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This study was an initial attempt to examine the assumption of a relationship between the subcomponent of Academic Language, Academic Vocabulary, and student and teacher knowledge as well as instruction and assessment in the fourth grade. To help investigate the researcher’s claims, the study also evaluated the effectiveness of an independent vocabulary program.

Coupled with a comprehensive literature review, this study utilized both qualitative and quantitative research. The researcher analyzed the use of Academic Vocabulary words taught in a state-approved ELA curriculum and compared them to the words used on the California Standards English Language Arts Tests in fourth grade. Data collected from a teacher survey and a student survey were used to evaluate the need for Academic Language and Vocabulary. Finally, the researcher evaluated an independent vocabulary program using pre- and post-assessments to help determine the effectiveness of an independent vocabulary program on a standardized exam.

Data show that the deficiency is evident when students and teachers are asked to define Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary and how it is instructed in class.
Also, the appearance of Academic Vocabulary on the California Standards Test shows a
definitive need to teach Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. With the
research and data to substantiate the need, it is recommended an Academic Language
Development program be created and modeled after the English Language Development
program.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Academic language can best be identified by describing the academic language functions and the level of the thinking and reasoning skills needed to accomplish specific content activities. Thus discrete language elements such as vocabulary, grammatical structures, spelling, and pronunciation are integrated into the language functions used in the content activities, not taught as separate components.

- Anna Uhl Chamot (2009)

The purpose of this study was to examine the assumption of a relationship between Academic Language\(^1\) (AL) instruction and assessment within the context of English language arts. A supplemental goal of the study was to set some of the groundwork of understanding for future studies to build on. Specifically, the study focused on a subcomponent of AL, Academic Vocabulary\(^2\), and more specifically Academic Vocabulary in the fourth grade of a northern California public elementary school. The research was based on the same learning theories and language acquisition process used for English Language Development\(^3\) (ELD), which was applied toward the

\(^1\) As defined by the researcher, Academic Language is the formal register of language used in the educational setting.

\(^2\) Academic Vocabulary is the list of robust words found in books, tests, and formal writing. This definition will be expanded upon in Chapters 1 and 2.

\(^3\) English Language Development is the standards and frameworks governing English language arts for English Language Learners.
formation of Academic Language Development\(^4\) (ALD). The researcher determined if the Academic Vocabulary, as identified by Coxhead (2002), are used in fourth-grade English language arts vocabulary curriculum and on the fourth-grade California Standards Test public release questions. By doing so, the researcher examined whether there was a need for Academic Language Development standards and framework in addition to the current content and ELD framework. Secondly, the researcher explored the effectiveness of an already implemented and established vocabulary program to propose a learning model for Academic Vocabulary. Finally, multiple surveys were used to determine the current understanding of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary by students and teachers. As a culminating result, a summary, conclusion, and recommendations were developed and outlined for use in future studies.

Problem Statement

*Academic Language* is not yet clearly defined or even a formal academic subject in K-12 curriculum. Consequently, the literature and research surrounding this subject is meager at best. All students, Second Language Learners and English Only (EO) learners, are at various stages of their language development and should be considered Second Language and Academic Language Learners. As repeatedly shown on California Standards Tests (CST) and Scholastic Aptitude Test and Placement Exams, the performance of Second Language Learners or English Language Learners (ELL)

\(^4\) Academic Language Development is the standards and frameworks proposed for Academic Language Learners.
exemplifies the result of the weak Academic Language instruction that occurs within our public school English Language Development (ELD) system. When compared to scores of 60% proficient, or advanced, for non-ELL students, Second Language Learners score around 20% proficient or advanced (Elk Grove Unified School District [EGUSD], 2008). These data directly exemplify the achievement gap. With the goal of eliminating the achievement gap between EO and ELL students, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) requires that all students achieve proficiency in English language arts by 2014. Even subgroups considered at-risk must demonstrate continuous progress toward proficiency in the core academic areas of English language arts, as measured by their performance on state assessments, or in the case of California, the CST. Failure to improve could result in serious consequences for the school, the district, the state, and most importantly, the students.

Following the introductory chapter, the researcher outlines the basic research underlying current learning theories, Second Language Acquisition, and English Language Development. The researcher then discusses domains and registers of English, including Academic Language with more attention given to Academic Vocabulary. Next, the study outlines instruction, assessment, and accountability as well as the legal, legislative, and leadership implications of Academic Language Development. The culmination of the literature review along with the research conducted and explained in Chapters 3, 4, and 5, answer the study’s three main research questions:
1. To what degree do the fourth-grade English language arts curriculum and the fourth-grade English Language Arts California Standards Test include Academic Vocabulary?

2. What is the impact of a specialized and supplementary “Academic” Vocabulary instructional program on the students’ Academic Language achievement and Academic Vocabulary acquisition?

3. What are students’ and teachers’ understandings about Academic Language?

Nature of the Study

The research conducted in this study utilized a mixed method style including both qualitative and quantitative research. The researcher analyzed the appearance of Academic Vocabulary words taught in a state-approved English language arts curriculum and on the California Standards Test release questions for the fourth grade. Data collected from multiple surveys of teachers and students were used to evaluate the current understanding of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary, which helped determine the need for an Academic Language Development framework and set of standards. The surveys included a sampling of teachers’ knowledge of Academic Language, their implementation and strategies for instructing Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary, and the potential need for professional development around Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. Along with the raw data of Academic Vocabulary words used in curriculum, testing, and surveys, the researcher evaluated the
effectiveness of an existing vocabulary program given to fourth-grade students. Students were given a survey along with pre- and post-assessments to evaluate the success of the program.

The overall goal of this research was to begin to provide evidence of curricular and societal needs for an Academic Language Development program. The researcher determined the extent to which Academic Vocabulary is currently taught in the fourth-grade English language arts curriculum. Additionally, the researcher used the effectiveness of an already implemented vocabulary program as a guide to an instructional model for the proposed implementation of an Academic Language Development program.

**Conceptual Framework**

Figure 1 and the corresponding description is the researcher’s design of a Second Language Learner’s pathway for acquiring a second language. Additionally, the diagram assumes the acquisition of Academic Language is a similar process to acquiring the English Language as a second language. Therefore, the newly developed Academic Language Learner pathway parallels the already established English Language Learner pathway.
As illustrated in Figure 1, a Limited Language Proficient (LLP) student is one who has not mastered a language including reading, writing, speaking, and comprehension in either their primary language (L1) or a second language (L2). Consequently, having Limited Language Proficiency in a student’s L2 would make them a Second Language Learner (SLL). A student who is not proficient in English is
considered an English Language Learner (ELL) since he/she is learning English. Researchers have developed frameworks and curriculum guides for implementing second language instruction in public education for ELL students, known as English Language Development (ELD). Once a student has mastered a second language, such as English, they are considered to have obtained Second Language Proficiency (SLP) and have Second Language Acquisition (SLA). As illustrated on the right side of the diagram, Academic Language Learners (ALL) are students whose primary language may or may not be English yet they are still LLP in Academic Language (AL). Academic Language is a second language to all learners and, as the current study suggests, needs explicit instruction based on a framework and curriculum guide modeled from second language curriculum called Academic Language Development (ALD). Parallel to the ELL student pathway, once ALLs master AL through ALD, they reach the end state of SLP and have acquired the second language, AL.

Operational Definitions

The following operational definitions are terms utilized throughout this research and are predominant in the field of study. Because some of these definitions are used interchangeably and lack consistency throughout the field of research, the researcher established “working definitions” to normalize the research conducted in this study.
Limited English Proficient

The term proficient is widely used throughout the educational field. It is used in terms of a student’s performance level on standardized test scores as well as a labeling system for students’ overall performance levels when they are from a home where a language other than English is spoken. Nationwide, students are identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) if they have specific characteristics pertaining to their academic success and primary language as defined in NCLB.

Under NCLB, students are considered LEP if their primary language is not English or they were born outside the United States, are between the ages of 3 and 21, and are currently enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary or secondary school. Students who are Native Americans, Alaska natives, or are a native living in outlying areas are also considered LEP. In addition, the definition includes students who are migratory or come from environments where a language other than English is the primary language, which makes a significant impact on the student’s English language proficiency. NCLB identified the student’s ability in speaking, reading, writing, and understanding English as determining factors for a student to be LEP. If students are unable to perform at a proficient level of state assessments, achieve successfully in a classroom where English is the primary language, or are not able to fully participate in society due to the lack of knowledge of the English language, they are considered LEP (NCLB, 2001).
The researcher defined LEP as it pertains to English; yet these definitions can be used for any language that is not a student’s primary language. In this research, the term Limited Language Proficient (LLP) will be used to refer to the student’s difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, and understanding of any language.

*Second Language Learner*

Associated with the second language acquisition process, a Second Language Learner is an individual acquiring new contextual or relative language or vocabulary that is not a part of his/her original or primary language lexicon.

*English Language Learner as described by California English Language Development Test (CELDT) Proficiency Levels)*

1. *Beginning* – Students performing at this level of English-language proficiency may demonstrate little or no receptive or productive English skills. They are beginning to understand a few concrete details during unmodified instruction. They may be able to respond to some communication and learning demands, but with many errors. Oral and written production is usually limited to disconnected words and memorized statements and questions. Frequent errors make communication difficult.

2. *Early Intermediate* – Students performing at this level of English-language proficiency continue to develop receptive and productive English skills. They are able to identify and understand more concrete details during unmodified instruction. They may be able to respond with increasing ease to more varied communication and learning demands with a reduced number of errors. Oral and written production is usually limited
to phrases and memorized statements and questions. Frequent errors still reduce communication.

3. Intermediate – Students performing at this level of English-language proficiency begin to tailor their English-language skills to meet communication and learning demands with increasing accuracy. They are able to identify and understand more concrete details and some major abstract concepts during unmodified instruction. They are able to respond with increasing ease to more varied communication and learning demands with a reduced number of errors. Oral and written production has usually expanded to sentences, paragraphs, and original statements and questions. Errors still complicate communication.

4. Early Advanced – Students performing at this level of English-language proficiency begin to combine the elements of the English language in complex, cognitively demanding situations and are able to use English as a means for learning in content areas. They are able to identify and summarize most concrete details and abstract concepts during unmodified instruction in most content areas. Oral and written production is characterized by more elaborate discourse and fully developed paragraphs and compositions. Errors are less frequent and rarely complicate communication.

5. Advanced – Students performing at this level of English-language proficiency communicate effectively with various audiences on a wide range of familiar and new topics to meet social and learning demands. For students at this level to attain the English-proficiency level of their native English-speaking peers, further linguistic
enhancement and refinement are still necessary. Students at this level are able to identify and summarize concrete details and abstract concepts during unmodified instruction in all content areas. Oral and written production reflects discourse appropriate for content areas. Errors are infrequent and do not reduce communication.

*Academic Language Working Definitions*

Due to slightly varied definitions of Academic Language by current scholars in the Academic Language field, below is a succinct list of definitions. These will be followed by the researcher’s definition used for the remainder of the study.

1. Dutro and Moran (2003) defined Academic Language proficiency as the abilities to construct meaning from oral and written language, relate complex ideas and information, recognize different features and genres, and use various linguistic strategies to communicate.

2. Diaz-Rico and Weed (2002) offered a helpful metaphor. They see Academic Language as a cognitive toolbox, that is, a set of thinking skills and language abilities used to decode and encode complex concepts.

3. Zwiers (2008) stated Academic Language is the set of words, grammar, and organizational strategies used to describe complex ideas, higher order thinking processes, and abstract concepts.

4. Cummins and Man Yee-Fun (2007) distinguish Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) from both conversational fluency and discrete language skills. They defined CALP as the ability to understand and express, in both
oral and written modes, concepts and ideas that are relevant to success in school.

5. Pauline Gibbons (2006) described the need to create a bridge between the everyday language of students with the academic registers of school.

6. Bailey and Butler (2003) defined Academic Language as the language not used in everyday informal speech that students use outside the classroom environment, but rather the language used within the classroom at a more formal register. The researchers stated,

The non-specialized language that occurs across content areas is a form of AL that is not specific to any one content area, but is nevertheless a register or a precise way of using language that is often specific to educational settings. (Bailey & Butler, 2003, p. 9)

7. According to Anstrom et al. (2010), there are three principal components of Academic Language: Lexical, Syntactic, and Discourse Patterns. The lexical component of Academic Language identifies individual words that have key conceptual meaning and can be labeled Academic Vocabulary.

8. For this study, the researcher describes Academic Language as the formal register of language used in the educational setting. Additionally, the researcher defines Academic Vocabulary as robust words not ordinarily found in a young child’s vocabulary but rather refer to vocabulary found in books, tests, and formal writing. Therefore, throughout this paper the researcher identifies Academic Vocabulary as it pertained to words in the California
Standards Test and vocabulary words found in fourth-grade English language arts curriculum.

Assumptions, Limitations, Scope, and Delimitations

This study examined the assumption of a relationship between AL instruction and assessment within the context of English Language Arts. It focused on a subcomponent of AL, Academic Vocabulary. While the researcher recognizes various levels and stages of language development, the researcher limited the study to fourth-grade students achieving basic or proficient on the California Standards Test (CST), fourth-grade English language arts (ELA) curriculum, standards, and framework adopted by the state of California. Assessments used to evaluate the curriculum include: CST, Mid-Year Program Assessment of Standards (MYPAS), and Elements of Reading: Vocabulary (EOR:V). It was assumed these assessments effectively measure strands of Word Analysis, Vocabulary, and the California fourth-grade ELA standards. Additionally, the study was limited by the research conducted in a rural town of Northern California and the population that resides within. The researcher assumed learning Academic Vocabulary improves overall academic success.

The scope of students evaluated for the research was limited to fourth graders who achieved basic and proficient on the prior years ELA CST and attended an independent vocabulary program, Elements of Reading: Vocabulary (EOR:V). The EOR:V program used during the research was assumed to be an effective model for
vocabulary instruction as well as a vocabulary program that could be used as a framework model for publisher selected words from Coxhead’s Academic Word List (2002). In the absence of access to grade appropriate academic vocabulary list, the researcher used the K-12 summative Academic Vocabulary as words researched and selected by Coxhead (2000). The Coxhead Academic Word List was compiled by Coxhead (2000) and consists of 570 word families not in the most frequent 2000 words of spoken English but that occur reasonably frequently over a very wide range of academic texts. These words are not limited to a particular field of study and, therefore, are useful to all learners. Knowledge of such high utility and high incident words increase students’ proficiency and comprehension of the English language.

The lens from which the researcher views the learning process could alter the scope of understanding. The researcher could have modeled second language learning on the foreign language framework, due to the fact that learning a Foreign Language is also second language learning. The researcher rejected this model because Foreign Language instruction is usually based on cultural “playground” or conversational language. Therefore, the researcher chose the English Language Learning model to create a general knowledge background for learning a second language. The researcher used Cognitivism including BICS and CALPS learning theory to research Academic Language Development.
Societal Need Justifying Research

As a societal problem, Academic Vocabulary is not consistently taught to students in the fourth grade as measured by standardized testing in California. Measurement is based on the requirements of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), *all* children will be advanced in English language arts on the state Standards Test. As a society, we have not met those requirements. Even if Academic Language and Vocabulary is only a part of the state and federal requirements, the educational system must implement a program that gives students the appropriate tools to meet the mandated federal goals. The identification and development of an Academic Language framework and the publication of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary standards would support students in becoming successful in school and performing well on the California Standards Test (CST).

Additionally, learning AV is one of the most reliable ways of predicting socio-economic success in the United States today (Zwiers, 2008). Learning the multiple complex features of Academic Language including AV, prepares students for “long-term success in public schools, completion of higher education, and employment with opportunity for professional advancement and financial rewards” (Rumberger & Scardella, 2000, p. 1). Academic Language involves mastery of a writing system and its particular academic conversations as well as proficiency in reading, speaking, and listening, which is a strong determinant for success in academia and the job market.
Unfortunately, Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary has not been given enough attention in the K-12 schools (Baker, 2001; Gersten & Baker, 2000; Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2000) as exemplified by 47% of University Freshman failing the English placement exam at 22 campuses of the California State University system. Consequently, our students are not prepared for success in today’s work force. Because there is currently no Academic Vocabulary Development framework, the need to conduct research in this field is evident.

Conclusion

Systemically, students are not being taught nor do they have access to Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary in public education. The deficiency is evident when students are evaluated using standardized tests. This chapter gave an overview of the research questions, methodology, frameworks, definitions, and outcomes, which are thoroughly explained in later chapters.

The second chapter cites learning theories and models used when acquiring Academic Language. The chapter reviews literature and research conducted to create the current California English Language Development framework. With this evidence and current research on Academic Language, a model and framework for California Academic Language Development is outlined. Furthermore, Chapter 2 reviews literature on the importance of leadership and the qualities a leader must possess to be a curricular
or policy change agent needed to bring Academic Language to the forefront of English language arts curriculum.

The third chapter outlines the methodology and research performed to identify vocabulary words in the CST and a district-created Mid-Year Performance Assessment (MYPAS) as well as in Open Court, one of the predominant current ELA curricula for California. Additionally, in Chapter 3, the setting, population, and data analysis is described along with the organization of the EOR:V program and how curriculum and assessments were administered to students.

Chapter 4 analyzes and reports the data from the study. The data is presented in order of teacher survey and student survey, followed by the comparison of Academic Vocabulary words on the California Standards Test release questions and Open Court Reading vocabulary. Each finding is reported with a table and description of data. Finally, Chapter 5 summarizes the research, provides a conclusion, and gives recommendations for further research.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter reviews the history and research behind second language learning and the English Language Development program to create the comprehensive platform upon which this study is based. Initially, the chapter summarizes the prominent human developmental learning theories and their relationship to second language learning. Following the section on learning theories, the chapter reviews Second Language Acquisition. Domains and Registers are then explained to understand the parts of language. Next, BICS and CALPS, casual and formal registers, are discussed to delineate language used in schools. Funneling down, Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary are thoroughly reviewed. To illustrate the implementation of Academic Language and, specifically Academic Vocabulary, instruction, assessment, and accountability is discussed. After looking at AL instruction, the chapter compares Academic Language Development to the existing English Language Development model. Next, the development, implementation, and evaluation of Federal, State, and local mandates of ELD in the “Legal and Legislative Foundations and Requirements for EL Students” section are examined. This review provides a parallel path for ALD to be developed. Finally, the chapter reviews effective leadership models to give a base of
knowledge for educational leaders to utilize this study’s information for the betterment of all students.

Relationship of Learning Theories to Second Language Acquisition

Introduction

How an individual acquires, processes, comprehends, and remembers information is the process of learning. Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is an example of the process that consists of learning a new language and vocabulary. Learning theories tend to fall into one of several paradigms, including behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, and others. These theories and models are the foundation for research, instructional design, and educational learning. The following section reviews the predominant learning theories existing in the literature and focuses on how they are related to SLA.

Learning Paradigms

The section lists theories and models of learning for educational research and practice along with the primary theorists and researchers. Behaviorism, Cognitivism, Constructivism, and Humanism are the four overarching learning paradigms. Within each paradigm, there are a number of learning theories including, but not limited to, the indicated theories below:

Behaviorist Theories:

- Behaviorism (Watson, 1930)
- Classical Conditioning (Pavlov as cited in Rescorla, 1987)
Behaviorism. The founders and proponents of Behaviorism Learning Theory are John B. Watson (1930) in the early 20th century, B.F. Skinner (1957), and Ivan Pavlov (as cited in Rescorla, 1987). The basic idea behind Watson’s Behaviorism learning theory is “stimulus-response.” In his theory, all behavior is caused by external stimuli (operant conditioning). Therefore, all behavior can be explained without the need to consider internal mental states or consciousness. Using the Behaviorist lens, a student’s ability to learn a new language would be based on positive reinforcements or avoiding negative consequences.

According to Watson (1930), the learner is viewed as passive and only responds to environmental stimuli. A subject’s behavior may be the result of reinforcement or
punishment. Pavlov (as cited in Rescorla, 1987) continued researching Watson’s theory with the study of animal behavior, including the renowned Pavlov’s dogs, and generalized it to humans. Recently, there has been a shift back to Pavlovian conditioning (Rescorla, 1987). Rescorla formulated Instrumental Behavior, which describes the amount of control one has over important events in the surrounding environment. When related to student learning Rescorla (1987) stated,

Students of learning have typically identified three elements in any instructional learning situation: a response on the part of the organism, a reinforcer that is arranged to be contingent upon that response, and a stimulus in the presence of which that contingency is arranged. (p. 119)

Skinner (1957) continued behavioral research through the lens of operant behavior. The major component of Skinner’s theory is that people respond when asked or, conversely, not asked. Another key factor to his theory was reinforcers, including verbal praise or good grades as it relates to education and the educational setting such as classroom management. Skinner stated that the ‘understanding’ of verbal behavior is something more than the use of consistent vocabulary with which specific instances may be described (Skinner, 1957). But, Skinner’s research was still only in its infancy.

