Northwestern College, Iowa

NWCommons

Master's Theses & Capstone Projects   Education

Spring 2020

Second Language Acquisition Theories and What It Means For Teacher Instruction

Amanda Friedrichsen

Second Language Acquisition Theories and What It Means For Teacher Instruction

Amanda Friedrichsen

Northwestern College

A Literature Review Presented

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Education

May 2020

Dr. Daniela Syed

Table Of Contents

Abstract

The United States has seen a large increase in the number of ELL students in schools nationwide over the past twenty years. This literature review evaluates and compares different second language acquisition theories, teacher practices, learning strategies to help determine what teaching strategies will best help the ELL population close the achievement gap while becoming fluent in the English language. In order to provide each child an equal, high-quality education as required under the ESSA, more teachers need to be trained and well-equipped with the knowledge and tools to effectively teach ELL students in their classrooms. School leaders and stakeholders need to invest in appropriate professional development to support the learning of teachers who are faced with the task of meeting every students' needs. Explicit instruction from teachers in areas of vocabulary, reading comprehension, and listening strategies are a few key strategies that teachers need to become effective in when teaching in their classrooms.

Keywords: second language acquisition, ELL, teacher practices, learning strategies, teaching strategies

Second Language Acquisition Theories and What It Means For Teacher Instruction

The United States is becoming an even larger melting pot than ever before, and the education system needs to keep up in providing every student with an equal and high-quality education that will set all students up for success (de Jong, Harper, & Coady, 2013). Laws such as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) which was replaced with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) were put in place to ensure that obtaining an equal and high-quality education is possible for all students, even English Learners (Ferguson, 2016). However, few general educators are well-equipped and trained to understand the foundational knowledge in regards to teaching English Language Learners (ELL) (de Jong, Harper, & Coady, 2013).

This literature review will examine different second language acquisition theories, teacher practices, learning strategies, and teaching strategies to determine the appropriate and effective instruction for ELL students. As the ELL programs in schools continue to grow at a rapid rate, more examination into second language acquisition (SLA) is necessary for teachers to understand the language acquisition process (Flynn & Hill, 2005). It is also vital that teachers are knowledgable about learning and teaching strategies that will benefit ELL students in their classes since the achievement gap between native English students and ELL students continues to grow (Guccione, 2011).

Many theories on second language acquisition have been developed by numerous people. The literature review will examine the similarities and differences among those that have the greatest impact on education and the classroom teachers. Many important people in history such as John Schumann, Avram Chomsky, Stephen Krashen, and Vygotsky have developed theories on how one acquires a second language to the degree of proficiency. These theories include the

acculturation model, sociocultural theory, universal grammar hypothesis, interlanguage theory,

Krashen's theory of second language acquisition, and the complexity theory (Menezes, 2013).

The current author will examine how specific research-based teaching practices such as

the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model and Cognitive Academic Language

Learning Approach (CALLA) connect to the second language acquisition theories. Finding and

stating the connections between the theories and practices will help educate professional

educators on how to effectively make a difference in their students' understanding of content

while acquiring a second language simultaneously. The ELL population of students in schools

will make up a large part of our future economy, and it is essential that educators are

knowledgeable in the contextual understanding of ESL students while using appropriate

pedagogical skills to allow all students access to a high-quality, equal education (de Jong,

Harper, & Coady, 2013; Horsford & Sampson, 2013).

Review of the Literature

Educators are being increasingly challenged with the task to support and teach EL

students grade-level content and a second language simultaneously (de Jong, Harper, & Coady,

2013). Understanding how second language acquisition occurs and using specific teaching

strategies may assist educators in helping students achieve success in second language

acquisition while being engulfed in content. This literature review will review and evaluate six

second language acquisition (SLA) models or theories to help determine which types of teaching

strategies will be best for students learning English as a second language. Finding the

differences and similarities among these theories and hypotheses which will help guide educators

in using the most beneficial teaching strategies with their students.

Acculturation Model

Barjesteh & Vaseghi (2012) explain the acculturation model as using social-psychological

factors to predict the proficiency levels of acquiring a second language which include proximity

to the target language, attitude, congruence of the two cultures, the desire to assimilate, preserve,

and adapt, as well as the intended length of time spent engulfed in the target language. This

model originated in a study conducted by John Schumann in the fall of 1973 where he studied

six migrant language learners (two adults, two adolescents, and two children) for ten months,

taking notes of their acquisition levels and using questionnaires to gather data (Barjesteh &

Vaseghi, 2012). According to the authors, (2012) Schumann noted that the English acquisition of

one male adult in his study did not show much of an increase in language acquisition over the

ten-month period, but Schumann pointed out that this man did not engage in the social or

psychological conversations that occurred among other native English speakers. According to

Schumann, (1986) the acculturation model is simply the beginning process of naturally acquiring a second language which is not a linear process.

Additional research was done to determine the validity of Schumann's model of acculturation by Schmidt who conducted research on a Japanese artist named Wes who moved to Hawaii when he was 33 years-old (1983). Without formal instruction, Schmidt followed Wes for three years examining the acquisition of the English language (Schmidt, 1983). The author found that given the proximity to the social and psychological components of the English language, Wes acquired competence in communication; but did not master linguistics in the English language (Schmidt, 1983). This study validates the theory of the acculturation model by showing that Wes mastered the language in the areas he was able to be engulfed in while living in a new country; whereas, he did not master the linguistics because the social and psychological factors did not relate to the literacy part of the language (Schmidt, 1983).

