Bethel University

Spark

2024

Strategies Teachers in the United States Can Use to Support English Language Learners With Special Needs

Jacqueline G. Ozuna
Bethel University

STRATEGIES TEACHERS IN THE UNITED STATES CAN USE TO SUPPORT ENGLISH

LANGUAGE LEARNERS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

A MASTER'S THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF BETHEL UNIVERSITY

BY

JACQUELINE GONZALEZ OZUNA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

MAY 2024

BETHEL UNIVERSITY

STRATEGIES TEACHERS IN THE UNITED STATES CAN USE TO SUPPORT ENGLISH

LANGUAGE LEARNERS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

JACQUELINE GONZALEZ OZUNA

MAY 2024

APPROVED

Thesis Advisor: Susana A Larson, MAC MS CCC-SLP

Program Director: Katie Bonawitz, Ed.D.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank Patrick A. Marzitelli for all his support. Completing my thesis would not have been possible without all his support, encouragement, undivided time, attention, and grace. I want to thank my mother, Nieves Gonzalez, for her unrivaled support; my children, Erasmo Ozuna, Bridgette Ozuna, Davina J. Garcia, and Joseph D. Garcia, who have supported me in various ways; and my grandchildren, Kaylean D. Hernandez, Ozra Mateo Causey, Erick A. Ozuna, and Levi Ozuna, for being precious to me. I want to thank Susan Larson for all the positive feedback and encouragement throughout the thesis process. Lastly, I want to thank God for guiding me on the right path and Jesus Christ for being with me every step of the way. "I will instruct you and teach you in the way you should go; I will guide you with My eye." (Psalm 32:8). God has never left me; it is because of His love that I can understand my purpose in life. "The things which you learned and received and heard and saw in me, these do, and the God of peace will be with you." (Philippians 4:9). It has been through intentional daily devotional Bible reading that I have moments of peace that have taught me to listen. "All scripture is given by the inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work." (II Timothy 3: 16-17 NKJV) Completing my thesis could not come to a close without God instructing me in righteousness. For this, I give thanks. "Rejoice always, pray without ceasing, in everything, give thanks; for this is the will of God in Jesus Christ for you." (I Thessalonians 5: 16-18 NKJV)

Abstract

Supporting English language learners (ELL) with special needs is critical due to the increased number of ELL students in the United States. The National Education Association (2020) predicted that by 2025, one in four students in general education classrooms will be second language learners. Educators can significantly impact the education of ELLs by implementing proven teaching strategies. Strategies such as co-teaching (Friend and Reising, 1993), teaching through a cultural lens (Garcia and Tyler, 2010), and vocabulary (Alshahrani, 2019) are critical. This paper discusses effective teaching strategies targeting special education students concurrently learning English while considering legal mandates requiring education in the least restrictive environment.

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER I: RESEARCH RATIONALE

The following research aims to help the reader understand how teachers in the United States can support EL learners with special needs. It can be claimed that in the United States, schools find it challenging to offer top-quality education to English Language Learners. Abdallah (2009, as cited in Hones & Alderton, 2017) suggests that "the push-in model can be more effective by increasing opportunity for ELs to interact with native English-speaking peers to develop social language and maintain access to important academic content in the classroom." The research discussed partnerships and support among teachers in an institution of higher learning focused on EL and bilingual educators in US schools; there is a need for more collaboration to help students learning a new language understand educational content. Therefore, considering the primary research for this thesis, a broad question would be, with the growing number of ELLs in the United States, is it essential to develop teaching strategies that are proven to help ELL students while minimizing the challenges teachers face? With the increased number of students in the United States whose first language is not English, Hones and Alderson (2017) precisely mention the importance of equipping teachers-in-training with the necessary teaching strategies to work excellently with ELL students. While some designs may not be as effective, teachers in the United States should use effective teaching strategies to serve ELLs better because, with the increase of ELLs in America, teachers need to know how to support ELLs with special needs. Training will help teachers meet the needs of ELLs so that they can keep up with their counterpart English-speaking peers.

Supporting ELLs with special needs is an essential skill in the education field (Hones & Alderson, 2017). According to the National Center for Statistics (2022), "The percentage of public school students in the United States who were English learners (ELs) was higher in fall

2019 (10.4 percent, or 5.1 million students) than in fall 2010 (9.2 percent, or 4.5 million students)." With the expansion of EL learners, the demand to support EL learners will increase. Consequently, with the growing number of EL learners, school districts prepare by collaborating and developing content based teaching strategies to instruct ELLs effectively. It is crucial to note that teaching strategies will benefit ELLs, but teachers who establish connections with parents and families also help bilingual students (Hones & Alderton, 2017). Therefore, the teacher-family relationships are crucial for the education of English language learners. Howard (2022) claims that "parents will have detailed information about the education system, language, and their child's past educational experiences. "Teachers can use the information from parents in inclusive classrooms to instruct students. Teachers can implement a variety of supports to reinforce student learning, such as co-teaching, pull-out, and push-in models. Furthermore, several teaching strategies, such as vocabulary visuals, choral reading, and picture walks, can help the students retrieve background knowledge or link to experiences in their lives outside of the school environment (Howard, 2022). The strategies mentioned help students make connections, which strengthens reading comprehension.

With all of the support and strategies teachers have at hand, they are still challenged with how to collaborate with other teachers to serve ELL students better. Thus, it is essential to point out the challenges teachers encounter. According to Khong & Saito (2014), there are three challenges teachers face, "The obstacles confronting educators can be categorized as social, institutional, and personal in nature, although all three categories are interrelated." Park & Thomas (2012) stated, "ELLs face many obstacles due to their cultural and linguistic diversity." Hence, teachers must give more attention to the teaching strategies and collaborate with other teachers to help support ELLs with special needs.

Significant Issues and Challenges Teachers Face when Educating ELLs

Regarding educating ELLs with special needs, Park and Thomas (2012) stated that ELLs with special needs are generally weakened in the United States public school systems. The No Child Left Behind Act named ELLs as a diverse group. It demanded that schools in America be responsible for closing the learning gap between students of color and English-speaking classmates without providing teachers with specific instruction on how to aid students by providing an education framework (Park & Thomas, 2012). With the requirements for teachers to be held accountable for closing the ELLs education gap, teachers ran into critical concerns and challenges when teaching EL learners. The literature review will research specific teaching practices that may support English language learners with special needs.

Challenges ELA Teachers Face in the General Classroom

This review contributed essential data relevant to the challenges teachers encounter when teaching ELLs in a regular English Language Arts class, where the ELL teacher conducts the course in English, and the majority of the students in the class speak only English. Learning the challenges teachers face with ELLs is essential to understand ELL students better. The research revealed that there are proven teaching strategies that may help students succeed academically alongside their English-speaking peers.

Proven Strategies that Lead to Academic Success

While attaining education is seen as something any child can do, not all children learn similarly. With the growing number of ELLs in the United States, teachers must provide all students with a top-quality education. The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, as stated in Hones and Alderton (2017) mentioned:

A difference in language is the first thing that sets ELLs apart from their native English-speaking peers. Nearly 80% of ELLs come to school speaking Spanish as their first language, while the remaining 20% come from more than 400 different languages backgrounds. In addition, ELLs are more likely than their English-proficient classmates to live in poverty, reside in large urban settings, and have parents with low levels of formal education. ELLs also tend to be enrolled in schools struggling with low academic performance and placed in less demanding courses. (NCCE, 2014)

Teachers need to understand teaching strategies that work for all ELLs (Hones & Alderton 2017). Goldenberg (2008) and Harklau (1999) as stated in Hones and Alderson (2017) mention while there are strategies such as pull-out, working one-on-one with students, or in small groups teaching helps to minimize anxiety, over some time, the design lacks strength for academic readiness. Abdallah (2009) and Theoharis (2007) also in Hones and Alderton (2017), have proven that the push-in educator model is successful among ELLs. ELLs have the freedom to communicate with other students who are native English speakers, which in turn helps them expand their social language and keep up with essential learning objectives. The pull-out and the push-in models do not require the general education teacher to change their teaching methods to support all students adequately. Therefore, a different strategy, co-teaching, can assist all students in the general education classroom. DelliCarpini (2009) and Dove and Honigsfeld, (2012) and Hones and Alderton (2017) mentioned that when two teachers share the same amount of teaching and assessment collaboration between the general education teacher and the EL teacher is rarely something that happens in schools. Hones and Alderton (2017) indicated that collaboration among teachers aids the students from different backgrounds and helps them reach their academic goals.

Beneficial Effects of Culturally Responsive Instruction (CRI) and Student Outcomes

Malo-Juvera (2018) stated that the continual education gap surrounding ELLs and white middle to high-privilege students and the expanding non-native-speaking pupils P-12 had urged teachers to place their focus on Culturally Responsive Instruction (CRI) in the areas of teacher training and ongoing education. Nieto and Bode (2008) and Malo-Juvera (2018) presented an approach focused on the CRI pedagogical way of adopting and increasing students' cultural understanding of their life stories to connect it to the lesson at hand, making it purposeful and, therefore, successful for students to succeed. The primary goal is for the teacher to design a lesson where ELL students can connect new information to past experiences, which will help bring meaning to learning. According to Paris (2012) Malo-Juvera (2018):

> Practices that focus on improving achievement for underserved students, scholars have called on school educators to value, support and perpetuate students' languages and cultural practices, arguing that students should be encouraged to consider critical perspectives on policies and practices that directly affect their lives.

Mentoring for Secondary Small School Educators

Thomas and Richins (2015) presented how new ESL teachers offered advice to teachers who work in rural areas or small secondary school districts. ESL teachers provided direction to their more experienced work colleagues by working in harmony, offering each other answers, and cooperating to complete tasks to serve ELLs better (Thomas & Richins, 2015).

This research addresses the following question: How can educators best support ELLs with special needs in the United States to improve students' academic outcomes from middle to high school? First, this research will examine research-based teaching strategies that work best for ELLs. Also, the examination will investigate the challenges teachers encounter when teaching

ELLs. Finally, an analysis of the evidence collected will shed light on the differences between effective and non-effective teaching strategies and collaboration methods among teachers who work with middle and high school students. This literature review will analyze proven strategies that lead to academic success for ELLs. Additionally, it will highlight how parent involvement is crucial for student academic success. The challenges teachers face when educating ELLs and sound instruction for ELLs with special needs will be discussed.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW LITERATURE SEARCH PROCEDURES

The data exploration considered the origin of co-teaching. To find the information for this thesis, searches of Education Journals, Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost, ERIC, JSTOR, and EBSCO Mega File were conducted for peer-reviewed studies found in journals from 1993 to 2022. The keywords used in these searches included "co-teaching," "co-teaching models," "universal design for learning," "push-in," "teamwork," "team teaching," "team building," "collaborative teaching," "inclusiveness in the classroom," "differentiating instruction," "assist students in general education classrooms who are not language proficient," "teaching roadblocks," "ELL," "ESL education," "best teaching practices," and "English Language Learners." This chapter will review the literature on co-teaching in three sections in the following order: The Origin of Co-Teaching; The Evolution of Co-teaching, Description of Co-Teaching Strategies, and The Effectiveness of Co-Teaching for English Language Learners.

The Beginnings of Co-Teaching, Evolution, Description of Co-teaching Strategies and The Effectiveness of Special Education Co-Teaching Transferable to English Language Learners

In the 1950s, Friend and Reising (1993) stated that co-teaching was derived as a special education service model for students with special needs or disabilities so that teachers had an equal share teaching students. Rather than giving one teacher the responsibility for instructing a large group of students, two teachers working together could accomplish the task. In the decades that followed, the team-teaching approach was found successful when the education environment was student-centered and provided educators with provocative and valuable skills (Friend & Reising, 1993).

Friend and Reising (1993), examined how in later decades in the early 1980s co-teaching or team-teaching was recognized as a strategy derived from general education and adopted into special education to aid students with disabilities in general education classes. This type of team teaching considered a new approach and needed defined parameters on how it would be used by teachers, particularly with the increased number of children who need special education services in the general education classroom because it is the Least Restrictive Environment. Routine teacher collaboration meetings are imperative to identify issues and develop lessons.

Friend and Reising (1993) evaluated co-teaching literature and found the current practice has been thoroughly investigated. The overall results found that children with mild disabilities such as learning disabilities were provided with co-teaching strategy instruction in general education classrooms. However, For the co-teaching strategy to work, teachers must adhere to the same teaching goals and have the support of family members to provide the best educational outcome for students. The co-teaching practice was *primarily* used in elementary school, due to learning and behavior issues and was *somewhat* used in middle school. The research also indicated that co-teaching was an infrequent teaching strategy implemented in junior high and high schools (Friend & Reising, 1993).

The research described how co-teaching occurred, and the findings indicated that co-teaching begins with devising a planned co-teaching schedule and proceeds with that schedule for any one semester or the entirety of the school year. The number of times teachers co-taught depended on the number of students with disabilities in general education classrooms and the severity of their needs. Friend and Reising (1993) indicated there were several co-teaching methods: One teach, one assist; Station Teaching; Parallel Teaching; Alternative Teaching; and Team Teaching. Using the One teach, one assist method, two teachers are present in the general

education classroom. One teacher leads the entire class and the other provides students with assistance or observation. In Station teaching, the teacher presents separate content, and each teacher has control over their group. Parallel teaching involves both teachers working together to design the lesson plans, but each teacher teaches half of the students. Alternative teaching is performed when one teacher works with a small group to pre-teach, re-teach, add, and enhance the content while the other teacher provides instruction to the remainder of the students. Lastly, team teaching occurs when both teachers divide the lesson and take turns guiding the lesson or discussion, show concepts, or provide learning strategies; They offer students a suitable manner in which to ask questions or disagree or address struggling behavior (Friend & Reising, 1993).

The research results indicated even when teachers partner to co-teach, they faced issues comparably common issues: In the co-taught general education classroom the structure of the classroom, instruction pattern, and tutelage were not altered. The general education teacher presumed the special education teacher could not influence the class. When this presumption occurred, the special education teacher functioned similarly to a paraprofessional. Due to minimal planning before co-teaching. When planning occurred, the general education teacher did not have instructional dominance (Friend & Reising,1993).

Results regarding the effectiveness of co-teaching indicated most of the recent data obtained about co-teaching was based on personal observations. Teachers reported co-teaching was effective and made a positive impact on student attainments. Friend and Reising (1993), noted that it was uncertain whether co-teaching would become a common practice or would depend on future findings of resources and participants.

Description of Co-teaching Strategies

Friend, M. (2007) examined a team teaching method proven to be successful for teachers who team up to meet the learning needs of all the students in the classroom. The author provides a variety of teaching strategies for students with disabilities and other special needs. The study aims to teach readers with the knowledge that two teachers in a classroom were better than one to assist all students in the general education classroom. The student to teacher ratio improved when two teachers co-teach in the general education classroom. For example, if two teachers have 50 students the ratio then is two teachers per 25 students (Friend, M. 2007, p. 49). Second, co-teachers provide a unique teaching method with the general education teacher focused on teaching the content curriculum while the special teacher is focused on the learning process, assisting students with memory retention, acquiring knowledge and highlighting special skills and abilities. When teachers work well together, the students have the advantage to prosper academically. Friend, M. (2007) stated that co-teaching does come with its challenges: (1) The special education teacher does not understand the curriculum and feels uneasy and the general education teacher does not know what to do. (2) Special education teachers feel like teaching assistants since the general education teacher takes on the role of providing the curriculum instruction. (3) Both teachers do not plan the lessons together. Therefore, it is not a teaching partnership. These types of challenges can signal to teachers that co-teaching is unsuccessful. However, co-teaching can benefit teachers and students if teachers partner to plan the curriculum and assist one another.