Proponents for behavioral language learning as reported by Lightbown and Spada (1999) stated the Behaviorism Learning Model is basically a system of habits. Language is acquired by reaction to stimulus and receiving reinforcements. Lightbown and Spada argue that children acquire language as fast as they hear it in the environment, and, as they receive reinforcements, they realize the concepts associated with the learning. In short, the behaviorist sees language learning as “imitation, practice, reinforcement, and
habit formation” (p. 35). Using the behavioralist theory, there are many models for learning. These theories and models are not adequate for second language development due to their primitive level of learning. Lightbown and Spada (1999) argue this viewpoint, saying language is not a set of habits, but is rule-governed. The mind is responsible for perceiving and processing linguistic data. Perception and processing is exemplified with cultural communication or miscommunication. The development of a second language needs strong cognitive and interpersonal communication skills.

*Cognitivism.* Cognitive theorists view Second Language Learning as the acquisition of a complex cognitive skill. Some of the skills and sub-skills involved in the language learning process are applying grammatical rules, choosing the appropriate vocabulary, and following the pragmatic conventions governing the use of a specific language. From a cognitivist’s point of view, language has both content and developmental sequences using higher order thinking.

The founder of the Cognitivism Learning Theory is Noam Chomsky. Chomsky’s (1965) theory replaced Watson’s behaviorism in 1960s as the dominant paradigm. Noam Chomsky’s basic learning theory revolves around the idea that mental functions can be understood. In Chomsky’s theory, the learner is viewed as the information processor. The Cognitivism theory focuses on inner mental activities. In short, the theoretical concept is opening the “black box” of the human mind. In the Cognitivism model, it is necessary to determine how the learning process occurs, such as thinking, memory, knowing, and problem solving. The Cognitivism theory posits people are not simply
“programmed animals” that merely respond to environmental stimuli; people are rational beings whose action are a result of thinking. Motivation and environment affect learning. Cognitivism is much like Lightbrown and Spada’s (1999) Behaviorism Learning Model as it relates to the learning environment for a Second Language Learner.

Moving from the broad Cognitivism theory to how it relates to SLA, the cognitive stages of development were some of the primary influences for The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) Handbook (Chamot, 2009). Research for the CALLA handbook was conducted with English Language Learners. By continually expanding their understanding of specific learning strategies at different cognitive developmental stages in different subject areas, such as reading, writing, math, and science, the author was able to develop specific academic language learning strategies for a variety of students across grades and curriculum. For example, the Cognitive theory can help a teacher understand how a student is processing new information and what connections the student is making to knowledge in their first language. It also helps the teacher understand the beliefs a student has about learning a new language.

Individual students can process language differently. For example, two students learning from the same second language lesson may have two completely different learning processes. The first student believes the major task with second language acquisition is to learn the vocabulary; the second student may believe that what they know in the first language is irrelevant to the second-language acquisition and tend not to transfer knowledge acquired through their first language to their new language.
Cognitive learning theory states that learning is an active process in which learners select information from their environment, organize the information, relate it to what they already know, retain what they consider to be important, use the information in appropriate contexts, and reflect on the success of their learning efforts (Chamot, 1999).

This study focuses on Academic Language through the use of Academic Vocabulary; therefore, the researcher recognizes a student’s active cognitive process to choose an academic word over a “playground” or conversational word as the applied learning theory.

**Constructivism.** The founders and proponents of the Constructivism Learning Theory were John Dewey, Jean Piaget, and Lev Vygotsky. The basic idea behind this learning model is that learning is an active and constructive process. Through the lens of the constructivist, the Second Language Learner is viewed as an information constructor. Piaget (1985) believed people actively construct their own biased representations of objective reality. Additionally, the newly acquired language is connected to prior knowledge; consequently, mental representations would continue to be subjective.

**Humanism.** The founders and proponents of the Humanism Learning Theory were Abraham Maslow (1943) and Carl Rogers (1961). This learning model is a personal act to fulfill one’s potential. Through the Humanism lens, the Second Language Learner is viewed as someone with emotional and cognitive needs that language needs to fulfill. The theory’s emphasis is on the freedom, dignity, and potential of humans. Humanism learning is student-centered and personal. The model is facilitated by
teachers, with the goal of developing self-actualized people in a cooperative, supportive environment.

The main criticism of the Humanist theory is, while it promotes growth in cooperation, creativity, and independence while improving one’s attitude toward school and learning, research shows little effect in other areas. This was asserted in 1982 when Giaconia and Hedges (as cited in Huitt, 2009) completed a meta-analysis of 150 studies of humanistic styles of education. Giaconia and Hedges reported the findings that while there were improvements in “lower language achievement and achievement motivation,” there was “no consistent effect of math, reading, or other types of academic achievement” (Huitt, 2009, para. 10).

Conclusion

Even though each of these learning theories could explain the means or part of the means through which a student acquires a second language, the researcher uses the Cognitive lens to view second language learning in this research. The Cognitive lens describes learning through thinking, memory, knowing, and problem solving. The researcher believes these are the primary cognitive functions used during Academic Vocabulary acquisition and assessment of the newly acquired language.
Second Language Acquisition

Introduction

The process of acquiring a second language has numerous stages and multiple measures of success. This section reviews the transition from theory to process as seen in Second Language Acquisition, the difficulties acquiring another language, as well as ELD mandates and instruction. Furthermore, the section reviews accountability, placement, and how progress of second language acquisition is measured.

Process of Acquiring a Second Language

It was once thought that language acquisition was a behavioral process before Chomsky (1965) claimed the brain was actually able to receive and process language while learning the complex characteristics and conventions of language. Later Krashen (1985) extended this idea regarding second language acquisition. He stated that a child must listen to the complex vocabulary and grammar when acquiring a second language, much like the learning process of a child first learning a language. Krashen continued by stating that hearing and reading must be in authentic context to produce the most gain. This example of receiving input or information can prove to be more difficult when abstract and complex concepts are introduced (Zwiers, 2008).

The next step of second language acquisition after input is output or producing language independently. SLLs need ample access to practice producing the language verbally and in written form. To be fluent in a second language, the learner must focus on meaning as well. To “negotiate meaning,” the learner must use verbal and nonverbal
strategies to interpret, express, expand, and refine the many ideas, thoughts, and subtle variations in meaning in a conversation (Hernandez, 2003). Once an individual has successfully proceeded through each step, it can be assumed that a second language has been acquired.

**Difficulties Acquiring Second Language**

Becoming proficient at a second language has proven to be very difficult for students across the United States. Besides the lack of vocabulary, another area in which SLLs are deficient is possessing background knowledge necessary to understand the language. Marzano (2004) stated, “We acquire background knowledge through the interaction of two factors: (1) our ability to process and store information, and (2) the number and frequency of our academically oriented experiences” (p. 4). The second of these two factors affects children entering schools every day. Students who have fewer academically oriented language experiences will have a more difficult time processing and retaining due to the fact they are not able to connect the new experiences with prior ones. This relationship was shown in the research conducted by Hart and Risley (1995) who studied 42 families with a mix of families on welfare and professional class. Their research indicated that by the time children were three, the welfare children heard approximately 10 million words while in contrast children from the professional families heard 30 million words (Payne, 2008). Since most tests and work conducted in schools are produced using Academic Language, which is a second language to many students, the lack of understanding puts these kids at a significant disadvantage.
English Language Development Mandates

According to the Nation’s Educational Mission Statement, as stated by the Sacramento County Office of Education AB430 participant’s manual, “All students in the United States will perform at proficient levels in reading and mathematics by 2014” (p. 1), and the state of California’s Educational Mission Statement, “All students in California public schools will demonstrate proficiency with state standards” (p. 1), truly no child can be left behind. Second Language Learners lack the language skills necessary to reach the state and Federal goals, as measured by the California Standards Tests. California mandates English Language Learners receive a minimum of 30 minutes a day of English instruction from a board-approved English Language Development program (California Department of Education, 2009). The researcher contends that Academic Language qualifies as a Second Language. Therefore, students should have an Academic Language program modeled and implemented as a Second Language Development program.

English Language Development Instruction

The term Second Language Learner (SLL) is used in education but more recently English Language Learner (ELL) is frequently heard across the United States. As a result of an increased focus on ELL achievement, the education system has increased its requirements for ELD programs. ELLs face two key tasks during schooling: to develop the English literacy skills necessary to navigate the academic curriculum and to demonstrate content area mastery. Literacy instruction must not only engage students’
interest but also prepare them to meet the demands of their content area classes 
(Alvermann, 2002).

Research has traditionally focused on helping students meet academic 
requirements to participate in society (Hinchman & Moje, 1998). Most of this research 
focuses on the instruction of reading, writing, listening, and speaking instructional 
processes. Furthermore, evidence has shown that the most effective language instruction 
for ELLs includes strategy instruction, content area language, and conceptual framework 
for understanding new learning (Crandall, Jaramillo, Olsen, & Peyton, 2002; Meltzer & 
Hamann, 2004). All of these instructional and pedagogical models value and emphasize 
the integration of the different language domains with content area cognitive 
development. This research emphasizes the fact that learning English does not occur in 
isolation, rather it is highly context dependent.

Content-based ESL instruction is most effective when language is introduced, 
developed, and applied in a natural learning situation (Chamot & O’Malley, 1996). In 
particular, strategy instruction in reading increases content area comprehension. The 
integration of skill and strategy instruction meets both the linguistic and academic needs 
of ELLs (Jiménez & Gámez, 1996). In laymen’s terms, comprehensive English 
instruction is best implemented through multiple modalities of delivery and learning. 
Teachers must develop both language fluency and literacy skills in their students. One 
way to ensure that language fluency and literacy skills develop simultaneously is to 
expose ELLs to high levels of academic language instruction embedded in content area
learning activities (Echevarria & Graves, 1998). Instruction integrating the multiple
domains of language facilitates ELLs’ overall academic development.

Accountability, Measurement, and Achievement

As a result of NCLB, many states are scrambling to increase the accessibility of
their core academic assessment program to the broadest range of students. Prior to
NCLB, most states did not have sufficient data to make sound judgments about the
academic progress of specific subgroups of students, especially those with special needs
(e.g., ELL). One helpful aspect of NCLB policy is the availability of better assessment
data for a wider range of student groups. Those data can potentially help drive
instructional improvements and increase student learning.

The measurement of the academic progress of ELL students, as required by
NCLB, poses specific challenges for many states. Historically, ELL student performance
on state tests has been low and improvement has been slow, with non school-related
factors (e.g., parent education and socioeconomic status) substantially correlated with
student learning (Abedi, 2002). The ever-changing composition of the ELL subgroup
due to redesignation and the continuous influx of new or migrant ELL students are other
challenges to tracking language acquisition and academic achievement by EL students as
accounted for on the state standardized tests. But no matter what factors lead to the
assessment score, NCLB mandates that all students must be taught to grade level
standards. Given that English is the primary instructional language in the United States
of America, students will be tested on their mastery of the grade level standards, in English, on state standardized tests.

Placement and Assessment of ELLs

While an ELL’s academic achievement reflects his/her level of English proficiency, it is argued that the two are interdependent rather than interchangeable. Lam (1993) warns of the limitations inherent in assessing the academic competency of ELLs in English. Without a clear understanding of the role of language proficiency in testing, any assessment of ELLs may measure language proficiency rather than academic competence. Research has attempted to isolate the effect of language proficiency on achievement. Goldschmidt and Wang (1999) found that the effect of track placement on the achievement of linguistic minority students varied based on the level of English proficiency. In addition, track placement itself has a greater effect on high school ELLs’ grades and math test scores than level of English proficiency. While English proficiency clearly influences ELLs’ academic performance, it is arguably not equivalent to academic competency.

The instructional content, both academic and linguistic, of ELLs’ course offerings will potentially affect both their English-language acquisition and their academic achievement. Literacy instruction and the language-learning environment affect how immigrant and linguistic minority students negotiate the academic requirements of a secondary system (Freeman, Freeman, & Mercuri, 2002; Ruiz-de-Velasco & Fix, 2000). Changes in program offerings affect the quality and quantity of both academic and
linguistic content to which ELLs are exposed. Observational studies have documented the detrimental effects of the academic segregation high school ELLs sometimes experience on their academic achievement. Isolated from the academic and social mainstream, ELLs often find little opportunity to develop their English-language proficiency skills.

ELLs enrolled in comprehensive ELD programs should advance approximately one level per academic year (Warren, 2004). Recent immigrants with school experience prior to their immigration encounter relatively little difficulty progressing through the levels of English proficiency. In addition, these recent immigrants are less likely to struggle academically regardless of their level of English proficiency (Freeman et al., 2002). However, recent immigrants who have missed a year or more of schooling prior to immigration often take longer to acquire English and meet grade-level standards in math, science, and social science (Freeman et al., 2002). An additional group of ELLs exists for consideration at the high school level. Educated primarily in U.S. schools, long-term resident ELLs demonstrate considerable oral fluency yet lack the academic literacy and content area proficiency necessary for mainstream success (Freeman et al., 2002). Each group of ELLs presents a unique set of linguistic and academic needs.

Conclusion

This section reviewed the principal components of the second language acquisition process including the difficulties children face. To create a uniform system in our schools, an English Language Development program was created. These ELD
mandates and instructional strategies were reviewed. The remaining sections outlined accountability, measurements, assessments, and placement for ELLs.

Domains and Registers of Language

Introduction

Language can be divided into many different sections depending on the lens at which it is being scrutinized. The researcher describes English language Arts as it pertains to the four language domains of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. For the purpose of this study, the different registers of language will also be reviewed. More emphasis will be placed on the formal register of language, Academic Language.

Second Language Acquisition in the Four Language Domains

While recent education policy equates literacy with reading, second language acquisition standards cover instruction and assessment in four domains: reading, writing, listening, and speaking (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. [TESOL], 1997). The importance of all four language domains is emphasized in the research dealing with academic language instruction. Scarcella (1996) argues that ELLs and other non-native English speakers require exposure to academic registers through reading and listening, as well as many opportunities to produce the language through speaking and writing. Dedicated comprehensive ELD programs instruct and assess through the four language domains. In a recent review of the literature, Meltzer and Hamann (2004) outlined the intersection of literacy development and the language
learning needs of ELLs. Meltzer and Hamann showed that the best practice for ELL development is an integration of all four language domains and content area learning.

The interdependence of the four language domains is evident in second language learning situations; oral skills influence writing development and writing instruction improves reading comprehension (Fisher & Frey, 2003). Similarly, Moje, Young, Readence, and Moore (2000) warned against narrowly defining literacy instruction as reading alone, citing struggling readers need to experience all facets of language to develop critical literacy skills. To both demonstrate and develop language and academic competency, ELLs’ literacy skills must span all four domains with a certain level of competence (Zamel & Spack, 1998).

Classroom English language teaching is obviously intended to develop English language proficiency. Cummins and Yee-Fun believe policymakers and curriculum designers typically think of English language proficiency in terms of the four “language skills,” speaking, listening, reading, and writing. The conceptualization of language proficiency has the advantage of corresponding to obvious distinctions in how stakeholders use and experience language but it also suffers from significant limitations with respect to the development of policy for curriculum design and language instruction.

A problem comes from the fact that none of the four language skills represents a unitary construct. If the distinctions within the four language skills are ignored, there is a risk of designing curricula and language instruction practices that are poorly aligned with the needs of learners and the overall goals of the program. Consequently, many pupils go
on to English-medium secondary schools ill prepared for the language demands of English literature, social studies, science, and mathematics.

Registers of Language

Researcher Joos (as cited in Payne, 2008) found that languages have five registers or levels of formality: frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate. The informal registers of casual and intimate are used when speaking with family and friends, while consultative (a mix of formal and casual) and formal are used in academic settings and the occupational industries (Payne, 2008). Academic Language is a formal register used in the educational field. Students who are coming from homes where English is not their first language or from lower income communities are apt to lack the knowledge and vocabulary needed in schools. Students tend to struggle learning this language and might give up due to the lack of familiarity or exposure for using it in the expected manner (Zwiers, 2008).

Similarly, the registers of writing often found in email or Internet chat rooms have as much in common with conversational language as they do with written language. Likewise, reading does not constitute a unitary construct. The decoding skills required to read a text represent a very different set of abilities than the skills and conceptual knowledge required to understand the text being read. Not surprisingly, the forms of instruction that are effective in developing decoding skills may be quite limited in their capacity to promote sustained development of reading comprehension skills (Cummins, Brown, & Sayers, 2007).
In contrast, researcher Jim Cummins (2005) described registers of language using just two categories. He continually emphasized a distinct difference between Academic Language and Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS). BICS is language acquired early in life and is highly contextual with paralinguistic cues. What this means is students can rely on more than verbal and language cues to learn and construct meaning. Students can use a variety of learning modalities to process language and vocabulary meaning. In laymen’s terms, the researcher describes BICS as “playground” or conversational language. Students intrinsically process and comprehend playground or conversational language through kinesthesis, their peer’s body language, and environmental cues.

**Conclusion**

This section reviewed the four language domains and explained that a combination of each domain is needed during the acquisition of a second language. Next, the section discussed the different registers of language. A brief overview of the two main registers used in schools was described and will later be discussed in greater detail.

**Comparing Languages Used in the Educational Setting**

**Introduction**

This section begins with a review of the literature that establishes the understanding of the languages used in schools as additional registers in children’s developing linguistic repertoire. Although grounded in differing theoretical frameworks
and often focused on disparate situations, each approach illustrates how language fits within a system of schools. This section reviews Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) as well as Social Language, School Navigational Language, and Curriculum Content Language. Each of these languages shares a recognition that the language of school exists. Additionally, each language suggests that an advanced level of language is foundational to accessing academics and for a student to be successful. The section concludes with a summary of linguistic features with the researcher identifying CALP as the language used for this study.

**BICS and CALP**

In the process of acquiring advanced registers of language, students build on a foundation that has been developing since early childhood in the home and broader cultural community (Butler & Stevens, 1997; Gibbons, 1998; Schleppegrell, 2004; Zwiers, 2008). Building on the basics of the Cognitive Learning Theory, Cummins (1980, 1981) characterized most of the language students bring to school as Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) or Social Language (SL). From that foundation, students develop broader language skills, which he referred to as Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). This early work by Cummins provided one of the first paradigms for thinking about AL. Cummins’s approach was interpreted as a dichotomous view of language acquisition and use, though his later position (Cummins, 2000) stressed the simultaneous acquisition and development of both in school-aged
children with the distinction being in the degree of cognitive and contextual demands of language-use situations. In the literature, BICS was considered social language (SL) and CALP the precursor to AL, with BICS relying on contextual cues for transmitting meaning while CALP was thought to be more cognitively complex and, thus, less reliant on contextual cues for meaning.

These languages were intended to draw attention to the very different time periods typically required by immigrant children to acquire conversational fluency in their second language as compared to grade-appropriate academic proficiency in that language. Conversational fluency is often acquired to a functional level within about two years of initial exposure to the second language, whereas at least five years is usually required to catch up to native speakers in academic aspects of the second language (Collier, 1987; Cummins, 1981; Klesmer, 1994). Failure to account for the BICS/CALP (conversational/academic) distinction has resulted in discriminatory psychological assessment of bilingual students and premature exit from language support programs (e.g., bilingual education in the United States) into mainstream classes (Cummins, 1984).

Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976) brought attention to the fact that Finnish immigrant children in Sweden often appeared to educators to be fluent in both Finnish and Swedish but still showed levels of verbal academic performance in both languages considerably below grade/age expectations. Similarly, analysis of psychological assessments administered to minority students showed that teachers and psychologists often assumed that children who had attained fluency in English had overcome all
difficulties with English (Cummins, 1984). Yet such children frequently performed poorly on English academic tasks as well as in psychological assessment situations. Cummins (1981) provided further evidence for the BICS/CALP distinction in a reanalysis of data from the Toronto Board of Education. Despite teacher observation that peer-appropriate conversational fluency in English developed rapidly, a period of five to seven years was required, on average, for immigrant students to approach grade norms in academic aspects of English.

