reviewed studies published since the time of Russell and Spada's meta-analysis. Ellis, Lowen, and Erlam (2006) involved adult ESL learners; Lyster (2004b) focused on Grade 5 immersion classrooms; and Ammar and Spada (2006) included Grade 6 ESL classrooms. All three studies tested the effects of implicit and explicit forms of corrective feedback, more specifically, recasts vs. prompts. When teachers recast a student's utterance, they rearticulate what the student was trying to say with an utterance that includes corrections of one or more errors evident in the student's utterance. Prompts explicitly draw a student's attention to an error and encourage or require the student to attempt to repair the utterance. As demonstrated by previous studies (Lyster and Ranta, 1997), recasts are less likely to interrupt communication between the teacher and student, but students may not notice the correction and therefore may not benefit from it. Prompts, on the other hand, may momentarily interrupt communication between the teacher and student, but students are more likely to register the error and attempt to repair it. All three studies reviewed by Lyster (2007) had a treatment group that received prompts as feedback, a treatment group that received recasts as feedback, and a comparison group that received no feedback. In all studies, all treatment groups also received form-focused instruction. Ellis, et al., (2006) found positive effects on students' use of the past tense for those students receiving prompts rather than recasts. On both oral and written measures administered immediately following the treatment and again two months later, Lyster (2004) found positive effects for both prompts and recasts (both treatment groups out performed the comparison group) but stronger effects for prompts than recasts. On immediate and delayed posttests of oral and written tasks, Ammar and Spada (2006) also found positive effects of both prompts and recasts and stronger effects for prompts in comparison to recasts. Ammar and Spada (2006) also found a differential effect: Whereas higher proficiency learners seemed to benefit equally from prompts and recasts, lower proficiency learners seemed to benefit more from prompts.

The research interest in prompts and recasts as forms of more and less explicit feedback relates to a relatively new but important construct in second language acquisition theory and research that focuses on *learner attention*, more specifically, what learners attend to during communication and language instruction. Lyster and Ranta (1997) studied teachers' interactions with students learning French as a second language. They found that there were several feedback strategies teachers used in responding to student errors during oral communication. The most frequent strategy was recasts. However, recasts were the least likely (31% of instances) feedback strategy to produce student "uptake," that is, an utterance by the student indicating an attempt to do something with the teacher's feedback. In contrast, "elicitations" (a

form of "prompts"), where teachers directly elicited the correct form from students, produced uptake in 100% of instances. "Metalinguistic feedback" (information or questions related to the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form) and "clarification requests" also provided high levels of student uptake, 86% and 88%, respectively. Interestingly, "explicit correction" produced uptake only 50% of time, suggesting too much explicitness might be counterproductive (but still better than implicit feedback, that is, recasts).

Lyster (2007) also provides an analysis of how feedback provided through more and less explicit forms might function differentially depending on teachers' relative emphasis on form vs. meaning. Based on a review of studies that looked at recasts and prompts in French and Japanese immersion classes (Lyster and Mori, 2006), Lyster concludes that the general classroom orientation influences the potential benefits of either recasts or prompts. In form-focused classrooms wherein teachers spend some time engaging students in oral drills and repetitions of correct forms, the more subtle or implicit recast can serve as meaningful feedback, yielding student repairs, because the students are used to attending to form and repetitions of teacher utterances. Recasts are less effective in meaning-oriented classrooms where students are more accustomed to attending to communication and more likely not to attend to corrections imbedded in teacher utterances. In meaning-oriented classrooms, prompts may be more effective because they explicitly mark the need for the repair of an utterance and therefore purposefully redirect students' attention, at least momentarily, away from meaning to the language itself.

The feedback guideline represents an important hypothesis for ELD instruction. First and foremost, feedback should not be taken for granted. We should not assume that students necessarily attend to and register corrective feedback delivered more implicitly. Where and when implicit feedback, such as recasts, seem to be relevant, ELD teachers will want to help students recognize them and understand their function, mostly likely as a broader orientation to the instruction block. ELD teachers will want to provide similar orientation to interactional activities and lessons that involve explicit feedback, so as to alert students to the fact that interactions will be momentarily interrupted to provide students with feedback intended to help them refine their language use. Most important, the evidence suggests that ELD teachers should not avoid or hesitate from providing corrective feedback. Rather the central matter regarding corrective feedback is how to do it effectively, such that students attend to it and benefit from it.

8) Use of English during ELD instruction should be maximized; L1 should be used strategically.

This guideline does not negate the fact that many studies have shown the advantages of maintenance and development of ELs' home languages, in particular the benefit for L2 literacy of teaching ELs literacy skills in their L1 (Goldenberg, 2008, reviews this research). We do not know with certainty, however, what the impact of L1 use during ELD instruction is on English oral language acquisition. In general, the evidence suggests that ELs' language choices tend to align with the dominant language of instruction. Chesterfield, Chesterfield, Hayes-Latimer, and Chávez (1983) investigated the language choices of Spanish-speaking ELs in bilingual pre-school classes. In classes where teachers tended to use more English for instruction, ELs tended to use more English with their peers. In classes where teachers tended to use more Spanish, ELs tended to use more Spanish. Chesterfield and Chesterfield (1985b) also report language use data for grade 1 Mexican-American ELs, half of whom were enrolled in "English" classes, and half of

whom were enrolled in Spanish bilingual classes. In the English classes, ELs used English during peer interactions a majority of the time. ELs in the bilingual classes used Spanish a majority of the time. Among grade 2 ELs in Spanish bilingual programs where at least a majority of instruction was delivered in Spanish, both Milk (1982) and Malave (1989) found that ELs were more likely to use Spanish during peer interactions; in fact, Malave found students using Spanish over English by a ratio of 6 to 1. Finally, among grade 4 ELs who had participated in Spanish bilingual classrooms through grade 3 and were then placed in an "English-only" class, Pease-Alvarez and Winsler (1994) found a substantial increase from the beginning to the end of the year in students' use of English in their classroom interactions (53% to 83%).

Based on these studies, we would conclude the following: Assuming that a practical goal of ELD instruction is increased use of English during ELD instruction, that goal will be served best by instruction delivered and tasks carried out primarily in English. However, we can imagine using L1 in a limited but strategic manner during ELD instruction in order to ensure students' understand task directions, draw students' attention to cognates, and teach language learning and metacognitive strategies. (See Dolson and Burham-Massey, this volume, for further discussion.)

9) Teachers should attend to communication and language learning strategies and incorporate them into ELD instruction.