Sociocultural Theory

Similarly, Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory has been used to explain SLA as a result of being widely used in the education field. Vygotsky's work began with researching the relationship between education and the mental development of a child (Vygotsky, 2011). Daneshfar & Moharami (2018) explain that the sociocultural theory (SCT) states that social interactions with the use of psychological tools (such as language) are a major part in one's cognitive development. Menezes (2013) explains that it is through these social and imitation experiences that language learners are able to advance to the next stage of language acquisition because language is only as valuable as the ability that one has to make meaning from it.

Furthermore, Vygotsky explains the zone of proximal development as being the level of which a student can independently do a task compared to what that same child can do while collaborating with a peer or teacher to complete the same task (Vygotsky, 2011). The zone of proximal development (ZPD) has made its way into most educators' vocabulary as the magnitude of teaching students at a level slightly beyond what is already developed and understood in their minds is vitally important (Turuk, 2008). Vygotsky's intent was to bring attention to the relationship between development and appropriate instruction (Daneshfar & Moharami, 2018). Interactions between one who is learning a new, targeted language and one who has mastered the language are appropriate and needed when considering the importance of those interactions as a way of communicating (Turuk, 2008). The ZPD promotes the use of negotiating language among a language learner and proficient language speaker (Danshfar & Moharami, 2018).

Universal Grammar Hypothesis & Interlanguage Theory

In contrast, Chomsky approached language acquisition as more than just social and psychological experiences; therefore the universal grammar hypothesis was created and presented as a way to understand how one acquires a language biologically. The universal grammar hypothesis (UG) looks at the capabilities of the brain and believes the brain is already programmed to learn language (Menezes, 2013). According to the author (2013) Chomsky believed environmental factors were insufficient in describing the acquisition of language because one's output can become more than just what was received through input. Menezes (2013) further explains that explicit instruction on grammar was not required for one to learn and acquire their first language; (L1) therefore, biologically, one is able to acquire a second language without explicit instruction and a vast amount of social experiences. Chomsky explained this as

using one's innate Universal Grammar (UG) to explain understanding that is beyond the input

which was received (White, 2007). However, White (2007) also explains that in order for

universal principles within the UG to be activated, it must be triggered by some type of input.

Even though Chomsky's theory was not intended to influence SLA as it originated to explain

how one learns their first language, it became widely used in SLA theories as it attempted to

explain the biological role of learning a new language (Gitsaki, 1998).

In fact, the UG hypothesis helped explain the interlanguage theory by relating it the

importance of one's cognitive abilities. According to Gitsaki (1998) interlanguage is described

as a temporary grammar which is used to bridge one's knowledge and use of their native or first

language (L1) to their second language (L2). Interlanguage is explained by Ipek (2009) as a type

of grammar that is always changing as one moves through the acquisition process and applies the

rules that govern the language. Grammar rules may be overgeneralized or underutilized as one's

cognitive abilities acquire the L2 while trying to apply what one knows about L1 or has been

taught about L2 (Gitsaki, 1998). Tarone (2012) further explained that the interlanguage theory

which was first developed by Selinker in 1972 was thought to only pertain to adults who were

learning a second language because they were not able to access their innate UG after puberty.

However, now interlanguage is thought to appear in both children and adults learning a second

language. Interlanguage also accounts for the possibility of never fully acquiring a second

language and termed such event as fossilization (Tarone, 2012).

Krashen's Theory of Second Language Acquisition

Stephen Krashen has influenced the world of SLA as he has studied and researched

language acquisition for many years. His theory is based on five different hypotheses which

include: acquisition/learning hypothesis, monitor hypothesis, natural order hypothesis, input

hypothesis, and the affective filter hypothesis (Abukhattala, 2013). However, there is criticism

according to Gitsaki (1998) & Menezes (2013) that Krashen's model is not defined clearly or

verifiable through research. Even though criticism is present, Krashen's model has had a great

impact in the field of SLA which warrants time in understanding the model as a whole. The next

few paragraphs will explain the importance of each hypothesis.

Krashen uses two distinctly different words to view skills learned in a second

language which is the difference between *acquisition* and *learning* (Abukhattala, 2013). The

acquisition-learning hypothesis is part of Krashen's model of SLA (Abukhattala, 2013).

According to Bahrani (2011) *learning* requires conscious effort on the individual's part to learn

language and focus on structure; whereas, *acquisition* occurs when subconscious activity is used

as a way to internalize the language in the individual's mind, making it natural for a person to

use. Abukhattala (2013) further explains that in classrooms, more *learning* is required than

acquisition which may hinder the development of automatic and long-lasting knowledge of a

second language.

The natural order hypothesis, another component of Krashen's monitor model, contrasts

the acculturation and sociocultural theories by explaining that there is a predictability in the

structures that are *acquired*; however, this is not the case with *learning* which may be still taught

in a specific order (Bahrani, 2011). As a result, Abukhattala (2013) explains that the errors made

in using language are because one has not fully *acquired* the skill, but *learning* specific skills still

may help as one attempts to use the skills in production. Therefore, planning an order in which

skills are taught first, second, third, etc. based on the complexity of the structure is unnecessary

because one will acquire more of the language that is used in situations and experiences rather than based on the exact structure taught (Abukhattala, 2013).