The researcher stated that co-teaching is more beneficial when it is an essential component of the school's attempt to provide students with the best education. Co-teaching should be part of the school's culture, providing support and confidence to teachers so they can

work as a team and achieve their goals (Friend, M., 2007, p. 49). For co-teaching to come to fruition, teachers should be provided with professional development and learn the basics of what co-teaching entails. Once the teacher receives professional development, they move on to visit the classroom to observe teaching models, exchange feedback on model practices, create a learning community, and meet regularly to celebrate their attainment and efforts, struggles, and exchange ideas. The power behind co-teaching arises from numerous less practical practices in the classroom with one teacher. Friend, M. (2007) provided leadership tips for co-teaching programs that included establishing professional relationships so teachers could generate and confer about strengths and concerns, assumptions for team teaching, and discuss disagreements. Next, teachers should observe co-taught classrooms to gain knowledge of how co-teaching is put into practice. Visiting and observing co-taught classes demonstrates a commitment to the success of co-teaching. In addition, teachers should take the initiative to try various teaching strategies and teaching methods. Small problems should be resolved before they intensify. If either team member is frustrated with the lesson, a classroom plan of action, or a situation that has transpired, it should be discussed immediately. If required, the problem-solving process should be simplified. Finally, acknowledge success, congratulate teachers, and share the success with the staff.

Friend, M. (2007) stated that we are now recognizing the possibilities of co-teaching for attaining the objectives of the present moment in schools. The research mentioned that teachers have made comments of what co-teaching provides. One teacher said, "I don't have special education training. But I have to admit, it's the best thing we've ever done for our kids. I could never go back to the old system. Another teacher stated, "They are making more progress than I ever thought possible when I had them in my special education classroom." And last, "Why

didn't we do this years ago? (Friend, M., 2007, pp. 51-52). From the study the researcher concluded that co-teaching was effective and when challenges arise, the best way to control them is to address them as soon as possible. Further research was not mentioned.

Friend (2015) presented six strategies that are the basis for co-teaching for co-teaching 2.0 Station Teaching, Parallel Teaching, Alternative Teaching, Teaming, One Teach-One Assist and One Teach-One Observe. Friend (2015) states, "for most students with IEPs, specially designed instruction can be more specific, using evidence-based strategies to improve speaking, reading, writing, computing, problem-solving, or other skills." Friend (2015) identified that all students can benefit from the six strategies in the general education classroom and the strategies can be used with efficacy to produce desired learning results. Friend (2015) indicated that when educators used the co-teaching strategies, both teachers needed to work together, sharing teaching responsibilities such as instruction, planning, grading, and delivery of instruction in the classroom and engaging all students in the instruction. The research found that when special education teachers worked alongside the general education teachers it helped all students in the classroom achieve their academic goals (friend, 2015). No longer are special education teachers trying to help students by using on-the-spot prompting or helping them to get through their academic content (Friend, 2015). According to Friend (2015), through successful co-teaching, teachers offered students the same precisely orchestrated and thoughtfully accurate instruction that has been distinguished in special education. Friend (2015), presented the six co-teaching strategies and techniques and how they function in the classroom as follows and each co-teaching strategy will be described, elucidated, and distinguished by the benefits and disadvantages of each strategy.

The first strategy, station teaching involves separating the students into three groups. Each teacher provided the students with a portion of the lesson at each station and the students rotated through the first and second station while on the third station students worked independently (Friend, 2015). Both educators worked with each student in the classroom and following the teacher's explanation the students corrected any errors (Friend, 2015, p.19).

The second strategy is parallel teaching. In this approach the researcher provided an example in which both teachers put into effect two unlike instruction viewpoints to specifically target students' learning needs (Friend, 2015). According to the researcher, two teachers worked together in the same classroom with two different groups of students introducing the same lesson. Friend (2015) stated that the benefits of parallel teaching are the number of students per teacher. Friend (2015) found that the number of students is divided among teachers, students benefited from working in small groups, asking questions, and being more active participants in the classroom. The researcher indicated that when required, the teacher educated the student to use the self-monitoring approach which was previously studied to keep behaviors under control. This teaching method took several practice sessions, but students were able to reach their goals in the end (Friend, 2015, p.20).

The third approach alternative teaching is an approach where one teacher, the licensed teacher, is in charge of instructing and managing the larger group of students (Friend, 2015). Opposite of the licensed teacher is the second licensed educator who acts as a supporting teacher taking a smaller group of students and giving more specific instruction (Friend, 2015). The students received more detailed instruction of the lesson which prepared them for a better understanding of the content and were able to rejoin the leading group of students understanding the lesson (Friend, 2015, p.20-21).

Friend (2015), stated, the remaining co-teaching approaches can be used by teachers by means of combining specially designed instruction in to all the co-teaching approaches. The researcher found the co-teaching methods have altered how teachers teach students in the general education classroom (Friend, 2015). Moreover, they found that teachers collaborated well with one another and provided students with essential knowledge and skills. Furthermore, the teaching strategy results suggest how teachers have reformulated the manner in which they approach co-teaching. For example, teachers found the collaboration between two teachers is more of a marriage or business associate partnership (Friend, 2015). The researcher noted that when two teachers come together to teach a lesson, they bring their strengths, knowledge, and skills. According to Friend (2015), the teacher's primary goal is to design a classroom where all cultures are welcomed and to provide different teaching strategies to meet all students' various learning needs. This present research study demonstrated how co-teaching has impacted students with disabilities and how they are able to learn content comfortably at their grade-level curriculum. Friend (2015), presented the six co-teaching strategies with clarity and provided various ways teachers can use different teaching methods to reach all students regardless of their special needs, disabilities, or language barriers. However, has the acclaim of the six-co teaching strategies and what has been written about them at present obtained the possibility of their achievement?

Conderman and Hedin (2014) examined how teachers can specify their teaching duty in the general education classroom. According to Conderman and Hedin (2014), co-teaching is a method used by special education teachers to assist students with disabilities and introduce to them the specific general education program in the least restrictive environment while the two certified teachers give students academic support. The researchers found there are different

strategies teachers have used, such as co-planning, co-instructing, and co-assessing. The research team indicated it is essential to provide evidence of teaching strategies that have worked, and that teachers needed to be cognizant of which methods worked best for students to help them reach their academic goals, uphold their level of education, and recognize which strategies are the best to aid teachers when educating students. Using research evidence, the team can expressly point out the teaching strategies that are most impactful to students' academic gains.

Conderman and Hedin (2014) suggest that the six co-teaching strategies one teach, one observe, one teach, one assist, station teaching, alternative teaching, parallel teaching, and team teaching can be used as a single method or as two or more methods when teachers are in the least restrictive environment. The researcher found that teachers and administrators are in favor and ardent about using co-teaching strategies. However, are all of these strategies effective?

Conderman and Heding (2014) found that there are strategies that are useful for students with disabilities. It is interesting to note that the researcher suggested that for co-teaching strategies to work, the teacher must dedicate at least 30 minutes of method teaching (Conderman & Heding, 2014). The researchers indicated there are two types of strategies special education teachers have used, general or specific strategies (Conderman & Heding, 2014). The first type general strategies takes the least amount of time for teacher preparation and delivery of content and the strategies can be applied with or without any definitive manner, possess ample usefulness, and can be applied to the majority of subjects (Conderman & Heding, 2014). The researchers indicated the general strategies as (1) organizational strategies, (2) emphasis strategies, and (3) general study skills. The second type, specialized strategies are fixed and narrow in choices, and are content and skill specified (Conderman & Heding, 2014). The researchers stated the specialized strategies as to develop and activate background knowledge,

discuss and clarify the strategy, demonstrate the strategy, learn the strategy, guided practice, and individual practice (Conderman & Heding, 2014, p. 161). The researchers also noted that during classroom instruction, practices that were accepted as being successful were those of step-by-step prompts, use of cues to remind students to use the strategies, and direction through strategy guidance, these strategies revealed academic gains as oppose to using other strategies (Conderman & Heding, 2014, p. 158). From their findings, the researchers suggested that co-teaching strategies with a favorable reputation in a few classrooms have not accomplished its acclaim.

Scruggs, et al., (2007) conducted a qualitative co-teaching investigation in the least restrictive environments to study co-teachers, their needs, and how they advocate for themselves. The objective of this investigation was to analyze the relationship between general education teachers and co-teachers, teachers essential needs, and the support needed when co-teaching in the inclusive classroom, and how this collaboration would provide success with the delivery of the curriculum (p.392). It was noted that the collaboration between two teachers offered students with disabilities the educational support they need when they are in the least restrictive environment. The investigation consisted of analyzing 32 existing literature reports which included 453 co-teachers, 42 administrators, 142 students, 26 parents, and five support personnel. The co-teachers were from regions of various schools, described as Northeast, Mid-Atlantic,Southeast, Midwest, Southwest, and Pacific coast of America, in addition, in Canada, and in Australia (Scruggs, et al., 2007 p. 398).

Scruggs, et al., (2007) found there are variations of co-teaching methods which include: One teach, one assist; Station teaching; Parallel teaching; Alternative teaching; and Team teaching. Out of the six the five co-teaching strategies presented, only one was primarily used in

the least restrictive environment. The strategy teachers use the most is one teach, one assist. When the general education and special education teachers use the "one teach, one assist" strategy, the general education handles the entire class by teacher-directed instruction with limited individualization. Conversely, the special education teachers assist students who receive special education services and additional students who require help inside the classroom. According to Scruggs, et al., (2007) teacher reported their curriculum delivery improved two teachers taught in the general education classroom. The investigators noted that teachers considered co-teaching to be beneficial to them, to students who received special education services, and to students who did not have disabilities. Furthermore, the investigators stated that from the perspective of co-teachers there are various requirements that must be attained for co-teaching to be effective. The investigators reported that the first requirement is administrative support and selecting the correct teacher, teachers volunteering to teach together, provided co-teaching training, compatibility among teachers, and teacher working together the co-teaching method viewing it as a marriage (Scruggs, et al., 2007, pp. 403-405)

Scruggs, et al., (2007), indicated that the authentic collaboration between two teachers with the same rank and ability to give their attention to curriculum needs, creative practice, suitable individualization has extensively been unsatisfactory. However, the current synthesis conveys that special education students were not receiving an exceptional education when they were in the least restrictive environment. These results can be connected to a broad description of the way in which teachers worked together. Although the investigation found that co-teaching is not effective as the current co-teaching popularity suggests, it is essential to say that teachers and administrators are content with using co-teaching strategies. However, the investigators concluded that for co-teaching to be effective true collaboration must be done willingly,

changeably, and should be designed with the intent of being geared toward growth. They stated

that since the general education teacher is the one who holds all of the content knowledge and

the special education teacher offers assistance, both teachers need to collaborate, divide the

instruction, and engage students which is not happening at present. Further research will have to

be done to address how teachers are prospering from co-teaching strategies.

In another study, the focus was placed in the middle and high school co-teaching setting,

teachers tools, and the effective teaching practices for teachers who work with students with

disabilities. Dierker, L.A. (2001) examined if there were co-teaching practices that were

successful so teachers could evaluate their teaching practices. The researcher read several

journals in the area of special education and found there is a rise in co-teaching. The articles

offered the researcher information on the co-teaching practice, how it ties to the general

education classroom, and how teacher may alter the co-taught classroom. This study revealed the

co-teaching model has been used since the 1970s formally known as team teaching, collaborative

teaching, or cooperative teaching (Dierker, L.A., 2001). The study included team participants

proposed by university professors, special education teachers, administrators, and a Midwestern

urban district. 15 teams were selected and out of 15 only nine teams were chosen to participate in

the study. The selected nine chosen teams were composed of nine general education and seven

special education teachers. In addition, two special education teachers were part of the

participants in the study and taught in two or more inclusive classrooms (Dierker, L. A., 2001).

Seven group teams were observed in the middle school setting and two teams in the high school

setting. The team's teaching experience was taken into consideration and the average teaching

experience from the general education teachers was 7.6 years and special education teachers was

7.4 years (Dierker, L.A., 2001). The participants provided instruction to students in the general

education classroom with "learning disabilities, emotional disturbances, mild-to-moderate cognitive disabilities and autism" (Dierker, L.A., 2001).

This study data collection was conducted in four categories. First, individual teams were observed four times throughout 16-weeks. When feasible, observations were video recorded for thorough examination. Themes that arose from the study of individual teams were joined with the nine teams to ascertain distinguishing teaching practices and concerns. Second, planning time data was collected by the nine teams by means of time spent co-teaching lessons throughout the six preplanned weeks inside the 16 weeks school year. During the six predetermined weeks and throughout the 16 weeks notes were taken to document how much time teachers used for planning. Third, two students for each team were interviewed to figure out what practices the team teachers used that were effective among them. Students who were interviewed were pupils with disabilities, in jeopardy of failing, and two students who were gifted and talented which were part of the class. When consulting with students the interviewers asked students questions about have two teachers in the classroom, advantage for teachers, and gains for students, and concerns about attainment and education. Last, at the end of the study, the researcher interviewed the educators who took part in the study to confirm the knowledge gathered during the research. The interviews were done in an organized manner and questions focused on how teachers planned to co-teach, various methods of co-teaching, selected co-teaching practices used while teaching, the advantage of the teaching development, the roadblocks during the procedure, and the technique used to assess pupils and the collaborative teaching approach. The researcher found that practices the teachers used during the observations. For example station teaching and alternative teaching were methods used by teachers. However, new teaching methods appeared in how the teaching was conveyed to middle and high school children. The practices that

emerged as successful were: (1) constructing a learning classroom that expresses positive understanding of the co-teaching process, (2) presenting the lesson in an active learning form, (3) establishing and keeping high-expectations, (4) designate time to plan for the co-teaching process, (5) look for a creative approach to determine the students' academic achievement (Dierker, L.A., 2001).

Dierker, L.A. (2001) discussed the results of the study. All of the team participants were taken into consideration. The researcher concluded that based on the observations what was seen primarily missing of excellent practices in the this literature on co-teaching is meeting before starting to teach the lessons, preplanning a conducive environment, establishing academic and behavioral goals, transparency roles when co-teaching, establishing a routine planning date, continue to present service choices when offering service delivery, and establishing an evaluating system. The researcher mentioned that since co-teaching is still on the rise, the teams observed offered an understanding of the basic structure on how to develop a plan to effectively teach secondary students to become academically successful (Dierker, 2001).