The BICS/CALP distinction also served to qualify John Oller's (1979) claim that all individual differences in language proficiency could be accounted for by just one underlying factor, which he termed global language proficiency. Oller produced a considerable amount of data showing strong correlations between performance on close tests of reading, standardized reading tests, and measures of oral verbal ability (e.g., vocabulary measures). Cummins (1979, 1981) pointed out that not all aspects of language use or performance could be incorporated into one dimension of global language proficiency. For example, if we take two monolingual English-speaking siblings, a 12-year old child and a six-year old, there are enormous differences in these children's abilities to read and write English and in their knowledge of vocabulary, but minimal differences in their phonology or basic fluency. The six-year old can understand virtually everything that is likely to be said to her in everyday social contexts and she can use language very effectively in these contexts, just as the 12-year old can. Similarly, as noted above, in second language acquisition contexts, immigrant children typically
manifest very different time periods required to catch up to their peers in everyday face-to-face aspects of proficiency as compared to academic aspects.

Zwiers (2008) captured the general understanding of the distinctions between SL and AL: Social Language (BICS) tends to be less complex and less abstract, and is accompanied by helpful extra-linguistic clues, such as pictures, real objects, facial expressions, and gestures. Social language is used to build relationships and get things done in less formal settings, such as the home, parties, sporting events, shopping, and so on. Academic Language (CALP) tends to be complex and abstract, lacking extra-linguistic support. A conversation with a friend about a recent sports event would involve much social language, whereas listening to a lecture on globalization would be more academic.

Of course there are criticisms to Cummins’s BICS and CALPS models. Early critiques of the conversational/academic distinction were advanced by Carole Edelsky and her colleagues (Edelsky et al., 1983) and in a volume edited by Charlene Rivera (1984). Edelsky (1990) later reiterated and reformulated her critique and other critiques were advanced by Martin-Jones and Romaine (1986) and Wiley (1996).

The major criticisms are as follows:

- The conversational/academic language distinction reflects an autonomous perspective on language that ignores its location in social practices and power relations (Edelsky et al., 1983; Wiley, 1996).
• CALP or Academic Language proficiency represents little more than “test-wiseness” – it is an artifact of the inappropriate way in which it has been measured (Edelsky et al., 1983).

The notion of CALP promotes a “deficit theory” in so far as it attributes the academic failure of bilingual/minority students to low cognitive/academic proficiency rather than to inappropriate schooling (Edelsky, 1990; Edelsky et al., 1983; Martin-Jones & Romaine, 1986). In response to these critiques, Cummins (Cummins & Swain, 1983) pointed to the elaborated sociopolitical framework within which the BICS/CALP distinction was placed (Cummins, 1986, 1996) where underachievement among subordinated students was attributed to coercive relations of power operating in the society at large and reflected in schooling practices. He also invoked the work of Biber (1986) and Corson (1995) as evidence of the linguistic reality of the distinction. Corson highlighted the enormous lexical differences between typical conversational interactions in English as compared to academic or literacy-related uses of English. Similarly, Biber’s analysis of more than one million words of English speech and written text revealed underlying dimensions very consistent with the distinction between conversational and academic aspects of language proficiency. Cummins also pointed out that the construct of academic language proficiency does not in any way depend on test scores as support for either its construct validity or relevance to education, as illustrated by the analyses of Corson and Biber.
Another main criticism is that Cummins oversimplifies the complexities of Academic Language. In addition to the complexities of the language, there are numerous external and contextual variables that affect learning an Academic Language. The reality usually plays out based on an individual’s personal language development and skill set. For example, an individual’s personal language development and existing language skill set might lend that individual to acquire BICS or CALPs more readily than the other. Even though Cummins outlined a variety of cognitive demands for specific tasks, he failed to operationalize tasks and, consequently, educators are left without guidance to help students learn Academic Language. The lack of guidance reiterates the need for an AL framework.

In comparison, those who believe in the BICS and CALP model contend English Language Learners acquire basic conversational skills within the first few years of being exposed to the language. However, their Academic Language acquisition is usually acquired after seven years of exposure (Collier & Thomas, 1989). The comparison is generic in nature and does not take into account the communities and language backgrounds of the individuals acquiring the new language. Although the SLL’s personal background and diversity is a common variable between both ELL’s and ALL’s, creating a standardized baseline for a scientifically significant study is hard to establish because of the language acquisition variables are just as diverse as the individuals themselves.
Social Language compared to Academic Language

In reexamining the differences between Social Language (SL) and Academic Language, critics have pointed out these characterizations are not sufficient to explain the complexities of language in school settings. Bailey et al. (2007), for example, cautioned against believing there is something inherent in Social Language that makes it less sophisticated or less cognitively demanding than language used in an academic context. Rather, she suggested the differences should be considered as differences in the relative frequency of complex grammatical structures, specialized vocabulary, and uncommon language functions.

On the surface, SL often appears less complex grammatically and lexically due to the setting and nature of the exchange, but banter and seemingly casual conversation can hide communication goals that could, in fact, be quite complex. There are instances in which SL and AL are not so disparate. Taking a somewhat different view, Schleppegrell (2004) located additional sources of the complexity of school language in the social experiences and knowledge about language students bring to school. She cautioned that a deeper awareness of the cultural and experiential roots of knowledge about language used at school can lead to a deeper understanding of challenges school language may pose for children from varying backgrounds. Schleppegrell believes that both SL and AL contain complex features, which make it more difficult when acquiring either language.

Bailey and Heritage (2008), in their discussion of the language of school-aged children broadened the conceptualization of school language use by breaking AL down
further into School Navigational Language (SNL) and Curriculum Content Language (CCL). SNL is the language students use to communicate with teachers and peers in the school setting, as well as the language of classroom management. In addition, CCL is the language used in the process of teaching and learning content material. The authors contrast SL, SNL, and CCL based on the following features: the purposes to which these language varieties are put, their degree of formality, the context of their uses, the context of their acquisition, the predominant modalities they utilize (e.g., listening, speaking, reading, writing), teacher expectations for language abilities across the three varieties, and grade-level expectations (e.g., those set by standards, instructional materials, administrators). This conceptualization captures the range and variety of language acquisition situations and use for all students, native English speakers, and ELLs while providing a potential framework to help educators address the role of language in school settings. The researcher is able to use this conceptualization when suggesting a framework for Academic Language Development.

In exploring the use of AL in the classroom, Gee (2005) defined AL as a large family of related social languages. It is important to note that Gee’s use of social language differs noticeably from that of Cummins or Bailey and Heritage. For Gee, Social Language refers to how language is used to establish a socially situated identity and carry out a particular socially situated activity. Rather than characterize Social Language in terms of an entire discipline (e.g., the language of biology or chemistry),
Gee relates it to the specific practices and activities carried out by users within particular sub-disciplines (e.g., the language activities of a microbiologist doing microbiology).

Thus, it is at the level of sub-disciplines (e.g., geometry within mathematics) that Gee identifies patterns of language use. Gee believes different patterns or co-relations of grammatical elements are associated with or are mapped to particular social languages associated with specific socially situated identities and activities. Gee indicated that within a sub-discipline there will be variations in language use by researchers.

Previously, Moschkovich (2002) explored the situated nature of AL in her examination of varying approaches to teaching mathematics, in particular, focusing on shifting notions of the mathematical communication integral to mathematical learning. The approaches she discussed are, in fact, applicable across content areas. The first approach, tied to a conception of mathematics instruction as carrying out computations or solving word problems, simplifies the view of language learning as a focus on the vocabulary students need to learn to carry out these operations. The second perspective, based on a situational framework of language use, focused on meaning making or, as Moschkovich put it, a shift in focus from acquiring words to developing meanings for those words. The third perspective, and the one she suggested more closely fits current theories of teaching and learning, is a situated socio-cultural view centered on student participation in instructional discourses (e.g., negotiating meaning, explaining solutions).

In addition, Scarcella (2008) discusses both the types of language and the types of cognitive knowledge; skills and strategies students must have to do well in content
classes. She included the notions of the Foundational Knowledge of English and Essential Academic Language (EAL), as well as SNL, in her discussion of AL and ELLs. The foundational knowledge of English referred to the basics of the English language, in essence, the basic skills important for communication both outside and within the school setting (e.g., knowing how to read and write, how to produce key types of sentences, how to use verb tenses, etc.).

In addition, basic vocabulary is critical; a large number of commonly known words must be acquired. EAL consists of the basic features of Academic Language used across all content areas including academic words, complex sentence structures, and discourse features that provide cohesion. Scarcella (2008) argued that prerequisite to the teaching and learning of subject-specific language, ELLs should have a foundational knowledge of English, should know SNL, and would benefit from already controlling EAL. In her discussion of the importance of cognitive knowledge and skills, Scarcella (2008) stressed the importance of prior knowledge around basic concepts (e.g., animals and their characteristics) and the associated language in acquiring new content-specific language and concepts in content classes. In her view, the language skills, cognitive knowledge, and strategies are interrelated, and all are essential for school success. Scarcella’s (2008) conceptualization, like that of Bailey and Heritage (2008), is broad with an emphasis on the language and cognitive skills that should ideally be developed prior to the study of subject-specific content language. Additionally, as Zwiers (2008)
argued, students also learn and need to learn a great deal of language and thinking as they study content, particularly in upper grades.

Snow and Uccelli (2009) provide a recent inventory of social and academic uses of language that draws on linguistic features already identified in the literature as a starting point. They suggested organizing linguistic features into the following categories: interpersonal stance, information load, organization of information, lexical choices, and representational congruence (i.e., how grammar is used to depict reality) with specific vocabulary and grammar structures necessary to actualize the features. Central to their approach is the notion that communication goals are seen as driving decisions about specifics of expression (p. 122). They offer a pragmatic heuristic based on context and social interaction as the core for characterizing AL that captures the specifics of lexicon, grammar, and discourse features. Like Scarcella (2008), Snow and Uccelli (2009) included cognitive domains in their discussion of AL performance.

Conclusion

The distinction between languages used in schools, including BICS and CALP, has exerted a significant impact on a variety of educational policies and practices (e.g., Cline & Frederickson, 1996). Specific ways in which educators' misunderstanding of the nature of language proficiency have contributed to the creation of academic difficulties among bilingual students have been highlighted by the distinction. At a theoretical level, however, the distinction is likely to remain controversial, reflecting the fact that there is
no cross-disciplinary consensus regarding the nature of language proficiency and its relationship to academic achievement.

The literature reviewed above has differing summaries about language used in schools, but each share commonalities such as register, subject, social, cultural, and contextual clues. Even though the researcher does not outright disagree with any of the existing literature, the researcher does choose to examine Academic Language through the Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency model.

Academic Language

Introduction

Academic Language has historically been viewed as a component of the English language and has not received the direct legislative and policy attention it may deserve. This section examines current Academic Language research while viewing it through the lens of Second Language Learning. While AL is generally accepted as a distinct register of language used in school, the characteristics must be described with a level of detail that allows for the development of frameworks, standards, teaching materials, and test specifications.

Components of Academic Language

AL can be viewed as part of overall English language proficiency, which also includes more social uses of language both inside and outside the school environment. It is referred to as a variety of English, a register, or as a style, and is typically used within
specific socio-cultural academic settings. In the broadest sense, AL refers to the language used in school to help students acquire and use knowledge (Bailey & Heritage, 2008; Chamot & O’Malley, 1994; Schleppegrell, 2004). AL is developmental with increasing levels of sophistication in language use from grade to grade, with specific linguistic details that can be the same or vary across content domains. Learners of AL fall along a continuum that includes nonnative speakers, speakers of nonstandard varieties, and native speakers with little exposure to AL.

Currently, there are at least three primary challenges to defining AL. First, varying perspectives on the nature of language and, specifically AL, have resulted in multiple systems for understanding the construct. Since researchers from different philosophies and educational backgrounds approach AL in very different ways, the range of conceptual frameworks and models vary from those with a primarily linguistic focus to those that emphasize the social context to those that emphasize use in specific content areas. Some of the work is extremely technical and requires a basic understanding of linguistics for the information to be accessible. The approaches are not mutually exclusive, but rather require those attempting to operationalize the construct to make choices for their specific situations. Depending on the goal—articulation of standards, curriculum development, test development—the focus or emphasis on language features and context will vary.

The picture is further complicated by the complex nature of the AL construct itself. In general, the linguistic elements that comprise the construct include discourse
features such as language functions, grammar/structure, and vocabulary across the language modalities (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), and content areas (science, mathematics, language arts, history/social studies). In addition, the increased complexity of linguistic features and sophistication of language use from year to year through the grades are a part of the picture. It is the interactions of these elements within specific sociolinguistic, socio-cultural, and cognitive settings that educators must understand for their work to be effective in helping students develop AL skills.

Finally, the nature of the information available varies in kind and completeness. A growing number of definitions and discussions about AL have appeared in the literature. However, as Bailey and Huang (submitted) point out, few empirical investigations have attempted a systematic approach to describing the construct. Most notably, the work of Bailey and colleagues (Bailey, Butler, Borrego, LaFramenta, & Ong, 2002; Bailey, Butler, & Sato, 2007) has provided initial methodologies and data for characterizing the AL construct that have implications for the education of ELL students. Others (e.g., Moschkovich, 2002; Snow & Uccelli, 2009) have provided insight through synthesis of the literature and examination of specific features and are helping the field gradually understand the scope of AL across grade levels from K through post-secondary content areas and socio-cultural settings.

*Academic Language Grammar*

This section discusses the grammar aspect of AL. Outside the classroom, grammatical knowledge enables English learners to make sense out of and use the
grammatical features, such as morphology and syntax, and associate language meaning with argumentative composition, procedural description, and analysis. Additionally, knowledge of limitations and expansion features of the verb system, including word families, common grammatical collocations, and the modality system plays a key role in an English learner’s ability to understand the meaning behind the words in language. English learners can struggle with meaning at any point in their language development, but especially when they need to understand the intricacies of grammatical metaphors. Finally, they must understand the more complex rules of punctuation, which could change the language’s meaning (Anstrom et al., 2010).

Academic Language Vocabulary

According to Anstrom et al. (2010) in their article, “A Review of the Literature on Academic English: Implications for K-12 English Language Learners,” there are three principle components of Academic Language: Lexical, Syntactic, and Discourse Patterns. In Academic Language, individual words have lexical meaning, or “forms and meanings” and can be labeled Academic Vocabulary. Knowledge of the ways academic words are formed with prefixes, roots, and suffixes, the parts of speech of academic words, and the grammatical constraints governing academic words are imperative for an AL learner. Words could have different meanings depending on the syntax (phrase and sentence structure) in which they are used. A Second Language Learner, for example, would have to comprehend the syntax to understand the meaning of the lexical term. Knowledge of the discourse features used in specific academic genres include such devices as
transitions and other organizational signals that, in reading, aid in gaining perspectives on
what is read, in seeing relationships, and in following logical lines of thought (Anstrom et al., 2010).

“Vocabulary is a central part of a language. The more words students know well
and can use, the more meaning they can communicate in a wide variety of
Language in her book Essentials of Teaching Academic Vocabulary. Initially, she talked
about common vocabulary as the first 2000 words a language learner most frequently
uses. These words are called high-frequency vocabulary. Coxhead said there are
approximately 2000 important word families because they make up the most frequent
words in English. In her research, she found that the first 2000 words make up about
75% of the words she analyzed. She exemplified that by saying, “the same list of 2000
words might represent up to 90 percent of the words in a fiction story” (Coxhead, 2006,
p. 2).

Once learners are able to recognize and use the first 2000 words of English, they
need to move on to learning other than high frequency vocabulary. Academic vocabulary
learning is essential for students who plan to attend college. Consequently,
understanding Academic Vocabulary in college requires students to learn them in K-12
education. This researcher proposes there is not only a need for students to learn and

---

5 High Frequency Words are the words found most in printed and spoke text (i.e., the, is,
and, can, see).
understand academic vocabulary for college, but there are requirements to know Academic Vocabulary as early as primary school.

Coxhead (2002) compiled a list of words that occur mostly in academic texts and newspapers. This list is called the Academic Word List (AWL). The AWL has 570 word families and is divided into 10 sublists. The first sublist contains the 60 most frequent word families on the list. These 60 families account for approximately 3.5% of the words in a collection of written academic text. The second sublist contains the next most frequent 60 word families. The AWL was designed to be a useful learning and teaching tool or guideline because it helps to identify the words worth spending time on in class (Coxhead, 2006). It is important to remember that knowledge of Academic Words alone may not create reading comprehension. Yet, in conjunction with the first 2000 high frequency words, a reader should have a positive grasp on the text concepts. With this said, the researcher emphasizes that just knowing the first 2000 words alone without Academic Vocabulary knowledge would not create comprehension of the texts for the reader.

The AL feature most addressed in the literature reviewed is academic vocabulary. Academic vocabulary consists of words students must comprehend to access the concepts associated with a particular discipline and use to display their acquisition of these concepts. One way to conceptualize academic vocabulary is in terms of tiers or categories. A commonly accepted classification system is the one first developed by

---

6 Word families are a group of words that share a common base to which different prefixes and suffixes are added.
Beck, McKeown, and Kucan (2002), and later adapted (e.g., Calderón et al., 2005). It frames academic vocabulary according to three tiers. The first tier is non-academic, conversational vocabulary such as flower or sleep; the second consists of general academic words such as however or illustrate; and the top tier is composed of content specific, technical vocabulary such as organism or rectangle. Stevens, Butler, and Castellon-Wellington (2000) offer a similar example of a vocabulary-classification scheme that uses different labels: high frequency words (Tier 1), non-specialized academic words (Tier two), and specialized academic words (Tier 3). Researchers have adopted other labels, such as brick and mortar words (Dutro & Moran, 2003) and content-obligatory and content-compatible words (Snow, Met, & Genesee, 1989) to describe the complexities of academic vocabulary development.

Recent research on academic vocabulary emphasizes the importance of instruction in general and content-specific vocabulary, including the multiple meanings of words within and across content areas and explicit teaching of word morphology and word origin. According to multiple authors (e.g., Bailey et al., 2007; Calderón et al., 2005) frequently neglected in both language and content instruction are Tier 2 words, also referred to as general academic vocabulary. These words are used across academic disciplines (e.g., conclusion, evidence, represent) and often have everyday counterparts, such as ending rather than conclusion (Calderón, 2007). The literature suggests this general academic vocabulary is critical for students to understand the concepts associated with academic content and demonstrate their understanding to others.
Snow (2008) provides the following justification for focusing on Tier 2 words with students. First, because Tier 2 words cross over into various fields, they take on multiple meanings with minute and nuanced differences. The literature has highlighted the importance of making explicit the multiple meanings of words (e.g., Adams, 2003). This, and the fact that Tier 2 words also only rarely occur in casual conversation, make acquisition more complex and instruction more necessary. Secondly, Tier 2 words are used to describe and explain Tier 3 words, so they are crucial to understanding more specialized vocabulary and overall success in understanding oral and written scientific discourse (p. 73).

In addition to Tier 2 words, the literature emphasizes the importance of word study, explicit instruction in the structure and origin of words. Aspects of academic vocabulary the literature suggests are important for teachers to understand include homonyms and word derivations, which involves knowledge of roots and affixes, and how these units work to change the meaning and usage of words (Calderón et al., 2005). According to Wong et al. (2000), students can learn words faster and more efficiently if they are instructed in the relationships between word forms; thus, teachers should know how the lexicon is structured and acquired.

Conclusion

This section described Academic Language including the three principal components of Academic Language; lexical, syntactic, and discourse patterns. The future context of this study is based on Academic Vocabulary. Therefore, the section went on
to examine grammar and Academic Vocabulary in more detail. While the researcher accepts Coxhead’s (2006) definition of Academic Vocabulary, for this study the definition is summarized as: robust words that are not ordinarily found in a young child’s vocabulary but rather refer to vocabulary found in curriculum and on standardized tests. In the next three sections, the researcher reviews Academic Vocabulary as it pertains to words in the California Standards Test, and Academic Vocabulary words in found in English language arts curriculum.

Instruction, Assessment, and Accountability

Introduction

In the American educational culture, English language instruction is academically, socially, and politically held accountable through state standards, adopted curriculum, and the state standardized exams. These forms of accountability create a need within the educational system. The California Standards Test, the California English Language Development Test, English language arts curriculum, and direct instruction with checks on learning are all requirements for a student to have a comprehensive understanding of the English language. Therefore, this section reviews the literature on Instruction, Assessment, and Accountability of learning the English language.
**Instruction**

Gibbons (1998), in her work with 9- and 10-year-old ELL students, stressed the inter-textual nature of classroom language, i.e., the interrelationship of the language modalities listening, speaking, reading, writing in learning content material. Classroom activities frequently involve multiple language modalities or inter-textual relationships.