Bahrani (2011) describes how the monitor hypothesis explains the influence and relationship that *learning* and *acquiring* has on the other. The monitor holds the information *learned* until the learner is ready to use the language (Bahrani, 2011). According to the author, (2011) the monitor (holding the learned information) is used properly when there is enough time for the individual to think about the content already learned, the focus is on using correct form of the language, and the learner has been taught the rule that applies to what he/she is attempting to use in production. It is possible according to Abukhattala (2012) that learners may under use, over use, or appropriately use the monitor depending on their confidence of their acquisition.

The input hypothesis is arguably the most influential and important hypothesis of Krashen's model because of the importance that he places on comprehensible input. Comprehensible input is explained as the information one is receiving (input) which should be slightly above or beyond what one can produce independently, also shown i + 1 (Abukhattala, 2013). The author (2013) also explains that Krashen emphasizes that the speaking and writing skills progress and mature as continual comprehensible input is given through one's receptive skills of listening and reading. The input hypothesis also explains that there will be a natural "silent period" where one is absorbing and acquiring the language, but does not produce any language yet (Bahrani, 2011).   The author continues to explain that Krashen believes the silent period is necessary as one is trying to feel competent in their acquired language before using it even though it seems unproductive to others surrounding the individual.

The last hypothesis of Krashen's theory is the affective filter hypothesis which explains that a learner must be open and willing to receive information in a new, targeted language in order for it to reach one's language acquisition device and result in acquiring the information completely (Abukhattala, 2013). One's affective filter is centered around one's mood about learning a new language which include motivation, self-confidence, self-image and anxiety as possible factors that lower or raise the affective filter (Bahrani, 2011). When the affective filter goes up, the input (even if comprehensible) will not be internalized because of the "mental block" that has been put up in one's mind (Bahrani, 2011).

Similarities. After investigating and evaluating different theories, it is possible to distinguish similarities and differences about the different theories which can be applied to the importance of understanding the complexity theory which will be discussed later. Understanding the meaning in the similarities and differences will help determine which teaching strategies will be helpful for educators to use in their classrooms.

First, it is important to understand that the theories created by Krashen, Vygotsky, and Schumann all have a social SLA viewpoint where the emphasis of learning a second language is placed on one's interactions and experiences in their targeted language (Larsen-Freeman, 2007) . Each theory accounts for how the language learner interacts with the world, and suggests that language input does directly affect the understanding and production of the L2 (Abukhattala, 2013; Barjesteh & Veseghi, 2012; Lantolf, 2011). Since language is used as a way to communicate thoughts and ideas, language can occur naturally (or be acquired) as one is engulfed in different situations requiring the use of the targeted language in that particular setting (Bahrani, 2011; Lantolf, 2011; Menezes, 2013).

There is a similarity between the acculturation model and Krashen's affective filter

hypothesis. Schumann saw through his study that the attitude and desire of one to adapt,

assimilate, and learn a new language had a great effect on the result of acquiring a L2

(Schumann, 1986). The affective filter, developed by Krashen, describes learners as having a

potential barrier that prevents the acquisition as a result of having anxiety, low self-confidence,

or little motivation to do so (Bahrani, 2011). Bahrani (2011) continues to emphasize that the

affective filter can change depending on the environment one is in at a given time. Schumann

(1986) also noted that when one did not desire to participate in conversation, acquisition did not

occur despite the environment the learner was in at the time of the study. Therefore, according to

Bahrani (2011) and Schumann (1986) SLA can be influenced by one's feelings and desires to

acquire the L2.

Another similarity among the theories is the comparability between the zone of proximal

development (ZPD) by Vygotsky and the input hypothesis created by Krashen. Even though the

ZPD was not created by Vygotsky to describe a person learning a second language, it is used to

explain the amount and type of information a learner can internalize based on one's current

ability to work independently with the content (Turuk, 2008). This knowledge of understanding

that each individual can only learn content that is slightly more difficult than what they currently

know supports Krashen's input hypothesis, or i +1 (Abukhattala, 2013). The author (2013) also

explains that Krashen uses the input hypothesis to explain that the input one receives must be

comprehensible to that specific individual or it will not be acquired by the individual. Therefore,

both the ZPD and input hypothesis (i+1) stress the importance of delivering input that is slightly

above what the individual can understand independently to move the individual to the next level

(Abukhattala, 2013; Turuk, 2008).

      Differences. Secondly, it is equally valuable to understand how the universal grammar

theory and interlanguage theory are similar to one another, but vastly different from Krashen's

model, acculturation model, and the sociocultural theory. Both theories view SLA as being part

of one's cognitive development (Menezes, 2013). The author (2013) explains that humans are

believed to have the distinct ability to learn language because there is UG device in the brain,

holding the initial component of developing a language. Interlanguage, which is governed by

rules and systematic by nature, helps bridge the differences between the two languages while still

relying on the UG to learn the rules of the second language (White, 2007).

      It is also important to acknowledge that cognitivist SLA theories such as the UG and

interlanguage also believe that there is an end point to learning a second language (Larsen-

Freeman, 2007). This will appear as one who has mastered the second language, or it will take

shape as fossilization in one's interlanguage. Whereas, the social SLA theories such as Krashen's

monitor model, acculturation, and the sociocultural theory believe there is never a final end point

of learning a targeted language (Larsen-Freeman, 2007).