Genesee, et al., (2006) found that more proficient ELs demonstrate a wider repertoire of language learning strategies than less proficient ELs. These strategies appear to emerge in the same order--from less to more sophisticated--and to be correlated with levels of language proficiency. Second language learners first use and rely most heavily on fairly simple receptive strategies, such as repetition and memorization, as they learn words and phrases. As they progress to the middle levels of language development, ELs begin to use more interactive strategies, such as verbal attention-getters and elaboration to engage in and sustain interactions with others. Finally, at more advanced levels ELs use language- and communication-monitoring strategies, such as requesting clarification and appealing for assistance, in order to maintain and, as needed, repair communication with others. In addition to the relevance of these findings for designing strategy instruction (see next paragraph), in more general terms, we view them as important information for ELD teachers. As ELs develop increasing proficiency, their capacity to use English increases, but so does their strategy use, which seems to undergo significant qualitative changes: from heavy reliance on receptive strategies to increased use of interactive strategies and eventually to more sophisticated communication-monitoring strategies. Reviewing the literature on language learning strategies, Chamot (2005) states:

Taken together, these studies identified the good language learner as one who is a mentally active learner, monitors language comprehension and production, practices communicating in the language, makes use of prior linguistic and general knowledge, uses various memorization techniques, and asks questions for clarification. Chamot, 2005, p. 115

One study suggests that explicit instruction on how to use strategies effectively, especially meta-cognitive strategies, might be beneficial for ELs' oral language development. O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Russo, & Kupper (1985) conducted a study to test the effects of an eight-day (50 minutes per day) intervention designed to train high school ELs to use meta-cognitive and cognitive strategies in the context of integrative tasks: listening to lectures and making oral presentations. The training did not produce significant effects for listening, but it did produce significant effects for speaking. The authors' analyses of the strengths and limitations of their training modules suggest that listening outcomes could have been improved with stronger curricula and instruction. While this is only one study, it yields a noteworthy hypothesis. The authors' previous observational and self-report investigations determined that students were less likely to apply strategies, particularly meta-cognitive strategies, to more challenging integrative tasks. Their subsequent experiment demonstrated that this weakness (or need) was amenable to instruction, at least for high school level ELs.

Several other studies have shown positive effects of teaching or priming listening comprehension strategies to ELs (e.g., Carrier, 2003; Thompson & Rubin, 1996 [cited in Chamot, 2005]; Vandergrift, 2002). Carrier conducted a study with seven intermediate-level ESL high school students that entailed ten 20-30 minute listening strategy instruction sessions. Some of the strategies taught were how to listen to the rhythm and sounds of English, how to listen for specific information, and how to take notes (both form and meaning focused). Pretest-posttest comparisons showed statistically significant improvements in performance on discrete listening tasks and video listening and note-taking tasks.

Teachers may need to use students' L1 (when they can) to teach strategies for students at lower levels of L2 proficiency (Chamot, 2005, citing Macaro, 2001)

#### 10) ELD Instruction should emphasize academic language as well as conversational language.

It is widely believed that successful performance in school requires proficiency in academic language and that a major objective of education for both majority and minority language students is teaching the academic language skills they need to master the diverse subjects that comprise the curriculum. For example, Snow et al. (1991) found that performance on highly decontextualized tasks, such as providing a formal definition of words, predicted academic performance whereas performance on highly contextualized tasks, such as face-to-face communication, did not. Within second language literature, the concept of academic language was first proposed by Cummins (1984) in his distinction between "basic interpersonal communicative skills" and "cognitive academic language proficiency." Since that time, a number of writers have proposed definitions of academic language (e.g., Bailey & Butler, 2002; Bailey, 2007; Scarcella, 2003; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007).

In this section, prior to discussing the research related to this guideline and why we characterize it as a hypothesis (see last three paragraphs), we provide an explanation of "academic language" (drafted first by Fred Genesee and reviewed by other authors of this volume). Indeed, there is no definitive or consensus definition of academic language (see Scarcella, 2003, for contrasts of two major perspectives, and see Valdés, 2004, for description and critique of both definitions and socio-political contexts related to conceptualizing academic

language). While not intending to dismiss this complexity, the authors of this volume agreed that it would be best to provide a working definition and explanation of academic language.

A succinct definition is that of Chamot and O'Malley (1994) who characterize academic language as "the language that is used by teachers and students for the purposes of acquiring new knowledge and skills...imparting new information, describing abstract ideas, and developing students' conceptual understanding" (p. 40). To expand on Chamot and O'Malley's definition, academic language refers to the specialized vocabulary, grammar, discourse/textual, and functional skills associated with academic instruction and mastery of academic material and tasks. In the simplest terms, "academic language" is the language that is needed in academic situations such as those students encounter during classroom instruction. The excerpt below includes an example of academic language during a lesson on using graphs to represent change in the manufacturing industry in California.

*T: Many things are manufactured in California, from airplanes to computer chips. Suppose you wanted to find out how many people worked in manufacturing jobs in California for the last 25 years. A line graph could help you. Look at the line graph on page 51 and trace the line to see changes over time. Why would the line be expected to move up over time?*

*S: More jobs.*

*T: That's right. Because manufacturing had increased over time, the line indicates the related rise in the number of jobs. What happened around 1990?*

*S: It stays the same.*

*T: Yes, the job market stabilized so there was only a slight increase – hardly discernable – in the line. What might happen if there were not products to manufacture?*

*S: People lose their jobs.*

*S: Some would move away.*

*T: That's right, and the graph would then indicate a decline. The line would go down in that case.*

Note this example is a verbal exchange between students and their teacher. This illustrates an important feature of academic language – it can be oral or written language. Also note that there is technical **vocabulary** (such as: *manufactured, line graph, trace, related rise*), **sentence patterns that require complex grammatical constructions** (such as "*What might happen if there were not products to manufacture*"), use of **explicit reference** to what is being talked about (e.g., "*...the graph would then indicate a decline. The line would go down...*"), and **specific background knowledge** – without the necessary background knowledge that was part of this lesson, the language used in this interchange would be even more challenging.

The performance of academic tasks also requires that students be competent performing sophisticated "**language functions**," such as those listed here:

- to argue persuasively for or against a point of view
- to analyze, compare, and contrast
- to evaluate alternative points of view and factual information
- to justify ones point of view or to debate different points of view
- to synthesize and integrate information

- to follow or give complex directions
- to hypothesize about the causal relationship between events
- to justify a predication, as in a science experiment
- to present a logical argument
- to question an explanation

Academic language is thought to differ from one subject to another (e.g., mathematics, science, history). Certain subjects require knowledge of specific technical vocabulary; sometimes, this means that students must learn alternative meanings of common words, such as the mathematical use of the word “table” or “times” versus the day-today meanings of these words. The specific academic language that is characteristic of one subject, such as science, can also differ from that associated with another subject, such as mathematics, with respect to the particular grammatical forms and discourse patterns that are typically used when talking or writing about these subjects.