Elliott and McKenney (1998) viewpoint of education comes from the idea that all student involvement in the general education classroom offers students with disabilities time to be with their peers to the fullest extent and all students gain knowledge. In their study, Elliot and McKenney (1998) believe all students acquire knowledge when a unified system method is used when educating all students in the least restrictive environment (LRE) rather than their being a disconnect of the mainstream teacher and special education assistance. Elliot and McKenney (1998) stated that consultation entails both general and special education teachers to schedule a designated time to discuss the needs of the students and services making adaptations and modifications as required. They go on to say that all students have the right to be educated in the

general education classroom and by being in the general education classroom regularly, students will feel they are part of the class, will know the routine, and have the freedom to be active participants. However, Elliot and McKenney (1998) stated that in their 4 years of putting into practice inclusion their coworkers felt it was unpopular. The researchers noted they encountered objections and resistance from coworkers. Their colleague teachers felt uneasy about the demanding hours of work and who would be assigned to spend the most time with curriculum planning. Regardless of what colleagues may think, there were no complaints from students or parents. The results that emerged from the study specify there are various teaching techniques which are successful when children with special needs are in the least restrictive environment (LRE) (Elliot & McKenny, 1998). The researchers noted the models as consultation, team teaching, aide services, and limited pullout services. The researchers go on to say that when both teachers meet for the consultation, due to pre-lesson planning, they need to devote time to consult with each other outside of the classroom environment to converse about the student services and needs that will be provided. They also will discuss the environmental modification to meet student's needs, and generate adaptations and modifications as necessary. Second, the team teaching approach can be accomplished in different ways by having the general and special education teachers teaching the entire class whether it be in unison, reversing the subjects or the days providing instruction. Furthermore, Elliot and McKenny (1998), state there are other team teaching pathways to take such as having a minimal group of students achieve their aim, one-to-one tutoring or provide support to make the participation positive. Third, aide services are most valuable to special education teachers as they are able to provide the support needed to students and work alongside the general education teacher in the least restrictive environment. The researchers recommend for the special education teacher to have aides who are well trained and

provide the correct assistance to students. It is essential for special education teachers to conduct check-ins with students at least once a month to monitor and evaluate their progress. Lastly, the pullout program grants students with severe disabilities increased instruction according to the student's ability. They also stated that the pull out model is limited to a certain number of students within the inclusion model. They go on to say that student should only be pulled out after the teacher has provided the students with instructions, and as required. The study goes on to say that the aim to pull students from the least restrictive environment is done as a last resort for students who need individualized instruction and tutoring to help them succeed in the classroom and the pullout model is the greatest controlled model within the inclusion models.

Elliot and McKenny (1998), discussed the advantage of the four inclusion models in a secondary school and mentioned the models bring forth best teaching practices in the least restrictive environment due to diversity in the class to be welcoming and acknowledging. It is important to note that with the cooperative practice students will gain independent life skill and progress academically. The researchers concluded this model practice to be preferred and favorable. The researcher reviewed the active assessment practice and concluded the practice provides a more reasonable estimate of students academic performance. The research team stated the function of the active assessment practices is for students to learn and for there to accountability (Elliot & McKenny, 1998). The team then concluded that personal growth and challenges in the least restrictive environment are present. That children need to learn in a classroom where the special education teacher will be teaching students multiple subjects in a mixed manner to educate students during the secondary school years. Lastly, the researcher team stated that the inclusion practices don't come without challenges such as adequate funding, concerns with students who have multiple disabilities or emotional interruptions, necessary

equipment to meet the needs of students, concerns from parents, and teachers and administrators worry the curriculum will become slower or be modified which will be a negative learning experience for students who are in the general education classroom (Elliot & McKenny, 1998).

Honigsfeld and Dove (2007) examined connection between using the same co-teaching models and practices in Special Education to the area of English Language Learners (ELL) to serve the need of ELLs in the general education classroom. In this study, Honigsfeld and Dove (2007) reviewed five feasible co-teaching structures and provided recommendations to avert probable difficulties. They determined that co-teaching practices can accomplish what is designed to provide the suitable needs for ELLs; support all students to fulfill the score requirements of national, state, and local standards; and create a foundation for an innovative partnership among the general education and special education teachers.

Honigsfeld and Dove (2007) explored five co-teaching models that perhaps can make clear different manners in which special educators and general education teachers can work together. They have modified fittingly the five models to show the way they could be useful in the context for English Language Learners. Honigsfeld and Dove (2007) stated that the five co-teaching models are (1) One teacher lead, and one teacher is committed to helping students. (2) Two teachers instruct the same lesson. (3) One teacher reinstructs, and one teacher educates using optional information. (4) Two teachers observe, assist, and check the progress of students as they teach. (5) Two teachers work together and teach the same lesson at the same time. The ESL teacher can aid by adding strategies to the lesson to accommodate ESL learners. The examiners identified how co-taught classes aid the overall teaching practices to meet the needs of various ELL students who are in the least restrictive environments learning alongside their English-speaking peers. Honigsfeld and Dove (2007) state that ELLs can learn and work

alongside students who have assorted academic abilities and are fluent English speakers. They go on to say that ELLs need different accommodations than students who require remediation. In their view, they mention it is essential to provide ESL students with a plan that will increase the students understanding of the English language while learning the subject being taught in the classroom, and at the same time listening to English speakers as language role models. Honigsfeld and Dove (2007) mention that in their view for co-teaching practices to function adequately within the general education classroom, the ESL teacher will integrate ESL strategies that the general education can later use when the ESL teacher is no longer present in the classroom. The researchers recommend planning to be crucial when co-teaching. They state that established planning offers both teachers the chance to designate among themselves the teaching plan duties, modified class work, textbooks, plus homework tasks in such a manner that all students can learn at the same time. The team suggested that in a perfect co-teaching model teachers should meet once a week to plan the projects and the plan of action established based on the syllabus and the state standards. However, the examiners mention that some school districts are at a loss for time for ESL teachers to come together and work with general education teachers in a normal school day. Hence, they insist co-teaching participants to choose a co-teaching model of their choice, test it, to see if that model approach can work and provide a successful co-teaching approach. Honigsfeld and Dove (2007) went on to say that if scheduling time is minimal then teachers must establish contact strategies where both teachers are well informed and are able to agree or disagree on lesson planning, teaching procedures, and additional materials. However, due to teachers having to meet national, state, and local standards with ELLs collaboration between teachers will offer the required to meet the academic standards (if available) (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2007, p.10).

This study is clear and direct. Honigsfeld and Dove (2007) explained that ELL teachers revised the ELL standards to combine language improvement in the academic and social plan. They go on to mention in detail the five standards and mention that different states have written their own academic ELL standards as of late and if ELL standards are applicable in the state they are residing or teaching, then, each of the five standards will indicate measurably abilities ELLs need to advance.

Honigsfeld and Dove (2007) concluded they feel assured that once teachers collaborate and co-teach, they will be able to collaborate frequently, and smoothly co-teach in the same classroom to exchange insight about teaching knowledge, including difficult situations that occur in the classroom. The researchers shared that when teachers jointly plan the lessons, they can share an understanding of the planning, to demonstrate the capability to give students a lesson instruction, to encounter difficulties and appreciate the recompense of educating the next generation to become woven into what is the classroom and school life.

Davison (2006) conducted a study to find the series of actions that are taken with co-planning and co-teaching as it is applied in English as a second language in the general education classroom and how teachers can support one another when having a diverse group of language students in the mainstream classroom. The researcher wanted to gain more knowledge about teacher collaboration in the inclusive classroom setting between the general education teacher and the ESL teacher.

The study was done using a questionnaire and data collected from conducting interviews where the English language was the primary medium when instructing students in the general education classroom in a middle school located in Asia-Pacific region (Davison, 2006, p. 460). The teachers who took the questionnaire were experienced ESL teachers. The questionnaire and

data collection were completed by taking into consideration all students in the general education setting to promote effective learning for all students. The data conferred in this study were gathered from an elementary school grade 1-5 which was grouped unified into four to five classes consisting of 20-22 students for each year level (Davison, 2006). The data analyzed in this study included 12 general education teachers working with grades 1, 2, and 5 who collaborated in a form of partnership with 5 ESL teachers. The primary procedure approach selected was qualitative and interpretive using a systematic inductive method to figure out the theoretical model of shared improvement. The researcher stated the ESL teachers who participated in the study had been working with ESL primary-age students for decades by means of pull- out, but the primary school that took part in the study wanted to apply a collaborative approach, educational program plan, instruction, and examination where both the content teacher and ESL teacher draft familiar goals and tasks. Data was also gathered about the participant through the means of member check-ins and triangulation which is a framework that details the collaboration done between the general education and ESL teachers at the grammar school level. Through the analysis of both data collection methods, the researcher was able to point out the difficult areas of collaboration teaching and the implications encountered (Davison, 2006, p.472).

Davison (2006) found that from the study of teacher collaboration between the general education and ESL teachers comes with challenges, even if it is done in an elementary school where its ESL students take precedence and the general education teachers are lax in their academic subjects. From the study analysis the researcher found teachers have a wide range of perspectives depending on the amount of collaboration, with specific levels, from enduring of oneself, in that teachers attempted to adjust their routines and were unwilling to change to a

recognition of the influence they both have on students, to address the critiques on instruction. The classification of teacher organization and professional reinforcements seemed inconsistent at separate times during the collaboration teaching phase, with choices of being solid with established support to central face to face pursuit such as the collaborations which are known to be more rewarding. An interference for teacher professional development is that collaborating educators may take advantage from a more hands-on teacher with deep-seated choices with interpretative reflection and analysis in the manner that learning, and teaching are done (Davison, 2006, p. 472). Additional research needs to be conducted to assess if the framework is sustainable to be used in other schools and with various grade school levels. The scope of effective and less-effective collaboration teaching strategies needs to increase and placed as top priority and more discussions need to be had about collaborative classrooms and team preparing consultations need to be attempted.

Garcia and Tyler (2010) examined educational qualities of ELLs with learning disabilities and present the structure for teaching planning and partnership among subject area English as a second language and special education teachers to guarantee students achieve academic success in the least restrictive environment. Garcia and Tyler (2010) reviewed the complexity connection among LD, ESLs, culture, and consequence obstacles encountered during subject area general education classrooms providing instruction in the English language. Garcia and Tyler (2010) focal point were students with LD since they state LD students make up approximately 50% of the entirety of all students ranging from ages 6 to 21 and 80% of this age group area of necessitate reading.

Garcia and Tyler (2010) analyzed the framework for teachers to have complete knowledge of students' learning needs based on their language, disability, culture, and focus on

recognizing a successful manner to plan lesson instruction for student learning achievement. They go on to say that when ELLs face challenges in education teachers speculate if it is because of their quality of language, a possible disability or a combination of one and the other. The researchers go on to say that many ELLs have been identified incorrectly, but there are ELLs that face academic challenges due to social economic situation, cultural environment, and educational past. ELLS who struggle academically whether they have been misidentified or face learning challenges are the focus of this study since interventions that are intertwined in general, ESL, and special education teaching fall short of academic success (p.115). Garcia and Tyler (2010) provide specifically the definition of learning disability as it is stated by IDEA. They state that LD students are a diverse group, and every student will encounter academic difficulties differently.

Garcia and Tyler (2010) took into consideration the education ELLs receive in second language and mention that teachers when teaching in the English language need to acknowledge the communication that takes place between ELL and LD. They noted that these students tend to have difficulties with reading in their mother tongue, they additionally need to learn the English language skills that relate to English mastery. Moreover; ELLs must express themselves using the English language based on concepts that are used in their school and are appreciated when spoken in the English language. They noted that it is this type of behavior that is seen in the general education classroom in the manner which ELL students behave and communicate, this in turn increases the LD thinking order of the lecture and this obstructs their attentiveness of what is being taught in class. Contingent to their area of reading altered by their disability, they can encounter hardships decoding new words, visual or auditory clarification, remembering more information, or organizing objectives (p. 116). Garcia and Tyler (2010) go on to say that teachers

should at least get to know that ELLs, even those with LD might have possibly been early

withdrawn from their ESL instruction before becoming skilled academically in English language,

such as language that is written in secondary textbook and educational materials.

Garcia and Tyler (2010) examined the cultural context of teaching and learning and

stated that in view that ELLs with LD are representative of the non-dominant social cultural or

linguistic groups they attend school with other perspectives different than those defined or

expressed at school. Their cultural orientation differs and it's apparent in their learning and

education completion and achievement. Furthermore, their behavior includes the way they refine

the information, use coherence, and connect with others and learn. The researchers go on to state

that from the point of view of a sociocultural school subject such as math, science, literacy, and

other descriptions of comprehension can be recognized as cultural tools to educate and reflect on.

Thus, the way learning instruction is provided in addition to how it is used to educate the

children mirrors the public portrayal of the academic subjects. Therefore, it is crucial for teachers

to understand that the lesson they provide is essentially shaped by culture as students gain

knowledge. Garcia and Tyler (2010) also investigated how teachers can support ELLs with LD

using mediated learning strategies and suggest a framework for modifying instruction that can be

used to an advantage by ELLs with LD and other students academically functioning at low grade

level. The researchers indicated this mediated instruction needs to be followed thoroughly even if

it is comparable to what teachers are already teaching (p. 116). They described teachers must

recognize what they want the learning result to be by means of examining the lesson subject and

teaching methods to recognize the intellectual and linguistic students' needs without diluting the

ideas that must be learned, but instead, allow ELLs with LD to exhibit what they have mastered.

Therefore, Garcia and Tyler (2010) stated that in order for teachers to help ELLs with LD it is

imperative they communicate and collaborate productively covering all strategies. Still, when working with students whose needs are with their language, disability, and culture it is essential for school districts and administrators, offer educators the necessary tools, time, and materials necessary for teachers to collaborate in arranging the lesson and the order in which instruction is given (p.118).

With U.S. schools becoming more diverse Hart, J. (2009) examined how teachers address the needs of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) students and any concerns with learning disability education. Hart, J. (2009) provides the present movement and general assessment, instruction, and frequency rates of students with special needs who are ELLs as well as general principles for suitable assessment of such learners with learning disability education. And finally, the researcher describes the scientific academic and behavioral master plan for ELLs with special needs and how some web resources are tailored to aid general and special education teachers who work with CLD students with special needs (p.197).

Hart, J. (2009) analyzed 63 studies to obtain concrete knowledge and present its findings addressing with close attention the necessities of CLD learners with disabilities. Results from the findings showed that problems with misrepresentation of CLD students are high in rate in the area of special education and that the same holds true for their diminished plans of action for gifted and talented students. Even though Hispanic students in the United Stated are moderately disproportionate in the learning deficit realm, there is no imbalance for developmental disability or emotional disturbance. Hart, J. (2009) found that in the US each state department of education does not gather data on students with language proficiency and the information that is gathered is information that just comes up. The researcher discovered there is only an ascending amount of information in the portrayal of ELLs receiving special education services. Hart, J. (2009) states

despite significant occurrences there is an uneven representation over cultural and linguistic

people due in part by various standardized assessments which may produce justifiable scores for

most students but play down the ability of CLD learners. The researcher discovered standardized

tests are being recommended by researchers and educators to provide a different form of testing

to faithfully assess pupil's potential. Hart, J. (2009) also found suggestions for assessment

techniques that are appealing to the general education classroom educators and for school staff.

The researcher provides the following assessment approaches. First, analytic teaching which is

an orderly way instruction is modified, actual observation, and keeping records of results.