A wide range of inter-textual relationships exist in all classrooms between, for example, what a teacher says and what students are expected to read; what students listen to and what they are expected to write; the print displayed in the classroom and the writing that students are to do; the discourse of the lesson and the texts students are expected to work with for homework. (Gibbons, 1998, p. 116).

To develop curricula for students who have difficulty linking language across modalities, Gibbons (1998) argued that a model of language is needed that is discourse and text-based and not focused on grammatical structures per se, though form is an integral component of any language model. As did others (e.g., Christie, 2002; Schleppegrell, 2004), Gibbons drew on Halliday’s (1994) systematic functional linguistics and Halliday and Hassan’s (1985) register theory to establish the importance of context in the teaching/learning of AL. Gibbons looked at four texts that varied by modality (both written and spoken), time (present and past), and level of formality (encyclopedia text and student writing) to illustrate how linguistic features change from situation to situation as context dependency changes. The texts showed a progression of specific language features that made the texts more or less context dependent as the communicative situation shifted. Gibbons work helps establish the critical nature of the
differences in classroom contexts and provides linguistic examples that reflect those differences.

In the article, “Nine Powerful Practices,” Payne (2008) discussed strategies to improve achievement of those students living in poverty. One extremely important strategy is to “Teach Students to Speak in Formal Register.” If students are expected to speak in Formal English, they need to be explicitly taught how to translate from Informal to Formal English. Students need guided practice from an instructor who uses consultative language, a mix of both formal and casual.

Payne emphasized the importance to “Monitor Progress and Plan Interventions.” Student performance needs to be recorded using rubrics and benchmarks. The learning standards and use of instructional strategies need to be logged to properly chart the steps taken to improve student learning. Payne believes she is answering the question, “Is there a need for academic language curriculum?” She believes an Academic Language Development framework should be created utilizing rubrics and benchmarks. The researcher proposes the frameworks could mimic the same curricular model as the Second Language Development frameworks. This leaves many questions of what and how to develop an Academic Language Framework. The following section reviews viewpoints, research, and criticisms of creating an Academic Language Development model.

Cummins of the University of Toronto Canada and Man Yee-Fun of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, China (2007) co-authored Chapter 48 of the *International
Handbook of English Language Teaching, titled “Academic Language: What Is It and How Do We Acquire It?” Their article proposed a framework for conceptualizing academic language and the pedagogical conditions that foster its development. Cummins and Yee-Fun distinguished academic language proficiency from both conversational fluency and discrete language skills and defined it as the ability to understand and express, in both oral and written modes, concepts and ideas relevant to success in school. Reading is critical for the acquisition of academic language. This is because more vocabulary is found primarily in written text. Most of written academic vocabulary is derived from Greek and Latin roots. Additionally, grammatical constructions and discourse structures found in representative written text significantly differ from those found in conversational interactions. The summation of this information and its conceptualization of academic language for English language teaching leave many gaps with current English Language classroom instruction.

In Hong Kong, a framework for conceptualizing academic language and language proficiency and illustrate its applications in the context of English language instructional policy has been developed. Even though the frameworks exist in Hong Kong, the issues are of central importance in language education contexts around the world. Hong Kong’s example could suggest the developing language policies both at the level of the school and at the level of educational systems as a whole.
Increasing Attention to ALD in ELD

The development of ELD standards and assessments has, to some extent, addressed the need for a language development program. The researcher contends that all students at some level are second language learners when it comes to Academic Language (AL). Consequently, all students should receive access to an Academic Language Development (ALD) program. This program would need to include vocabulary that is utilized in academia and its supporting subjects. Even though ELD has been legislatively and pedagogically addressed, ALD has not. Contrary to Second Language policies, policies that focused on academic language are still in their infancy. Additionally, the implementation of these policies and the development of improved curricula and program services has been stifled by the lack of consensus about the construct of AL, the limited dissemination about the body of knowledge on AL in existence, and the scarcity of pedagogical research. The development of AL and ELD, however, are interdependent. By analyzing the difficulties ELLs face, a deeper and more thorough conceptualization of AL could be formulated. Conversely, a deeper understanding of AL could improve ELD standards and assessments, which would provide better guidance to teachers on how to support ELLs and AL learners.

The interaction between academic language and academic content continues to challenge teachers, researchers, and policymakers. Although academic language is arguably the most important factor in students’ academic success (Francis, Rivera,
Lesaux, Kieffer, & Rivera, 2006), the nature of academic language as it is used in academic discussions, classroom texts, and on state content assessments is still unclear.

An intervention study that illustrates the effectiveness of word study in developing AL is reported by Calderón (2007) (also discussed in August, Carlo, Dressler, & Snow, 2005). The report describes results of a six-month academic vocabulary treatment based on the Success for All model, a whole-school reform model that includes a reading, writing, and oral language development program. Study participants included 300 bilingual (English-Spanish) third graders across eight elementary schools in an El Paso, Texas school. Students received 90 minutes of reading instruction per day, including 30 minutes focused specifically on academic vocabulary: pronunciation, meanings, and English-Spanish cognates. The vocabulary used in the lessons was selected from school texts, and classified according to a process adapted from the three-tier model developed by Beck et al. (2002). Calderón and colleagues (2005) further classified target words with respect to the following criteria: 1) concrete or abstract; 2) presence of a Spanish cognate; 3) polysemous within a certain content area; and 4) utility across content areas. Instructional activities were then assigned to word groups, depending on their perceived complexity for an ELL.

According to Calderón (2007), findings indicated that the intervention had a positive effect on academic vocabulary: post-test scores on the English versions of the Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery-Revised (WLPB-R) were significantly higher for the experimental group than those of the control group in three of four sections.
Findings also indicated that even though the treatment included no instruction on Spanish language, only references to Spanish cognates, the ELLs’ scores slightly improved on the Spanish test as well.

Calderón (2007) also reported on similar findings from a quasi-experimental study of monolingual and bilingual (English-Spanish) elementary-level students. The researchers (Carlo, August, & Snow, 2005) implemented a word study intervention for 254 fifth-grade students in nine classrooms located in three states (California, Virginia, and Massachusetts). Instruction consisted of 30-45 minute vocabulary lessons, four days a week for four months. Spanish-speaking students were given Spanish previews of classroom texts and instruction in English-Spanish cognates. The pre- and post-tests measured breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge, including multiple meanings, morphology, and text comprehension. At the end of the school year, the ELLs showed gains on vocabulary and reading comprehension, and, as a whole, all students showed significant improvement in knowledge and use of vocabulary meanings.

While there is currently no legislation or current California State mandates to teach Academic Language or Vocabulary, there is an abundance of research on Second Language Acquisition. If the learning of Academic Language and Vocabulary could be identified as or associated with the acquisition of a Second Language and Vocabulary, then the previous research and following legislation would directly apply. The researcher proposes that all students in an academic environment are Second Language Learners; more specifically they are English Language Learners. The academic environment and
academic text provide a completely different context for English Language Learning than does “playground” or conversational language. The next section reviews the existing legal and legislative foundations for English Language Learners.

Legal and Legislative Foundations and Requirements for EL Students

Introduction

Change in public education stems from an educational need and manifests through political action. Institutional change occurs when individuals challenge the status quo, often through the court system or through the legislative process. This section reviews some of the predominant court cases and legislative actions of Title I and Title III that have shaped second language development since 1868. During the creation of Academic Language Development, these cases need to be considered. In the researcher’s conceptual framework, Second Language Acquisition Pathway, ALD parallels ELD; therefore, legal ramification of ELD could affect ALD.

Foundations

Over the past decade, states and districts made some progress in laying the foundation for improved opportunities for ELLs to develop Academic Language (AL). This progress includes the creation and implementation of English Language Development (ELD) standards and English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessments that address some aspects of academic language (Abedi, 2007), along with federal
requirements that hold states and districts accountable for ELLs’ progress toward and attainment of English Language Proficiency (ELP).

Since NCLB took hold in 2002, literacy has emerged as a primary measure of achievement for all students. The importance of literacy development is two-fold for ELLs whose progress is measured by both ELP under Title III of NCLB, and grade-level language arts achievement under Title I. Equating literacy to academic achievement has instructional implications for all students, but especially for ELLs. As earlier stated, teachers of ELLs have traditionally provided instruction in the four domains of literacy: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Well-developed programs encompass language development across the content areas as well as through discrete English as a Second Language (ESL) or ELD instruction (Chamot & O’Malley, 1996). The interpretation of literacy as reading only divorces language from its interactive and communicative functions. A comprehensive ELD program incorporates each of these components: reading, writing, listening, and speaking to ensure ELL achievement.

The language regarding literacy development in Title I of NCLB (2002) focuses on reading, with little attention paid to listening, speaking, and writing. This is a critical omission for students acquiring English as a second language (August & Hakuta, 1997). Balanced literacy instruction incorporates background information, vocabulary development, and strategies for constructing meaning through listening, writing, and speaking, as well as reading (Meltzer & Hamann, 2004). When literacy instruction focuses primarily on reading, fewer content area connections are possible and fewer
opportunities occur to develop written and oral proficiency. For ELLs, the distinction between academic competence and linguistic proficiency is complicated (Abedi, 2002; Lam, 1993). Title I of NCLB (2002) blurs the line between these two competencies: equating academic achievement to performance on English language arts assessments. Titles I and III of NCLB require the closure of existing achievement gaps, both academic and linguistic, to ensure federal funding. Financial pressures can prompt educators and administrators to adopt quick fixes to boost the achievement of students performing below grade level (Glatthorn & Fontana, 2000), subjecting ELLs and other at-risk students to reactionary, rather than proactive, changes in instructional programs. In short, the pressures of high-stakes standardized testing can reach farther than just reporting scores.

Comprehensive analysis of standardized data proves there is a true achievement gap between ELL and EO students. Therefore, ELD instruction within schools has been mandated by law for all identified ELLs. The foundation for providing ELLs equitable access to learning began with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Civil Rights Act and the Equal Opportunities Act of 1974 is Federal Legislation that mandates ELD instruction occur in public schools. Supreme Court opinions, case law precedent, and congressional actions following passage of the laws have strengthened the legal rationale for assuring that ELLs receive an equitable education appropriate to their linguistic and academic needs. The court cases of *Lau v. Nichols* in 1974, and *Casteneda v. Pickard* in 1981 upheld the requirements of ELD instruction in public schools. With these protections,
there is ongoing, improved clarification about the implementation of instructional practices that ensure equitable access for all ELLs in publicly supported programs and practices (Berube, 2000). Schools are bound by legal provisions that support English language learners. The federal legislation Title III Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students authorizes funds to pay for ELD instruction. Finally, the California Education Code §430 mandates that 30 minutes of English instruction, not during core, should be given to each English Language Learner. The following is a basic timeline of legal events that helped form current ELD policy and education:

- 1868 – United States Constitution – Fourteenth Amendment: No person is denied the protection of the laws of the United States.
- 1964 – Civil Rights Act – Title VI: "No person shall, on the grounds of race, color or national origin, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal Financial assistance.
- 1974 – Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA): This act states that schools need to take appropriate measures to overcome language barriers that impede students' participation in programs.
- 1974 – Supreme Court Case – Lau v. Nichols: The court ruled that giving all students the same desks, books, teachers, and lessons does not mean they have equal opportunity, especially if there are students who do not speak English.
• 1974 – Federal Court Case – *Serna v. Portales Municipal Schools*: The court ascertained that Spanish surnamed individuals did not reach the same achievement levels as non-Spanish surnamed peers. The court ordered the Portales Municipal School District to design and implement a bilingual and bicultural program.

• 1981 – Federal Court Case – *Castaneda v. Pickard*: The Fifth Circuit Court established a three-part test to determine if school districts are complying with the EEOA of 1974. The requirements include: Theory – The school must implement a program based on sound educational theory or, at a minimum, a legitimate experimental program design; Practice – The school district must put into practice the educational program they have designed. They must allocate the necessary personnel and practices to transfer theory to practice; Results – The school must stop programs that fail to produce results.

• 1982 – Supreme Court Case – *Plyler v. Doe*: The court ruled that schools cannot deny students access simply because they are undocumented (illegal) aliens. In other words, the schools are not agencies or agents for enforcing immigration law.

• 1987 – Federal Court Case – *Gomez v. Illinois State Board of Education*: The court ruled that the State Educational Agencies must also comply with the three-point test established in *Castaneda v. Pickard*. 
• 1998 – California – Prop 227 “English Language in Public Schools Initiative Satute”: The passing of Prop 227 requires all public schools instruction be conducted in English. Some requirements from the proposition may be waived if parents or guardian show that child already knows English, or has special needs, or would learn English faster through alternate instructional technique. In certain circumstances, Prop 227 provides initial short-term placement, not normally exceeding one year, in intensive sheltered English immersion programs for children not fluent in English. The financial impact of Prop 227 on individual school districts would depend on how schools, parents, and the state respond to the proposition's changes. These impacts could vary significantly by district.

• 2001 – No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 – This act makes federal funding for states dependent on student progress. According to the act: "States that do not meet their performance objectives for LEP students could lose up to ten percent of the administrative portion of their funding for all ESEA state administered formula grant programs" (NCLB, 2001, p. 17).

*Title III*

In addition to these significant historical events, there is current legislation that directly effects how ELD programs are implemented: The Title III – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act, which was formerly the Bilingual Education Act – Title VII and the Emergency Immigrant
Education Program of the Elementary and Secondary Education ACT (ESEA). As a Federal program, Title III consolidates the Bilingual Education Act with the Emergency Immigrant Education Program. Title III reforms existing law and focuses existing programs on teaching English to Limited English Proficient (LEP) children, including immigrant children and youth, and holding States accountable for their LEP students attaining English.

The purpose of the Title III program is to make sure LEP students attain English proficiency and develop high levels of academic attainment in English (including Academic Language) while meeting the same challenging state academic content and achievement standards as all other children are expected to meet. Title III assists all limited English proficient children to achieve at high levels in the core academic subjects so those children can meet the same challenging State academic content and academic achievement standards all children are expected to meet.

Title III §1111 (b)(1) states its nine primary goals are

to develop high-quality language instruction educational programs designed to assist State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools in teaching limited English proficient children and serving immigrant children and youth; to assist State educational agencies and local educational agencies to develop and enhance their capacity to provide high-quality instructional programs designed to prepare limited English proficient children, including immigrant children and youth, to enter all-English instruction settings; to assist State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to build their capacity to establish, implement, and sustain language instruction educational programs and programs of English language development for limited English proficient children; to promote parental and community participation in language instruction educational programs for the parents and communities of limited English proficient children; to streamline language instruction educational programs into a program carried out through formula grants to State educational
agencies and local educational agencies (LEA) to help limited English proficient children, including immigrant children and youth, develop proficiency in English, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards; to hold State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools accountable for increases in English proficiency and core academic content knowledge of limited English proficient children by requiring:
(A) demonstrated improvements in the English proficiency of limited English proficient children each fiscal year; and
(B) adequate yearly progress for limited English proficient children, including immigrant children and youth, as described in section 1111 (b) (2)(13) Title I; and to provide State educational agencies and local educational agencies with the flexibility to implement language instruction educational programs, based on scientifically based research on teaching limited English proficient children, that the agencies believe to be the most effective for teaching English. (NCLB, 2001, Title III, §1111 (b)(1))

Title I

Often, second language learners, including ELL students, fall into the category of socioeconomically disadvantaged. In other circumstances, impoverished students are not exposed to academic language instruction causing an achievement gap between affluent and disadvantaged students. The Title I program is designed to improve the academic achievement of the disadvantaged. The purpose of Title I, Sec. 101, “Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantage,” of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) is to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging State academic achievement standards and state academic assessments. This purpose of Title I can be accomplished 12 ways:

1. Ensuring that high-quality academic assessments, accountability systems, teacher preparation and training, curriculum, and instructional materials are aligned with
challenging State academic standards so students, teachers, parents, and
administrators can measure progress against common expectations for student
academic achievement;

2. Meeting the educational needs of low-achieving children in our Nation's highest-
poverty schools, limited English proficient children, migratory children, children
with disabilities, Indian children, neglected or delinquent children, and young
children in need of reading assistance;

3. Closing the achievement gap between high- and low-performing children,
especially the achievement gaps between minority and nonminority students, and
between disadvantaged children and their more advantaged peers;

4. Holding schools, local educational agencies, and States accountable for
improving the academic achievement of all students, and identifying and turning
around low-performing schools that have failed to provide a high-quality
education to their students, while providing alternatives to students in such
schools to enable the students to receive a high-quality education;

5. Distributing and targeting resources sufficiently to make a difference to local
educational agencies and schools where needs are greatest;

6. Improving and strengthening accountability, teaching, and learning by using
State assessment systems designed to ensure that students are meeting
challenging State academic achievement and content standards and increasing
achievement overall, but especially for the disadvantaged;
7. Providing greater decision-making authority and flexibility to schools and teachers in exchange for greater responsibility for student performance;

8. Providing children an enriched and accelerated educational program, including the use of school-wide programs or additional services that increase the amount and quality of instructional time;

9. Promoting school-wide reform and ensuring the access of children to effective, scientifically based instructional strategies and challenging academic content;

10. Significantly elevating the quality of instruction by providing staff in participating schools with substantial opportunities for professional development;

11. Coordinating services under all parts of this title with each other, with other educational services, and, to the extent feasible, with other agencies providing services to youth, children, and families;

12. Affording parents substantial and meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children.

Title I has many important aspects that effect schools. Due to the fact that Title I holds schools accountable for all students to achieve proficiency, the researcher needs to consider the legal implications when developing Academic Language programs. In addition to the law, learning grade level standards in a second language is easier with language instruction. As a rule, ELL students with higher levels of language proficiency score higher on the measures of grade level standards. Therefore, ELD is one approach
to closing the achievement gap for ELLs. Research has shown the socioeconomic disadvantaged students do not have equal access to Academic Vocabulary; therefore, Title I can hold schools accountable to close the Achievement Gap.

**Conclusion**

New laws governing Second Language Learners has helped shape modern education. Equity and achievement have been addressed both in court and through the legislative process. This by no means has eliminated the achievement gap between English Only and Second Language Learners, but it has shined a spotlight on a real issue affecting students. Even though Second Language Learning has received a lot of legislative attention in the last century, the foundation for academic language is still being laid. This section reviewed the legislative and legal actions that affect SLL as well as socioeconomically disadvantaged students. The same legislative and legal actions have the potential to parallel laws and mandates for the proposal of ALD.

**Leadership**

*Introduction*

Educational leadership comes in all different shapes and sizes. There are many traits successful educational leaders all share. This section reviews some of the common traits shared by successful leaders and attempts to narrow them down to useful traits to help inspire institutional change focusing on Academic Language in Chapter 5.
Models and Characteristics of Effective Leadership

Researchers have examined leadership skills from a variety of perspectives. Early analyses of leadership, from the 1900s to the 1950s, differentiated between leader and follower characteristics. Finding that no single trait or combination of traits fully explained leaders' abilities, researchers then began to examine the influence of the situation on leaders' skills and behaviors. Subsequent leadership studies attempted to distinguish effective from non-effective leaders. These studies attempted to determine which leadership behaviors were exemplified by effective leaders. To understand what contributed to making leaders effective, researchers used the contingency model in examining the connection between personal traits, situational variables, and leader effectiveness. Leadership studies of the 1970s and 1980s once again focused on the individual characteristics of leaders, which influence their effectiveness and the success of their organizations. The investigations led to the conclusion that leaders and leadership are crucial but complex components of organizations.

These "trait" investigations were followed by examinations of the "situation" as the determinant of leadership abilities, leading to the concept of situational leadership. Studies attempted to identify "distinctive characteristics of the setting to which the leader's success could be attributed" (Hoy & Miskel, 1987, p. 273). Hencley (1973) reviewed leadership theories and noted, “the situation approach maintains that leadership is determined not so much by the characters of the individuals as by the requirements of social situation” (p. 38). According to this research focus, a person could be a follower
or a leader depending on circumstances. Attempts were made to identify specific characteristics of a situation that affected a leader’s performance. Hoy and Miskel (1987) listed four areas of situational leadership: “structural properties of the organization, organizational climate, role characteristics, and subordinate characteristics” (p. 273). Situational leadership revealed the complexity of leadership but still proved to be insufficient because the theories could not predict which leadership skills would be more effective in certain situations.