Definitions of academic language often contrast it with language used in everyday social situations. Cummins (1980), for example, characterized academic language as decontextualized and cognitively-demanding, whereas social language tends to be more contextualized and less cognitively-undemanding. As a result, academic language tends to draw on more specialized technical vocabulary, to use more complex grammatical constructions, and to be more explicit in its intended meaning. Others have highlighted the nature of the vocabulary that characterizes academic versus everyday language use – academic language tends to use less common, more technical, and highly specialized vocabulary in contrast to that which is used in everyday conversations (e.g., Stevens, Butler, & Castellon-Wellington, 2000). While it is useful to contrast social and academic uses of language, it is important to guard “against believing that there is something inherent in social language that makes it less sophisticated or less cognitively demanding than language used in an academic context” (Bailey, 2007, p. X). It is differences in the overall prevalence of different kinds of language use in and outside school that distinguishes academic and social communication. All of the language functions listed earlier can be part of conversational language use. The difference between academic and social language lies in the fact that, in school, these functions are linked to academic content and, thus, to information or ideas that are often complex and abstract. To express these functions in school settings, the learner requires well-developed vocabulary, grammatical, and discourse/textual skills as well knowledge of the content domains (e.g., math or science).

Although the concept of academic language has gained attention within the EL literature, there is very little research to draw upon to guide ELD instruction. The notion that ELs' language development will benefit from ELD instruction that focuses heavily on academic language is a very compelling hypothesis--but a hypothesis nonetheless since no study that we know has put it to the test. The hypothesis emerges from at least two interrelated findings. First, studies consistently find that ELs require from five to seven years to achieve native-like proficiency in oral language and literacy (Genesee, et al., 2006; Collier, 1987). One question that arises from these findings is whether this rate of acquisition can be accelerated. More specifically, given that academic language probably plays an increasingly important role in defining what actually constitutes "language proficiency" as students go up the grades, it is reasonable to hypothesize that a focus on academic language might help ELs attain advanced

levels of language proficiency more quickly. The second finding is that the rate at which students acquire proficiency tends to slow as they move to higher levels of proficiency (Genesee, et al., 2006). Since higher levels of proficiency tend to be characterized by more academic uses of language, the question again arises whether higher levels of proficiency could be promoted by instruction that focuses more extensively on academic language.

At this point, we do not have empirical answers to these questions. Moreover, we do not have a good empirical understanding of the kind of instruction that would reliably promote the development of academic language. A recent "practice guide" from the Institute of Education Sciences provides an indication of the state of research on academic language instruction (Gersten, Baker, Shanahan, Linan-Thompson, Collins, and Scarcella, 2007). Based on their review of the research, the authors put forth recommendations for effective literacy and language instruction for English learners at the elementary grades. All of the recommendations were rated by the authors as having strong empirical evidence, except for "develop academic English," for which the panel found only two relevant studies, both of which focused on narrow aspects of academic English (quality of oral narrative and syntax) and did not explicitly test an instructional approach. The authors retained the "develop academic English" recommendation on the grounds of expert opinion. They observed the same phenomenon as we have: Numerous EL scholars (Bailey, 2007, Scarcella, 2003), especially those synthesizing and meta-analyzing the EL research literature (August and Shanahan, 2006; Genesee et al., 2006) and/or reviewing those syntheses and meta-analyses (Goldenberg, 2008) are calling for attention to academic language or academic language proficiency, specifically because of its absence in the research literature and its apparent importance. Thus it seems appropriate to put forward as a strong hypothesis that teaching academic language will help promote ELs' language development. From a practical standpoint, although we support the current emphasis on academic language and the call for instruction that effectively develops academic language among ELs, we must also acknowledge that this emphasis runs ahead of actual pedagogy, curriculum, and professional development that schools might use to answer the call. As Gersten et al. (2007) note: "The Panel feels the best way to promote the development of academic English is to use a curriculum with a scope and sequence aimed at building academic English. Unfortunately, the Panel knows of no existing curricular materials that have solid empirical support for this purpose" (p. 16).

The chapters on K-5 and 6-12 ELD instruction included in this volume are intended to provide the reader with concrete examples of ELD instruction and curriculum that emphasize academic language. Although not yet systematically evaluated, the work in both chapters is informed by research related to ELD instruction and specific conceptualizations of academic language.

11) ELD instruction should continue at least until students reach level 4 (early advanced) and possibly through level 5 (advanced).

This guideline is consistent with California statute and federal law that require that ELs receive ELD instruction until they are redesignated as fluent in English. From a research standpoint, this guideline—a hypothesis—emerges from evidence about the rate at which students achieve advanced levels of proficiency. ELs' English proficiency--both oral language proficiency and literacy--develops over time (five or more years). The evidence regarding



literacy development has been reported and debated and theorized about for at least the last two decades (Collier, 1987; August & Shanhanan, 2006). The evidence regarding English oral language development among ELs has received much less direct attention. However, the synthesis of oral language research contained in Genesee, et al., (2006) provides estimates based on a compilation of a small number of K-12 U.S. studies that contained longitudinal or cross-sectional oral language outcomes

Summarizing across the studies (primarily elementary grades) and the various measures, Genesee, et al., report the following:

- 1) ELs require 4 to 6 years to achieve what would be considered “early advanced” proficiency (level 4, where level 1 is beginning and level 5 is advanced);
- 2) average oral English proficiency approached native like proficiency (level 5, advanced) by grade 5 in fewer than half of the available studies;
- 3) progress from beginning to middle levels of proficiency is fairly rapid (level 1 to 3), but progress from middle to upper levels of proficiency (level 3 to 5) slows considerably--in other words, there is evidence of a *plateau effect*, where many ELs get to a middle level of English proficiency then make little progress thereafter; and
- 4) as evident in one study that allowed for comparisons to native-English speaker norms (Hakuta, et al., 2000; Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery), the gap between ELs and native speaker norms increased across grade levels.

Genesee et al. highlight the common patterns in rates that emerged across grades 1-5 for students from both bilingual education and all-English programs and also for ELs learning English and for native English speakers learning Spanish in two-way bilingual programs. The consistent patterns that emerged across programs, however, should be interpreted with caution because the number of studies representing each program is small (1-3).