Second, curriculum-based assessments offer educators particular data about which subjects, or

models give the students the most struggles. Third, language sampling, which is normally

gathered in a normal and various settings and must be done when students communicate or

converse and use culturally appropriate language. The research states students can be filmed, or

audio recorded for later listening analysis. Fourth, a narrative analysis consists of collecting

written samples and the product can be later examined for written form, content writing, and

function. Fifth, research-based instruction and value orientation strategies can be used by

educators working with CLD students when they are in the least restrictive environment. Sixth,

keeping an adjustable environment where students can have flexibility when responding to

questions, offering more time when speaking, and approving of responses done in their native

tongue or in the English language. Seventh, acknowledge students' native language, and provide

voluntary native language usage as this will continue to encourage students to communicate. In

addition, the researcher suggests that a technique that students can take part in as part of their

education in a formal setting with a free inside the classroom where they can voice their answers

to the class, amenable, extending pause breaks, allow time for students for free speaking accepting all answers in the students' native language or in English (p.199).

Hart, J. (2009) studied how the increase of literature on particular academic teaching strategies can help students who are ELLs and those with specific needs obtain subject matter and proper vocabulary forms. The researcher stated "total physical response (TPR), reciprocal teaching, semantic mapping, marginal gloss, advance organizers, the language experience approach, and other reading comprehension techniques" are part of the specific strategies mentioned in the research. Hart, J. (2009) concluded schools in America are becoming rapidly different. The first difficulty educators encounter is the demand on how to provide for all students, even those who come from different backgrounds or who are faced with an education or behavior ailment. with practical and useful instruction. The research review concluded that it is essential for all teachers to prepare with scientific assessment methods and teaching routines to empower ELL students to attain their highest form of success to become triumphant while attending school and after high school graduation (Hart, J., 2009, p.202).

Foil and Alber, (2002) conducted a review on an enjoyable and efficient manner in which students can augment their vocabulary. The purpose of this study was to learn how vocabulary words correlate with other information, and its ideas which are a demanding sub skill that can affect reading comprehension. Students who lack vocabulary will be inclined to struggle with understanding what they are reading. This study looked at middle and high school students with experimentally approved strategies and suggested exercises for vocabulary education. With the focus on deliberating, instructing vocabulary by the way of drama, graphic organizer, digital media, the keyword method, and engaged students while in an assignment. This study showed that skilled reading depends on an intricate collection of subskills.

Findings from this study showed that reading comprehension is a sub skill that is necessary for experienced reading. The vocabulary via drama was meant for students to use multisensory systems to improve reading. Teachers implement the multisensory approach by having students group in teams, and silently act out chosen words. Although this study does not provide a measurement of vocabulary increase using drama, it is a teaching approach that encourages all student participation. The team examined the semantic teaching approach and how teachers used it by having students use a computer to expand their vocabulary. The researchers noted that students with special needs were able to understand and form new information. The team mentioned results from a study where video technology augmented reading comprehension. Different forms of advanced video technology can help students boost reading comprehension. Video technology for greater learning includes a list of related vocabulary so students can develop a deeper understanding of the words and videotape themselves practicing the words. Students present abstract nouns which they can draw and then perform skits. They video tape themselves illustrating how each skit ties to the abstract noun illustration. Then, they express whether the illustration represents the concept. Another teaching approach is the keyword found which is a mnemonic strategy. The researchers mentioned that the mnemonic strategy helps students refine new words and approaches by making it more useful and factual for them. The study includes several ways in which teachers can use mnemonics including having students create their own mnemonic and using the acronym LINCS to develop more words for purposeful vocabulary. In addition, the team suggested activities for students to practice their newly acquired vocabulary using response cards, participating in choral responding, and peer tutoring (p. 136).

In order for students to cultivate rich reading comprehension, Foil and Alber (2002) suggested that to develop a solid vocabulary to comprehend reading and listening, it is essential for students to be provided with instruction that corrects unfamiliar words to prior learning and experience. Teachers should develop significant situations for practicing new words and allow students to have a constant window of opportunity (p.138).

Bos, C. S. and Anders, P. L. (1990), studied the effects of interactive vocabulary to improve vocabulary and reading comprehension in junior high learners with disabilities. The research team described how to combine theory-driven instruction and reading vocabulary to make connections. The team studied the connections to improve the validity of three interchangeable vocabulary strategies. The study included 61 learning disabled junior high students, 41 males and 20 females. Using content area documents, the learners participated in one of the three interactive strategies - semantic mapping (SM), semantic feature analysis (SFA), and semantic/syntactic feature analysis (SSFA) or used definition instruction (DI). Their acquisition of knowledge was determined by short and long term evaluation of vocabulary and reading comprehension and recall. Students were casually assigned one or four intervention assessment circumstances and taught in group sizes of six and 12. The purpose of this study was to juxtapose the efficacy of two types of vocabulary instruction: interactive vocabulary teaching established on principles of knowledge hypothesis and word description instruction situated as access/instrumental hypothesis employing junior high students with learning disabilities educated in science vocabulary (Bos, C. S. & Anders, P. L., 1990, p. 32). This study chose learning disabled students for two purposes: to immediately produce vocabulary or due to previous issues in vocabulary as a result of vocabulary instruction linked with reading comprehension (Bos, C. S. & Anders, P. L., 1990, p. 33).

Bos, C. S. and Anders, P. L. (1990), found that a continuous control variable observed in each examination was distinct from the reading examination and the written recollection. For the vocabulary, students who took the SFA and SM instructional conditions learned more words than students who took the DI. Regarding the long-term learning follow-up examination, students who took interactive instruction conditions surpassed subjects through the acceptance of definition instruction. Neither short nor long learning differences appeared amid the three combined instructional conditions. They also found in the comprehension tests results were very similar to the vocabulary results, no differences were found in the posttest or follow-up the three combined instructional conditions. The tests revealed no differences amid the four strategies shortly after instruction, however, 30 days later, students in the DI condition produced fewer new vocabulary words than the students in the SSFA or SFA conditions. Overall, the research team found students' participants in the SSFA and SFA conditions generated greater comprehensiveness than the DI participants (p. 38).

This study found that prior research developed with learning disabled participants derived from contradictory findings with reference to vocabulary comprehension. The researchers noted that in former studies the instrumental/access-based interventions did not determine positive reading comprehension results compared to a no instruction control condition. Nevertheless, interactive or knowledge based interventions have led the way to increase reading comprehension compared to instrumental/access-based intervention along with three knowledge-based interventions. The researchers concluded that instructional methods resulted in greater comprehension for pupils who were committed to learning the word definition using related information. Teachers offered students an introduction to vocabulary to be learned. Also, researchers found that techniques that only provided students with word definitions proved to be

an effective manner for students to understand a reading passage. Conversely, interactive strategies stressed related information via student discussions where they would initiate, communicate, and become involved in the vocabulary by providing past experiences to think of the definition and generate word meaning information. The researchers also concluded that written recalls used as a follow-up resulted in increased remembering in contrast with definition instruction. Bos, C. S. and Anders, P. L. (1990) found the study promoted the belief that involving students in learning consequently eased students into long term learning that transformed into a model on where advanced learning can happen (p. 40). The researcher team discovered that by thoughtfully questioning and investigating theory-related applications, educators can observe the investigation and implementation connection when planning.

Findings showed that previous research which included learning disabled students led to inconsistencies regarding connections to vocabulary comprehension. The instrumental/ access-based interventions have not shown clear results on reading comprehension compared to a non-instruction controlled environment; however, the conjoint knowledge-based intervention led the way to deeper comprehension versus using dictionary practice for learning vocabulary. Whereas definition instruction focused more on how to use the words when processing them, use of the definition, and making sense of the word which offered students more than one or two outlooks to the selected learned words. Other differences found were that definition instruction was relatively unrelated to definitions. Despite the fact that the definition was related to the content, it did not provide a wealthy source for the definitional knowledge. Therefore, providing only definitions offered students more of a surface processing which did not encourage them to think about how the vocabulary correlated to their understanding or how one idea was connected to another. Other findings showed that all interactive conditions showed an excellent quality of

recall in contrast to definition. Another essential finding showed that there was a notion that students who received suggestive lessons captured their ideas which in turn made it possible for long-term learning which would become the foundation on which new learning would take place (p. 40).

Alshahrani (2019), analyzed 15 articles related to English vocabulary and spelling in the classroom for English Language Learners (ELL), English as a second language (ESL), English Only (EO), and Learning Disabilities (LD) pupils. The purpose of this study was to find strategies to help students during classroom instruction. Researchers focused on the most essential skills for students to thrive academically, vocabulary and spelling. To conduct the research, Alshahrani (2019) reviewed articles to determine if the strategies were successful classroom interventions. The researcher conducted the analysis by using ERIC, RefWorks, and Google Scholar engines to identify studies relating to vocabulary and spelling interventions. The research looked at more than 100 studies and reduced the search by following the next criteria: First, the analyzers investigated the effectiveness of either a vocabulary strategy or spelling strategy in a school or home environment. Second, the candidate's age or grade varied from pre-kindergarten to undergraduate level. Third, the candidates were either English only speakers, ELL, had LD, or a combination. Finally, the studies were published from 1990 through 2016 by means of peer-reviewed journal articles or as a dissertation. The researcher analyzed 15 articles to analyze and include in research.

Results from this analysis revealed the researcher found 15 journal articles describing successful vocabulary and spelling strategies for augmenting English vocabulary and spelling for ESL, EO, and LD pupils. Results determined established vocabulary strategies including explicit

vocabulary instruction along with implementation of reading, and rote rehearsal of spelling words (p. 68).

Overall, the findings from Alshahrani (2019) proved there are many strategies to help students ameliorate vocabulary and spelling difficulties. Several strategies were found successful such as direct instruction, storybook reading, and memorization which were fruitful for increasing English language vocabulary and spelling for students who are ESL, EO, or LD. The researcher also found the most used strategies were storybook reading and cover, copy, and compare (CCC) strategies. CCC and writing strategies were the most helpful for spelling. In addition, the researcher found that the storybook reading strategies augmented vocabulary. Parent assistance with vocabulary usage at home grew from 50% to 80% amid two six-week assignments.

In this analysis, the researcher found two limitations. (1) Home storybook reading strategies because the educator had no dominance over the implementation of the intervention. (2) Listening to stories because visuals were not included, the teacher must guess about students' experiences as their vocabulary comprehension. Nevertheless, the method may be advantageous for teachers to clearly use in the classroom by incorporating the strategy into their routine lessons.

Faraj (2015) studied effective teaching methods for activating receptive vocabulary and changing it to expressive vocabulary in an English Foreign Language (EFL) framework. The study examined how student's receptive vocabulary developed to expressive vocabulary within the learning context. The purpose of this study is to provide strategies to educators that address vocabulary skills for EFL learners.

The Faraj (2015) study included 30 students who were all native speakers of Kurdish language at Sulaimani University. Students were from 29-53 years old and included 11 males and 19 females. All students participated in a general English course focusing on vocabulary and comprehension for two-hours per week. Data was collected using a questionnaire to examine Kramsch's practice and technique of vocabulary study and teaching strategies to promote students to practice their receptive vocabulary using the effective skills and then use the skills in the form when speaking or writing (pg. 15).

The researcher included pre and post-test of productive vocabulary performance. Pre and post test results found a large increase (28%) in the Kramsch vocabulary techniques had significantly changed receptive vocabulary into productive and expanded the use of productive vocabulary for ELL students. The researcher found that students who chose their own vocabulary and Memory Strategies (MEM) recalled the words effortlessly and used them effectively. The researcher also found that the student use of productive vocabulary advanced when they were knowledgeable about a word and used it effectively independently rather than via instruction targeting receptive vocabulary increases were also observed with students sharing what they learned with their peers, addressing one another's learning and reusing the vocabulary words. Lastly, the students expanded productive vocabulary faster than with pre-selected receptive vocabulary.Overall, Faraj (2015) found that the Kramsch's vocabulary learning significantly increased vocabulary for EFL students.

Hung-Chang Liao, et al. (2018) studied comprehension strategies for students demonstrating lack of self-confidence, doubtfulness, and capability when reading English as an unfamiliar language. The purpose of this study was to examine whether reading English using

reading comprehension strategies diminish anxiety and augmented self-confidence for Taiwanese students reading English.

Hung-Chang Liao et al. (2018) included 62 Taiwanese college students from various universities in central Taiwan whose students were an average of 20.8 years. Participants consisted of 43% male and 57% females divided into two groups, one controlled group with basic instruction and experimental group instructed by control teaching. The researchers used the quasi experimental design and the experiment lasted 15 weeks. Data was analyzed to examine possible group differences and evaluate the effects of the intention strategies.

Results revealed the reading comprehension strategies positively impacted the students. Participants demonstrated reduced reading tension, improved self-efficacy, and continued development of their reading skills. The experimental group demonstrated a significant increase in English reading confidence.

Hung-Chang Liao et al. (2018), discussed that their results demonstrated that students with English reading anxiety who received reading comprehension strategies exceeded students who did not obtain that education. Researchers discussed that students who used English comprehension skills reduced reading anxiety by using context clues and prefixes, suffixes, and base words to comprehend the grammatical and structure distinctness between the two languages and understand the main idea, analyze fine points, and implicit knowledge found in a paragraph. Overall, this study supported effectiveness using reading comprehension strategies to help students manage and minimize reading anxiety, boost their self-efficacy, and improve reading ability. The researcher also mentioned that the teachers need to be patient when teaching strategies to increase student self-confidence, reduce anxiety, and meet reading proficiency goals (p. 456).

The Effectiveness of Special Education Teaching, General Education Teaching

Transferable to English Language Learners for Students Academic Better Outcomes

Secondary school students must learn collaboration skills before entering the workforce. Teachers should consciously model teamwork skills to highest effective collaboration skills in the work setting to prepare students for work life after high school graduation. Vangrieken, et al., (2015) discussed teacher collaboration as a crucial tool to educate students during high school preparation for the work environment. The researchers analyzed studies completed after the year 2000 and examined five teacher collaboration forms (p.18). The analysis found no systematic reviews of authentic team teaching, but instead, the aim focuses on professional learning communities (PLCs) or specific purpose partnership of collaboration. Vangrieken, et al., (2015) stated they had several aims and equivalent questions that would drive the aim and the framework of the review (p.20). The researcher gathered literature from a variety of databases and to investigate even further on teacher collaboration, they selected a narrative review method to adapt the research plan. They determined this method of research would provide them with sufficient information from various sources and combined it in a manner that would offer new evidence to the literature as opposed to providing an overview of their findings (p.21). They found that previous research terminology contained in the area of teacher collaboration several unclear terms. The researcher found a lack of distinctness in how teacher collaboration has been described. The different terms consisted of: "teacher teams, teacher collaboration, professional (learning) communities, (teacher) learning communities, (teacher) learning teams, etc." (Vangrieken, et al., 2015). The researcher defined the six terms: teacher collaboration, professional learning community, communities, teacher teams, teacher learning groups, and other (critical friends' group, collaborative practice, interaction, networks, and different forms) and

provided a clear description of each. In addition, they included depth of collaboration, balance of opposite force results, helping and impending circumstances, and successful collaboration. The researchers stated that the teacher collaboration term had been used unclearly and interchangeably by educators. It could be debated whether the terms being used alluded to the same form of teaching collaboration or to other forms which made it inconvenient to produce accurate results; hence, for this review the correct teacher collaboration terms were used. The researchers shed light on the terminology that materialized in the literature. They suggested that team groups are on a continuous sequence of ideas of what it means to be a team. The results also showed positive and negative outcomes when teachers work together and they revealed teacher collaboration positively affects students, teachers, and the entire school stating it is essential and exciting for teachers to collaborate. Next, the researcher mentioned recognition of preconditions that impeded teacher collaboration, along with factors that facilitated the teacher partnership. They state that teachers must also find the time to collaborate with each other. However, that is not enough, they must defeat the slowing down factors connected to a cultural alignment and the foundation associated with the teacher's perspective. They mentioned that an entrenched culture of identity, independence, and freedom presented itself in education. Hence, there needs to be open-mindedness and a change of mind among the teachers and the instruction they provide. Without the openness, researchers claimed that the teachers' effort would be missing in the culture of a false team.