Other research efforts to identify leadership characteristics focused on the fit between personality characteristics, leaders’ behaviors, and situational variables. The “situational leadership” approach contains an underlying assumption that different situations require different types of leadership, while the contingency approach attempts to “specify the conditions or situational variable that moderate the relationship between leader traits or behaviors and performance criteria” (Hoy & Miskel, 1987, p. 274). Fielder (1967), differentiating between leadership styles and behaviors, concluded that leadership styles indicate leaders' motivational systems and that leadership behaviors are leaders' specific actions. He believed that group effectiveness was a result of the leaders' style and the situation’s favorableness. House’s (1971) Path-Goal Theory included the interaction of leadership behaviors with situation characteristics in determining the leaders’ effectiveness. House identified four leadership behaviors: directive, achievement-oriented, supportive, and participative, and two situational variables (subordinates’ personal characteristics and environmental demands such as the
organization’s rules and procedures) that most strongly contributed to leaders’ effectiveness. The contingency models furthered the understanding of leadership but did not completely clarify what combination of personality characteristics, leaders’ behaviors, and situational variables were most effective.

Leadership literature over the last three decades has focused on effective leaders coupled with personality traits of effective leadership. It primarily contributed to understanding the impact of personal characteristics and individual behaviors of effective leaders and their role in making organizations successful. The studies differentiated between leaders and managers and introduced a new leadership characteristic of “vision” and explored its importance. Along with having vision, effective leaders are said to facilitate the development of a shared vision and value the human resources of their organizations. In addition to these insights on leadership, a new theory emerged – transformational leadership.

“Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing” (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 21). Burns (1978) described managers as transactors and leaders as transformers. Managers concern themselves with the procurement, coordination, and distribution of human and material resources needed by an organization (Ubben & Hughes, 1987). The skills of a manager facilitate the work of an organization because they ensure that what is done is in accord with the organization's rules and regulations. The skills of a leader ensure that the work of the organization is what it needs to be. Leaders facilitate the identification of organizational goals. They initiate the
development of a vision of what their organization is about. “Management controls, arranges, does things right; leadership unleashes energy, sets the vision so we do the right thing” (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 21).

The central theme of the research is that those who find themselves supervising people in an organization should be both good managers and good leaders. As Duttweiler and Hord (1987) stated,

the research shows that in addition to being accomplished administrators who develop and implement sound policies, procedures, and practices, effective administrators are also leaders who shape the school's culture by creating and articulating a vision, winning support for it, and inspiring others to attain it. (p. 65)

“All leaders have the capacity to create a compelling vision, one that takes people to a new place, and the ability to translate that vision into reality” (Bennis, 1990, p. 46). Current leadership literature frequently characterizes the leader as the vision holder, the keeper of the dream, or the person who has a vision of the organization’s purpose. In Leadership is an Art (1989), De Pree asserted, “the first responsibility of a leader is to define reality” (p. 9). Bennis (1990) wrote that leaders “manage the dream” (p. 46). Vision is defined as “the force which molds meaning for the people of an organization” by Manasse (1986, p. 150).

According to Manasse, this aspect of leadership is “visionary leadership” and includes four different types of vision: organization, future, personal, and strategic. Organizational vision involves having a complete picture of a system’s components as well as an understanding of their interrelationships. “Future vision is a comprehensive
picture of how an organization will look at some point in the future, including how it will be positioned in its environment and how it will function internally” (Manasse, 1986, p. 157). Personal vision includes the leader's personal aspirations for the organization and acts as the impetus for the leader’s actions that link organizational and future vision.

“Strategic vision involves connecting the reality of the present (organizational vision) to the possibilities of the future (future vision) in a unique way (personal vision) that is appropriate for the organization and its leader” (Manasse, 1986, p. 162). A leader’s vision needs to be shared by those who will be involved in the realization of the vision.

An important aspect of vision is the notion of “shared vision.” “Some studies indicate that it is the presence of this personal vision on the part of a leader, shared with members of the organization, that may differentiate true leaders from mere managers” (Manasse, 1986, p. 151). Murphy (1988) applied shared vision to previous studies of policymakers and policy implementation; he found that those studies identified gaps between policy development and its implementation and concluded that this gap also applies to current discussions of vision. He stressed the need for the development of a shared vision. “It is rare to see a clearly defined vision articulated by a leader at the top of the hierarchy and then installed by followers” (Murphy, 1988, p. 656). Whether the vision of an organization is developed collaboratively or initiated by the leader and agreed to by the followers, it becomes the common ground, the shared vision that compels all involved. “Vision comes alive only when it is shared” (Westley & Mintzberg, 1989, p. 21).
Burns (1978) introduced the concept of transformational leadership, describing it as not a set of specific behaviors but rather a process by which “leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation” (p. 20). He stated that transformational leaders are individuals that appeal to higher ideals and moral values such as justice and equality and can be found at various levels of an organization. Burns (1978) contrasted transformational leaders from transactional leaders, which he described as leaders who motivated by appealing to followers’ self interests. Working with Burns’s (1978) definition of transformational leadership, Bass (1985) asserted the leaders motivate followers by appealing to strong emotions regardless of the ultimate effects on the followers and do not necessary attend to positive moral values. The Reverend Jim Jones of the Jonestown massive suicide could be an example of Bass’s definition of transformational leadership. Other researchers have described transformational leadership as going beyond individual needs, focusing on a common purpose, addressing intrinsic rewards and higher psychological needs such as self actualization, and developing commitment with and in the followers (American Association of School Administrators [AASA], 1986; Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Coleman & La Roque, 1990; Kirby, Paradise, & King, 1992; Leithwood, 1992; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990; Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1989, 1990).

**Conclusion**

In summary, the literature revealed that effective leadership in an organization is critical. Effective leaders, as recognized in the previously mentioned literature, arise
when a situation presented itself, they have vision, they are able to successfully share their vision, and they collaborate with stakeholders to reach a situational goal. In regard to Leadership with Academic Language, a situation has not been thoroughly reviewed in the literature; therefore, a leader has not been able to effectively share a vision for a State Framework in Academic Language. “Vision comes alive only when it is shared” (Westley & Mintzberg, 1989, p. 21). Westley and Mintzberg offer their own explanation as to why a leader has not transformed education to include Academic Language.

Conclusion

This chapter reviewed the learning theories surrounding Second Language Acquisition and English Language Development. To analyze Academic Language deeper, the researcher reviewed the four language domains as well as registers of language used in schools. After comparing current theories of language acquisition and language registers, the researcher modeled this study on the CALP model. Furthering the literature review, the researcher described Academic Language and more specifically Academic Vocabulary. The researcher then discussed instruction, assessments, and accountability followed by a comparison of ELD to ALD. The remaining sections outlined the legal and leadership implications when developing and incorporating a new program into the educational field.

With the inception of No Child Left Behind in 2001 came greater academic accountability. Greater academic accountability led to a plethora of data as reported by
state-level standardized exams. The acquired data shed a bright light onto a phenomenon called the achievement gap. The achievement gap had many facets, one of which was the achievement divide between English Language Learners and English Only learners in English language arts. The identification of this phenomenon led to research on its causes, its influencing factors, the components of language acquisition, the components of languages, English Language Development programs, the pedagogy for instructing English Language Learners, accountability models, and how to measure the success of second language learners in English language arts.

The preponderance of the research has emphasized English Language Development instruction as a separate process from English Only instruction. English Language Learners must have access to a defined English Language Development curriculum. The curriculum must be comprehensive and cover the entire language development process. The program and policy implications include English Language Development programs, assessment programs, accountability policies, and civil and educational rights to a fair and equitable education.

The areas still in need of further research are the subgroups within the English Language Learners (different languages), the variables affecting each subgroup of English Language Learners (social and cultural factors of each language subgroup), and the acquisition of Academic Language Development (ALD) vs. ELD. If educators are truly going to leave “No Child Left Behind,” they need to continue the hard work of reaching each and every student no matter their racial, cultural, ethnic, or language
background. Only the first brick of the road has been laid to reach the goal, “all students achieve proficiency in English language arts by 2014.”

In an attempt to truly leave no child behind, the researcher saw the need for a greater understanding of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary and the potential impact on student achievement. With a comprehensive understanding of the literature covering ELD, AL, and AV, the researcher developed the rest of the study to help students excel on the ELA portion of the California Standards Test and in one of the current ELA curricula in fourth grade.
Chapter 3

METHOLODGY

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to examine the construct of Academic Language more closely through an investigation of fourth graders’ Academic Vocabulary development, instruction, and testing. The researcher determined whether the Coxhead Academic Vocabulary words appeared in the fourth-grade English language arts vocabulary curriculum and on the fourth-grade California Standards Test public release questions. The researcher used the following questions to guide the research:

1. To what degree do the fourth-grade English language arts curriculum and the fourth-grade English Language Arts California Standards Test include Academic Vocabulary?
2. What is the impact of a specialized and supplementary “Academic” Vocabulary instructional program on the students’ Academic Language achievement and Academic Vocabulary acquisition?
3. What are students’ and teachers’ understandings about Academic Language?

The contents of this chapter outline the methodology used to evaluate these questions.

Question 1 asked to what degree do the fourth-grade ELA curriculum and CST Release Questions include Academic Vocabulary. To answer the question, the researcher performed an analysis of Academic Vocabulary in current curricula. The researcher
determined whether the words from the Coxhead Academic Vocabulary word lists were taught in the fourth-grade Open Court Reading 2000 English language arts vocabulary word lists and whether they appeared on the fourth-grade California Standards Test public release questions. Furthermore, the researcher evaluated the appearance of the fourth-grade Open Court Reading vocabulary words on the fourth-grade CST Release Questions.

Question 2 raised the question as to whether a specialized and supplementary Academic Vocabulary instructional program would have an impact on the students’ Academic Language achievement and Academic Vocabulary acquisition. The researcher evaluated an established vocabulary program that used direct instruction, Elements of Reading: Vocabulary (EOR:V). Students were assessed using a ‘snapshot’ of data from an established district-created standardized test, Mid-Year Program Assessment of Standards (MYPAS), before and after attending the program to answer this question.

Question 3 was related to the understanding of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary of the two major groups in the educational setting. Teachers were asked to participate in a survey that provided the researcher with valuable information regarding the understanding of those who were teaching, as well as the amount of time spent on and future needs of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. A select group of students participating in the independent vocabulary program were given a survey to evaluate their understanding of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary and the impact of the program.
Question One: Academic Vocabulary in Current Curricula

Research Design

To determine the degree of Academic Vocabulary being taught and assessed, the researcher used the Coxhead Academic Word List to check the congruence to and occurrence of Academic Vocabulary on the fourth-grade Open Court Reading vocabulary list and fourth-grade CST release questions. Furthermore, the researcher determined the degree to which the fourth-grade Open Court Reading vocabulary words are found on the fourth-grade CST release questions. To summarize, the researcher evaluated the following pairs:

1. Fourth-grade Open Court Reading ELA vocabulary words on the Coxhead AWL (see Appendix C)
2. Fourth-grade Open Court Reading ELA vocabulary words on the Fourth-grade ELA CST Release Questions (see Appendix D)
3. Coxhead Academic Words on the Fourth-grade ELA CST Release Questions (see Appendix E)

Instrument and Material: Open Court Reading

Open Court Reading is a comprehensive English language arts program developed by SRA/McGraw Hill. It was designed to systematically teach decoding, comprehension, inquiry and investigation, and writing in a logical progression. The researcher isolated the vocabulary words taught within Open Court Reading (OCR) ELA
curriculum for fourth grade. The researcher used five units from the fourth-grade ELA curriculum. Each unit contained 28-50 words with a total of 204 vocabulary words.

*Instrument and Material: California Standards Test*

California educators develop the California Standards Tests. The fourth-grade ELA CST measures students’ progress towards achieving the California state-adopted academic content standards, which describe what students should know and be able to do by the end of the specific grade-level year.

The CST Release Questions were taken from the Grade 4 ELA Standards Test. The CST Release Questions are part of the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program and follow guidelines set by the State Board of Education. To produce a grade appropriate and equitable product, a committee of experts, together with administrators and teachers, evaluate and approve all questions for the CST.

The researcher used the CST Release Questions from 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008. Within the 73 pages of this document, there are 114 released test questions in a variety of formats, including passages with related questions and independent questions. All CST Release Questions can be found electronically on the California Department of Education website. They are open to the public and for the purpose of this study, the fourth-grade CST release questions were downloaded and saved for further evaluation.
Instrument and Material: Coxhead Academic Word List

For this research, it was assumed the most reliable Academic Vocabulary word list was the Coxhead Academic Word List. The 570 words are disaggregated into 10 sublists with the most frequently used words in the lower numbered sublists. The first nine sublists contain 60 words while the last sublist contains just 30 words.

The Academic Word List was developed to provide students and teachers with a reference list of words needed for success when entering higher education; therefore, exposure is necessary in earlier years. This list does not incorporate the high frequency sight words but rather the more advanced vocabulary words used in academic texts. These words are not limited to a particular field of study; therefore, they are useful to all learners.

Data Collection

The researcher collected three documents to analyze words within current curricula and an assessment exam. Each document, Open Court Reading vocabulary list, California Standards Test Release Questions, and the Academic Word List, were saved electronically and organized in a manner allowing the researcher ample accessibility to each word.

Since the researcher had the word lists and the fourth-grade CST release questions electronically, the process of searching each document was possible through using a “search” or “find” tool within the computer software. One at a time, the Open Court Reading vocabulary words were inputted into the “search” tool of both the fourth-grade
CST release questions document and Academic Word List. Each time a vocabulary word was found, the researcher recorded it on a separate spreadsheet. Once all the Open Court Reading vocabulary words were searched in the fourth-grade CST Release Questions and recorded, the researcher searched the Academic Word List. To further analyze the words, the researcher used the same technique to find the Coxhead Academic Words on the fourth-grade CST release questions.

Once the raw data was gathered, the researcher inputted the words into a common spreadsheet for further ease when evaluating. An Excel spreadsheet was created with each Academic Vocabulary sublist on a sheet and a column for CST and OCR. A zero, if not found, or one, if found, was inputted in the corresponding row and column for each word. This comprehensive spreadsheet was used to create each table for the findings.

Setting and Population for Question Two and Question Three

Setting of the Research

This study was conducted at a moderate sized K-6 elementary school in a large school district in the river valley located just south of California’s state Capital, Sacramento. The district covers 325 square miles of the greater Sacramento Region. The district stretches from the Sacramento River to the foothills of the Sierra Nevada. The district has 39 elementary schools, seven middle schools, and seven comprehensive high schools. The district hosts a diverse demographic breakdown.
Table 1

Unified School District Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The district has constructed the local education mission statement: “The Unified School District will provide a learning community that challenges **ALL** students to realize their greatest potential” (Elk Grove Unified School District, 2010, para. 1). The district has taken their mission statement and used it to develop a set of “Bold Goals” to help drive their academic programs. From the “Bold Goals,” performance targets were established. These Bold Goals are separated into four different categories: California Standards Test, the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE), English Language Development (ELD), College and Career Preparation. While the Bold Goals may serve as the end goal of where the district wants to be, the performance targets are the immediately obtainable goals individual school sites need to be accountable for.
Population of the Study

The Elementary School has constructed the school site mission statement:

The Elementary School community, consisting of students, staff, families, and community members has developed a mission for our school consisting of three points: Instill essential skills necessary for ALL students to become lifelong learners, provide a safe and nurturing environment that fosters responsible citizenship, model and develop respect for diversity while recognizing commonality. (C.W. Dillard Elementary School, 2010, para. 5)

The Elementary School hosts almost 500 students with an ethnic breakdown including White, Hispanic, Asian, African American, American Indian, Filipino, and Pacific Islander. Additionally, the student body includes two statistically significant subgroups: English Language Learners and socio-economically disadvantaged.

Table 2

The Elementary School Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The specific population of the study was all the teachers from the Elementary School, as well as all the fourth-grade students who had achieved basic or proficient on the ELA portion of the CST.

Question Two: Supplementary Academic Vocabulary Program

Research Design

The researcher analyzed the effectiveness of an independent vocabulary program already in place. The goal of evaluating the Elements of Reading: Vocabulary (EOR:V) program was to measure the direct effectiveness of an independent vocabulary program, not one embedded in current ELA curricula. The researcher selected the Elements of Reading: Vocabulary program. This program was chosen because it was a school-board approved curriculum, and because of the availability of resources and data from other schools in the district that already utilized the program. The Harcourt Achieve (Steck-Vaughn) Elements of Reading: Vocabulary program is an intervention designed to supplement existing classroom reading programs and enhance vocabulary and comprehension skills in elementary school students. According to its publisher, this is the first program to systematically and explicitly teach oral language vocabulary as direct preparation for success in reading (Beck, 2007).

Setting and Population

The instruction of EOR:V took place in a classroom at the Elementary School identified above. The researcher randomly selected a group of fourth-grade students who
performed basic or proficient on the third-grade California Standards Test the year prior. There were a total of 68 fourth-grade students and 25 of them fit into the category of performing basic or proficient. Randomly, 14 of the 25 students were selected to attend the independent vocabulary program while the remaining 11 stayed in their general education classroom.

Instrumentation and Materials

While the *Elements of Reading: Vocabulary* program was originally designed for grades kindergarten through three, based on the success of the program at that level, Harcourt Achieve extended the curriculum to include grades four and five. Based upon reading research endorsed by the National Reading Panel (2000), the program strives to systematically build the broad oral vocabulary students need for reading proficiency by using authentic read-aloud literature. The program incorporates a design and format that allows teachers to provide explicit, systematic instruction as well as engaging activities essential for oral vocabulary development. This is accomplished through a variety of materials and strategies such as, but not limited to:

- Words chosen represent rich, sophisticated words for which students have a conceptual base
- Words are introduced through the use of teacher read-aloud, discussed, and reviewed (and explored) through picture sorts, word chats, word watcher posters, word cards, and interactive student book activities
-Each lesson contains explicit teaching plans using select words in a variety of contexts and situations
-Personalization is stressed during the word snapshots, word chat, and writing activities, and students are encouraged to make connections between past experiences and vocabulary words

Each lesson provides opportunities to link vocabulary and comprehension.

*Elements of Reading: Vocabulary* is designed to be paced at one lesson per week and should be used in class for 1 hour and 40 minutes to 2 hours per week (or approximately 20-25 minutes per day). In addition to classroom instructional time (contact time), each student is expected to practice their vocabulary outside the classroom and at home. Each lesson is designed to follow the same instructional path:

-Introducing the Vocabulary (Day 1)
-Using the Vocabulary (Days 2-4)
-Assessing the Vocabulary (Day 5)

A typical *Elements of Reading: Vocabulary* lesson begins each week with the introduction of the new lesson and the week’s reading passage. This was done as a whole-group activity and also included a discussion using the Comprehension Callouts and Talking About the Story points in the program. Following the passage, the vocabulary words were introduced using the in Action. Days two to four of the *Elements of Reading: Vocabulary* lessons included Word Chat, Concept Cards, and Word Snapshots activities as well as reading from the “R.E.V. It Up” booklet, and completion
of Writer’s Log activities. Days four to five were designated for finishing “R.E.V. It Up!” assignments, re-reading the passage, and completing word organizers as well as assessment (oral or written).

The assessment of the effectiveness of the EOR:V program was conducted with a pre- and post-test using the Unified School District’s Mid-Year Performance Assessment Survey (MYPAS) test. The MYPAS exam was modeled and directly correlated to the CST exams and can be disaggregated into standard, strand, and cluster. The fourth-grade MYPAS Reading exam contains 58 questions in various formats reflecting the same format as the CST (see Appendix F for raw data).

Data Collection

The researcher administered the MYPAS exam prior to any instruction of Elements of Reading: Vocabulary. In a group setting, students were given the exam in a classroom free of noise and distraction. All test documents and answer documents were distributed in accordance with typical standardized testing practices. Students were given an unlimited amount of time to get a full understanding of students’ knowledge. Once all exams were complete, the researcher scanned the answer documents and uploaded them into the district-created student information data analysis system. This system analyzes the findings and can run multiple reports on them. At the culmination of the six weeks of instruction with Elements of Reading: Vocabulary, students were administrated the same MYPAS exam. These pre- and post-exams were further evaluated to gauge the effectiveness of an independent vocabulary program.
Question Three: Teacher and Student Surveys

Research Design

The surveys had a two-fold purpose: to provide a quantifiable measure of the understanding of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary and to assess various factors contributing to the possible relationship between contextual perceptions of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary and the static definitions of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. The majority of the surveys consisted of Likert-type scale questions. The surveys also contained questions designed to employ a mathematical sorting model to determine the most common perception of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

Population

The population of the first survey was 26 teachers from the Elementary School. The sample being used is 15 returned surveys, which is 58% of the population. For purposes of analysis, 15 questionnaires are to represent 100% of the population. The population of the second survey was 14 students from the Elementary School’s fourth-grade class who participated in the Elements of Reading: Vocabulary instruction. The sample used was 14 returned surveys, which was 100% of the population. For purposes of the analysis 14 questionnaires represented 100% of the population.
Instrumentation and Materials

The Teacher Survey was created as a Word document and contained 10 questions used to obtain information about the length of time they had been teaching and the grade level (see Appendix A). It also asked the teacher if they had heard of or taught Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. It asked more questions about the need for professional development and whether they believed Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary should be taught. The first nine questions had multiple-choice answers for the teachers to mark. The final questions were written definitions of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

The Student Survey was created as a Word document and contained 23 questions, with the first 21 requiring an answer to mark and the last two requiring a written answer (see Appendix B). The first five questions gathered background knowledge on the students. The following 15 questions pertained to the independent vocabulary program they attended. It gathered feedback on the instruction in the program and use of words outside the program. The last two questions gave the students the opportunity to write their own definition and also add additional comments.