The hypothesis, then, is as follows: If ELs continue to receive explicit ELD instruction once they reach middle levels of English proficiency and as they move into early advanced and advanced levels, they can more rapidly attain native-like levels of oral proficiency and avoid the plateau many experience before becoming advanced speakers of English. Two assumptions underlie this hypothesis, and it is important to make them explicit. First, the hypothesis implicitly assumes that (a) ELs typically do not receive ELD instruction once they get to middle proficiency levels and, even less so, as they move into early advanced and advanced levels and (b) that this is perhaps one reason for the stagnation. Our observations at school sites corroborate this assumption. We rarely find cases where the ELD block, or a pull-out ELD program, or ESL coursework is maintained for ELs once they pass middle proficiency levels. However, we do not have empirical evidence to verify that this is common practice. Second, the hypothesis assumes that ELD instruction would accelerate students' language development from middle level proficiency to early advanced and on into advanced English proficiency. As we discussed in Guideline 8, however, it is probably the case that instruction for ELs at higher levels of proficiency requires considerable attention to academic language. However, again, and as reported in Guideline 8, we do not have models of ELD instruction shown to be effective in promoting ELs' academic language proficiency.

### **Guidelines Applicable to ELD but Grounded in Non-EL Research**

12) ELD Instruction should be planned and delivered with specific language objectives in mind.

The use of instructional objectives is often considered a centerpiece of effective instruction. Good objectives function as starting points and rudders to help keep lessons and activities focused and heading toward productive ends (Slavin, 2000). Yet the use of objectives can generate controversy. In their classic educational psychology textbook, Gage and Berliner (1975) identify and address a number of arguments against instructional (sometimes called "behavioral") objectives, e.g., only trivial learning outcomes can be put in behavioral terms, certain types of learning do not lend themselves to stipulating objectives, and behavioral objectives lead to mechanistic teaching. Gage and Berliner refute each argument, but acknowledge that educators do not universally subscribe to the use of instructional objectives. Moreover, the case for instructional objectives is not ironclad, and the evidence for their effects on achievement is mixed.

For example, DuChastel and Merrill (1973) found in their review that some studies report positive effects of instructional objectives on student learning while other studies do not. Similarly, Duell (1974) reviewed 8 studies, 4 showing positive effects and 4 showing negative effects of instructional objectives. On the other hand, White and Tisher (1986) reviewed a number of studies, including a meta-analysis, in science teaching and concluded that although results are mixed, "general support for the use of objectives is available" (p. 876). White and Tisher (1986) cite a meta-analysis by Boulanger that found, "Among the strongest contributors to the large effect [of using preinstructional strategies] were the five studies on the use of behavioral objectives" (p. 876). Gage and Berliner (1975), despite the mixed evidence, come down strongly on the side of using instructional objectives because of the evidence suggesting that teaching will be more focused and purposeful when teachers use explicit objectives. In a more contemporary text in educational psychology, Slavin (2000) makes a similar point, citing a study by Cooley and Leinhardt showing that the strongest predictor of student reading and math scores was the extent to which students were actually taught the skills that were tested. Although this might seem mundane common sense, Slavin draws the conclusion that instructional objectives enhance learning outcomes "to the degree to which objectives, teaching, and assessment are coordinated with one another" (p. 465).

What we do not know empirically is the degree to which what seems to be generally true for other academic subjects also holds true for ELD instruction. However, we would like to elaborate on a potential connection between the more general research on instructional objectives and evidence on second language instruction reported earlier. Norris and Ortega (2000) found strong effects for explicit instruction of targeted language forms. As operationalized by Norris and Ortega, explicit instruction constituted lessons wherein students were provided with an explanation or presentation of the rule or language form or specific directions to attend to a particular language form. A subset of the studies analyzed by Norris and Ortega included direct contrasts between treatments that specifically focused students' attention on the targeted language form and comparison conditions that involved simple exposure to or experience with the same language form. Such comparisons showed that explicit instruction that directs student attention to the targeted language form can substantially increase the success of such lessons. It is quite possible that formulating clear language objectives would support teachers' efforts to effectively direct students' attention to the targeted language form. Thus our hypothesis is that

instructional objectives will be as useful for ELD instruction as it is for other types of academic instruction. California's ELD standards should serve as the foundation for ELD instructional objectives.

13) ELs should be carefully grouped for ELD Instruction, not in classrooms segregated by language proficiency, but by language proficiency for specific ELD Instruction.

Should ELs be grouped with other ELs or kept with English speakers? If grouped with other ELs, should they be with others at similar language levels, or should they be in mixed-language level groups? If grouped with others at similar language levels, for what purposes and for how much of the school day? We know of no research to answer these questions directly. However, as is the case for instructional objectives, many studies have examined the pros and cons of different types of grouping arrangements in other content areas, primarily, reading and mathematics. This research, which has been synthesized by Slavin (1987, 1989), suggests the following:

1. Keeping students of different achievement/ability levels in entirely separate ("homogeneous") classes for the entire school day (and throughout the school year) leads to depressed achievement among lower achieving students with little to no benefit for average and higher achieving students. A possible exception is for extremely high-achieving students (sometimes referred to as "gifted"), whose achievement can be significantly enhanced in homogeneous classes with other extremely high-achieving students. Unfortunately, we have found no studies that have looked at grouping practices for extremely high achieving ELs.

2. Students in mixed ("heterogeneous") classrooms can be productively grouped by achievement level for instruction in specific subjects (e.g., math or reading). Grouping can be done with students in the same classroom or students in different classrooms (the latter is sometimes called "Joplin plans"). In contrast to keeping students in homogeneous classes throughout the day (#1, above), grouping students by achievement in specific subjects will result in enhanced achievement at all ability levels provided (a) instruction is well-tailored to students' instructional level and (b) students are frequently assessed and regrouped as needed to maintain optimal match with their instructional needs, that is, students are taught what they need to know to make continuous progress.

There are many ways that second-language learning might be very different from learning school subject matter such as reading and mathematics. Consequently, it is difficult to know if we can apply findings based on reading and mathematics to ELD instruction. On the other hand, and to the extent that second-language learning is analogous to learning in other curriculum areas, findings from the ability grouping literature serve as a useful starting place to make decisions about how to group ELs.

These findings suggest that ELs should not be segregated into all-EL classrooms, much less into classrooms consisting of all high-achieving ELs or all low-achieving ELs. Instead, ELs should be in mixed-ability (heterogeneous) classrooms, but then grouped by English language proficiency specifically for ELD instruction. Moreover, they should be regularly assessed to monitor their progress and make certain that instruction and group placement are well-suited to

their language-learning needs. Presumably, as ELs gain in English language proficiency, they can and should receive increasing amounts of instruction with students who are already proficient in English. (For further discussion of grouping see, in this volume, Genesee and Lindholm-Leary for dual language programs and Dolson and Burnham-Massey for English medium programs.)