Lastly, the researchers explained effective collaboration. They defined effective collaboration as incorporating divided responsibilities, team innovation and exchanging of information adequately. In addition, as a result of good collaboration, the team will achieve its goals which will lead to an advancement of teaching practices. They noted that teacher

collaboration could not be viewed as disconnected from context, since the education context, culture, and distinctiveness of teacher vocation would impact the performance and the continuance of teacher collaboration (p.36).

Teachers should be cognizant of the focus on teacher teams and teacher collaboration and other terms explored for professional learning communities. The researchers will conduct future research by collaborating with a variety of contexts which include education, manufacturing, management, healthcare, etc. to increase their knowledge of how good teams work together in different settings. In other words, they will be crossing their boundaries from education and researching other settings so that teachers can learn from how others work since progress can only be attained when boundaries of rules of conduct are crossed (p. 37). Vangrieken, et al., (2015), stated they will be conducting extensive future research in teacher collaboration in connection with higher education concentrating on the partnership between professors and university or college education.

A qualitative acumen was used to compare a case study of two school districts in the same district; one which achieved success in positive academic results for migrant English Language Learners, and the other, a school that was not able to attain similar level of academic success with their ELs.

Vallavicencio, et al. (2021) studied how teachers obtained a desired effect when they collaborated to raise the academic progress for migrant English Learners. The purpose of their study was to discover to what degree and what constituted teacher collaboration in schools that provided service to a large number of English Learners and how teacher collaboration impacted learning favorably for English Learners and their teachers. Moreover, the researchers will analyzed practices in learning environments that generated noticeable distinct outcomes for

comparable students. The findings of this study offer reasonable considerations for English Language Learners instruction in the United States and beyond (Villavicencio, et al., 2021, p. 2).

Vallavicencio, et al. (2021) analyzed the International Network of Public Schools with an increased number of immigrant children who had a narrow English language proficiency (p. 3). The researchers analyzed data from Internationals Network of Public Schools located throughout the United States. These schools strive to meet the needs of immigrant students who arrive from over 115 countries speaking roughly 100 distinct languages. In addition, more than 90% of the immigrants have low socioeconomic status and a great deal are undocumented. The method in this examination included two Network schools and two non-Network schools with the aim to determine teacher collaboration to find out which school teacher collaboration performance achieves success with International students; and how the successful teaching practices could be implemented in a traditional school environment. Two schools participated in the analysis, Sunny Hills and Central High. The data analyzed revealed that one school possessed noted characteristics interconnected with teacher collaboration resulting in academic success in the areas of attendance, GPA, and increased in graduation numbers. The non-achieving school located in the same district did not yield similar results. The researchers used a dense account of teacher methods in both school locations. They examined the profundity of collaboration among educators. The school with the greater student performance demonstrated connectedness in responsibility equally for all ELL students. The successful teaching practices included teaching in the least restrictive environment (LRE), combined partnership, and consideration of all teaching elements in the LRE to benefit the teachers and students.

The researchers contested the collaboration reported among teachers, especially in the area of curriculum planning and teacher knowledge that resulted in academic gains. The school

that prospered academically was Sunny Hills. At Sunny Hills the teachers centered their attention on diversity, culture, traits, passion, and demands. While the second school, Central High, showed deficiency in skillful environments that helped teachers collaborate, which resulted in disintegration and remoteness of EL educators. Even though the teachers reported a distinguished degree of collaboration, teacher interaction was low and EL educators clearly had minimal contact with their collaborator (p. 9).

An analysis of the case study discussion and implications shed light on the manner in which teachers could balance collaboration to oblige the needs of immigrant ELL students with distinguished characteristics. Teachers at Sunny Hills school demonstrated structure and allocation of time, meeting three hours per week with an aim to plan a curriculum that accommodated language in teaching content, delivery strategies to assist ELs, and teacher learning guided by teachers. In contrast, teachers at Central High were guided by the lecture form, reducing opportunities for teachers to control their own learning. The teachers met twice per month; ESL teachers met at a different location. Benchmarks for standard state test and language assistance were only provided as needed. There was irregular involvement from teachers with careful topics chosen and led by the school administrator. Furthermore, teachers at Central Hill detailed their communication, whether relevant to instruction or ongoing training, and placed the focus on the separation of EL teachers (p. 9). Vallavicencio, et al. (2021), discussed that while the number of English Language Learners continues to increase in schools across the United States as a diverse group they have been diminished and currently face a dislike since they are not from America. This study committed to the main research goal through empirical investigation for methods that could support a more favorable result for immigrant English Language Learners and it showed how disintegration can strengthen unfair academic

results while clearly demonstrating how teachers could design the learning space immigrant children deserve. The researchers did not mention any further research to be conducted.

There are various ways in which to teach students who are English Language Learners alongside students with learning disabilities at the middle school level. O'Connor et al. (2021), described a method where English Language Learners in middle school were educated in the same English/Language Arts class as students with learning disabilities by teaching 15 minutes of quotation vocabulary assignments. The authors attested that ELLs learned and retained the learned vocabulary outstandingly placing them ahead of ELL students who were in a controlled classroom. O'Connor, et al. (2021) provided the results from a multi-year study to acutely account the number of words students absorbed and retained while they were instructed compared to students in the special education English/Language Arts classroom. Teachers used Creating Habits that Accelerate Academic Vocabulary of Students (CHAAOS) to instruct students. The essential components of CHAAOS included learner-friendly word definitions, circumstantial descriptions, numerous chances for students to answer, phonetic and orthographic depiction of terms. Assistance for appropriately applying the use of vocabulary when vocalizing or writing were defined in the education package.

O'Connor, et al. (2021) stated that researchers instructed middle school English Language Arts teachers who taught students with learning disabilities showing them how to weave 15 minutes of vocabulary assignments into their special education language arts daily curriculum. Teachers administered a pre-test, post-test, and follow-up assessment to evaluate the sustained knowledge of learned vocabulary. During the first year of the study, the sixth-grade middle school teachers used a created habit that accelerated the academic vocabulary of students. CHAAOS words were implemented into the lessons to broaden vocabulary using helpful words

from a variety of academic word lists created by professionals for students with LD and other

disabilities. The sixth grade LD students used the CHAAOS words the teachers provided to help

them learn new essential academic vocabulary useful to them in middle and secondary school.

The second year, the now seventh grade students, continued to use the CHAAOS words making

use of current academic words. Special Education Teachers educated the students using 48

academic words annually separated into a series of three four-week groups. According to

O'Connor, et al. (2021) the CHAAOS words were designed to be incorporated into the 55-

minute English Language Arts Class during 15 minutes of the designed instruction. During the

non-CHAAOS instruction teachers conferred with students focused on corrective reading,

decoding B and using the entire classroom directive. Instruction was also observed in the

business-as-usual (BAU) controlled class one time per the educational marking period (i.e.,

thrice). The teachers in the BAU employed two reading programs and used corrective reading,

decoding B, four days per week when providing whole day instruction. On Fridays, the teacher

provided Newsela, an online ELA education reading platform for students as the reading subject

matter, but not use targeted educational vocabulary. In addition, during the first week of teaching

CHAAOS lesson mentors clearly defined how to precisely instruct the students by incorporating

the CHAAOS words. In that first week of CHAAOS teaching instruction, the teachers were able

to focus on the way CHAAOS instructed the students. Teachers learned not only how words

were incorporated into the lesson, but to what measure the students were taking part in the

lesson, a count of the number of students turns, inspection of the amount of formally used words,

and a detailed account of ways to scaffold customary words.

O'Connor, et al. (2021), noted that during the course of the first week, the teachers

noticed how the CHAAOS teachers provided instruction to students. A few were astonished as to

the excellent participation of the students who possessed poor vocabulary and overall English proficiency. During the second week, the months that followed, the teachers conducted lessons instructing students in the same manner as they had observed the CHAAOS teachers to evoke a thumbs up. During the CHAAOS classes, students were allowed to share the definitions of words related to vocabulary without raising their hand which motivated them. Teachers allowed students to provide examples of how they were accustomed to using the words. This was essential as the student's generated sentences or used several forms of word meanings. Furthermore, one teacher specifically used a book to focus on visual perception, instructing the students to jot down what they recognized. This practice might have encouraged participation of spoken words which potentially recompensed to a rigid lexical description of words secured by their significance. Lastly, O'Connor, et al. (2021), mentioned interpreting results with discretion as the sample of curricular approaches was limited by the small class size and the number of students with LD special needs. The majority of the students were ELLs with and losing 15 students were absent from the initial year trial and replaced with 27 new students during the second year. O'Connor, et al. (2021), mentioned that results from the small samples could fail to identify the dissimilarity amidst the vocabulary posttest and preservation or words test. However, test results from this study revealed increased vocabulary noted in the examinations supported the end results that students retained comprehension of words they mastered during the CHAAOS instruction.

To conclude, O'Connor, et al. (2021), found that with the use of CHAAOS in place, students with disabilities were able to respond to the organized instruction at their suitable age educational language. Although the tests did not produce evidence of increased vocabulary that solidified academic success when the students were in secondary school, the researchers

mentioned that longer term studies are required to determine if slight growth in comprehension of academic vocabulary influenced long-term results.

Bulgren, J.A., et al. (2011) analyzed how question-exploration tasks connected with a graphic organizer and embedded into daily teaching practices offered to secondary students improved responses to complex questions. Researchers compared the classical lecture-discussion plan with the graphic organized embedded question -exploration finding an equal balance between both methods used with opposite effects (p. 578).

This study was directed by researchers who asked parents of possibly 178 students for consent to assess them. Of the 178 students, roughly 116 students provided a signed parent consent form. The 7th grade students with varied abilities were in science and social studies classes. The categories of the students were comprised of various levels of academic achievement including high, average, and low achiever; students with disabilities (SWD) and learning disabilities (LD); and students who had other health disabilities (OHD). The researchers conducted the study in the general education classroom at the school selected to participate. The researchers studied how the effects of the question exploration routine (QER) helped students answer complex questions in contrast to the results of traditional lecture conversation direction (Bulgren, J.A., et al., 2011p. 589). The researchers used graphic organizers to highlight key information along with a fixed understanding of how to answer complicated questions. The team directed their attention to the student achievement performance measurements consistent with how they would answer questions constructed with the intent to test student knowledge that would test their ability to answer questions at various ranks of thinking The students who participated in school A were 90% White, 5% were African American, and 3% were Hispanic

students, school B students were 93% White, 4% African American, and 2% Hispanic (Bulgren, J.A., et al., 2011 p. 581).

The study outcome revealed that students with QER direction were more successful than students who were instructed in a traditional lecture conversation. The researchers reported truly notable differences. The results pointed to factual evidence that students who received QER instruction improved significantly in both class subjects than students who were provided with lecture-discussion teaching methods using the brief answer and multiple-choice questions (Bulgren, J.A., et al., 2011 p. 590). In addition, the researchers found that the effect of the QER instruction provided higher scores with the exception of one, which indicated that student test grades can be improved by using the QER regardless of the extent of academic achievement, skills, or knowledge. The team also examined in detail the subgroup of students with disabilities, students who performed low, normal achievers, and high performers. They found that students in the subgroups who received QER assistance were more successful than students who received the traditional teaching instruction.

Bulgren, J.A., et al. (2011) arrived at the conclusion that all students, regardless of disabilities, who receive detailed oral and written demonstration along with the addition of sub-questions can improve test grades that moderately contain more advanced questions. They noted that students in all subgroups encountered challenges when answering written test questions versus answering multiple choice questions that were designed to elicit comprehension. They observed that a majority of students were unable to answer questions, with a written response, nonetheless, students were able to grasp the main idea and respond to the questions in a multiple-choice answer selection. Although subgroups of students performed well, the team noted that the SWD achieved moderate gains than students who received lecture-discussion instruction

reaching a grade that to no extent attained a passing score. It is essential to note that the research findings discovered that students in the LA class who received QER instruction outperformed all groups of students on the main idea section of the test of chemical weapons using multiple choice answer selection. It was noted that all the students in the LA group answered all of the questions correctly which was a significant difference compared to the students who received lecture only instruction. The researchers concluded that the large difference in performance may have been due to various factors which comprised prior knowledge, student attentiveness, and basic dissimilarities in the subject matter. Overall, the researchers suggested future research needs to be conducted with the focus on classroom teachers using daily scheduled instructional procedures integrating QER into several courses taught with fidelity. Also, the team mentioned that in future research should give attention given to the student's capacity to retain strategic attitudes to rational, teaching advanced approaches of reflection on various subject matters, documentation of the recurrent length of time it took students using the QER to reach favorable results, additional support students may need while using the QER, the practicality of using the CERs to increase discipline specific intelligent demands, and teaching the information to help students with writing. Finally, the team noted the QER along with the graphic organizer used in the classrooms for diverse groups of students could amply raise the scoring results for each and every student and subgroup (p.591).

In another analysis to support teacher instruction of English language learners in science class, Garza, T., et al. (2019) conducted a study with a saturated science intervention for students who are English Learners (EL). The objective for the analysis was to explore how ELL students in a controlled environment had the determination to learn science and English language acquisition through the application of language weaved into a science instruction question or

science inquiry model with written lectures while the instructor scaffold the lessons. The team

mentioned that a survival analysis was used for fifth-grade science student instruction with no

lecture-based education. Two groups of students had class time to work on survival instruction

assignments without interruption in the initial year of starting the plan. The two groups consisted

of a treatment and a control group. The treatment group employed an instructional model

involving implementation of the science curriculum instruction provided by the school

professional specialist asking educators to use written lesson plans which were made to meet

scientific academic standards along with science questioning. Language was woven into the

lesson activities. In addition, the treatment group received biweekly workplace training and their

paraprofessionals were provided monthly teaching instruction. The control group implemented

the science instruction provided by the school district and asked to use science questions or

probing adjusted to coordinate with the state standards. In addition, educators participated in 30

hours of workplace training in the area of science. There was no conclusive evidence the lesson

instruction included language improvement in the master plan beside the scientific teaching

instruction specifications (p. 379).

