This study explores how using songs during ESL instruction could lead to productive vocabulary gains in 2nd grade English language learners. Key influences included Medina (1990) and Beck, McKeown, and Kucan (2002). This study included a control group—given traditional vocabulary instruction, and experimental group—exposed to vocabulary instruction incorporating songs. Three sets of vocabulary were presented in conjunction with three stories. Pre-tests, end-of-story oral assessments, and post-tests were administered. Most of the findings were inconclusive; however, students given instruction using songs felt more confident in their vocabulary knowledge at the conclusion of the study.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

While teaching elementary English as a Second Language (ESL) students, I found that they were struggling with the production of new vocabulary terms. This seemed odd to me since the vast majority of them passed the multiple-choice vocabulary portion of their ESL unit tests with over 90 percent accuracy. A question arose: Why are my ESL students successful on the vocabulary tests, but unable to use the new words in their oral or written language? This question lingered in the back of my mind when I stumbled upon an article about receptive and productive vocabulary. I then discovered that productive vocabulary is the ability to know and use a word in various written and spoken contexts. In contrast, receptive vocabulary means that learners may be aware of the word, and may even understand it when others use it, but do not produce it in oral or written discourse (Webb, 2005; Waring, 1999; Lehr, Osborn, & Hiebert, 2004). Previously, I had viewed vocabulary learning as one category of word knowledge. I had not thought about the differences in productive versus receptive use of new words. After becoming aware of these differences in vocabulary acquisition, I realized that my students were successful in the receptive area of vocabulary learning (the multiple-choice questions on the unit tests), but not necessarily the productive area (using the new words in written or spoken contexts).

English language learners need to be able to use new vocabulary productively in order to be fully proficient in the language. The ability to produce words is crucial in
communicating. Springer (2004) studied advanced college ELLs who were enrolled in an advanced writing course that took place over three months. In this course they were required to learn the entire *Academic Word List*, consisting of approximately 560 new word families. On vocabulary quizzes, that were receptive in nature, the students all managed to get 80% or above. However, these new vocabulary words were not being used in their writing (Springer, 2004). This rote memorization led to receptive vocabulary gains, but the students still were unable to transfer the knowledge into production of new vocabulary in their composition. Communication remains limited when words cannot be produced.

It is true that not all words are needed for productive usage. Adult native English speakers have acquired words that they understand when reading or listening, but do not use them in a productive manner—either orally or in writing. When thinking of technical medical terms or Shakespearean terminology, many understand the vocabulary when presented with it, but would never choose to use that word productively. According to Cervatiuc (2008), in general, the average size of adult native English speakers’ productive vocabulary is approximately half the size of their receptive vocabulary. However, this ratio is not constant and studies have shown that with more education, native speakers’ receptive vocabularies continue to grow larger than their productive vocabularies (Nation, 2001). Even though not all words need to be productive, it is vital that English speakers have a large pool of productive words to select from when communicating. Without the necessary words it is difficult to
complete many communicative tasks, such as, explaining one’s point of view, telling stories, providing accurate instructions, or expressing one’s feelings. Teachers must present the opportunity for ESL students to make the jump from receptive understanding of vocabulary to productive use.

After identifying a need for enhancing my ESL students’ productive vocabulary, I started thinking about the use of songs in my instructional practices. I have always loved using songs with my elementary ESL students. My students always seemed to be engaged in the learning of the songs and enjoy the time spent singing them. My rationale for using songs in my instruction included lowering the students’ inhibitions, building their confidence, and improving pronunciation all while having fun. Songs provide a way to focus on rhythm and rhyming patterns, introduce supra-segmentals, and foster automaticity. I also noticed that the repetition and rhyme found in songs seemed to enhance memory and retention. After learning a new song it was not unusual to find students singing later on during the lesson or while walking down the hall. I started to think about how my students were quickly able to remember and produce the lyrics to a song, but unable to use specific vocabulary words that had been drilled relentlessly for over a week. Could songs help ESL students with the production of new vocabulary words?

Music and Productive Vocabulary Development

Research has been done suggesting that music can be an effective way to help learn a language. Some studies have focused on the beneficial nature of songs and their
ability to enhance memorization, retention, and motivation (Medina, 1990; Obarow, 2004). Others suggest that the repetitious nature of songs helps in acquiring various language features, such as syntax, word segmentation, intonation and automaticity (Lems, 2001; Schoepp, 2001; Schön et al., 2008; Wallace, 2004; Abbott, 2002). However, the connection between music as a pedagogical tool for language acquisition—specifically in the development of one’s productive vocabulary—has yet to be established. Determining if or to what extent productive vocabulary can be increased through the use of songs during vocabulary instruction may help teachers realize the full range of areas in which music could be used to benefit ELLs.