14) The likelihood of establishing and/or sustaining an effective ELD Instructional program increases when schools and districts make it a priority.

A sizeable literature suggests that a sustained and coherent focus on academic goals in schools and districts is associated with higher levels of student achievement. However, because of the near-absence of experimental research and detailed case studies in this area, it is very difficult to draw firm conclusions about cause and effect. Moreover, some researchers have concluded that 'distal' factors such as school and district policies are too removed from students' daily experience to have much impact on their achievement (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993). Nonetheless, there is at least some consensus in the published literature that what gets emphasized in schools and districts can influence what teachers do and students learn. Numerous dimensions of school and district functioning--leadership, common goals and curricula, professional development, on going support and supervision, regular assessments that inform instruction--are levers school and district administrators can use to help shape the academic experiences of students (e.g., Edmonds, 1979; Fullan, 2007; Good & Brophy, 1986; Joyce & Showers, 1983; Goldenberg, 2004; McDougall, Saunders, & Goldenberg, 2007).

A recent study suggests the same holds true for English learners: What school and district leadership emphasize has an influence on what students learn. Parrish, Merickel, Perez, et al., (2006) found that relatively high-achieving California schools with high EL concentrations shared various characteristics that converged on making EL achievement a priority. At the school level, according to principals, there was a school-wide focus on ELD and standards-based instruction; shared priorities and expectations regarding the education of ELs; and curriculum, instruction, and resources targeted at ELs. District administrators cited a shared vision and plan for EL achievement and professional development, resources, and school and classroom organization to support EL achievement. It is important to bear in mind that "high achieving" in this study was defined as high levels of academic achievement (literacy and other content areas), *not* necessarily high levels of English language development. Parrish et al. note, however, that inclusion of CELDT scores as a criterion for the selection of high-achieving schools "seemed to have little to no impact on the lists of top-ranked schools that were generated" (p. IV-10), suggesting that among the high-achieving schools, ELs tended to perform well on both English language development tests (CELDT) and academic achievement tests (CST).

Although far from definitive, available research suggests that one way to promote higher levels of English language development among ELs is to make sure it is a school- and district-wide priority. As is true in other areas of academic achievement, the direction set by school and district leadership is likely to influence what is emphasized in classrooms. It is no guarantee, of course, and without the other factors considered in this chapter and volume, school or district priorities are by themselves unlikely to have an effect. But, together with curriculum and instruction based on the best research currently available, and reasonable inferences drawn from it, a high priority placed on ELD instruction by schools and districts is likely to contribute to

promoting higher levels of English acquisition by ELs.

### Summary and Conclusions

In this final section we attempt to offer a synthesis of the research summarized in the chapter. Our goal is to provide a set of implications for practice and policy that are as clear as possible, given the tenuous nature of many of the findings. (See Table A2 in Appendix A to complement the discussion below).

Our review of the research suggests there is good evidence for the following practice guidelines:

- 1) ELLs should be provided with ELD instruction (rather than merely being provided with large amounts of exposure and input).
- 2) Interactive activities must be carefully planned and carried out (rather than being left unstructured and open-ended).

Both guidelines are quite reliable, since they are based on a number of studies, many of them experiments, that converge on these findings. Both guidelines also have adequate support from studies conducted with ELs in the U.S. and from studies that use measures of language proficiency. The research supporting guideline #2 provides direction about the design of effective interactive activities, including the nature and structure of interactive tasks, the level of proficiency of the ELs, and the various ways in which ELs might be paired together during interactive tasks.

We consider the following guidelines hypotheses. That is, there are insufficient studies to constitute strong, reliable findings, and the studies that do exist have been conducted with only a small portion of the U.S. EL population, thus limiting their generalizability. Although enough evidence exists to consider these "best guesses" at the moment, future research might well cause us to revise these estimates:

- 3) A separate, daily block of time should be devoted to ELD Instruction.
- \*4) The ELD block should emphasize listening and speaking although it can incorporate reading and writing.
- 5) ELD instruction should teach elements of English explicitly (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, grammar, conventions).
- 6) ELD instruction should integrate meaning and communication to support explicit teaching of language.
- 7) ELD instruction should provide students with corrective feedback on form, and explicit feedback may be more effective than implicit feedback.
- 8) Use of English during ELD instruction should be maximized; L1 should be used strategically.
- 9) Teachers should attend to communication and language learning strategies and incorporate them into ELD instruction.
- \*10) ELD Instruction should emphasize academic language as well as conversational language.
- \*11) ELD Instruction should continue at least until students reach level 4 (advanced intermediate) and possibly through level 5 (advanced).

Of these eight guidelines, the strongest (indicated by \*) are 4 (the ELD block should emphasize listening and speaking), 10 (ELD instruction should emphasize academic language as well as conversational), and 11 (ELD instruction should continue through the higher levels of English language proficiency). However, with the exception of O'Brien (2007) and Saunders et al. (2006) for Guideline 3, there are no experimental or quasi-experimental studies (comparing specific instructional approaches) supporting any of these hypotheses, so they have not been tested directly. The studies that exist provide circumstantial evidence suggesting differences in student language development as a result of different types of instruction, but the evidence is not as strong as it is in the first group of practice guidelines. In addition, although all of the studies for guidelines 4, 10, and 11 focus on U.S. English learners, most focus on the elementary and not on the secondary grades. The studies do have good outcome relevance, however, since they use measures of English language proficiency rather than narrow tests of specific language forms or functions.

Guidelines #5 (elements of English such as vocabulary and grammar should be taught explicitly) has a strong supportive body of evidence, but very few of the studies were conducted with U.S. English learners in grades K through 12 or use outcome measures that are good gauges of language proficiency; instead most use narrow assessments that measure specific language features, such as word order, verb conjugation, relative clauses, compliments, and questions forms. Nonetheless, we still believe that guideline 5 is probably valid for English learners in the U.S. There is considerable evidence from literacy instruction that teaching specific components of literacy makes a contribution to literacy development (see August and Shanahan, this volume). Although there are limits to the analogy between literacy development and oral language development, it is likely that both respond to comparable instructional approaches. The study by O'Brien (2007) with California first graders suggested that an ELD program that included explicitly teaching elements of English (grammar, functions, etc.) produced more growth in language development than approaches that did not explicitly teach these elements.