      It is evident that there are many SLA theories that describe how one learns, acquires, and

uses a second language. Among the different theories there are similarities, overlaps, and

differences, yet each theory only seems to capture a certain aspect of learning a second language

(Menezes, 2013). This leads into the importance of acknowledging that SLA is a complex

process.

Complexity Theory

The complexity theory intertwines many thoughts and ideas of different ways to learn something new, in this case, a second language. Larsen-Freeman resonated with the SLA theories that were cognitive in nature such as the universal grammar hypothesis and interlanguage theory; however, the work done by James Gleick in regards to naturally occurring systems changed her mind (Larsen-Freeman, 2011). The author believed that even if language was all cognitive by nature, there are still elements that were not accounted for which affected each scenario (2011). The complexity theory attempts to take nonlinear systems and explain the open-ended, dynamic, and adaptive system that it is (Larsen-Freeman, 2011). As a result, Larsen-Freeman (2011) now argues that language learning is a complex system, which requires the need to account for the emergence of change, acknowledge the process, and understand that there is structure. According to the complexity theory and Larsen-Freeman, (2011) SLA does encompass a working interlanguage system that arises through use of an individual; however, the complexity theory does not support the innate UG as explained earlier. It does, however, support that there are cognitive abilities and social interactions that drive an individual through the acquisition process of a L2, making this theory the most encompassing of the social and cognitive thoughts that are used to explain SLA (Larsen-Freeman, 2011).

Teacher Practices

Learning about SLA theories and models is a great place to start; however, educators need more guidance in how to help students acquire the English language while also learning the content taught in classrooms. As stated in the introduction, the United States has seen a large increase in the number of ELL students enrolled in schools over the past two decades (Horseford

& Sampson, 2013). Horseford & Sampson (2013) explain that this increase requires more

highly-qualified teachers, compressible instructional programs, ongoing professional support,

and a safe environment at school for these students. In the next few pages, an attempt to compare

and evaluate different teaching strategies that have been created in response to different SLA

theories will be explored. Proper steps need to be implemented in schools by the administrations

and stakeholders to ensure that all educators can use effective teaching strategies within their

classrooms to support ELL students (de Jong, Harper, Coady, 2013).

   Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol Model. Sheltered Instruction Observation

Protocol (SIOP) model created by researchers at the Center for Research on Education,

Diversity, and Excellence offers a reliable instructional framework to help educators support

ELL students (Daniel & Conlin, 2015). The authors (2015) continue to explain the term

sheltered instruction as the type of instruction that ELL students can access while still making

valuable meaning from grade-level content. The SIOP model is comprised of 30 features listed

throughout the eight components for teachers to use to guide their lessons. These eight

components include: lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies,

interaction, practice & application, lesson delivery, and review & assessment (Echevarría &

Short, 2011).

   According to Echevarría & Short, (2011) this model is applicable across content areas

and grade levels which makes it an appealing for schools to use during professional development

time. Teachers use this model while independently or collaboratively working with other

colleagues to create lessons that are appropriate and beneficial for all their students, especially

those who are ELL. If done with fidelity, teachers' lessons will be created with research-

supported features necessary for ELL students to be successful which include the use of language

objectives, cooperative learning, specific attention drawn toward academic vocabulary, and the

effort in activating students' background knowledge on a topic(Short, Fidelman, & Louguit,

2012).

Short et al. (2012) examined research regarding the effectiveness of the SIOP model in

two districts in New Jersey over the course of two years. The research used the state's

standardized English language proficiency test as a way to measure the outcome of students'

progress. The authors (2012) explain that one district was the treatment district (teachers

participated in SIOP training for two years) while the second district was used as a comparison

district. Those who participated in SIOP training participated in summer workshops, school-

based coaching, and observations done by researchers (Short et al., 2012). Furthermore, each

district had a well-established ESL program that was serving a diverse linguistic population.

The results showed that students who were taught by SIOP-trained teachers performed

better on the state standardized tests in writing, reading, and oral language compared to the

comparison group of students in the second district. The significant differences in the average

means for each component of the standardized tests as well as the increase in academic language

favored the district with SIOP-trained teachers even though these teachers were teaching content

areas such as mathematics, social studies, and science classes, not just focusing on the English

language (Short et al., 2012). This presents a strong case that learning a second language while

being engulfed in content learning can be done simultaneously with teachers who are trained in

the SIOP model.

Although the SIOP model has valuable research that shows its validity, there is also research that shows that the SIOP model has created a mixed message to teachers and administration alike. Daniel & Conlin (2015) acknowledge that the SIOP model was created to provide EL students with comprehensible input that was such a key component of Krashen's Input Hypothesis. Giving students access to comprehensible input would result in lowering their anxiety to learn which helps the acquisition process occur (Bahrani, 2011). However, Daniel & Conlin (2015) found in their own study that EL students who were taught by SIOP-trained teachers did produce better oral language, but their reading scores were similar to those EL students who were taught in the control group. The authors also believe that the SIOP model has become misconstrued by teachers and used more as a checklist of things to have in their lessons instead of focusing on the deep, rich conversations that students could be having if the focus wasn't on doing every component in the SIOP model.