This study consisted of a significant number of fifth grade students who were ELLs and

needed help in the science classroom. The instrument used to conduct the observation was the

Transitional Bilingual Observation data [TBOP]. It was used to gather all of the data for teacher

and student reciprocity. Garza, T., et. al. (2019), were attentive in documenting the instructional

task lesson design. This was instrumental to the study as it provided the researchers with

observational discovery of cooperative learning and communication in the classroom

environment. A trained rater gathered all of the observational data from the first year of the study

of a large number of fifth graders from four treatment and four controlled classes. The trained

rate instruction consisted of an extensive mastery of the TBOP area and categorization, rehearsing grading or ranking the documentation of students in the class environment, and adjusting the ratings with the team of researchers up. Until data was set side by side, they found an increase of no less than 90% agreement. Each class was 90-minutes with 60 documented entries gathered. In total, at the end of the observation duration, 1,966 observations were collected (p. 380). The study was conducted in the learning environment where teachers used a scaffolding science activity that included a scripted lesson plan. TBOP domains provided a description of the activity structure, communication mode, language content, and language of instruction. Codes by subdomains were also used to code the teacher behavior/ student behavior during the time of the observations (Garza, T., et. al., 2019, p. 380).

Following the data collection and sampling, the researchers analyzed the science instruction survival in the treatment and controlled learning environments with ELs. The results indicated that with the use of scripted lesson plans, where language was woven into the science inquiry instruction, was used with the treatment group, students were not diverted from the science inquiry survival in the course of the time. The researchers noted that the inquiry-based model was beneficial for the success of ELs in science class compared to the controlled group. They believed it was likely the language infused plan of action elevated, and aided science inquiry teaching that benefited EL students due to the language infused science lesson. Thus, the researchers mentioned that supplying teachers with a scripted lesson helped them know how to scaffold the English Language into the science lesson plan so ELs students could excel academically. Second, students remained on task while learning in the classroom with few interruptions. The researchers believed this was due to the teacher's scripted plan. The students may have been more committed to working on the lesson because the teacher had a designed

lesson plan with language woven into instruction that helped the students understand the content and stay engaged. Garza, T., et. al., (2019), mentioned that more research needs to be done to explore why and how the independent variable can have a changing effect for ELs during their science class instruction (p. 383).

Schmitt, N., (2008) analyzed second language vocabulary learning and the amount of English language words students need to know in reading and oral communication, along with vocabulary required to comprehend the lexical information for words. The researcher believed that students use between 8000-9000 English words for reading in the household and maybe 5000-7000 words for families for oral communication. Taken together it is challenging for students to learn the English vocabulary. Schmitt, N., (2008) stated that to assist students an association needs to be made among teachers, students, researchers and those who write the education. The researcher conducted a literature analysis of vocabulary learning. He focused his attention on pedagogical lessons that could be used to help students acquire the English language. To begin the research Schmitt, N., (2008) studied the number of lexical items needed for foreign learners to comprehend the English language. He concluded that students learning a second language must acquire a significant number of spoken and written English words. He found that research suggested students need to have about 98-99% of the minimum for written discussion. In other words, what the findings suggested was that one word in 50 was unfamiliar to students thus leading to comprehension difficulty. In a spoken conversation, Schmitt, N., (2008) found that the students with 80-89% of lexical vocabulary had an acceptable understanding of their reading, while students who understood 90% of the lexical vocabulary possessed superior reading comprehension. However, this was not to say that comprehension could be on the rise. The researcher found that learners who were unfamiliar with less than 80%

of lexical vocabulary had poor reading comprehension, and that 43% of students who were familiar with lexical vocabulary gained an average understanding of the word learning target. It could no longer be accepted that a fair amount of vocabulary would be obtained from being subjected to language assignments or communication. He emphasized that more applicable access needed to be established for students to progress with vocabulary acquisition, and that students needed to be motivated to learn over a long duration with the guidance of the learning partnerships, which includes the students, teachers, material writers, and researchers. Since a great number of lexical learning assignments are required, the partnership must work in unison to achieve success. If at any point one party breaks off the partnership, the activity will fail (Schmitt, N., 2008, p. 333).

Schmitt, N., (2008) found that for students to learn a significant number of lexical items, the students must have an in-depth knowledge of each word to comprehend it well, and the number of vocabulary words is essential. First, the researcher found that word knowledge details are motivating in terms of willful learning such as word meaning and word form while placing a word in a specific context such as collocation and instance of recurrence through enormous exposure to lexical items which would include considerable reading. In addition, the researcher mentioned that since different words are learned at different levels it would be necessary to use a variety of strategies to teach word acquisition. An explicit method, whose aim is placed on word meaning connection, proves to be successful, while at a later time, an exposure method could be most valuable in increasing contextual understanding. In addition, knowledge of each word used in various contexts would help students increase vocabulary skills (pp. 333-335). Schmitt, N., (2008) found seven principal methods to vocabulary acquisition. (1) Offer time for incidental learning of words. (2) Identify which 3,000 words are most frequently used for students to study.

(3) Offer time for willful vocabulary learning. (4) Provide time for developing word knowledge. (5) Offer time for growing fluency with familiar vocabulary. (6) Practice vocabulary guesswork from text. (7) Review various types of dictionaries and educate students on usage. Furthermore, the researcher stated that learners need to have an ample vocabulary to be able to correctly use the second language. Therefore, high vocabulary standards should be the goal. Language learning is difficult and there should be various instructional methods at each level of achievement. During the initial learning, forming a foundation of word meaning is important, and willful learning is successful for this. For students who have L1, a sufficient vocabulary base and are willful learners is a practical way for them to rapidly make the word connections. After the primary meaning-form has been ingrained it is essential to combine it with recurrent exposures. It is essential to enhance word knowledge by exposing lexical items in several manners in various contexts. Lastly, it is imperative for learners to sustain a significant amount of commitment with lexical times. The researcher states that incidental and complementary methods need each other. Hence, exposure to a significant amount of reading and listening is required for strengthening and improvement of precise instructed lexical items. Conversely, words that are gained by incidental learning are rarely planted and reach a fruitful level. The willfulness of learning will assist in taking the student to a level of mastery. Therefore, teachers and material writers must acknowledge all aspects of vocabulary instruction and take an aggressive approach to address the four strands of vocabulary growth.

The researcher concluded from the study that it is essential to consider that to increase vocabulary learning, one must have the knowledge that successful vocabulary instruction is ongoing and takes into consideration the abundance and capacity of lexical understanding. There is no best teaching methodology. Rather, the main objective is to support commitment with

lexical items that need to be acquired and depend on successful vocabulary education (Schmitt, N., 2008, p. 354).

Wei, L., (2021) examined specific strategies to help English Language Learners (ELLs) expand their academic vocabulary. His research looked at guided principles that teachers can use in their classroom to help ELLs augment their academic vocabulary while focused on the difficulties ELLs face when they encounter academic vocabulary.

Wei, L., (2021) detailed paired learning assignments and learning English as a second language in grade level education. ELL students contend that speaking effortlessly in English causes them to spiral down in their academic studies. The intention behind teaching academic vocabulary to ELLs is to provide teachers with a purposeful foundation that they can use in the classroom to educate ELLs (p. 1507).

This study focused on the difficulties ELLs face when learning new vocabulary. (1) Instruction in academic vocabulary to ELLs. (2) Principles in academic vocabulary. (3) Amplification of features of academic vocabulary. The aim of the research is for teachers to use established principles for effective vocabulary instruction. The researcher indicated that student vocabulary is firmly connected to academic achievement. For students to be accomplished in academics, it is essential they achieve the proper general academic and domain-specific terminology. Furthermore, a Lexical Approach used to teach different languages is necessary for students to comprehend and generate lexical chunks. The understanding and creation of lexical chunks is essential for the construction of meaning, while grammar takes part as a subordinate commanding role. Grammatical expertise is not obligatory for successful communication. The researcher states that according to the Lexical Approach, grammar is not how conversations begin. Instead, the starting point for developing the ability to communicate begins with lexis. If

teachers welcome this teaching principle, the conclusion is that teachers would concentrate more on instructing students to grow basic phrases with brief teaching on grammatical structure and placing all the focus on informing students of the lexical essence of the language (Wei, L., 2021, p. 1508). The researcher goes on to say that vocabulary development strategies inserted into the lesson plan which include reviewing concepts, building vocabulary, present the appropriate use of academic terms, using vocabulary that is equivalent to students English proficiency level, helping students built their background knowledge, showing a variety of exposures, arrange the learning environment so that it is ample with language, offer vocabulary strategies training which include roots, prefixes, and suffixes, and cultivate word awareness (Wei, L., 2021, pp. 1511-1513).

Results from this research study showed that teachers must not only write curriculum for their class, but they must integrate ELL instruction into their lesson plans to place ELLs on grade level while they grow their English Language toward mastery. The findings support that for language instruction to be most rich and excellent it should be conveyed over context-embedded learning which will assist in vocabulary expansion (Wei, L., 2021, p. 1510).

Regina, D., and Manimekalai, J. (2017) examined the effects of music for students who are learning English while in post-secondary education. The team wanted to prove whether students who received a private post-secondary education in Malaysia increased their English vocabulary by listening to music using mobile devices (M-Learning) in English. Part of the rationale was the result of using mobile technology in the learning environment. The team observed various types of mobile devices students had access to, such as wireless laptops, portable MP3 players, personal digital assistant (PDA), electronic dictionaries, smart phones, and iPads (p. 39). Therefore, the team sought to explore whether there were advantages of listening

to English music as a way to increase English vocabulary learning. The research team used a quantitative approach, pre-tests, and post-tests to collect the data to examine if there was an increase in the student's English vocabulary through listening to vocabulary instruction via music and smart telephones. Furthermore, an analysis was conducted to determine if the students who used electronic handheld devices for English language learning had a positive attitude.

The research team found that students expressed an ardent feeling for learning vocabulary. The participants chosen for this study were 60 diploma business students in a private post-secondary institution. The students took a pre-test which consisted of defining 30 English words from three legendary songs and the scores were documented. The selected group continued firmly for three vocabulary exercises which were administered outside of the classroom using smartphones and songs. The students then completed worksheets specifically designed for each song. Two weeks later, the students were asked to take a post-test writing about the meaning of the 30 targeted words used during the initial pre-test of the scores. A one-hour survey questionnaire using the Likert scale and 10 statements was issued to the 60 participants to gather their point of view on learning English vocabularies through the use of smartphones and music. All data was collected on the same day the survey questionnaire was administered (Regina, D., and Manimekalai, J., 2017, pp. 41-42).

When the research team finalized the data, the results revealed that music used with mobile devices may be helpful in an educational manner in which students could become inspired. It stimulated ESL learners, especially when acquiring vocabulary. Regina, D., and Manimekalai, J. (2017) found that the pre-test and post-test outcome appeared to approve of the argument that ESL learners would expand their English vocabulary when they learned words through using music and mobile devices. The pre and post-test results from the 60 participants

indicated a positive change in vocabulary knowledge after three vocabulary music listening assignments. In addition, the participants' attitude was positive toward learning English by listening to music by means of mobile devices. The students made growth in their vocabulary knowledge and took pleasure in their assignments which lead to English vocabulary knowledge gains. Therefore, the researchers suggested that teachers should discover innovative approaches for using music through mobile devices so that students have the freedom to learn English vocabulary at any time or place of their choosing. The findings of this research noted that a small sample of 60 ESL learners provide limited data due to self-reported input. In addition, there were concerns with Internet connectivity and how quickly students received the songs sent electronically based on their distinct devices, suggesting that the assignments arrived at different times. Furthermore, investigations would be required to examine how a large group of ESL students would react to a long-term response since adult students might respond differently in the small group due to the newness of the knowledge. Finally, the researchers only acquired a quantitative method of data. A qualitative method to detect how learners utilized their devices for instruction and educational purposes might provide deeper understanding in this latest area of study with the possibility of conducting discussions. Overall, the researchers recommended that future research be conducted to examine the practicality of M-learning in increasing further functions of the English language including speaking, writing, reading, and listening (Regina, D., & Manimekalai, J., 2017, pp. 43-44).

Stinson, C., (2018) evaluated ways to address issues linked to English language learners who have disabilities and an IEP or 504 plan along with the results of policy and established systems of admission to the least restrictive environment (LRE) curriculum through joint language lessons and co-teaching in grades K-12. The purpose of this study was to emphasize the

importance of the needs of ELLs with disabilities along with the planning and teaching which was inclined to be judged to guarantee that a significant education be provided to ELLs with disabilities along with their peers in the inclusive environment overall educational settings. Despite the distinct position that teachers find themselves having to provide quality instruction to all students and at the same time following state and federal policies and regulations concerning ELLs and pupils with special needs, it has been difficult for ELLs with disabilities to receive the education they need in the least restrictive environment.

The researcher conducted the study to discuss unique ways that teachers can address issues that arise with students' who have a disability and are learning English in the general education classroom. Stinson, C., (2018) presented several students and their attitudes about unified admittance into the general education classroom where they received their education. Then, the researcher analyzed the New York State Education Department (NYSED) rules on instruction and various methods used to collaborate with her colleges to guarantee the free and appropriate education for all students. And lastly, Stinson, C., (2018) defined collaboration between two teachers and herself to support English as a new language (ENL) writing block lessons that were presented to students in the inclusive environments.

The discussion focal point was based on a small group of third grade students in the least restrictive environment at the researcher's school. The classroom consisted of three students who had IEPs and were ELLs; one student was diagnosed with a specific learning disability (SLD) in reading and was at the intermediate English proficiency level. Another student had a speech language impairment (SLI) and SLD diagnosis and was at the beginner low intermediate level of English proficiency. The third student was identified with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). He communicated using a combination of verbal speech and an augmented and alternative

communication (AAC) application on iPad called Proloquo 2 Go. This student was at the transitioning English proficiency mark. Additionally, the three students received services correlating with their disability labels and removed from their inclusive classroom without consideration for ENL instruction and assistance. In the state of New York recent policy changes regarding instruction demand that ELL students follow strict guidelines with respect to the extent of time and school location where they receive ENL instruction and assistance and in accordance with the English proficiency levels. One modification is to extend the English proficiency levels consistent of four: beginning, intermediate, advanced, and proficient to five: entering, immerging, transitioning, expanding, and commanding. The researcher mentioned that with the new proficiency labels, ENL instruction across the inclusive and segregated settings has greatly changed to the point that ENL teachers face challenges with the new regulations. Because the new regulations simply guarantee a minimum number of minutes of combined English language instruction and special education, ELL students regularly miss instructional time due to being removed from class for special education services or behavior problems. The researcher conferred with third grade classroom teachers to create an ENL instructional schedule for the inclusive classroom. The teachers agreed to the creation of the schedule and to co-plan with the researcher weekly to meet students' most important needs. The arrangement of space and resources in the least restrictive environment was negotiated even though the NYSED regulations appeared not to offer an explanation for the needed space or advising on how instructors would be positioned within the educational program; nor did it provide guidelines for classroom instruction where two or more teachers are cooperated in providing a distinctively designed course of study. Stinson, C., (2018) stated that negotiations for classroom space were difficult, but, in spite of the challenges, the teachers were able to make siting arrangements so

students with disabilities or special needs could share classroom space with their non-disabled peers. This change provided room for the teacher to assist students so that no student would be excluded or isolated from their peers. The researcher then provided knowledge about the individual student needs and assistive technology to the general education teachers. As a learning resource, the researcher used an iPad communication application. On a weekly basis, the researcher arranged for a student with autism to learn content vocabulary using augmentative communication before the teacher presented during the whole class instruction. Since the research had to ensure the student's language requirement was met, there was not sufficient time to meet weekly with the general education teachers to consider language needs and progress. Planning time was an unsuccessful resource provided for third grade teachers due to the researcher helping with other grade levels. However, technology was utilized to write and submit plans to develop accommodations, suggestions, or clarifications. All communication was completed via email or digital devices.