Guideline #6 brings together critical elements around which there are differing views: explicit instruction of language forms and the role of meaning, communication, and authentic and functional language use in the service of language learning. The truth is there is no definitive empirical answer about the appropriate balance and exact relationships among these elements. Recall Ellis' statement cited near the beginning of this chapter: "...research and theory do not afford a uniform account of how instruction can best facilitate language learning." We know, empirically, that it is probably detrimental to language learning to leave explicit instruction out of the equation, but how—in an ELD instructional context—meaning and authentic and functional use complement explicit instruction is just not known at this time. We concluded based on our review of the literature that all of these elements are important for ELD instruction. The major challenge for instructional design and subsequent research is determining the right balance among these elements. With such subsequent work in mind, we would add one other observation. The construct of "meaning" can and should remain a central topic in subsequent research. Most first and second language acquisition theories posit a role for meaning-making in the acquisition process. Our review of current research, however, suggests that meaning—as an element of an instructional approach or intervention—is typically not

sufficiently operationalized to study and understand its nature and/or contribution to language acquisition and learning.

The other four guidelines in this group--3 (use a separate, daily ELD block), 7 (provide corrective feedback on form), 8 (maximize the use of English during ELD instruction), and 9 (incorporate communication and language learning strategies in ELD instruction) have either very few studies and/or have examined only a tiny fraction of the K-12 English learner population. There is compelling evidence for guideline 7 insofar as the effects of corrective feedback (either implicit or explicit) have been successfully replicated in both classroom and laboratory contexts but not with U.S. English learner populations. In the case of guidelines 8 and 9 only one study supporting each guideline actually used student English language proficiency measures as an outcome variable; thus we know very little about the effect of maximizing English use during ELD instruction (guideline 8) or incorporating communication and language learning strategies (guideline 9) on students' English language development. Guideline 3 (use a separate, daily ELD block) had the most valid outcome measures, but there are only two studies, and they were conducted with kindergarten and grade 1 students.

Our third category of guidelines draws from the broader educational literature, not from research on ELs per se:

- 12) ELD instruction should be planned and delivered with specific language objectives in mind.
- 13) ELs should be carefully grouped for ELD Instruction, not in classrooms segregated by language proficiency, but by language proficiency for specific ELD Instruction .
- 14) The likelihood of establishing and/or sustaining an effective ELD instructional program increases when schools and districts make it a priority.

These guidelines are not definitive in the context ELD instruction for English learners, but they are generally accepted as meaningful and reliable within education research more broadly defined. The issue for ELD instruction is generalizability. Do these guidelines apply to schools and classroom contexts serving EL populations and specifically with regard to ELD instruction? This is clearly an empirical question, although our experience leads us to believe they do. While we have not tested these specific guidelines in our own EL and school improvement studies, they are consistent with what we have observed in our work trying to help schools with large numbers of ELs become more effective schools.

Clearly there is much work to be done to develop an empirical research base from which to build effective ELD instructional programs. As we said at the beginning of the chapter, however, many sources and resources might guide the direction of ELD instruction, including theory, research, ELD standards, practitioner experience, and published programs. Our experience in schools throughout California suggests there is growing attention to ELD instruction and important efforts underway to develop effective ELD programs for both elementary and secondary school students. There is also growing attention to the matter of academic language proficiency. It is imperative to complement these efforts and interest with careful research and evaluation. From our experience, strong opinion too often trumps careful weighing of evidence.

Current accountability practices shine a bright spotlight on the progress of ELs--or the lack thereof. This could be a good thing for schools and ELs, or it could be very problematic. It could produce a strong and long-term commitment towards building effective programs for ELs; or it could result in a frenzied search for the next quick fix. The major theme of this entire volume is that success for ELs likely requires comprehensive programs and approaches that incorporate ELD instruction, strong English literacy instruction, effective sheltered instruction in the content areas, and--ideally--effective use of students' primary language. The major theme of this specific chapter is that we have a lot to learn about what constitutes effective ELD instruction. Nothing in this chapter or this volume suggests there are quick fixes waiting around the corner for schools and districts trying to meet next year's accountability criteria. For ELD instruction specifically and educating ELs more generally, success is going to require a sustained effort informed by attention to both evidence and thoughtful practice.



## References

- Alcón, Eva. "Research on Language and Learning: Implications for Language Teaching," *International Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 4 (2004), 173-196.
- Ammar, Ahlem, and Nina Spada. "One Size Fits All? Recasts, Prompts, and L2 learning," *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 28 (December 2006), 543-574.
- August, Diane. "Effects of Peer Tutoring on the Second Language Acquisition of Mexican-American Children in Elementary School," *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 21 (December 1987), 717-736.
- August, Diane and Timothy Shanahan. *Developing Literacy in Second-Language Learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2006.
- Bailey, Alison. *The Language of School: Putting Academic English to the Test*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Bailey, Alison L., and Frances A. Butler. "An Evidentiary Framework for Operationalizing Academic Language for Broad Application to K-12 Education: A Design Document." Los Angeles: University of California, 2002. (National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST)).
- Carlisle, Joanne, and others. "Relationship of Metalinguistic Capabilities and Reading Achievement for Children Who Are Becoming Bilingual," *Applied Psycholinguistics*, Vol. 20 (December 1999), 459-478.
- Carrier, Karen. "Improving High School English Language Learners' Second Language Listening Through Strategy Instruction." *Bilingual Research Journal*, Vol. 27 (Fall 2003), 383-408.
- Cathcart-Strong, Ruth. "Input Generation by Young Second Language Learners," *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 20 (September 1986), 515-529.
- Chamot, Anna. "Language Learning Strategy Instruction: Current Issues and Research," *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 25 (July 2005), 112-130.
- The CALLA Handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*. (1994 Edition). Compiled by Anna Chamot and J. Michael O'Malley. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1994.
- Chesterfield, Ray, and Kathleen Barrows Chesterfield. "Natural Order in Children's Use of Second Language Learning Strategies," *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 6 (1985), 45-59.

Chesterfield, Ray, and Kathleen Barrows Chesterfield. "'Hoja's with the H": Spontaneous Peer Teaching in Bilingual Classrooms," *Bilingual Review*, Vol. 12 (September-December 1985), 198-208.

Chesterfield, Ray, and others. "The Influence of Teachers and Peers on Second Language Acquisition in Bilingual Preschool Programs," *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 17 (September 1983), 401-419.

Collier, Virginia. "Age and Rate of Acquisition of Second Language for Academic Purposes," *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 21 (1987), 617-41.

Cummins, James. "The Construct of Language Proficiency in Bilingual Education," in *Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics*. James E. Alatis. Washington: DC Georgetown University Press, 1980.

Cummins, James. "Wanted: A Theoretical Framework for Relating Language Proficiency to Academic Achievement Among Bilingual Students," in *Language Proficiency and Academic Achievement*. Charlene Rivera. Clevedon: England Multilingual Matters, 1984.