According to Menezes (2013) the acculturation theory, Krashen's model, and the sociocultural theory all incorporate a strong emphasis on the social experiences one has with the language. However, when Daniel & Conlin (2015) examined the SIOP model in-depth, it was discovered that out of the 30 features, only three of them focus on what the students do in the classroom; therefore, making the SIOP model very teacher-oriented by nature. When discovering this, Daniel & Conlin (2015) followed how preservice teachers used the SIOP model in their own lessons. These authors found that a particular teacher who was trained in SIOP did become more intentional, direct, and thoughtful with her lesson planning and delivery; however, it was also discovered that the SIOP model failed to train her to be able to for see the types of responses students would make and how to further the conversations based on those responses.

According to some of the SLA theories that were discussed earlier, the conversation responses and discussions could be the most influential parts of the lesson for a child learning a second language.

Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach. The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) was created in 1986 as a way to to teach students specific learning strategies to use to help learn and become proficient in their L2 while learning content (Chamot, 1995). It is based on the cognitive learning theory that views learning as an active process by the learner who interacts with the teacher to learn new content (Chamot & O'Malley, 1996). The authors (1996) explain that this model is used as a way of teaching students to regulate their own learning by using different learning strategies taught by teachers which is great for all students, not just language learners. The CALLA model focuses on using content areas that are considered high priority (mathematics, science, social studies, and literature), specific content-related vocabulary, and direct instruction on using specific learning strategies so students can choose their own way to learn the content and language (Chamot & O'Malley, 1996).

Guapacha Chamorro & Benavidez Paz (2017) explain teachers' responsibilities as preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion while the students' responsibilities are to attend, participate, apply strategies, self-assess strategies, independently use those strategies, and transfer the learned strategies to new tasks. According to the authors (2017) teachers need to prepare their lessons in a way that activates students' background knowledge, present information and content in a way that models using the learning strategies that students can use, practice using strategies throughout the lesson, give feedback on how students are

doing, assess student proficiency in using the strategies, and support the transfer of knowledge to

other content. The learning strategies that need to be explicitly taught to particularly ELL

students are categorized as metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, and social/affective

strategies (Chamot & O'Malley, 1996). Specifically the authors (1996) explain the learning

strategies as teaching students how to plan, monitor, and evaluate their own learning, and it is

also important that students can activate their own prior knowledge, use imagery, make

inferences, and use linguistic transfer when possible to help understand the content.

Chamot (1995) acknowledges that implementing the CALLA method requires additional

professional development for teachers. According to Chamot, (1995) many teachers may be

experts in a particular field; however, it is also vital that teachers become experts in teaching

learning strategies to their students as well. In order to accomplish this task, Chamot (1995)

explains how a particular school in Virginia used workshops that met 5-7 times with teachers

throughout the year with a leader who showed and taught staff how to recognize which strategies

were being used at different times throughout the lessons. It is throughout the year of this work

that teachers practice in their own classroom and report back their findings and ask more

questions. During professional development time, it is also important that ESL teachers work

collaboratively with content area teachers to create lessons that rich in content and language

while allowing all teachers to learn more about how to help their students in their own classes

(Chamot, 1996).

Implications of teacher practices. First, it is imperative that school districts understand

the need for more professional development in the area of helping ELL students become

proficient in the English language while also becoming proficient in grade-level content areas

(Chamot, 1996; Short et al., 2012). According to de Jong, Harper, Coady, (2013) well-prepared

teachers can make a large difference in student learning; therefore, more time and energy needs

to be spent in providing those opportunities to mainstream teachers so they are equipped with

strategies and knowledge on how to help all of their students. Horsford & Sampson (2013) state

that funding further professional development to help this specific population of ELL students is

needed to prepare the future of our economy with successful citizens who are able to be

productive members of society.

In addition to more teacher preparation through professional development, it is also

critical that content teachers have time to collaborate with ESL teachers (Chamot, 1996; Short et

al., 2012). The authors explain that creating joint lessons or lessons that correspond with one

another can really help students acquire the content and language together in a way that becomes

accessible to them later. However, Short et al. (2012) clarify that collaboration among teachers

is not automatic or easy and requires sustained time and practice to work throughout the year

together.

Both teacher practices were created to help teachers effectively meet the needs of ELL

students in their day-to-day lessons; however, the SIOP model focuses on what the teacher does

compared to the CALLA model which focuses on how students' actively respond and use of

learning strategies to enhance their understanding (Chamot & O'Malley, 1996; Daniel & Conlin,

2015). Daniel & Conlin (2015) found that only three out of the thirty features in the SIOP model

require the response or action of the students which is how the focus has shifted to the teacher

instead of the students. The CALLA instructional model uses the five cycles of preparation,

presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion to guide teachers in developing lessons that are

appropriate and accessible to all students while also pairing requirements for students to do to help themselves learn the content and language (Guapacha Chamorro & Benavidez Paz, 2017). These authors explain that the student responsibilities include attending, participating, applying the strategies being taught, assessing their use of strategies, and transferring those strategies to other areas to learn new tasks. The CALLA model is designed to be student-oriented; whereas, the SIOP model has unintentionally become teacher-oriented in the way that lessons are developed and delivered.

Through research, it was determined that both models use high-quality instruction that is effective for all students, not just ELL students (Chamot, 1995; Short et al., 2012). Both models have been proven to be effective with students who are and are not native English speakers. The high-quality instruction found within the SIOP model includes, but is not limited to, the use of cooperative learning, reading comprehension strategies, building background knowledge, and orally discussing content (Short et al., 2012). The CALLA model promotes the use of academic language activities, learning strategies instruction and practice, collaborative learning experiences (Chamot, 1995). The learning strategies include self-management and self-regulation strategies such as grouping, highlighting, taking notes, paying attention, cooperating with peers, and asking for clarification (Guapacha Chamorro & Benavidez Paz, 2017). Regardless which model is used, if done with fidelity, teachers can provide all students with effective strategies to help them become successful.