Results from this study indicated that co-teaching triads were not fruitful the majority of the time. Classic examples indicated other co-teaching methods more appropriately met the student's needs. However, despite finding it difficult to form a co-teaching foundation, the triad's collaborative connections were productive in that the same beliefs were shared which in turn made relationships among the triad hopeful. Overall, plenty of research that is accessible to teachers related to co-teaching and ELLs with disabilities. Still, the changes in state and federal regulations present difficulties to ENL educators related to meeting the needs of ELLs with disabilities and the legal responsibilities that are written in the student's IEP. It is critical for ENL teachers to continue to ask for support through professional development and other

resources to continue progressing with all policy and regulations changes. There was no mention of further research.

Kangas, S. E. N. (2017) examined the truth about how special education and dual language meet to foster bilingualism and that researchers need to conduct more in-depth studies about service provision routines in bilingual situations for ELL students with special needs. This examination looked into how the service provision routines form favorable conditions for ELLs to attain their goals. As an ethnographic case study, the main focus was an elementary bilingual charter school.

Kangas, S. E. N. (2017) described what transpired when a student was identified as an ELL with special needs, how bilingual schools offer services to ELLs with special needs, and on how service providers are weakened by unplanned difficulties and educational accommodations. Kangas, S. E. N. (2017) amplified why and how a school selected bilingualism as their top priority in an effort to maintain ELLs with special needs, only to unknowingly give up on the ELLs bilingual advancements; bilingual and special education planned models were unable to function optimally (pp. 2-3).

The researcher conducted a seven-month ethnographic study at the San Pedro Public Charter School in the northeastern United States focused on kindergarten to fifth grade. San Pedro, a Title I school, had 85% Latino and 15% were African American students. Of 550 students, 146 students were identified as ELLs, with 65 distinguished as having some disabilities. Overall, 15 students were identified as ELLs with disabilities. There were five teachers at San Pedro who took part in the study: one ESL teacher, two general education teachers, and two special education teachers, Individually the teachers specified they used The Way Immersion (TWI) model, half of the time educating students in Spanish and the other half teaching them in

English. The students were taught in Spanish by one teacher during the AM hours, then the students switched to the English class in the afternoon dividing the 600 minutes of instructional time into two parts. There were, however, students who were given instruction in the least restrictive environment by the same teacher. Students with IEPs received push-in special education providing support and accommodations as needed. In addition, San Pedro provided a pull-out literacy intervention where students were removed to a different classroom for English literacy intervention (Kangas, S. E. N., 2017, pp. 8-10).

The study included 46 visits to San Pedro School throughout the 2013-2014 school year with ethnographic data collected by: (1) classroom observation, (2) school employee interviews, (3) conferences and consultations with employees, and (4) school artifacts. Kangas, S. E. N. (2017) found that the TWI was not performed with fidelity and the merging of elements such as (1) restricted resources, (2) teachers' beliefs about students, and (3) confidence in the educational law affected the academic advantages of ELLs with disabilities. The researcher mentioned that what is necessary for administrators to implement the program models with loyalty and demonstrate bilingual education authentically in every classroom to meet the needs of ELLs with special needs. For integrated ELL instruction to be implemented and effective, special, and general education teachers must be trained in a multidisciplinary viewpoint. The researcher found limitations in lack of deep-rooted conduct for accuracy which was a disservice to ELLs with disabilities. ELL student data was not collected; therefore, the researcher could not produce proof of their perspectives. Additionally, the researcher could not inspect IEP documents firsthand because the IEPs were not shared. However, administrators and teachers shared IEP information. Hence, the researcher was unable to conclude to what measure all the accommodations and modifications were provided as they were written in each student's IEP

(Kangas, S. E. N., 2017, pp. 24-30). Overall, future research services provided for ELLs with special needs (Kangas, S. E. N., 2017, p. 31).

Murphy, A. F. (2014) analyzed the results of Dual Language (DL) and Transitional-Bilingual Education (TBE) Models on mastery for first and second grade students who are in first and second grade in Spanish. The purpose of the study was to examine the connection between the home and the English language proficiency (Murphy, A. F., 2014, p.183).

The study took place in first and second grade classrooms where the teachers used both models DL and TBE with ELLs in the home language to convey notions or ideas to the second language. Participants were ELLs with Spanish as their home language who did not receive a passing grade on the state's English Language Proficiency test. All participants had been enrolled at school for a minimum of two years. The researcher conducted a first-grade class sample which involved a one TBE class composed of 10 males and five females and two DL classes which included 15 males and eight females. The second grade sample class consisted of one TBE class which included 10 males and 11 females and two DL classes which involved 17 boys and 18 girls. Both grade levels and groups were given a lesson and reader/writer instructional practice in both Spanish and English. The researcher used an evaluation tool to calculate literacy skills in Spanish. The test used a six-point scale and was composed of several items to test students on alphabet/sight words, reading, writing, listening, and written expression (Murphy, A. F., 2014, pp. 186-187).

Results from the first grade students indicated that they improved pretest to post-test, but there was no major change between- subject outcomes. The group did not show any significant augmentation in the results of the response variables. Results showed that from the second group of EL SOL assignments, a difference was found for verbal expression where students in the DL

group showed growth in between the pre-test and post-test to a greater extent than the students who were in the TBE group. From these results the researcher concluded that home-language skills were significant for ELL students overall academic achievement. DL instruction in verbal expression was beneficial to ELLs at the second-grade level since they were exposed to a specific teaching model. The results were revealed one year later when students moved from grade one to grade two; that with time students would demonstrate significant improvement. Overall, the dual language instruction model was beneficial to ELLs in a manner of instruction alongside English speaking peers who provided communication models for them. The researcher mentioned future research should continue to examine how home language can be helpful in schools over the extent of academic subjects.

Strategies for encouraging the primary speaking language for all students is significant for students who are learning English as a second language. Freeman, D., and Freeman, Y. (1993) examined the theory of offering English Language Learners initial instruction in their first language and presented teachers with various strategies. The purpose of this review was to review the theory connected to offering ELLs with an education in their primary language and provide five common strategies to instruct bilingual students and support their primary language (p. 552).

Freeman, D., and Freeman, Y. (1993) analyzed 21 journal articles which included the theory of how teachers identify the importance of aiding ELLs in the development of English proficiency and strategies that could be implemented to help students advance in their first language (pp. 553-554). The researchers stated that when students develop an understanding of their first language, they form a foundation that is needed for educational concepts. The researchers provided five strategies for teachers to put into practice to improve bilingual

students" first language and literacy advancement: (1) providing students with printed documents that reflect the first language, (2) schools must offer students with library books in their first language, (3) offer bilingual students support to help them share books, magazine articles, and stories written in their language with their peers, (4) instruct students to read and write with aides, parents, and other peers who speak native speaking language, and (5) have student make use of professional or self-made video tapes to help assist students in increasing their self-confidence (pp. 554-558).

The researchers found that the number of ELLs is increasing, and teachers need to take the necessary steps to meet their needs by being present at teacher workshops and reading articles on second language-learning. In addition, teachers need to look for resources such as people and material to help ELLs grow their oral and written ability. Overall, the researchers found it challenging to locate materials and experiments with procedures focused on ELL proficiency in their home languages. No further research was mentioned (Freeman, D., and Freeman, Y., 1993, p. 558).

Llosa, L., et al. (2016) evaluated the effect of a broad science intervention aimed at English Language Learners. The purpose of this literature review was to evaluate the impact a science curriculum and professional advancement intervention plan for fifth grade students, aiming the attention at ELLs to determine if P-SELL (Promoting Science Among English Language Learners) had a positive effect on students who were previous, current, or non-ELLs based on assessment results. In addition, the researchers focused on addressing the disparities present in the literature by analyzing the P-SELL educational program and ongoing education focused on enhancing science performance for all students, specifically ELLs.

The research team identified six studies to include in the analysis. Several were administered to find evaluated interventions woven into science and language lessons with focused attention on ELLs. The majority of the studies conducted were small and several used research-developed solely. Only two studies analyzed the effect of the interventions for ELLs, previous ELLs, and non-ELLs. The intervention used a standalone revised fifth grade science curriculum which took one year in duration of the three-year intervention. The study was conducted with 66 schools and implemented a critical science test to obtain baseline data (Llosa et al., 2016).

The study took place in three urban and suburban school districts in a southeastern state that included students with a range of ethnic, racial, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds. The schools were chosen based on ELL population with 11 of the chosen schools assigned a treatment group and 11 the control group, 12 schools were chosen with a high number of ELLs and 10 were chosen with ELLs functioning below the norm totaling 33 treatment and control schools. All the fifth grade students along with their teachers participated in the 33 treatments implementing the P-SELL curriculum. Conversely, the 33 controlled schools implemented the district curriculum, textbooks. District A implemented Interactive *Science* by Pearson, District B implemented the National Geographic Science, and District C implemented the *Science Infusion* by Houghton Mifflin Hartcourt. In the 2012-2013 school year, there were 123 teachers who participated in the treatment group and 135 teachers took part in the controlled group, totaling 258 for this study. During the 2012-2013 school year, 66 schools participated in the study and a total of 6,673 students took part in the study. The studies were measured by (1) two equated forms of research-developed testing, and (2) the high-stakes science test assessments (Llosa et al., 2016).

The data from the studies compiled by Llosa, L., et al. (2016) found positive results. Research data found that the P-SELL curricular and professional development intervention crafted to enhance the performance of ELL students yielded positive effects for both the research and developmental science test and the state science test, however, the impact was not detected until the second year of the study implementation. The researcher determined positive results based on the P-SELL given to students who were former ELLs, newly reclassified ELL, current ELLs, and non-ELLs. However, even though the results were positive, they were not statistically significant results. Two explanations were found. First, the findings indicated that the researcher-developed assessment was not in any degree a treatment-inherent measure, but instead it was created to assess the fifth-grade science standards and composed of NAEP and TIMSS elements, not elements that would particularly line up with the intervention. There was also a dissimilar type of the assessment in which the researcher-developed assessments incorporated three short response entries that may have provided ELLs and newly classified ELLs on advantage by generating more detailed answers highlighting science knowledge compared to the state science assessment, which consisted solely of multiple-choice selections (Llosa, et al., 2016).

Llosa, L., et al (2016) reported the results of the first year of the three-year study implementation and used the data to analyze the effect on the intervention over an extended period of time working in the same schools and with the same teachers over three groups of students. The researcher noted that an essential next step would be to continue the implementation and as the school district would provide money to continue with the intervention, professional development, curriculum materials, and science supplies (Llosa, L., et al, 2016).

Louie, B., and Sierschynski, J., (2015) analyzed multiple studies to find if wordless picture books captured the attention and motivation for ELLs to become involved in discussions,

analysis, and production when viewing their personal books. The purpose of this study was to examine how teachers could use wordless pictures books to grab the attention of the EL students to generate oral language throughout discussions, and written language for self-validation for printed work.

Louie, B., and Sierschynski, J., (2015) study included structural guidelines where students with the direction of a teacher the readers can identify the plot, structure, characters, and setting in the wordless story book to support readers to use details to draw up their conclusion from the details contained in the book. In addition, wordless books aid readers to verbally discuss the story using the details of the images to encourage them to create their own written work. Furthermore, the teacher guides the instructional sequence as an illustration strategy when working with a couple of students or a small group of students to discuss and have the readers voice their ideas that surface from looking at wordless pictures (p. 108).

Prior to providing the structural strategy, the researchers analyzed several academic journal articles and found evidence that readers viewing wordless books have a similar understanding as those who read books with words. To be specific, wordless books have a sequential order that the researchers stated provided the readers with a ranking sequence embedded within the images making some details more essential than others. Hence, readers can progress through the story advancing to other forms such as repeated viewing and then orally retelling what happened in the story. The researchers said that wordless books may serve as co-authors where students could construct their relevance and story after examining the wordless books.

Louie, B., and Sierschynski, J., (2015) also stated that visual images may be used for readers to develop language in numerous ways. Students in the preliminary stages of learning a

new language could gain an understanding of what is happening after viewing the images in a book and then learn to indicate the actions and objects that they see in the pictures. Developing ELs, could retell the story by writing from sentence stems. Still, students who are skillful English Learners could retell the story from their viewpoint. And lastly, teachers should provide students with an ample amount of time to examine the pictures and provide linked images to home-culture and everyday living occurrences (p. 107).

Through analyzing readers who used wordless picture books, Louie, B., and Sierschynski, J., (2015) found small groups of EL students progressing to form written text. Determined readers engaged in conversations with their peers regarding observable details, reflections, and probing about the text. The researchers discussed that students were able to read their own selection of subsequent books with self-assurance because the books seized the attention of the reader by providing fun images for viewing and sharing. The team explained that from viewing images inquiry EL students generated in speech form an exchange of ideas and inquire, in addition to constructing written text with confidence and freedom. This study did not mention if any future research should be done (p. 110).

CHAPTER III: CONCLUSION

With the growing number of ELLs in the United States, interest is consistent in what effective co-teaching strategies teachers use in their general education classrooms to meet the needs of all students (Hones & Alderton, 2017). The review by Khong and Saito (2014) showed that teachers faced challenges when teaching ELLs. Teachers can better educate ELLs in the general education classroom through a series of teaching strategies. Some processes include teacher collaboration, co-teaching, and push-in strategies that work more effectively than pull-out strategies. Furthermore, in Culturally Responsive Instruction (CRI) teacher training and ongoing education, it is essential to note that ESL teaching strategies can be effective when teachers collaborate. It is crucial to note that teachers must communicate well with students and their families to assist them better in the classroom. Additionally, Park and Thomas (2012) recommend that teachers offer linguistic and culturally suitable assessments and interventions in harmony with EL learners who have special needs. It is also vital for more experienced general education teachers to learn skills from new ESL educators to reciprocate the learning experience. When teachers collaborate, they become knowledgeable on better serving all students, including students with disabilities. Khong and Saito (2014) proposed that more research is required to explore how U.S. teachers compare to other teachers in a context similar to the U.S. by analyzing the challenges teachers encountered when working with a diverse group of students.

According to Bell and Baecher (2012) and Honigsfeld and Dove (2010) as cited in Hones and Alderton (2017), teacher collaboration strategies have been accepted to help students of various cultures. English Language Learners (ELLs) have successfully attained academic gains with the teacher collaboration strategies. Elbaz-Luwisch (2010) and Hones (1998), as stated in Hones and Alderton (2017) identified six participants, three teachers, and three university

professors who, through observation experiences, collaborated as a strategy to serve ELLs better. The partners shared their experiences, collaboration, observations, and understanding of school leadership and specific education strategies needed to help EL learners advance academically (Hones & Alberton, 2017).