Data Collection

The Teacher Surveys were disseminated to teacher’s boxes in the school library. The researcher provided a window of two school days for teachers to complete and return the survey into the researcher’s box. The surveys remained anonymous; therefore, no record keeping of who returned the surveys was needed. Once the timeframe was up, the
The researcher obtained the surveys and collection box. The Teacher Surveys were analyzed, recording a total number for each item selected and then recorded onto a spreadsheet. The spreadsheet was used to create tables for further analysis.

The Student Surveys were distributed during the last class meeting. Students had the opportunity to participate in the survey at their own will. It was anonymous and students returned the survey into a box so identification was unknown. Once the participating students completed the survey and returned it, the researcher analyzed the student surveys by recording a total number for each item and recording them into a spreadsheet. This spreadsheet was used to create tables for further analysis.

**Conclusion**

The research design of this project included a detailed comparison of the words found on the California Standards Test fourth-grade ELA release questions, the fourth-grade Open Court Vocabulary program, and the Coxhead Academic Word list. The detailed comparison determined whether the Coxhead Academic Vocabulary words were used in the fourth-grade English language arts vocabulary curriculum and on the fourth-grade California Standards Test public release questions. Furthermore, the research concluded whether or not the fourth-grade Open Court Reading vocabulary words were found on the fourth-grade CST Release Questions through a detailed comparison. The research design used the effectiveness of an already implemented and established vocabulary program to determine a need for an Academic Vocabulary program and
Academic Language Learning model. Finally, multiple surveys were used to determine students’ and teachers’ current understanding of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.
Introduction

This chapter includes the results of the mixed method study, “Analysis and Perception of Academic Vocabulary as it pertains to Fourth-Grade Education.” An analysis of Academic Vocabulary of fourth-grade ELA vocabulary curriculum and fourth-grade CST release questions, an effectiveness study of an existing vocabulary program, and quantitative and qualitative student and teacher surveys, provides the breadth of data to complete a comprehensive study pertaining to Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary in fourth-grade education today. The study’s progressive research design helps to answer the driving research questions:

1. To what degree do the fourth-grade English language arts curriculum and fourth-grade English Language Arts California Standards Test include Academic Vocabulary?
2. What is the impact of a specialized and supplementary “Academic” Vocabulary instructional program on the students’ Academic Language achievement and Academic Vocabulary acquisition?
3. What are students’ and teachers’ understandings about Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary?
The data are reported in a successive format. First, the analysis of current fourth-grade vocabulary curriculum and the California Standards Test release questions for Academic Vocabulary determined the curricular and social need to teach Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. Secondly, an effectiveness study on an existing vocabulary program helped establish a model for teaching Academic Vocabulary. Finally, a student survey and a teacher survey outlined the understanding of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

**Question One: Academic Vocabulary in Current Curricula**

*Introduction*

This study compared the Academic Vocabulary content among three documents: Coxhead Academic Word List, fourth-grade Open Court Reading vocabulary list, and fourth-grade English Language Arts California Standards Test Release Questions.

*Academic Vocabulary Findings*

The publishers of Open Court Reading 2000 created a vocabulary list for each lesson within the overall units of the curriculum. These words were to be specifically taught during the lessons of the story for the week.
### Table 3

**Open Court Reading 2000 Vocabulary Word List Fourth Grade Unit 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treacherous</td>
<td>Timid</td>
<td>Troublesome</td>
<td>Folly</td>
<td>Astronaut</td>
<td>Consoled</td>
<td>Intrigued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>Enviously</td>
<td>Feisty</td>
<td>Pondered</td>
<td>Excell</td>
<td>Fugitives</td>
<td>Beguiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fierce</td>
<td>Mock</td>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>Lofty</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>Caressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffectively</td>
<td>Snare</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Downcast</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>Vouch</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubiously</td>
<td>Cunning</td>
<td>Pesky</td>
<td>Dismayed</td>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>Asserted</td>
<td>Ignorance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>Haughty</td>
<td>Peering</td>
<td>Rash</td>
<td>Simulates</td>
<td>Abolitionist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarmingly</td>
<td>Menacing</td>
<td>Alarmed</td>
<td>Wrath</td>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>Indignantly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mustering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eloquence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

**Open Court Reading 2000 Vocabulary Word List Fourth Grade Unit 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Restaurateur</td>
<td>Refreshments</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Advertise</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Uncharted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Supplier</td>
<td>Restoring</td>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Groundwork</td>
<td>Merchandise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profits</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exasperated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing</td>
<td>Customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Devised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated</td>
<td>Supervising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5

Open Court Reading 2000 Vocabulary Word List Fourth Grade Unit 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epidemic</td>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>Gorge</td>
<td>Gossamer</td>
<td>Reservation</td>
<td>Gored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plague</td>
<td>Suture</td>
<td>Enchained</td>
<td>Threshold</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>Amputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germs</td>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>Pitches</td>
<td>Stethoscope</td>
<td>Inundated</td>
<td>Pamphlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infected</td>
<td>Condemnation</td>
<td>Herb Medicines</td>
<td>Profusely</td>
<td>Siege</td>
<td>Infirmary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbes</td>
<td>Anesthesia</td>
<td>Poultice</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Ominous</td>
<td>Listlessly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antibodies</td>
<td>Incision</td>
<td>Lulling</td>
<td>Curandera</td>
<td>Maneuvered</td>
<td>Feebly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immune</td>
<td>Meticulously</td>
<td>Superstition</td>
<td>Consternation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteria</td>
<td>Hemorrhage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manipulate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desolately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterilize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Open Court Reading 2000 Vocabulary Word List Fourth Grade Unit 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Befall</td>
<td>Expedition</td>
<td>Notions</td>
<td>Mite</td>
<td>Tidal</td>
<td>Concentration camp</td>
<td>Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursued</td>
<td>Arctic</td>
<td>Scavenging</td>
<td>Distinctly</td>
<td>Wreckage</td>
<td>Confide</td>
<td>Misery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deserted</td>
<td>Glaciers</td>
<td>Rankled</td>
<td>Zephyr</td>
<td>Unconscious</td>
<td>Overawed</td>
<td>Hardships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idly</td>
<td>Inuit</td>
<td>Stunted</td>
<td>Trifling</td>
<td>Sorrowfully</td>
<td>Stifled</td>
<td>Unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omen</td>
<td>Trek</td>
<td>Meandered</td>
<td>Rambunctious</td>
<td>Renewing</td>
<td>Chattels</td>
<td>Spirituals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chafing</td>
<td>Peculiar</td>
<td>Quivering</td>
<td>Ornery</td>
<td>Faltered</td>
<td>Indescribably</td>
<td>Tribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation</td>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>Calculate</td>
<td>Persuaded</td>
<td>Ration</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crevasses</td>
<td>Unclenched</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfortunate</td>
<td>Quarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulation</td>
<td>Terrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7
Open Court Reading 2000 Vocabulary Word List Fourth Grade Unit 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td>Signed</td>
<td>Parchment</td>
<td>Raisedprint</td>
<td>Blares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinction</td>
<td>Posture</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Quill</td>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>Monotonous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td>Obnoxious</td>
<td>Manuscripts</td>
<td>Pattern</td>
<td>Columnist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>Infancy</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Scribes</td>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Profoundly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>Guilds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporarily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Distress</td>
<td>Tinkered</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWL Sublist</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>Vocab Words</td>
<td>AWL Words and also in Open Court 2000 Fourth Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Authority, Income, Benefit, Distribute, Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community, Consume, Distinct, Complex, Perceive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Technique, Physical, Contribute, Dominate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Investigate, concentrate, attribute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Energy, Medical, Facilitate, Pursue, Notion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Incorporate, Rational, Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stimulate, Ignorance, Identical, Portion, Unique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prospect, Restore, Manipulate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the findings indicate the majority of the words are from the first eight sublists. There is an average of 4.125 words out of 60 words from each of the first eight sublists on the Open Court (OC) vocabulary lists.
The results of these findings indicate there are 204 vocabulary words taught in Open Court during five units of curriculum in fourth grade. Out of the 204 vocabulary words, 33 words are also on the Coxhead Academic Word List, which is 16% of the Academic Word List. The number of Academic Words appearing in each Unit of Open Court ranges from five to eight words.

Table 10 lists the Fourth-grade Open Court Reading vocabulary words also found on the CST Release Questions by Open Court Reading Units.
Table 10

Open Court Reading Vocabulary Words by Unit Found on CST Release Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
<th>Unit 4</th>
<th>Unit 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fierce</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Deserted</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarmingly</td>
<td>Restaurateur</td>
<td>Arctic</td>
<td>Raisedprint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enviously</td>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>Cow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarmed</td>
<td>Refreshments</td>
<td>Terrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronaut</td>
<td>Supplier</td>
<td>Wreckage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Persuaded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groundwork</td>
<td>Confide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Open Court 2000 Fourth-grade Vocabulary and CST Release Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Court 2000 Fourth-Grade</th>
<th>Total Vocabulary Words</th>
<th>Vocabulary Words also in CST Release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>50 words</td>
<td>5 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>28 words</td>
<td>7 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>46 words</td>
<td>0 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>48 words</td>
<td>8 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td>32 words</td>
<td>2 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units 1-5</td>
<td>204 words</td>
<td>23 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of these findings indicate there are 204 vocabulary words taught in Open Court during a five units of curriculum in fourth-grade. Out of the 204 OC vocabulary words, 23 words are also found on the CST, which is 11% of the OC vocabulary list. The number of Open Court Vocabulary Words appearing on the CST ranges from zero to seven words.
Table 12 lists words found on the Academic Word List also found on the Fourth-Grade CST.

### Table 12

**Academic Words Found on Fourth-grade CST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AWL Sublist Number</th>
<th>Total Vocab Words</th>
<th>AWL Words and also in Fourth Grade CST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Approach, Area, Consist, Individual, Issue, Major, Occur, Percent, Process, Research, Role, Section, Similar, Source, Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Category, Compute, Conclude, Construct, Credit, Design, Feature, Final, Injure, Item, Journal, Purchase, Range, Region, Resources, Seek, Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Considerable, Illustrate, Instance, Layer, Locate, Publish, Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Approximate, Contrast, Cycle, Error, Goal, Grant, Job, Principal, Series, Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Challenge, Compound, Contact, Draft, Energy, Logic, Objective, Orient, Style, Substitute, Symbol, Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Author, Brief, Display, Edit, Index, Reveal, Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chemical, Contrary, Couple, Equip, File, Quote, Somewhat, Survive, Topic, Unique, Visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Detect, Drama, Exhibit, Inspect, Paragraph, Revise, Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Found, Sphere, Team, Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Odd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of these findings indicate 91 vocabulary words are found on the fourth-grade ELA CST release questions. Sixty-one of the 91 words are found in the first five Coxhead Sublists.

Table 13 lists Academic Words found on both the CST and in the fourth-grade Open Court Reading Vocabulary list.

Table 13
AWL found on CST and OCR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AWL Sublist Number</th>
<th>Total Vocab Words</th>
<th>AWL Words and also in Fourth-Grade CST and Fourth-Grade OCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of these findings indicate there were only two Coxhead Academic Words found on both the fourth-grade Open Court Reading program and on the fourth-
grade ELA CST release questions. Only one word was found in the top five frequented word lists.

Table 14

Academic Words on CST and Open Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Word Sublist</th>
<th>Words on the List</th>
<th>Words on CST</th>
<th>Words in Open Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 1</td>
<td>60 words</td>
<td>15 words</td>
<td>5 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 2</td>
<td>60 words</td>
<td>17 words</td>
<td>5 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 3</td>
<td>60 words</td>
<td>7 words</td>
<td>4 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 4</td>
<td>60 words</td>
<td>10 words</td>
<td>3 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 5</td>
<td>60 words</td>
<td>12 words</td>
<td>5 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 6</td>
<td>60 words</td>
<td>7 words</td>
<td>3 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 7</td>
<td>60 words</td>
<td>11 words</td>
<td>5 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 8</td>
<td>60 words</td>
<td>7 words</td>
<td>3 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 9</td>
<td>60 words</td>
<td>4 words</td>
<td>1 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublist 10</td>
<td>10 words</td>
<td>1 words</td>
<td>1 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units 1-10</td>
<td>570 words</td>
<td>91 words</td>
<td>35 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of these findings indicate 570 vocabulary words are on the 10 sublists of the Coxhead Academic Word List. Of those 570 vocabulary words, 91 of them were found on the CST release questions. The CST release questions had 16% of the total number of words from the Academic Word list. There were a total of 35 Academic
Words found on the Open Court vocabulary word list. The Open Court vocabulary word list had 6% of the total number of words from the Academic Word list. There is a difference of 10% between the number of Academic Words appearing in Open Court and those appearing on the CST release questions.

**Paired Sample Statistics of the Effectiveness of an Independent Vocabulary Program**

A paired sample *t*-test was used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the average values of the same measurement made under two different conditions. Both measurements were made on each unit in a sample and the test was based on the paired difference between these two values. The usually null hypothesis is that the difference in the mean value is zero. This paired sample *t*-test was used to determine whether there is a significant difference between Academic Vocabulary found in Open Court Reading Vocabulary and Academic Vocabulary found on the fourth-grade ELA CST release questions.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opencourt</td>
<td>.0649</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>.24659</td>
<td>.01033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cst</td>
<td>.1579</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>.36496</td>
<td>.01529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of a paired sample *t*-test show there is a significant difference between the means of Academic Vocabulary in Open Court and the mean of Academic...
Vocabulary in CST release questions. The mean for Academic Words in Open Court is 0.06 with a standard deviation of 0.24659. The mean for Academic Words on the CST is 0.1579 with a standard deviation of 0.36496. The mean for the CST is significantly greater than the mean of Open Court.

Table 16

Open Court and CST Paired Sample Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>opencourt &amp; cst</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of a Paired Sample Correlation test show that out of 570 Academic Words, the correlation between Open Court and the CST is -.036 with a significance of .391. Statistically, there is no correlation between the Academic Words found in the Open Court Vocabulary list and those found in the CST release questions. Academic Words present in the Open Court Vocabulary do not tend to be present on the CST release questions. Academic Words present on the CST release questions do not tend to be present in the Open Court Vocabulary list.
Table 17
Open Court and CST Paired Sample Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>opencourt - cst</td>
<td>Mean = -.09298</td>
<td>Std. Deviation = .44775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the paired sample test show the paired sample difference between Academic Vocabulary, Open Court vocabulary, and CST release questions. The results show a mean of 0.09298 with a standard deviation of 0.44775. With a 95% confidence level and a standard deviation of 0.00, which is less than 0.05, this test is considered significant.

Question 2: Supplementary Academic Vocabulary Program

Introduction

In addition to the Academic Vocabulary data, the researcher analyzed the effectiveness of an independent vocabulary program already in place. The goal of evaluating the EOR:V program was to measure the direct effectiveness of an independent vocabulary program, not one embedded in current ELA curricula.
Effectiveness of a Supplementary Academic Vocabulary Program

Table 18 shows the results of the pre- and post-standardized test the participating fourth-grade students were given to use as an assessment tool. Independent Sample Tests are those samples selected from the same populations, or different populations, which have no affect on one another. That is, no correlation exists between the samples. In this study, two groups of students were independent from each other when receiving vocabulary instruction.

Table 18

Vocabulary Instruction Pre- and Post-test Independent Sample Test-group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74.8000</td>
<td>10.46476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66.9333</td>
<td>19.18134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79.9000</td>
<td>11.26893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>77.1333</td>
<td>16.64274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 describes the data for the control and study groups pre- and post-test. There were two groups, one containing 10 students, the other having 15. Group 1’s pre-test mean score was 74.8%, with a standard deviation of 10.4 and a standard error mean of 3.3. Group 2’s pre-test mean score was 66.9%, with a standard deviation of 19.1 and a standard error mean of 4.9. Group 1’s post-test mean score was 79.9, with a standard
deviation of 11.2 and a standard error mean of 3.5. Group 2’s post-test mean score was 77.1, with a standard deviation of 16.6 and a standard error mean of 4.2.

The Independent Samples Test was used to determine whether the independent vocabulary program was effective in improving student academic performance.

Table 19

Vocabulary Instruction Pre- and Post-Test Independent Sample Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>22.359</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>22.975</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of an Independent Sample Test conducted on students receiving a pre- and post-test for an established vocabulary program show the program was not effective.
The significance of the pre-test when compared to a control group was 0.199 and 0.232 for the post-test. Due to the fact that 0.199 and 0.232 are greater than 0.005 means the test is not significant. There is no significance in the variance of the means whether or not one assumes equal variance. There is no need for the researcher to describe any further statistics due to the fact that the results show no significance. Therefore, it can be determined that the independent vocabulary program the researcher was evaluating showed no growth in student performance.

Question 3: Teacher and Student Survey

Introduction

To get a current perspective of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary from teachers and students, the researcher created a survey for each grouping. Below are the findings for the Teacher Survey and the Student Survey.

Teacher Survey Findings

Question 1 asked the teacher which grade they taught.

Table 20

Question One Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers at the Elementary school who responded to the survey are equally divided regarding which grades they taught; 50% taught kindergarten through third grade
and 50% taught fourth grade to sixth grade. The number of responses was greater than
the number of surveys analyzed due to the fact that teachers had the option to mark more
than one choice.

Question 2 asked the teachers how many years of teaching experience each one
had.

Table 21

Question Two Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 2 indicate that 13% of teachers had 0-5 years of
experience and 20% had 6-10 years, while a majority, 67%, of teachers had over 11 years
of experience.
Question 3 asked teachers to identify if they had heard the terms Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

Table 22

Question Three Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, explain definition</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but I do not know what it</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One hundred percent of the Elementary School teachers who responded to the survey had heard the terms Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary and explained a definition.

Question 4 asked teachers if they taught Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

Table 23

Question Four Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of Question 4 indicate that 100% teachers surveyed taught Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary, yet 27% of them only taught it somewhat.

Question 5 asked teachers how often they explicitly taught Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

**Figure 2** Question Five: Frequency of Teaching Academic Language

The results of Question 5 indicate that 100% of teachers explicitly taught Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary with the majority, 80%, teaching it daily.

Question 6 asked if the teacher felt they were given enough time in the library when they went with their class.
The results for Question 6 indicate that 40% of teachers answered they felt they had enough time in the library. The remaining teachers were divided evenly with 20% indicating “somewhat,” “no,” or did not answer.

Question 7 asked if professional development would be beneficial to their instruction of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of Question 7 indicate that 87% of teachers at the elementary school feel they would benefit from receiving professional development on Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

Question 8 asked teachers if Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary should be 30 minutes of explicit instruction, integrated into ELA instruction, or other.

Table 25
Question Eight Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes of explicit instruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated into ELA instruction</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 8 indicate 67% of teachers felt Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary should be integrated into ELA instruction. Forty-two percent of teachers indicated it should be instructed in another way. (The percentages will not add up to 100% because teachers indicated more than one response.)

Question 9 asked teachers if they had used an independent vocabulary program.
The results of Question 9 indicate that 67% of the teachers who responded to the survey had used an independent vocabulary program and 27% had not.