Learning and Teaching Strategies

Learning Strategies. Chamot & O'Malley (1996) describe learning strategies as a mental process that students can use when a challenging task arises. Zare (2012) added that

learning strategies are used by the individual student to help them process information in a way

that promotes comprehension and learning which allows the individual to retain the processed

information. Students need to be explicitly taught these strategies by teachers and then allowed

to explore and try them independently to determine which strategies work best for them

(Chamot, 1995; Guapacha Chamorro & Benavidez Paz, 2017). Teachers may make posters to

display of different strategies as well as provide explicit instruction on how to think through the

strategies. It is then important that direct instruction is given on how each strategy would be used

and what it would like in action (Chamot, 1995).

        Determining which strategies work best for each individual is important as each student

is different and has different experiences to relate to (Guapacha Chamorro & Benavidez Paz,

2017). Teaching students to use *metacognitive strategies* include how to plan, monitor, and

evaluate one's learning which is an important for students to use to help them set goals and check

their performances as they partake in tasks (Chamot & O'Malley, 1996; Zare, 2012). These

strategies are needed so students are able to think about how to process and retain their own

learning. Chamot & O'Malley (1996) describes *Cognitive strategies* as strategies that help

students complete the task which include strategies such as using and activating background

knowledge, making predictions and inferences, visualizing, and linguistically transferring

similarities between one's L1 and L2. Zare (2012) also explains cognitive strategies as directly

manipulating the material to aid in understanding which may also include repetition, translation,

or contextualization. According to Chamot & O'Malley, (1996) the final category of learning

strategies is called *social and affective strategies* which are used when a student needs to

complete a communication or learning task. A student may need to ask questions for

clarification, collaborate with peers, explain a thought, or use positive self-talk to calm any anxiety that may arise as one is trying to participate verbally with others (Chamot & O'Malley, 1996).

Learning strategies are designed to give students the tools they need to move to an independent stage of learning while still acquiring the targeted language (Guapacha Chamorro & Benavidez Paz 2017; Zare, 2012). It also provides students the opportunity to select the strategies they feel most comfortable with and practice it through different lessons while having a teacher nearby to help refine the strategies as needed. This is vital as Zare (2012) found that ELL students who were successful language learners also reported a broader range of learning strategies to help themselves make sense of the content and language.

Teaching Strategies. In order for students to obtain success in acquiring their L2, specific teaching strategies and differentiated instruction from teachers are also a key components (Bolos, 2012). With careful and intentional planning, teachers can provide differentiated instruction for ELL students by using teaching strategies that will help students move through the acquisition of their L2. Research agrees on three main components of effective teaching strategies which include strategies to help enhance reading instruction, reading comprehension, and the oral use of the language (Barr, Eslami, & Joshi, 2012; Kazakoff, Macaruso, & Hook, 2017; Cisco & Padrón, 2012). Opportunities for EL students to engage in academic content and collaborate with peers are necessary which can be supported through a variety of teaching strategies.

The following teaching strategies can be used to enhance reading instruction, comprehension, and vocabulary: small group instruction, clear objectives explained to the

students, personalized learning through the use of blended learning, cooperative learning, modeling, and using academic print and concepts to teach the language (Barr et al., 2012; Kazakoff et al., 2017). It is important to understand that students will not become proficient in academic content in one year; instead, it will take approximately four to seven years of consistent and precise instruction for a student to acquire the L2 to the degree of proficiency, making it essential that every teacher is competent in reading and vocabulary instruction (Carhill-Poza, 2015).

Explicitly instructing students in phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, structural analysis, syntax, and grammar is an integral part of acquiring a L2 (Barr et al., 2012; Kazakoff et al., 2017; Cisco & Padrón, 2012). EL students tend to need the same direct instruction in regards to as one who is non-EL when learning phonological awareness, phonics, and word recognition; however, more instruction will be needed in the vocabulary and syntax areas for EL students to become proficient (Kazakoff et al., 2017). This also requires teachers to know each students' literacy level in order to teach in the ZPD of each student, including EL students (Barr et al., 2012). Understanding each students' ZPD requires teachers to know the proficiency level in the targeted language which may come from a variety of different assessments (Bolos, 2012). This information can help teachers determine which teaching strategies would work best for their students.

Using small reading groups, also known as guided reading groups, are an effective teaching strategy because it provides instruction in a student's level of ZPD while engaging in text where vocabulary can be discussed and used in conversation (Bolos, 2012). The author (2012) continues to explain that guided reading groups also offer EL students the opportunity to

hear text read out loud fluently and time to use their oral language with a small group of peers

and the teacher as the EL student engages in meaningful text. It is through tailored reading

instruction that direct vocabulary instruction should be delivered as well (Bolos, 2012).

Vocabulary should be directly tied to words within the content one is reading in order to offer

context for the student to make meaning of new words.