DeKeyser, Robert, and Alan Juffs. "Cognitive Considerations in L2 Learning," in *The Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Eli Hinkel. Mahwah: NJ Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005, pp. 437-454.

DuChastel, Phillippe, and Paul Merrill. "The Effects of Behavioral Objectives on Learning: A Review of Empirical Studies," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 43 (1973), 53-69.

Duell, Orpha. "Effect of Type of Objective, Level of Test Questions, and the Judged Importance of Tested Materials upon Test Performance," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 66 (April 1974), 225-232.

Edmonds, Ronald. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 37 (October 1979), 15-27.

Ellis, Rod. "Communicative Language Teaching: Strategies and Goals," in *The Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Eli Hinkel. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005b, pp. 635-651.

Ellis, Rod. "Principles of Instructed Language Learning," *System*, Vol. 33 (June 2005), 209-224.

Ellis, Rod; Shawn Loewen; and Rosemary Erlam. "Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar," *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 28 (June 2006), 339-368.

Foster, Pauline, and Amy Snyder Ohta. "Negotiation for Meaning and Peer Assistance in Second Language Classrooms," *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 26 (September 2005), 402-430.

- Fullan, Michael. *The New Meaning of Educational Change (4th Edition)*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, (2007).
- Gage, Nathaniel, and David Berliner. *Educational pPhology*. Chicago: Rand McNally, (1975).
- Garcia-Vázquez, Enedina, Luis A. Vasquez, Isabel C. Lopez, and Wendy Ward. "Language Proficiency and Academic Success: Relationships Between Proficiency in Two Languages and Achievement Among Mexican-American Students," *Bilingual Research Journal*, Vol. 21 (Fall 1997), 395-408.
- Gersten, Russell, and others. *Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades*. NCEE 2007-4001. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Educational Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, 2007. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee>
- Genesee, Fred. *Program Alternatives for Linguistically Diverse Students (Educational Practice Report 1)*. Santa Cruz, CA and Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, 1999.
- Genesee, Fred, and others. *Educating English Language Learners: A Synthesis of Research Evidence*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Goldenberg, Claude. *Successful School Change: Creating Settings to Improve Teaching and Learning*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2004.
- Goldenberg, Claude. "Teaching English Language Learners: What the Research Does—and Does nNot—Say," *American Educator*, Vol. 32 (Summer 2008), 8-23, 42-44.
- Goldstein, Barbara Comoe; Kathleen Harris; and M. Diane Klein. "Assessment of Oral Storytelling Abilities of Latino Junior High School Students with Learning Handicaps." *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, Vol. 26 (February 1993), 138-143.
- Good, Tom, and Brophy, Jerry. "School Effects," in *The Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd Ed.) Merlin Wittrock. New York, NY: Macmillan, 1986, pp. 570-602.
- Hakuta, Kenji.; Butler, Yuko Goto; and Witt, Daria. *How Long Does It Take English Learners to Attain Proficiency?* Linguistic Minority Research Institute, 2000. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. FL 026 180). (Available at LMRI website: [http://www.lmri.ucsb.edu/rsdiss/pdf\\_files/hakuta.pdf](http://www.lmri.ucsb.edu/rsdiss/pdf_files/hakuta.pdf)).
- Howard, Elizabeth; Christian, Donna; and Genesee, Fred. *The Development of Bilingualism and Biliteracy from grade 3 to 5: A Summary of Findings from the Cal/CREDE Study of Two-way Immersion Education*. Santa Cruz, CA, and Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, 2003.

- Jacob, Evelyn, and others. "Cooperative Learning: Context and Opportunities for Acquiring Academic English," *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 30 (Summer 1996), 253-280.
- Johnson, Donna M. "Natural Language Learning by Design: A Classroom Experiment in Social Interaction and Second Language Acquisition," *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 17 (March 1983), 55-68.
- Johnson, Karen. *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Joyce, Bruce; Beverly Showers; and Carol Rolheiser-Bennett. "Staff Development and Student Learning: A Synthesis of Research on Models of Teaching," *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 45 (October 1987), 11-23.
- Keck, Cornelia, and others. "Investigating the Empirical Link Between Task-Based Interaction and Acquisition: A Meta-analysis," in *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching*. John M. Norris, and Lourdes Ortega. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 2006, pp. 91-131.
- Krashen, Stephen. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982.
- Lindholm, Kathryn. "English Question Use in Spanish-speaking ESL Children: Changes with English Language Proficiency." *Research in the Teaching of English* Vol. 21 (February 1987), 64-91.
- Lindholm-Leary, Kathryn. *Dual Language Education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2001.
- Loban, Walter. *Language Development: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* (Research Report No. 18). Urbana, ILL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1976.
- Long, Michael. "Does Second Language Instruction Make a Difference? A Review of Research," *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 17 (September 1983), 359-382.
- Long, Michael. "The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition," in *Handbook of Research on Language Acquisition: Second Language Acquisition 2*. W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bahtia. New York: Academic Press, 1996, pp. 413-468.
- Lyster, Roy. "Research on Form-focused Instruction in Immersion Classrooms: Implications for Theory and Practice," *Journal of French language Studies*, Vol. 14 (November 2004), 321-341.
- Lyster, Roy. "Differential eEffects of Prompts and Recasts in Form-focused Instruction," *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 26 (September 2004), 399-432.

- Lyster, Roy. *Learning and Teaching Languages Through Content: A Counterbalanced Approach*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 2007.
- Lyster, Roy, and Leila Ranta. "Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms," *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 19 (March 1997), 37-66.
- Malave, Lilliam. "Contextual Elements in a Bilingual Cooperative Setting: The Experiences of Early Childhood LEP Learners," *NABE Journal*, Vol. 13 (1989), 96-122.
- McDougall, Dennis; William Saunders; and Claude Goldenberg. "Inside the Black Box of School Reform: Explaining the How and Why of Change at Getting Results Schools," *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, Vol. 54 (March 2007), 51-89.
- Medina, Marcello, and Kathy Escamilla. "English Acquisition by Fluent- and Limited-Spanish-proficient Mexican-Americans in a 3-year Maintenance Bilingual Program," *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 14 (May 1992), 252-267.
- Milk, Roberto. *Language Use in Bilingual Classrooms: Two Case Studies*. In M. Hines & W. Rutherford (Eds.), *On TESOL '81* Washington, DC: TESOL, 1982, pp. 181-191.
- Nassaji, Hossein, and Sandra Fotos. "Current Developments in Research on the Teaching of Grammar," *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 24 (March 2004), 126-145.
- Norris, John M., and Lourdes Ortega. "Effectiveness of L2 Instruction: A Research Synthesis and Quantitative Meta-analysis." *Language Learning*, Vol. 50 (September 2000), 417-528.
- O'Brien, Gisela. "The Instructional Features Across Three Different Approaches to Oral English Language Development Instruction." University of Southern California, 2007 (unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- O'Malley, J. Michael, and others. "Learning Strategy applications with Students of English as a Second Language," *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 19 (September 1985), 557-584.
- Parrish, Thomas B., and others. *Effects of the Implementation of Proposition 227 on the Education of English Learners, K-12: Findings from a Five-Year Evaluation*. Final Report for AB 56 and AB 1116, *American Institutes for Research & WestEd*, 2006.
- Pease-Alvarez, Lucinda, and Adam Winsler. "Cuando el Maestro No Habla Espanol: Children's Bilingual Language Practices in the Classroom," *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 28 (Fall 1994), 507-535.
- Peck, Sabrina. "Signs of Learning: Child Nonnative Speakers in Tutoring Sessions with a Child Native Speaker," *Language Learning*, Vol. 37 (December 1987), 545-571.