Question 10 asked teachers what Academic Language and Vocabulary meant to them. The results are organized by the comprehensive understanding of Academic Language or Vocabulary. A rubric for the teacher definitions is located in Table G1 in Appendix G.
Table 26
Question Ten Teacher Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has Comprehensive Understanding of Academic Language or Vocabulary (3):</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-“Academic Language is language used in text books, in a classroom, and on tests”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-“Words that are used on standardized tests and language that discussed in academic settings”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-“Academic Vocabulary (words) are the standard words found in textbooks, books, on test, assist us to obtain a job”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has General Conceptual Understanding of Academic Language or Vocabulary (2):</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-“Vocabulary used in education that is not used in normal everyday vocabulary”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-“Words that meet standards for the grade level”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-“Ac. Vocabulary is voc. used on a daily basis in curriculum throughout the student’s academic career”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-“Language used in teaching to context as opposed to content”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-“Words students should incorporate in everyday language that they may see on tests, ex. “comparison,” “adequate,” “synonyms,” “sum””</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- “Instructional language that helps define instructional strategies, directions, on a test, gives information regarding a task and supports student learning”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Words that should be apart of a students everyday vocabulary/speech. Words that students come across in their regular reading and discussions”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Academic vocabulary is the vocabulary necessary to understand concepts taught in school”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Academic Vocabulary is vocabulary critical to understand concepts of content subjects taught in schools”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Minimal Understanding of Academic Language or Vocabulary (1):</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Language you would expect to see in learning and business environments”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Language used on standardized test”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Vocabulary that students need to know to help them learn”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has No Understanding of Academic Language or Vocabulary (0):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses: 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the total of 15 responses, three appeared to have a comprehensive understanding of Academic Language. Nine teachers had a general conceptual
understanding of AL or AV. The remaining teachers had a minimal understanding of the
concepts. This data indicates that 80% of teachers did not fully comprehend AL or AV.

Question 11 asked teachers for additional comments. The responses were
categorized into two groups depending on the focus of the free response. The sorting
categories for the responses are in Table G2 in Appendix G.

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Responses</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Comments:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(5/15 responded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel I constantly use Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. It comes from a million hours of district classes and masters program classes.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“AL knowledge separates the educated from the non-educated. It distinguishes a person’s SEC and opens or closes the doors to the middle class. The Hidden Rules of business and professional careers dictates facility of academic language. Limited AL students reduces ability to succeed in school.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I work with our special friends. I try to mimic what is happening in the regular classroom and be supportive of that curriculum when I can. Many times the “Academic” Language is over my lower friends heads.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I wish our ELA program supported the expectations I(standards) our students are tested on”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Responses</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Although I don’t formally “teach” academic vocab. on a daily basis I certainly use it everyday”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you focus on the miniscule, you lose sight of the bigger picture”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language and Vocabulary. The second is #2-Teachers whose answers tell what kind of
Academic Language and Vocabulary instruction they do or could do. Two of the five
responses felt they had more to say about the definitions of Academic Language and
Vocabulary. Three of the five responses felt the answer was a chance to explain what
they felt they did or should do for Academic Language instruction.

Student Survey Findings

Question 1 asked for the students’ grade levels.

Table 28

Question One Results-Student Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 1 indicate that all students who participated in this survey
were in the fourth grade.
Question 2 asked the student’s primary language.

Table 29

Question Two Results – Students’ Primary Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 2 indicate that the overwhelming majority of students who participated in the survey had a primary language of English with just one student indicting Spanish.

Question 3 asked if the students were second language learners.

Table 30

Question Three Results – Second Language Learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 3 indicate 86% of all students did not consider themselves second language learners. Fourteen percent or two students were second language learners.
Question 4 asked what educational level did the student expect to attend.

The results of Question 4 indicate that the overwhelming majority of student will attend college with over half of them completing and 14% continuing on to graduate school.
Question 5 asked the frequency of which the student read or was read to.

Figure 6    Question Five: Frequency of Reading

The results of Question 5 indicate 64% of students read or were read to daily. The remaining of the students selected weekly or monthly and no students indicated “never.”
Question 6 asked if the students had heard the term Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

Table 31

Question Six Results – Knowledge of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but unsure of definition</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from Question 6 show 71% of the students had heard the terms “Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary,” yet 50% of the students were unsure of the definition of the term. The results also denote that 29% of the students had not heard of the term.

Question 7 asked the students if they liked attending the independent vocabulary class.

Table 32

Question Seven Results – Liked Attending Vocabulary Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results were unanimous with all students reporting they liked attending the independent vocabulary class.

Question 8 asked the students if they felt it was worthwhile attending the independent vocabulary class.

Table 33

Questions Eight Results – Worth Student’s Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 8 indicate 93% of the students believed it to be worth their time to attend the independent vocabulary class.

Question 9 asked students if they would attend the independent vocabulary class if it was available again.

Table 34

Questions Nin Results – Attend Again

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 9 show that a majority of the students would attend an independent vocabulary program if it was offered in the future.
Question 10 asked students if they used any of the words taught in the independent vocabulary class outside of the class.

Table 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that all the students used the vocabulary taught in the independent vocabulary class in other areas outside the classroom.

Question 11 asked students how they used the vocabulary words when they were not in the independent vocabulary class.

Table 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoken</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken &amp; Written</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 11 clearly show that all students used the vocabulary words while speaking in other settings and 78% spoke and wrote the vocabulary words after having been taught them in the independent vocabulary class.
Question 12 asked students if the instruction in the independent vocabulary class helped them better understand words that were not in the vocabulary class.

The results of Question 12 indicate that more students, 64%, believed instruction in the independent vocabulary class helped them understand the new vocabulary words yet 35% did not believe it helped them.

Question 13 asked students what they thought the best strategy for teaching the vocabulary words was.
The results of Question 13 clearly show that students were almost evenly divided on their opinion as to which instructional strategy was most effective for teaching vocabulary. “Using Pictures” was selected slightly more with 31% as compared to “Telling Definitions” and “Writing in My Own Words” that were selected 25% and “Reading in a Story” was last with 19%.
Question 14 asked students which of the instructional strategies would help them learn other words.

Figure 9  Question Fourteen: Best Strategy for New Words

![Pie chart showing student preferences]

The results of Question 14 show students were split in their beliefs of which strategy would help them learn future words. A slight majority of students believed they would be able to learn new vocabulary words when they read them in a story with 38% of students selecting “Reading in a Story.” The other three strategies were split with “Using Pictures” at 25%, “Telling Definitions” at 21%, and “Writing in My Own Words” at 19%.
Question 15 asked students if they had enough time to learn the new vocabulary words.

Table 37

Question Fifteen – Enough Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 15 show that the majority of students, 78%, felt they had enough time to learn the new vocabulary words.

Question 16 asked students which form of writing helped them learn the words the best.

Table 38

Question Sixteen – Form of Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of Writing</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finishing the sentence</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 16 show the students felt both forms of writing helped them learn the words the best, but the majority selected “Creative Writing” with 64%.

Question 17 asked students which way of teaching vocabulary helped them learn new vocabulary words the best.
Table 39

Questions Seventeen – Regular Classroom vs. Independent Vocabulary Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Vocabulary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 17 show that all students felt they were able to learn new vocabulary words the best while in the independent vocabulary classroom.
Question 18 asked students if they used the new vocabulary words in other subject areas such as science, math, and social studies.

Figure 10    Question Eighteen: Use of Vocabulary in Other Subject Matters

The results of Question 18 reflect the students’ use of vocabulary words in other subject matters. The majority of students, 71%, were able to use the word in other subject matters including, science, math, and social studies.

Question 19 asked students if any of the vocabulary words taught were on the CSTs.

Table 40

Question Nineteen – Vocabulary on the CST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results to Question 19 indicate students believed some of the vocabulary words taught in the independent vocabulary class were words used on the CST.

Question 20 asked students to indicate which words were on the CST if they could remember them from the previous year.

Table 41
Questions Twenty – CST Vocabulary Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Could Not Remember</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote Words</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 20 show that 43% of the students wrote specific vocabulary words they believed to be taught in the independent vocabulary class and located on the CST. The remaining 50% of the students could not remember what specific words were on the CST and 7% did not respond.

Question 21 asked students if there were any words on the CST they did not know the meaning of and, if so, approximately how many.
Table 42

Question Twenty-one – Part 1: Unknown Words on CST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43

Question Twenty-one – Part 2: Approximate Number of Unknown Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,7,3,6,5,5,16,7,3,3,2,10</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Question 21 are indicated in two parts. The first part indicates that 86% of the students did not understand all the words on the CST while 14% of them did. Those students who did not know what all the words meant on the CST gave a response for approximately how many words they did not know. The responses ranged from 3-16, which averaged 5.8 and 3 was indicated most often.

Question 22 asked the students to write what Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary meant to them. The researcher organized students’ responses depending on the comprehensive understanding of Academic Language or Vocabulary. A rubric for their definitions is in Table G3 in Appendix G.
Table 44

Question Twenty-two Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Responses</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has Comprehensive Understanding of Academic Language or Vocabulary (3):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has General Conceptual Understanding of Academic Language or Vocabulary (2):</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Minimal Understanding of Academic Language or Vocabulary (1):</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Smart in Language”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Your way of answering”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has No Understanding of Academic Language or Vocabulary (0):</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I have no idea”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I have no idea”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I have no idea”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I don’t know!!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I don’t know”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I don’t know”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Know idea”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I don’t know”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I have no idea”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I don’t know”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “I don’t know”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “NA”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “NA”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses 14
Out of the 14 responses, an overwhelming majority of students, 12, had no understanding of Academic Language or Academic Vocabulary. Of the two answers that students did give, both only described a minimal understanding of AL or AV.

Questions 23 asked students to write additional comments.

Question 23 Results

- “I loved to do the creative writing.”
- “It was fun!”
- “Can you do it next year for 5th!”
- “Thanks for improving in vocab. for me. I hope it’s next year too.”
- “My favorite part was when we shared our paragraphs and sentences.”
- “I think you should give us prompts to write about.”

Conclusion

This chapter included the findings of the data collected to create a study that analyzed the vocabulary words taught to and tested on fourth-grade students as well as the perceptions teachers and students held regarding Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. To strengthen the study, the research conducted an effectiveness study of an independent vocabulary program. The research conducted provided data to help answer the following questions:
1. To what degree do the fourth-grade English language arts curriculum and the fourth-grade English Language Arts California Standards Test include Academic Vocabulary?

Results show there is a statistically significantly low number of AV words found on the OCR vocabulary list. There is a statistically significant higher number of Academic Vocabulary words on the CST. Additionally, there is no significant correlation between Academic Vocabulary words found on Open Court and those found on the CST.

2. What is the impact of a specialized and supplementary “Academic” Vocabulary instructional program on the students’ Academic Language achievement and Academic Vocabulary acquisition?

Based on the Effectiveness Study of the implemented vocabulary program, the data showed no impact on student achievement.

3. What are students’ and teachers’ understandings about Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary?

As indicated in the findings, 80% of teachers had only general knowledge of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary, whereas an insignificant number of students had even a remote understanding of AL or AV.
Chapter 5
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Overview of the Study

The research conducted in this study utilized a mixed method style including both qualitative and quantitative research. The researcher analyzed the use of Coxhead Academic Vocabulary words taught in a state-approved English language arts curriculum and on the California Standardized Test’s release questions for the fourth grade. Data collected from multiple surveys of students and teachers were used to evaluate their understanding of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary and helped to determine the need for an Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary program. The surveys included a sampling of teachers’ knowledge of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary, their implementation and strategies for instructing Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary, and looked at the need for professional development around Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. Along with the raw data of Academic Vocabulary words used in curriculum, testing, and surveys, the researcher evaluated the effectiveness of an existing vocabulary program given to fourth-grade students. Students were given a survey along with a pre- and post-assessment to evaluate the success of the program.

Through the mixed method research of this project, it proved there is curricular and social need for an Academic Language and an Academic Vocabulary Development
program. The researcher also determined Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary was taught in the fourth-grade English language arts curriculum and tested on the CSTs. Additionally, the researcher used the success of an already implemented vocabulary program to determine an instructional model for the proposed implementation of an Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary Development program. This project, therefore, identifies the need for a Second Language Development framework and the creation of an Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary Development framework. Consequently, this study answers the following questions:

1. To what degree do the fourth-grade English language arts curriculum and the fourth-grade English Language Arts California Standards Test include Academic Vocabulary?

2. What is the impact of a specialized and supplementary “Academic” Vocabulary instructional program on the students’ academic language achievement and Academic Vocabulary acquisition?

3. What are students’ and teachers’ understandings about Academic Language?

Interpretation of Finding

*Academic Words in ELA Vocabulary*

Because 16% of the OCR ELA vocabulary words are also Academic Vocabulary words, it was determined that Academic Vocabulary is a statistically significant part of the ELA curriculum. However, the researcher interpreted the low percentage rate to
mean that OCR ELA vocabulary does not sufficiently teach Academic Vocabulary. In reverse comparison, only 6% of Coxhead’s Academic Words are found on the OCR ELA vocabulary word list. This statistic reinforces the researcher’s interpretation that OCR ELA vocabulary does a poor job of teaching Academic Vocabulary.

*ELA Vocabulary on CST*

Because 11% of OCR ELA Vocabulary words are found on the fourth-grade CST, it was determined that the OCR ELA vocabulary is a statistically significant part of the fourth-grade CST. But the researcher interpreted the low percentage rate to mean that OCR ELA vocabulary does not sufficiently teach to the CST.

*Academic Words on CST*

Because 16% of Academic Words are found on the fourth-grade CST, it was determined that Academic Words are a statistically significant part of the fourth-grade CST. The researcher continued to state that the high rate of Academic Words means there is a need to teach Academic Vocabulary to meet the challenges of the CST.

*Effectiveness Study*

After the analysis of pre- and post-data from students who took an established independent vocabulary program, the data showed that the program was ineffective and did not meet the requirements of the MYPAS exam. The researcher’s interpretations for this study are that a vocabulary program not specifically designed to teach students Academic Vocabulary and/or the meet the requirements of a grade-level standardized ELA test. The researcher recognizes there are too many variables to make conclusive
statements about the effectiveness of a program such as this. But, the researcher still proposes a specifically designed Academic Vocabulary program be developed based on lessons learned from this and other research projects.

**Student Survey**

The vast majority of students surveyed spoke English as their primary Language. Approximately three quarters of the students planned to attend college, with one-fifth of those students planning to attend graduate school. Two-thirds of students’ reported that they read or were read to on a daily basis. Seventy-eight percent of students reported that they were of unsure what Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary was, but 50% of those students had heard the terms Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

The bulk of the students reported they liked attending an independent vocabulary class. They felt it was worthwhile and would like to attend again if it was available. All students reported they used the vocabulary words from the independent vocabulary class in other areas outside the classroom. The students continued to say they used the learned vocabulary in both spoken and written forms of communication. Moreover, 64% of students reported that learning the taught vocabulary words helped them learn new vocabulary words. Students were evenly split on what they perceived to be the best strategy for learning new vocabulary words. Seventy-eight percent of students felt they had enough time to learn the new vocabulary words as instructed in the independent vocabulary program. Two-thirds of students felt creative writing helped them learn the new vocabulary words more efficiently. The remaining one-third felt that completing a
sentence with the new word was the best strategy. All students perceived an independent vocabulary program to be the most effective way of teaching vocabulary. Approximately three-quarters of the students indicated they were able to use the new vocabulary words in other content areas such as science, math, and social studies.

When students were asked to compare the new vocabulary words taught to the words on the CST, 78% of them believed the new words were found on the CST. When asked for specific words found in both the new independent vocabulary program and on the CST, 50% of students could not remember any specific words on both. The majority of students did not understand all the words found on the CST. Students reported, on average, they did not know the definition of five to eight of the vocabulary words on the CST. When asked to write definitions of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary, students were unable to show any understanding of the concept of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. Responses varied from, “I don’t know” to “smart in language.”

The researcher interpreted the students’ responses about their backgrounds to be that their families’ primary language was overwhelmingly English and that the general expectation of fourth-grade students at the elementary school was to attend college. Using the findings from this research, the researcher can make a non-conclusive supposition that students who read or were read to on a daily basis were more likely to be exposed to Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary and, therefore, have a better vocabulary and perform better on the academic testing.
Due to the fact that only 21% of students believed they knew what AL meant, a clear definition is needed and should be used throughout ELA. Students who attended an independent vocabulary program felt the program was successful in teaching them new vocabulary words, was worthwhile attending and would like to attend again. Therefore, an independent Academic Vocabulary program could have the same effect on student achievement.

The researcher can conclude that teaching vocabulary independently is a successful strategy considering students reported using the new vocabulary words outside the vocabulary class in both spoken and written. Furthermore, this conclusion can be supported by the fact that students also believed the newfound strategies (telling the definition, using pictures, reading a story, or writing in their own words) for learning vocabulary would also help them learn new words outside the direct instruction of class. Students identified that both creative writing and filling in the blank of a sentence helped them acquire the new vocabulary words with creative writing being slightly more effective. It can be determined that incorporating multiple forms of writing in academic vocabulary acquisition programs would be the most beneficial to student achievement.

Considering all students felt the independent vocabulary program helped them learn new words better than the strategies used in their regular education classroom and most student felt the amount of time given to learn each new vocabulary word was adequate enough to successfully acquire the word, this program could be used as a model. The majority of students reported using the new vocabulary words in other subjects such
as science, math, and social studies. This indicates the need for cross-curricular vocabulary words to be acquired and also emphasizes the positive impact having a large vocabulary repertoire would have on all subject areas.

The results can be interpreted in comparison with the CST as well. The vast majority of students believed that some of the words taught in the independent vocabulary program were also found on the CST. In fact, almost half of them were able to identify exact words, yet half were not. If students believe the words were going to be found on the CST, they may believe there is a greater need to learn them. In fact, the overwhelming majority of students said they did not understand the meaning of all the words found on the CST. Therefore, there is a need to incorporate academic vocabulary with concrete frameworks into the ELA program.

Teacher Survey

All teachers at the elementary school had heard the term Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary and were able to give a definition. The respondents indicated Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary is the language used in an academic setting. One respondent’s definition stated,

Academic Language or Vocabulary is the language or words used in textbooks, classrooms, and on test. It is different in structure and vocabulary from everyday spoken informal English. It is not the technical vocabulary of a particular subject, but is used to teach across all disciplines.

The data indicated 100% of teachers at the elementary school taught Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary yet only 27% of them taught it some of the time. Although 80% of teachers explicitly taught Academic Language and Academic
Vocabulary on a daily basis, 87% of the respondents indicated that professional development would be beneficial to their instruction.

The teachers surveyed indicated Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary should be integrated into ELA instruction or instructed a way other than 30 minutes of explicit instruction. The majority of teachers indicated Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary should be integrated into all curricula. With regard to integrating the vocabulary into the ELA instruction, a respondent stated, “Critical for success in school and must be specifically taught.” Another respondent stated, “based upon student need.” The data reflects 67% of the respondents had used an independent vocabulary program.

The researcher believes the teachers at the elementary school were conscious of the terms Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary and were able to produce a definition. A majority of the teachers reported a definition with characteristics consistent with leading researchers of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary yet only two teachers were able to write a clear and comprehensive meaning. Overall, teachers seemed to understand that Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary are words used in the school setting. Answers did vary to the degree of usage and context in the educational field. Considering all teachers believed they were teaching Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary without a clear and consistent definition used throughout the school, the researcher sees a need for a universal definition of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary to be implemented at the school. The
overwhelming majority, 80%, of teachers stated they taught Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary on a daily basis. The percentage needs to be increased to show 100% of teachers teaching Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary every day. Therefore, teachers at the elementary school need professional development training for consistency.

The respondents indicated that 67% of them had used an independent vocabulary program in their classroom, which is contrary to what they indicated regarding the way instruction of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary should be performed. Since the majority of teachers were familiar with implementing an independent vocabulary program, the transition into implementing a formal Academic Language vocabulary program should be successful.

Leadership Implications

When change and transformation is needed, the leader is the pivotal role. A visionary and transformational leader is one who sees a need for change, makes data-driven decisions, and mobilizes assets and stakeholders to make the change. Giving all stakeholders in the organization a voice including the students provides the most effective transformational leader the shared vision needed for success. A strong leader compels all involved to contribute to the goal and vision becoming common ground to lead to an ultimate solution.
This study provides the foundation for an exceptional transformational leader to build a platform for curricular change. Through the analyses of surveys, vocabulary word analyses, and examination of the current curriculum and California Standards Tests, this study provides justification and societal need to implement a State Framework in Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

Now that the issues and needs are clearly defined, the transformational leaders need to implement the change. State, district, and site level administrators need to establish a vision for the organization whether it be collaboratively or initiated by the leader and then decided by all stakeholders. This proactive approach will allow districts and school sites to be leaders in the educational communities.

To create dramatic and necessary change, the leader will need to take risks and be a skilled communicator. When implementing a new curriculum, project, or policy, it is necessary to have buy-in from the stakeholders; therefore, initial formal professional development and follow-up sessions must be offered throughout the years. To receive dedication and enthusiasm regarding Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary, stakeholders need to have a solid background knowledge and understanding of the need and effectiveness.