Within reading and vocabulary instruction, graphic organizers should be used to help

students organize their thinking (Bolos, 2012). Graphic organizers offer a visual support for

students to use to connect concepts and words to draw meaning from to enhance their

understanding. Graphic organizers can appear as charts, word webs, vocabulary quilts, and

graphs (Bolos, 2012). Students can see the information presented in a way that reduces the

language needed to understand the content while being shown visually a way to understand the

content; thus knowing how to store the information.

Another teaching strategy that can be used within any whole group instruction or in

guided reading groups is modeling (Cisco & Padrón, 2012). According to the authors, modeling

can be incorporated into every lesson to help EL students understand the task and the flow of the

language while the teacher shows how to accomplish the task. Pair this with cooperative

learning to allow students the opportunity to learn from one another as well (Barr et al., 2012).

Carhill-Poza (2015) explains that negotiating meaning through oral language can be a positive

influence through cooperative learning for students who are becoming proficient in the language.

Barr et al. (2012) and Cisco & Padrón (2012) also found it important for teachers to

explicitly teach reading comprehension strategies which will help students make meaning from

text through reading and/or listening. Teaching reading comprehension skills through an

interactive read-aloud by the teacher can be an effective teaching strategy for teachers to use with

all students, especially ELL (Bolos, 2012). Read alouds allow the students to listen to the

language being fluently read with expression and appropriate pausing. If teachers strategically

plan ahead, they can pause in certain areas of the story, and ask thought-provoking questions that

require students to use comprehension skills to answer. Bolos (2012) explains how the teacher is

able to model the strategy in the moment with the students to help promote their understanding

of the text. The teacher also has the opportunity to offer rephrasing, visual support, or an

extension with the strategy being discussed in the read aloud.

Barr et al. (2012) also explains how important oral language is when promoting

comprehension. What a student can comprehend orally is usually evidence of the maximum

level of reading comprehension one can understand, and because EL students have fewer words,

comprehension skills can be much harder for EL students (Barr et al., 2012). In order to increase

the vocabulary, teacher need to directly teach academic and social vocabulary words and phrases

which can be accomplished through illustrating the words, using them in different contexts, and

finding relationships to different words (Barr et al., 2012). Allowing students to collect these

words and phrases in their own dictionary that they have access to use and add when necessary

helps students acquire more words to use to communicate. Oral literacy proficiency is the

foundation to acquiring literacy proficiency (Barr et al., 2012).

Utilizing blended learning as a teaching strategy can be an effective use of time if done

with fidelity. Blended learning programs, such as *Lexia Reading Core5* and *Fast ForWord*

Language, are explained as using a technology-based intervention program in combination with

teacher-led instruction based on specific targeted areas of need (Kazakoff et al., 2017). The

authors (2017) explain how blended learning allows instruction from a designated program to be completely tailored to each individual, moving at a pace that is appropriate for that student, while also continuing to meet with the teacher for more instruction in areas of difficulty. If this strategy is used consistently, information can be given to the teacher to see how EL students are progressing through the intervention program independently while monitoring their progress. The data can be used in a variety of ways to make sure instruction continues to stay in the ZPD of the student (Kazakoff et al., 2017).

Future Research

More research needs to be done on ELL students who speak a different first language other than Spanish (Cisco & Padrón, 2012). Even though Spanish speakers are a large majority of ELL students in the public schools in America, more research needs to be done and reviewed on other first languages. Cisco & Padrón (2012) also acknowledge that their information about teaching strategies in regards to EL students is based on a smaller-scale of EL students. In the future, it would be beneficial to study the comprehension skills of EL students on a much larger scale to determine more validity of the strategies.

Blended learning needs further research done in the area of how it benefits EL students and non-EL students. According to Kazakoff, (2017) there was an uneven number of EL and non-EL students who were observed using a blended learning approach. With fewer EL students who were monitored, more data needs to be collected and analyzed to determine the efficiency of blended learning with EL students. In addition, more emphasis on the data collected from blended learning programs is needed to determine specific skills that were gained and acquired during the use of the program (Kazakoff, 2017).

Conclusion

ELL students are becoming a larger subgroup in school districts nationwide, and educators need to be prepared to provide these students the high-quality education that each student needs and deserves according to the ESSA (Bolos, 2012; Ferguson, 2016). This literature review compared and evaluated second language acquisition theories which linked beneficial teacher practices, learning strategies, and teacher strategies that can be used to help teachers become more equipped and prepared to teach EL students.

Districts, administrators, and teachers can ensure they are meeting the needs of their ELL students by engaging in professional development and using research-based practices and strategies to help close the achievement gap between peers (Bolos, 2012). Picking the SIOP or CALLA model for teachers to follow can be a place to start, provided that extra support is given to teachers for many years to develop competence in creating lessons that support EL students while simultaneously teaching content.

It is evident that second language acquisition is a social and cognitive learning experience which will require ample experiences with peers and teachers in both areas. Providing students with the learning and teaching strategies needed to enhance their oral language and achievement in literacy is essential. By giving students access to learning strategies that they may choose from is empowering and will help them work independently to acquire the skills needed to learn content and language at the same time. Teaching strategies make content more accessible and are an important piece in closing the achievement gap among peers (Bolos, 2012). Preparing teachers with the ability to teach EL students is no longer a choice; it is a critical component to ensuring every student receives an equitable and high-quality education in America.

References

Abukhattala, I. (2013). Krashen's Five Proposals on Language Learning: Are They Valid in

Libyan EFL Classes. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(1), 128-131.