- Public Agenda. *A Mission of the Heart: Leaders in High-needs Districts Talk About What it Takes to Transform a School*. New York: Public Agenda, 2008. Available at [http://www.publicagenda.org/research/research\\_reports\\_details.cfm?list=118](http://www.publicagenda.org/research/research_reports_details.cfm?list=118)
- Rodriguez-Brown, Flora. "Questioning Patterns and Language Proficiency in Bilingual Students," *NABE Journal*, Vol. 13 (1987), 217-233.
- Royer, James, and Carlo, Maria. "Transfer of Comprehension Skills from Native to Second Language," *Journal of Reading*, Vol. 34 (March 1991), 450-455.
- Russell, James, & Nina Spada. "The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback for the Acquisition of L2 Grammar," in *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching*. James M. Norris and Lourdes Ortega. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 2006, pp. 133-164.
- Saunders, William. "Improving Literacy Achievement for English Learners in Transitional Bilingual Programs," *Educational Research and Evaluation* Vol. 5 (December 1999), 345-381.
- Saunders, William; Barbara Foorman; and Colleen Carlson. "Is a Separate Block of Time for Oral English Language Development in Programs of English-learners Needed?" *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 107 (November 2006), 181-198.
- Saville-Troike, Muriel. "What Really Matters in Second Language Learning for Academic Achievement?" *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 18 (June 1984), 199-219.
- Scarcella, Robin. *Accelerating Academic English: A Focus on the English Learner*. Oakland, CA: Regents of the University of California, 2003.
- Short, Deborah, and Shannon Fitzsimmons. *Double the Work: Challenges and Solutions to Acquiring Language and Academic Literacy for Adolescent English Language Learners*. A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education, 2007.
- Slavin, Robert. "Ability Grouping and Student Achievement in Elementary Schools: A Best-Evidence Synthesis," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 57 (Fall 1987), 293-336.
- Slavin, Robert. *School and Classroom Organization*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1989.
- Slavin, Robert. *Educational Psychology*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2000.
- Squire, James. "The History of the Profession," in *The Handbook of Research on Teaching the English Language Arts*. James Flood, and others. New York: Macmillan, 1991, pp. 3-17.

- Snow, Catherine E., and others. "Giving formal definitions: a linguistic or metalinguistic skill?" in *Language Processing in Bilingual Children*. Ellen Bialystok. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, pp. 90-113.
- Snow, Catherine, and others. *Second Language Learners' Formal Definitions: An Oral Language Correlate of School Literacy* (Tech. Rep. No. 5). Los Angeles: University of California, Center for Language Education and Research, 1987.
- Spada, Nina, and Patsy Lightbown. "Form-focused Instruction: Isolated or Integrated?" *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 42 (June 2008), 181-207.
- Stevens, Robin; Frances Butler; and Martha Castellon-Wellington. *Academic English and Content Assessment: Measuring the Progress of ELLs*: (CSE Tec. Rep. No. 552). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST), 2000.
- Strong, Michael. "Social Styles and the Second Language acquisition of Spanish-speaking Kindergartners," *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 17 (June 1983), 241-258.
- Strong, Michael. "Integrative Motivation: Cause or Result of Successful Second Language Acquisition?" *Language Learning* Vol. 34 (September 1984), 1-13.
- Thomas, Wayne, and Virginia Collier. *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students' Long-term Academic Achievement Final Report: Project 1.1* Santa Cruz, CA, and Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, 2002.
- Ulibarri, Daniel M., and others. "Language Proficiency and Academic Achievement: A Study of Language Proficiency Tests and Their Relationship to School Ratings as Predictors of Academic Achievement," *NABE Journal*, Vol. 5 (Spring 1981), 47-79.
- Vandergrift, Larry. "It Was Nice to See That Our Predictions Were Right: Developing Metacognition in L2 Listening Comprehension," *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des langues vivantes*, Vol. 58 (June 2002), 55-575.
- Valdes, Guadalupe. "Between Support and Marginalization: The Development of Academic Language in Linguistic Minority Children," *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Vol. 7 (2004), 102-132.
- Vygotsky, Lev. *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1962.
- Wang, Margaret; Geneva Haertel; and Herbert Walberg. "Toward a Knowledge Base for School Learning," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 63 (Fall 1993), 249-294.

Saunders & Goldenberg, Submitted December 1, 2008

Watson-Gegeo, Karen, and Sarah Nielsen. "Language Socialization in SLA," in *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Catherine J. Doughty and Michael H. Long. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003, pp. 155-177.

Weslander, Darrell and Gene V. Stephany. "Evaluation of an English as a Second Language Program for Southeast Asian Students," *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 17 (September 1983), 473-480.

White, Richard and Richard Tisher. "Research on Natural Sciences," in *The Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd Ed.). Merlin Wittrock. NY: Macmillan, 1986, pp. 874-905.



Appendix A

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
<b>For Which There is Evidence from EL Research</b>			
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)
<b>Based on Hypotheses Emerging from Recent EL Research</b>			
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), Ullbarri et al. (1981)	Studies listed to the left are synthesized in Genesee, et al. (2006)	
<i>Studies of ELD Instruction.</i>			
5) ELD instruction should teach elements of English explicitly (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, grammar, function).	Saunders, et al. (2006), O'Brien (2007)		
6) ELD instruction should integrate meaning to support language learning and explicit teaching of language.	O'Brien (2007)	Genesee, et al. (2006) Lyster (2007)	Norris and Ortega (2000) August and Shanahan, this volume Norris and Ortega (2000)
7) ELD instruction should provide students with corrective feedback on form.	Ammar & Spada (2006), Ellis, Lowen, & Eplam (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. (2006)	