Recommendations

Based on the statistically significant correlation of less than .05 from the Paired Sample Test between Academic Vocabulary and the predominant measure for the CST,
the researcher recommends proposing an Academic Vocabulary framework be developed based on the new Common Core Standards. From the established frameworks, the researcher recommends an Academic Vocabulary curriculum be developed directly addressing academic vocabulary by grade level, in current curriculum, and on the new standardized assessment (the replacement for the CST). The framework should establish an accepted and standardized definition for Academic Vocabulary and Academic Language.

The standardized definition should be the rallying point for efforts to teach Academic Vocabulary and Language. Based on the evidence provided from the researchers surveys, it has been indicated that a lack of a standardized definition for Academic Vocabulary and Language and a common understanding of their concepts means students are not receiving consistent or focused instruction in the topic. Finally, the researcher recommends a replacement for the Coxhead Academic Word list, using more relevant words organized by grade level or development sublists. The study that generates the new Academic Word list should follow the same methodology created by Averil Coxhead, but be conducted with modern and culturally relevant literature.

Further Study

This study was a beginning look at Academic Vocabulary in fourth-grade CST and Open Court ELA curriculum in correlation with the Coxhead AWL. It took an in-
depth look into this area and produced findings and conclusions with a solid foundation yet additional research may be expanded from it.

As the researcher stated earlier in Chapters 1 and 2, there is not a universal definition for Academic Language or Academic Vocabulary in the pedagogical field of education. It would be imperative to the advancement of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary to create a uniform definition and for it to be used throughout classrooms in the United States. Therefore, a further study of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary could be researched. Not only defining each term, but also creating a uniform understanding of it across the educational field is needed.

This research only looked at fourth grade; therefore, further studies such as Crothers (2011) that look at fifth grade and sixth grade could be conducted. Further studies continuing into middle school and high school curriculum could also be conducted. With a thorough analysis of the Academic Vocabulary all grades, a complete analysis of all public education can be found. In addition to researching all grades, kindergarten through 12th-grade English language arts curriculum, a further study could analysis Academic Vocabulary in different subject areas, including math, social studies, and all disciplines of science.

A parallel study of Academic Vocabulary could also be conducted using standardized tests other than the CST. When looking at Academic Vocabulary in correlation with high school curriculum it would be necessary to analyze the California High School Exit Exam (CASHEE) as well as the CST for each subject. Additional
studies for high school Academic Vocabulary could use Advanced Placement (AP) exams and the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) to reinforce finding a need for an Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary framework. Furthermore, analysis of the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) would give a comprehensive study through higher education.

With the adoption of the new National Common Core Standards, further studies are needed to analyze the Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary used in these new standards, which will resonate in the new standard-aligned curriculum adopted by states. Due to the fact that new standards and new curriculum will be adopted, a new standardized assessment will be used instead of the CST. A further study will be needed utilizing this new standardized assessment.

Conclusion

What is our educational system’s main goal? Some may say it is to educate the youth so they are able to read, write, and do arithmetic. Others may expand and say it is also to foster children to be successful members of society. No matter what the perspective is, the goal of the national educational system is to have all students achieve at proficient levels (NCLB, 2001). For students to reach proficient, they must learn the language of education, Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

Children are born into families and cultures all over the world that speak different languages. This becomes their primary language with early development happening in an
informal register. Once children begin their career in education, they have a solid foundation of their language in a more casual and comfort dialect. Entering the first year of school brings about a new language, which will be used throughout their schooling. They then become a second language learner of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.

Although there have been research, books, and lectures stating how important Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary is to the success and leading of students into higher education, no one has created a standard of framework. This study looked deeper into the rational, societal need and suggested a format for future development of an Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary Development framework. To justify such a statement, the study asked and answered the four research questions.

Question 1: To what degree do the fourth-grade English language arts curriculum and the fourth-grade English Language Arts California Standards Test include Academic Vocabulary?

Anticipated Answer Question 1: Both the fourth-grade English language arts curriculum and the fourth-grade English Language Arts California Standards Test contain Academic Vocabulary at an equivalently significant level. The amount is at a level that provides students ample access to Academic Vocabulary.

Actual Answer Question 1: Both the fourth-grade English language arts curriculum and the English Language Arts fourth-grade California Standards Test contain
Academic Vocabulary at a level that is significant yet not to a level that provides
students with adequate access to Academic Vocabulary.

Question 2: What is the impact of a specialized and supplementary Academic
Vocabulary instructional program on the students’ Academic Language
achievement and Academic Vocabulary acquisition?

Anticipated Answer Question 2: The students who participate in the specialized
supplemental Academic Vocabulary instructional program will increase their
overall English language arts score at a level that exceeds the scores of students
who did not participate.

Actual Answer Question 2: The students and program studied in this research
showed little to no impact on improving student’s achievement as measured by
the Independent Sample t-test over students who did not participate in the
program.

Question 3: What are students’ and teachers’ understandings about Academic
Language and Academic Vocabulary?

Anticipated Answer Question 3: Teachers have at least a general understanding and
strongly valued the need of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary.
Students have at least a general understanding of Academic Language and
Academic Vocabulary. Students believe they use Academic Vocabulary in all
subject areas.
Actual Answer Question 3: Of the two groups surveyed, only the teachers had
general knowledge of Academic Vocabulary. The students surveyed had no
general knowledge of how to define Academic Language or Academic
Vocabulary. In both cases, neither groups showed a comprehensive
understanding of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary. Yet, both
groups valued the need to increase knowledge of Academic Vocabulary and did
not feel it was happening to the appropriate level.

The initial data from this research continued to yield potential answers to a larger
question for educational leaders.

Question 4: From this study’s initial data collection and analysis, what factors
should be taken into account in designing an Academic Language and Academic
Vocabulary Framework?

Answer: When designing an Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary
Frameworks, three major factors should be examined:

1. Use the English Language Arts Development Framework as a model
2. Increase student, parent, and teacher knowledge including creating one
   universal definition for Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary
3. Curriculum needs to be embedded in the English language arts
   curriculum coupled with complementary lessons independent of the
   core curriculum.
This research is the beginning of a path toward awareness, expansion, and true success for students of our future. With a fundamental understanding that Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary is a second language to all students and a common plan to reach proficiency, the students of our nation will be successful.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Academic Language Teacher Survey

You are being invited to participate in a research study about Academic Language. This study is being conducted by Mr. Burke as part of a dissertation. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are a teacher at C. W. Dillard Elementary.

There are no known risks if you decide to participate in this research study. There are no costs to you for participating in the study. The information you provide will be used to evaluate the current understanding of Academic Language by teachers. The survey will take approximately ten minutes to complete. The information collected may not benefit you directly, but the information learned in this study should provide more general benefits to education.

The survey is anonymous. Do not write your name on the survey. No one will be able to identify you or your answers, and no one will know whether or not you participated in the study. Should the data be published, no individual information will be disclosed.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. By completing and returning the survey, you are voluntarily agreeing to participate. You are free to decline to answer any particular question you do not wish to answer for any reason.

If you have any questions about the study, please contact Mr. Burke at C. W. Dillard Elementary, 916-687-6121. Any questions about your rights may be directed to Dr. Virginia Dixon, Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at California State University, Sacramento at 916-278-5516 or by email at dixonv@csus.edu.
Check one answer only.
1. What grade do you teach?
   ☐ K-3
   ☐ 4-6
2. How many years have you been teaching?
   ☐ 0-5
   ☐ 6-10
   ☐ 11+
3. Have you heard the term Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary?
   ☐ yes
   ☐ yes, but I do not know what it means
   ☐ no
4. Do you teach Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary?
   ☐ yes
   ☐ somewhat
   ☐ no
5. How often do you explicitly teach Academic Language and/or Academic Vocabulary?
   ☐ daily
   ☐ weekly
   ☐ monthly
   ☐ never
6. Do you feel you are given enough time in the library when you go with your class?
   ☐ yes
   ☐ somewhat
   ☐ no
7. Would professional development be beneficial to your instruction of Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary?
   ☐ yes
   ☐ somewhat
   ☐ no
8. How should Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary be instructed?
   ☐ 30 minutes of explicit instruction
   ☐ integrated into ELA instruction
   ☐ other Explain
9. Have you used an independent vocabulary program?
   ☐ yes
   ☐ no
10. What does Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary mean to you?
Academic Language and Vocabulary
Student Survey

Please check only one answer per question.

1. What is your grade level? ____ K ____ 1 ____ 2 ____ 3 ____ 4 ____ 5 ____ 6
2. What is your primary language? ____________________________________________
3. Are you a second language learner? _____ Yes _____ No
4. What educational level do you expect to obtain? _____ High School Graduate _____ Some College _____ College Graduate _____ Graduate School
5. Do you read or get read to? _____ Daily _____ Weekly _____ Monthly _____ Never
6. Have you heard the terms Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary? _____ Yes _____ Yes, but unsure of definition _____ No
7. Did you like attending the Vocabulary Class? _____ Yes _____ No
8. Was it worthwhile attending the Vocabulary Class? _____ Yes _____ No
9. Would you like to attend again if it was available? _____ Yes _____ No
10. Did you use any words taught in the Vocabulary Class while you were in other place? _____ Yes _____ No
11. How did you use the vocabulary words outside of the vocabulary class? _____ Spoke _____ Written
12. Did the class help you better understand words that were not in the vocabulary class? _____ Yes _____ No
13. What was the best strategy the class taught you the words? _____ Telling definition _____ Using pictures _____ Used in a story _____ Writing in my own words
14. Would any of the above strategies help you learn other words? _____ Telling definition _____ Using pictures _____ Used in a story _____ Writing in my own words
15. Did you feel you had enough time to learn the words? _____ Yes _____ No
16. Which form of writing helped you learn the words the best? 
   _____ Finishing the sentence 
   _____ Creative writing

17. Which way of teaching vocabulary helps you learn words best? 
   _____ Regular English class 
   _____ Vocabulary Class

18. Were you able to use the vocabulary words learned in other areas, such as science, math, 
   social studies? 
   _____ Yes 
   _____ No

20. If yes to #14, what were the words? 
   ____________________________________________ 
   or, _____ I can’t remember them

21. Were there any words on the STAR test that you did not know what the meaning was? 
   _____ Yes 
   _____ No 
   Approximately how many? 

22. What does Academic Language and Academic Vocabulary mean to you?
   ____________________________________________ 
   ____________________________________________ 
   ____________________________________________ 
   ____________________________________________

23. Additional Comments 
   ____________________________________________ 
   ____________________________________________ 
   ____________________________________________ 
   ____________________________________________

19. Were any of the vocabulary words you learned in the vocabulary class on the STAR test? 
   _____ Yes 
   _____ No
APPENDIX B

Assent to Participate in Research at C. W. Dillard Elementary School

You are being asked to participate in research, which will be conducted by Mr. Burke, principal and education doctoral student in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at California State University, Sacramento. The Department of Education supports the practice of informed assent (permission) and protection for human subjects (you, the student) participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you will participate in the present study. You are free to withdraw yourself at any time.

The purpose of this study is to review how student’s whose first language is not English are taught and use it to describe how lessons can be taught. The researcher will look at the scores from multiple Mid-Year Progress Assessment (MYPAS) exams, you will take the test twice.

To determine the your current understanding of Academic Language a survey will be filled out. The information gathered from this survey is important since it will represent a small sampling of student opinions and test data. Even though risks to you are small, we recognize some students have test anxiety. If you experience high levels of stress or anxiety you will be referred to the school counselor if desired.

Your participation is wanted but you don’t have to participate. It is completely safe and is not associated with any known health risks. The researcher assures you that your name will not in any way be associated with the research findings. Your signature below indicates that you have read this page and agree to participate in the research.

If you have any questions about this research, you may contact Mr. Burke at (916) 687-6121, or by email cburke@egusd.net.

Thank you very much for your time, and I appreciate your support and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mr. Burke
Principal/Doctoral Student

_____________________________
Student name (printed)

_____________________________    ___________________
Signature        Date
Consent to Participate in Research at C. W. Dillard Elementary School

Your child is being asked to participate in research, which will be conducted by Mr. Burke, administrator and education doctoral student in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at California State University, Sacramento. The Department of Education supports the practice of informed consent and protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you will allow your child to participate in the present study. You are free to withdraw your child at any time.

The purpose of this study is to review the history and implementation of the English Language Development (ELD) model and use it to propose the creation of a new framework for Academic Language. The researcher will analyze the scores from multiple Mid-Year Progress Assessment (MYPAS) exams. To determine the students’ current understanding of Academic Language a survey will be filled out.

Your child will participate in a re-examination of the district mid-year assessment, MYPAS, eight weeks after the initial test, and a survey. The information gathered from this survey is important since it will represent a small sampling of student opinions and test data. Even though risks to students are minimal, we recognize some students have test anxiety. Students experiencing high levels of stress or anxiety will be referred to the school counselor if they desire.

Your child’s participation is solicited but strictly voluntary, is completely safe and is not associated with any known health risks. The researcher assures you that your child’s name will not in any way be associated with the research findings. Your signature below indicates that you have read this page and agree to have your child participate in the research.

If you have any questions about this research, you may contact Mr. Burke at (916) 687-6121, or by email cburke@egusd.net.

Thank you very much for your time, and I appreciate your support and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mr. Burke
Principal/Doctoral Student

_____________________________    ___________________
Student name (printed)    Signature of parent or legal guardian    Date
APPENDIX C

Open Court 2000 Fourth Grade Vocabulary also on Coxhead AWL

--Assumption-root word ex: Authoritative-Authority

Unit 1
Lesson 1
  Prospect-8
  Authoritative-Authority-1
Lesson 2
Lesson 3
  Energetic-Engery-5
Lesson 4
Lesson 5
  Simulates-Simulate-7
  Techniques-Technique-3
Lesson 6
Lesson 7
  Ignorance-7

Unit 2
Lesson 1
  Investing-Investigate-4
  Incorporated-Incorporate-6
  Income-1
Lesson 2
  benefits-benefit-1
Lesson 3
Lesson 4
  community-2
  restoring-restore-8
Lesson 5
Lesson 6
  Identity-identical-7
  Consumers-consume-2
Lesson 7

Unit 3
Lesson 1
Lesson 2
  Colleagues-colleague-10
Lesson 3
  Herb medicines-medical-5
Lesson 4
Facilities-facilitate-5
Lesson 5
Physician-physical-3
Manipulate-8
Lesson 6

Unit 4
Lesson 1
Pursued-pursue-5
Lesson 2
Lesson 3
Notions-notion-5
Lesson 4
Distinctly-distinct-2
Lesson 5
Lesson 6
Concentration camp-concentrate-4
Ration-rational-6
Lesson 7
Portion-7
Unique-7
Tribute-distribute-1
-tribute-3
-attribute-4

Unit 5
Lesson 1
Environment-1
Intellect-intelligence-6
Complex-2
Dominance-dominate-3
Lesson 2
Lesson 3
Perceptions-perceive-2
Lesson 4
Lesson 5
Lesson 6
Temporarily-temporary-9
APPENDIX D

Open Court 2000 Fourth Grade Vocabulary found on CST Release Questions 2003-2008

Unit 1 (50 words)
Lesson 1- (7)
   fierce – wild or threatening appearance (21) Pg. 13
   alarmingly – filled with a sense of danger (28) Pg. 46 (alarm)
Lesson 2- (8)
   enviously – with jealousy (36) Pg. 19
Lesson 3-(7)
   alarmed – frightened (59) Pg. 46 (alarm)
Lesson 4-(9)
Lesson 5-(7)
   astronaut – a person who travels in space (77) Pg. 27
Lesson 6-(7)
Lesson 7-(5)

Unit 2 (28 words)
Lesson 1-8)
   interest – money received on an investment (127) Pg. 10, 12, 21, 33, 35, 36, 37, 37, 45, 48, 56,
Lesson 2-(6)
   restaurateur – a person who owns a restaurant (140) Pg. 32 (restaurant) 52
   customers – people who buy something (141) Pg. 55 (custom)
Lesson 3-(2)
   refreshments – food or drink (148) Pg. 11 (refreshing)
   supplier – a person who makes items available (148) Pg. 49 (supplies)
Lesson 4-(3)
Lesson 5-(2)
   product – something that is sold (167) Pg. 35 & 43
Lesson 6-(7)
   groundwork – a basis or foundation (186) Pg. 32

Unit 3-(46 words)
Lesson 1-(10)  
Lesson 2-(8)  
Lesson 3-(6)  
Lesson 4-(7)  
Lesson 5-(9)  
Lesson 6-(6)
Unit 4-(48 words)
Lesson 1-(6)
   deserted – abandoned (325) Pg. 62 (4 times), 63, 64 (all desert)
Lesson 2-(9)
   arctic – having to do with the North Pole (330) Pg. 65
Lesson 3-(9)
   cow – make afraid (356) Pg. 20 (cow/animal-multiple meaning)
   terrain – the type of natural features in an area (358) Pg. 32 (3 times- 2
   subterranean, terra)
Lesson 5-(8)
   wreckage – the remains of something that has been destroyed (380) Pg. 30
   (shipwreck)
   persuaded – led another person to agree with you (386) Pg. 12 and 53
   (persuade)
Lesson 6-(8)
   confide – tell secrets to; to discuss private thoughts (395) Pg. 21 (confident)
Lesson 7-(8)
   unique – special; the only one of its kind (410) Pg. 11, 56, 59

Unit 5-(32 words)
Lesson 1-(6)
   marine – of or relating to the sea (421)-Pg, 30, 10, 56, 32, 31
Lesson 2-(4)
Lesson 3-(6)
Lesson 4-(6)
Lesson 5-(4)
   raisedprint – a type of print for blind people in which letters of the alphabet are
   raised from the page so that they can be felt (466)- raised pg. 8 print pg. 22, 43
Lesson 6-(6)
APPENDIX E

Coxhead’s AWL on 4th-grade CST Release Questions

AWL word-CST word-page

Sub-list 1

Approach-approached-8
Area-areas-48, 49, 33
Consist-consists-10
Individual-individuals-48
Issue-69
Major-67, 65, 10
Occur-occurred-62
Percent-17
Process-23
  processing-22
Research-31, 45, 59
  researchers-30
role-44
section-33, 45, 67, 68, 69,
similar-17
source-17, 50, 55, 58,
specific-48

Sub-list 2
Category-29
Compute-computers-43, 44, 45, 28
Conclude-42, 64
Construct-construction-39
Credit-credited-50
Design-26
Feature-56
  featured-35
final-finally-8, 36, 37, 38, 46
injure-injured 14
item-item & items-27, 35, 39, 33
journal-12, 41
purchase-17, 62
range-ranges, rangers-62, 63
Symbol-10
Target-39

Sublist 6
Author-12, 25, 28, 29, 44, 56 57
Brief-45
Display-33, 35, 69
Edit-editor-45, 68, 69
Index-49
Reveal-59
Transport-transported-30

Sublist 7
Chemical-44
Contrary-65
Couple-7
Equip-equipment-10, 12
File-22, 23
Quote-44, 63
Somewhat-18
Survive-survivor-56
Topic-49
Unique-11, 56, 59
Visible-invisible-14

Sublist 8
Detect-detective-28
Drama-dramatic-10
Exhibit-35
Inspect-32
Paragraph-12, 21, 42, 44, 47, 49, 57, 58, 60, 61, 66, 67
Revise-55, 66
Tense-58, 60

Sublist 9
Found-13, 26, 33, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45, 47, 52, 53, 56, 57, 62, 65, 69
Sphere-hemisphere-62, 65
Team-27, 48, 68
Vision-television-12, 43, 44,

Sublist 10
Odd-26, 58
### APPENDIX F

Data Analysis/EOR:V Pre Post Raw Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>POST</th>
<th>EOR group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

Rubrics and Sorting Categories Chard for Survey Questions

Table G1

Rubric for Teacher Survey-Question 10-Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teacher has a comprehensive understanding of Academic Language or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teacher has a general understanding of Academic Language or Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The teacher has minimal understanding of Academic Language or Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The teacher has no understanding of Academic Language or Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G2

Sorting Categories for Teacher Survey-Question 11-Additional Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teachers whose answer tells what kind of Academic Language and Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary instruction they do or could do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teachers whose answer continues to define the terms Academic Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Academic Vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table G3

Rubric for Student Survey-Question 22-Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student has a comprehensive understanding of Academic Language or Academic Vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The student has a general understanding of Academic Language or Academic Vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The student has minimal understanding of Academic Language or Academic Vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The student has no understanding of Academic Language or Academic Vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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