Bahrani, T. (2011). The implications of the monitor theory for foreign language teaching. *Asian

Social Science*, *7*(10), 281-284.

Barjesteh, H., & Vaseghi, R. (2012). Acculturation model for L2 acquisition: Review and

evaluation. *Advances in Asian Social Science*, *2*(4), 579-584.

Barr, S., Eslami, Z. R., & Joshi, R. M. (2012). Core Strategies to Support English Language

Learners. *The Educational Forum*, *76*(1), 105–117. doi: 10.1080/00131725.2011.628196

Bolos, N. (2012). Successful strategies for teaching reading to middle grades english language

learners. *Middle School Journal (3), 44*(2), 14-20.

Carhill-Poza, A. (2015). Opportunities and outcomes: The role of peers in developing the oral

academic english proficiency of adolescent english learners. *The Modern Language

Journal, 99*(4), 678-695. doi:10.1111/modl.12271

Chamot, A. U. (1995). Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach:

CALLA in Arlington, Virginia. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *19*(3-4), 379-394.

Chamot, A., & O'Malley, J. (1996). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A

model for linguistically diverse classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal, 96*(3),

259-273.

Cisco, B. K., & Padrón, Y. (2012). Investigating Vocabulary and Reading Strategies with Middle

    Grades English Language Learners: A Research Synthesis. *RMLE Online*, *36*(4), 1–23.

    doi: 10.1080/19404476.2012.11462097

Daneshfar, S., & Moharami, M. (2018). Dynamic assessment in Vygotsky's sociocultural theory:

    origins and main concepts. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *9*(3), 600-607.

Daniel, S., & Conlin, L. (2015). Shifting attention back to students within the sheltered

    instruction observation protocol. *Tesol Quarterly, 49*(1), 169-187. doi:10.1002/tesq.213

de Jong, E. J., Harper, C. A., & Coady, M. R. (2013). Enhanced knowledge and skills for

    elementary mainstream teachers of English language learners. *Theory into*

    Practice, *52*(2), 89-97.

Echevarría, J., & Short, D. J. (2011). The SIOP Model: A professional development framework

    for a comprehensive school-wide intervention. CREATE brief. Center for Research on

    the Educational Achievement and Teaching of English Language Learners, 1-5.

Ferguson, M. (2016). ESSA is more than the latest acronym on education's block. *Phi Delta*

    Kappan, *97*(6), 72-73.

Flynn, K., & Hill, J. (2005). English language learners: A growing population. *Policy Brief: Mid-*

    Continent Research for Education and Learning, 1-12.

Gitsaki, C. (1998). Second language acquisition theories: Overview and evaluation. *Journal of*

    Communication and International Studies, *4*(2), 89-98.

Guapacha Chamorro & Benavidez Paz. (2017). Improving language learning strategies and

    performance of pre-service language teachers through a calla-tblt model. *Issues in*

    Teachers' Professional Development, 19(2), 101-120.

Guccione, L. M. (2011). Integrating literacy and inquiry for english learners. *Reading Teacher*,

    64(8), 567-577. doi:10.1598/RT.64.8.2

Horsford, S. D., & Sampson, C. (2013). High-ELL-Growth States: Expanding Funding Equity

    and Opportunity for English Language Learners. *Voices in Urban Education*, *37*, 47-54.

Ipek, H. (2009). Comparing and contrasting first and second language acquisition: Implications

    for language teachers. *English Language Teaching*, *2*(2), 155-163.

Kazakoff, E., Macaruso, P., & Hook, P. (2017). Efficacy of a blended learning approach to

    elementary school reading instruction for students who are english learners. *Educational*

    Technology Research and Development, 1-21, 1-21. doi:10.1007/s11423-017-9565-7

Lantolf, J. P. (2011). The sociocultural approach to second language acquisition: Sociocultural

    theory, second language acquisition, and artificial L2 development. In D. Atkinson (Ed.),

    Alternative approaches to second language acquisition (pp. 36-59). New York, NY:

    Routledge.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2011). A complexity theory approach to second language development/

    acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language*

    acquisition (pp 60-84). New York, NY: Routledge.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2007). Reflecting on the Cognitive-Social Debate in Second Language

    Acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*, 773-787. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/

    stable/4626131

Menezes, V. (2013). Second Language Acquisition: Reconciling Theories. *Open Journal of*

    Applied Sciences, *03*, 404–412. doi: 10.4236/ojapps.2013.37050

Schumann, J. H. (1986). Research on the acculturation model for second language

acquisition. *Journal of multilingual & multicultural development*, *7*(5), 379-392.

Short, D. J., Fidelman, C. G., & Louguit, M. (2012). Developing academic language in English

language learners through sheltered instruction. *Tesol Quarterly*, *46*(2), 334-361.

Tarone, E. (2012). Interlanguage. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 1-7.

Turuk, M. C. (2008). The relevance and implications of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory in the

second language classroom. *Arecls*, *5*(1), 244-262.

Vygotsky, L. (2011). The dynamics of the schoolchild's mental development in relation to

teaching and learning. *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology, 10*(2), 198-211.

doi:10.1891/1945-8959.10.2.198

White, L. (2007). Linguistic theory, universal grammar, and second language acquisition. In B.

VanPatten & Jessica Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An

introduction* (pp. 37-55). New York, NY: Routledge.

Zare, P. (2012). Language learning strategies among EFL/ESL learners: A review of

literature. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *2*(5), 162-169.