The first concern was that ELLs with disabilities faced linguistic and cultural distinctness and also had special needs. Teachers need to derive a teaching plan to identify and assess this concern. The second concern is how educators can better serve ELLs with special needs and their need to know "linguistic, cultural, and disability-related needs" to serve students better (Park & Thomas, 2012).

Through their discussion and recommendation, Park and Thomas (2012) concluded that to improve the education for ELLs with special needs, they should offer linguistic and culturally suitable assessments and interventions that are in harmony with EL learners with special needs. Furthermore, the researchers stated that one present concern for English language learners is that they are often identified for special education services, but it may be that their language proficiency, culture, and linguistic dissimilarities have been mistaken a learning difficulty since all the factors influence a student's success in the classroom.

Moreover, it is prescribed that all educators and families of EL learners work together to serve ELLs with disabilities better. Through extensive research, Khong and Saito (2014) found that teaching programs for ELL teachers need to address the issues regarding the current education and knowledge ELLs receive better. They need to focus on social and institutional challenges. (Brown, 2009; Holly Hansen-Thomas, 2013; Powell, 2016; Khong & Saito, 2014).

The review suggested that for teachers to serve ELLs better, they first need to look at their own "ethnocentricity or negative biases" concerning ELLs (Khong & Saito, 2014). The

main point is that regardless of where the ELLs come from, they need to be welcomed by their educators. Teachers must change their mindset and work together to show ELL students and their families that educators care about them and their education. The challenges reviewed offered the reader a wealth of knowledge about how teachers with a proper understanding of different cultures, languages, and family backgrounds can help students thrive in the English Language Arts classroom. The researchers noted that the vast cultural and linguistic differences among students make it challenging for teachers to teach EL learners adequately.

The favorable outcome of teacher collaboration offers a solid strategy to support teachers who teach EL learners. Projects were conducted between university and graduate school personnel. Hones and Alderton (2017) found that to train teachers to work with students in grades K-12, minor adjustments to a lesson task, such as concentrating on academic vocabulary and writing on the board, impacted students' learning in a way where they better understand their teachers and student teachers.

Research has resulted in positive outcomes from the viewpoint of students and teachers in separate homerooms and academies (Malo-Juvera, 2018). However only a few studies provided pre and post assessment data, or provided data used as quasi-experimental methods to show the advantages of teachers using CRI implementation (Malo-Juvera, 2018). Powell et al., (2016) and Malo-Juvera (2018) stated that even with all the positive outcomes, there are many complicated issues if the instruction is unstructured when it is time for the plan to go into effect. The study demonstrated that it is essential for teachers to know how to implement CRI instruction. Teachers need knowledge about how to communicate with diverse families and students using common, how to develop and implement CRI effectively, and need to have a thorough understanding of CRI to have the confidence necessary to implement their knowledge into the

lesson (Malo-Juvera, 2018). According to the National Center for Statistics (n.d.), "The percentage of public school students in the United States who were English learners (ELs) was higher in fall 2019 (10.4 percent, or 5.1 million students) than in fall 2010 (9.2 percent, or 4.5 million students)" (p. 1). With the growing number of ELLs in the United States, culturally responsive pedagogy will become necessary for teachers to adopt and implement into their curriculum. However, teachers must understand how to implement CRI and use it as a guide because what is advised is valuable information to adequately prepare teachers to better serve ELLs in the general education classroom.

In their gathering of data, Thomas and Richins (2015) found that mentoring, planning mentoring, teacher collaboration, and ESL teaching challenges work when there is reciprocal teaching. The findings revealed that the wisdom gained from their collaboration helped all participants (Thomas and Richins 2015). Palincsar and Brown (1984) mentioned that the mentor teachers accessed new knowledge of ESL, SLA, and multicultural teaching and implemented the knowledge into the working partnership, stimulating how teachers see themselves when collaborating. For example, when math and science general education teachers worked with the ESL teacher specialist, they became math and science ESL teachers by learning proper ESL teaching methods. Additionally, Hansen-Thomas and Grosso (2013) mentioned that mentor collaboration was effective and sustainable and that other educators can receive the same knowledge of well-structured programs on professional development days. It comes at a low cost and successfully augments the education of its learners.

The United States has seen an influx of children of different ages who speak only their native language. It is essential for teachers in America to support English Language Learners (ELLs), especially children with special needs. Research studies have shown a variety of ways in

which teachers can assist ELLs in the classroom. For over 50 decades, co-teaching has been a method implemented by teachers as part of their special education service. Two teachers working together in the least restrictive environment can achieve the goal of aiding students with disabilities because the teachers work together to deliver an effective lesson that suits all students. Not only do teachers work together in the classroom, they meet when they are not instructing students to collaborate to highlight concerns and establish lesson plans.

Teachers in the United States desire to help English Language Learners achieve academic success even when students are faced with the challenge of only speaking their native language. Hence, it is essential to understand which strategies will support ELLs with and without disabilities in the general education classroom. Researchers have discovered numerous methods for educators to use to teach children with mild disabilities like learning disabilities, such as One Teach, One Assist; Station Teaching; Parallel Teaching; Alternative Teaching; and Team Teaching. Researchers found this practices to be effective and benefited students. However, researchers were committed to resolving the issue of whether co-teaching practices could aid English Language Learners appropriately.

Honigsfeld and Dove (2007) explored five co-teaching models that perhaps could clarify different methods in which special educators and general education teachers can work together to service the needs of ELLs. The researchers five effective co-teaching models and that co-teachers should choose one model, test it, and determine the response as a way to offer students the best co-teaching approach. The researchers also suggested that teachers should meet one time a week to make a plan of action based on the syllabus and state standards. They suggested that if arranging a time to meet was slim, the co-teachers should make a contact strategy as a way to stay connected and be well-informed. Using shared documents, teachers

could collaborate on lesson planning, teaching procedures, and additional materials (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2007, p.10). This research finding kept me engaged and made me ponder on how teachers set aside time to connect and collaborate to make outstanding lesson plans. If these steps occur, the effectiveness of co-teaching strategies can aid students in learning English as a Second Language and the content presented to them.

Alshahrani (2019) discovered that the reading, storybook reading, memorizing, CCC and writing strategies intensified the English vocabulary and spelling skills for ESL, EO, English and LD students. The researcher did not offer a definite answer, only that future research would be conducted to examine utilizing the CCC strategies to enhance vocabulary skills for ESL and LD students since some studies found it necessary to increase the time to determine the accuracy or increase the number of subjects to determine if the CCC strategies could be advantageous for special education students who have a learning disability. From my research, what stood out to me is that teachers need to work harmoniously when lesson planning and co-teaching to execute effective teaching strategies so all students can attain the best education. Once teachers understand the value of co-teaching and begin to work as a team, they will be better able to educate all children regardless of whether or not they have a disability or special needs or if they are English language learners. All children deserve to receive the best education in the United States.

References

Alshahrani, H. A. (2019, December 31). Strategies to improve English vocabulary and spelling in the classroom for ELL, ESL, EO, and LD students. *International Journal of Modern Education Studies, 3*(2), 65-81. https://doi.org/10.51383/ijonmes.2019.41

Bos, C. S., & Anders, P. L. (1990). Effects of interactive vocabulary instruction on the vocabulary learning and reading comprehension of junior-high learning disabled students. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 13*(1), 31–42. https://doi.org/10.2307/1510390

Bulgren, J. A., Marquis, J. G., Lenz, B. K., Deshler, D. D., & Schumaker, J. B. (2011). The effectiveness of a question-exploration routine for enhancing the content learning of secondary students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103*(3), 578–593. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023930

Conderman, G., & Hedin, L.R. (2014). Co-teaching with strategy instruction. *Hammill Institute on Diabilities, 49*(3), 156-163. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451213496158

Davison, C. (2006). "Collaboration between ESL and content teachers: How do we know when we are doing it right?". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(no.4), 454–75. DOI: 10.2167/beb339.0

Dierker, L. A. (2001, Fall). What are the characteristics of "effective" middle and high school co-taught teams for students with disabilities? *Preventing School Failure, 46*(1). https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1080/10459880109603339

Dorairaju, R., & Jambulingam, M. (2017). The role of music and m-learning in English: Vocabulary gain among tertiary students. *National Research University Higher School of Economics, 3*(2). https://doi.org/10.17323/2411-7390-2017-3-2-39-44

Elliott, D., & McKenney, M. (1998). "Four inclusion models that work.". *Teaching Exceptional Children, 30*(4), 54–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/004005999803000411.

Faraj, A. K. A. (2015). Effective strategies for turning receptive vocabulary into productive vocabulary in EFL context. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(27), 10-19. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1077387.pdf

Foil, C. R., & Alber, S. R. (2002). Fun and effective ways to build your students' vocabulary.*Intervention in   School and Clinic, 3*(37), 131– 139.https://doi.org/10.1177/105345120203700301

Freeman, D. E. & Freeman, Y. S. (1993, April 1). Strategies for promoting the primary languages of all students. *Reading Teacher, 46*(No.7), 552-558. DOI: http://www.jstor.org/stable/20201132

Friend, M. (2007, February). The coteaching partnership. *Educational Leadership, 64*(5), 48-52. https://pdo.ascd.org/lmscourses/PD09OC59/pdfs/ParaELCoteach.pdf

Friend, M., Reising, M., & Cook, L. (1993). "Co-teaching: An overview of the past, a glimpse at the present, and considerations for the future.". *37*(4), 6-10. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.1993.9944611

Friend, M. (2015). "Welcome to co-teaching 2.0.". *Educational Leadership 73, 4*, 16-22. http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational_leadership/dec15/vol73/num04/Welcome_t o_Co-Teaching_2.0.aspx

García, S. B., & Tyler, B.-J. (2010). Meeting the needs of English language learners with learning disabilities in the general curriculum. *Theory Into Practice, 49*(2), 113– 120.http://www.jstor.org/stable/40650724

Garza, T., Huerta, M., Tong, F., Lara-Alecio, R., & Irby, B. J. (2019). A survival analysis of a

    language-infused science inquiry intervention for English learners. *Journal of*

    Educational Research, 12(3), 377-384. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2018.1536965

Hansen-Thomas, H., & Richins, L. G. (2015, December). ESL mentoring for secondary rural

    educators: Math and science teachers become second language specialists through

    collaboration. *TESOL Journal, 6.4*. DOI: 10.1002/tesj.221

Hansen-Thomas, H., Casey, J., & Grosso, L. (2013). Multiplying the effect of professional

    development: Teachers training teachers. *Tesol Journal, 4*(1), 129-150.

    https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.54

Hart, J. E. (2009). Strategies for culturally and linguistically diverse students with special needs.

    Preventing School Failure, 53(3), 197–208. https://doi.org/10.3200/PSFL.53.3.197-208

Hones, D.F., & Alderton, E. (2017, Spring/Summer). Road made by walking: University & EL

    teachers learning together. *Multicultural Education*, 24 (3-4), 2-9.

    https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.54

Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. (2007). Co-teaching in the ESL Classroom. *Delta Kappa Gamma*

    Bulletin, 74(2), 8–14. https://observatorioieb.com.br/docs/docs1265185384.pdf

Howard, D. (2022). Empowering reading with home language texts. *Reading Teacher, 75*(5),

    649-645. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2081

Liao, H.-C., & Wang, Y.-h. (2018). Using comprehension strategies for students' self-efficacy,

    anxiety, and proficiency in reading English as a foreign language. *Social Behavior and*

    Personality, 46(3), 447-458. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6648

Kangas, S. E. N. (2017). "That's where the rubber meets the road": *The intersection of special*

education and dual language education, 119(7), 1-36.

https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811711900701

Khong, T. D. (2014). Challenges confronting teachers of English language learners. *Education Review, 66*(2), 210-225. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.769425

Llosa, L. L. (2016, April 1). Impact of a large-scale science intervention focused on English language learners. *American Educational Research Journal, 53*(2), 395-424. DOI:10.3102/0002831216637348

Louie, B. &. (2015, July). Enhancing English learners' language development using wordless picture books. *Reading Teacher, 69*(1), 103-111.

https://doi-org.ezproxy.bethel.edu/10.1002/trtr.1376

Malo-Juvera, V., Correll, P., & Cantrell, S. (2018, May 14). A mixed methods investigation of teachers' self-efficacy for culturally responsive instruction. *Teacher and Teaching Education, 74*, 146-156. DOI:10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.003

Mastropieri, M. A., McDuffie, K. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional children, 73*(4), 392-416. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290707300401

Murphy, A. F. (2014, August 8). The effect of dual-language and transitional-bilingual education instructional models on Spanish proficiency for English language learners. *The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 37*, 182-194.

DOI:10.1080/15235882.2014.934971

The National Center for Education Statistics (2014). *The condition of education*. Retrieved June 28, 2022. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2014/2014083.pdf

National Education Assosiation. (2020, July). *NEA*. Retrieved May 8, 2024, from English

    Language Learners: https://www.nea.org/resource-library/english-language-

    learners#:~:text=ELL%20students%20are%20the%20fastest,a%20conference%20on%20

    bilingual%20education.

O'Connor, R. E. (2021). Systematic CHAAOS: Teaching vocabulary in English/language arts

    special education classes in middle school. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 54*(3), pp.

    187-202. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219420922839

Palinscar, A.S., & Brown, A.L. (2009, Dec 14). *Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering*

    and comprehension-monitoring activities. Retrieved June 28, 2022, from Taylor &

    Francis https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/s1532690xci0102_1

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and

    practice. *Educational Research, 41*(93), 93-97.

    https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12441244

Park, Y., & Thomas, R. (2012). Educating English-Language Learners with Special Needs:

    Beyond Cultural and Linguistic Consideration. *Journal of Education and Practice , 3*(No.

    9). https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.54

Powell, R., Cantrell, S. C., Malo-Juvera, V., & Correll, P. (2016). Operationalizing culturally

    responsive instruction: Preliminary findings of CRIOP research. *Teachers College*

    Record, 118(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811611800107

Schmitt, N. (2008, July). Review article: Instructed second language vocabulary learning.

    Language Teaching Research, 12(3), 329-363.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089921

Statistics, N. C. (2016, November 2). *U.S. department of education national center for education statistics*. Retrieved from National Center for Education Statistics: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/pdf/coe_cgf.pdf

Statistics, The National Center for Education (2014). *The condition of education*. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2014/2014083.pdf

Stinson, C. (2018, December 22). Beyond compliance: An approach to serving English language learners with disabilities. *TESOL Journal, 9*(4), 1-8. DOI:10.1002/tesj.405

Vangrieken, K., Dochy, F., Raes, E., & Kyndt E. (2015). Teacher collaboration: A systematic review. *Educational research review, 15*, 17-40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.04.002

Villavicencio, A. J.-W. (2021, January). "You can't close your door here:" Leveraging teacher collaboration to improve outcomes for immigrant English Learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 97*(103227). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103227

Wei, L. (2021, December). Teaching academic vocabulary to English language learners (ELLs). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 11*(12), 1507-1514. DOI:10.17507/tpls.1112.01