Importance of Vocabulary Development

Research suggests that vocabulary size plays an essential role in determining success in school (Sobolak, 2008; Blachowicz, Fischer & Watts-Taffe, 2005; Lehr et al., 2004; Pikulski & Templeton, 2004). According to Biemiller (2001) students’ word knowledge at the elementary school level is directly related to students’ ability to comprehend texts when they reach high school, thus demonstrating the importance of vocabulary development in the early grades. The average kindergartener enters school with approximately 5,000 words in his or her vocabulary (Blachowicz et al., 2005). However, English language learners (ELLs) enter kindergarten with an English vocabulary far below this and are playing a catch-up game from their first day of school. This smaller vocabulary size makes overcoming this gap difficult even though, once in school, vocabulary is acquired at a similar rate for all students (Biemiller, 2001).
The importance of reading in overall academic success is generally agreed upon. Reading performance is greatly dependent upon students’ ability to comprehend the vocabulary they encounter. A major factor influencing reading performance discrepancies between ELLs and native English speakers is the ELLs’ English vocabulary knowledge—even if the student’s native vocabulary is extensive (Garcia, 1991; Goldenberg, 2005; Verhoeven, 1990 as cited in Blachowicz et al., 2005). Therefore, these studies suggest that vocabulary development should be made a priority in all educational settings to ensure greater academic success of ELLs.

Vocabulary acquisition has become a focus in education in recent years. The continually increasing number of high-stakes tests required at all levels has put pressure on teachers to make sure that their students are making appropriate gains in reading. In order to successfully comprehend the problems on these tests students must have reached a certain level of vocabulary acquisition. Various strategies and activities have been developed to foster vocabulary acquisition. Creating definition maps, conducting feature analysis, comparing and contrasting words, teaching word parts, using words in sentences, constructing synonym webs and illustrating word meanings are just a few of the strategies and activities being using in classrooms today (Blachowicz et al., 2005; Texas Education Agency, 2002). Although some research has been conducted examining the benefits of using songs in education, little has been done to connect it to vocabulary development. It is my hope that this study will shed some light on how songs may be beneficial for eliciting vocabulary production.
Role of the Researcher

The purpose of this study is to examine how songs may promote the productive vocabulary of second-grade ESL students. It is my hope that the results will shed some light on how songs used during instruction could help productive vocabulary development for ELLs. Research has shown that struggles with vocabulary acquisition affect not only English language learners, but also students of minority backgrounds and students with lower socio-economic status (Sobolak, 2008; Biemiller, 2001; Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002; Lehr et al., 2004). The school at which I teach contains a student population of around 20 percent non-native English speakers and 35 percent minority students. Free or reduced lunch services, which indicate lower socio-economic status, are provided for 57 percent of the students. According to this demographic information, the need for concentrated vocabulary instruction may be warranted.

As an ESL teacher, I am responsible for helping the ESL population in my school attain fluency in English. Through instruction in the ESL classroom and collaboration with the mainstream classroom, students work on the four areas of language development: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. The research that I will be conducting will take place in a self-contained second grade ESL class that meets for 45 minutes daily. My role as researcher will be as participant, observer and data collector. I will be developing the lessons, finding and creating songs that include the selected key vocabulary words, and providing the instruction to both the control and experimental groups. I will be analyzing the data collected to determine the results.
Background of the Researcher

As an ESL teacher, it is my hope that the results of this research could influence my pedagogical practices. From my own experience anecdotally, I have noticed that the use of songs in language instruction can have many positive affects: improving rhythm and intonation patterns, increasing memorization, and enhancing retention; however, I am uncertain about their effects on vocabulary building. As previously noted, I recently became aware of how productive vocabulary is separate from receptive vocabulary. Before that, I had grouped the two together into one larger category of vocabulary knowledge. Now I believe that, depending on the intention of instruction, the outcome of the vocabulary lessons could yield varying results—productive use or receptive understanding. I think that this could affect how teachers, ESL and mainstream teachers alike, teach vocabulary. From this research I hope to determine whether productive vocabulary acquisition can be improved upon through the use of songs during vocabulary instruction.

Summary

The focus of this study involves two components: the pedagogical benefits of using music as an educational tool and increasing productive vocabulary. Using music in the language classroom has been associated with good instructional practice, but can it increase productive use of new vocabulary in elementary ESL students? The question that guides my investigation is: How does using songs in vocabulary instruction contribute to the productive vocabulary of ESL second-graders?
Chapter Overviews

Chapter One introduced the elements that initiated my interest in songs and productive vocabulary. Chapter Two provides a review of literature that explores the use of songs as a pedagogical instrument and how it might enhance productive vocabulary in young students. Chapter Three describes the quasi-experimental study using an experimental group and a control group of second grade ELLs. It discusses the rationale and description of the research design using data collected using a pre-test, end-of-story tests, and post-tests. It includes an overview of the participants, setting, and procedure used during the study. Also included is a discussion of the reliability and validity of the research methodology. Chapters Four and Five deal with the research results. Chapter Four presents pre-test results, end-of-story test results, and results from the three-part post-test. Comparisons are made between the pre-test and the post-test results and general findings are addressed. Chapter Five provides a discussion of the major findings from the series of tests conducted. Based on these results, conclusions are drawn, implications are addressed, limitations are identified, and recommendations are made for further research.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Music has been used in numerous ways throughout history and still today. Music and songs are a great source of entertainment, but they can also be used as an instructional tool, a storytelling device, or even taught as a rite of passage. Music can soothe a weeping child, teach values, or give praise to God. It often elicits an emotional response in people, possibly from the unusual melody, stirring lyrics, or associated memories.

Songs are also often used as an educational tool. Think about first learning to read. Beginning readers often start by learning the letters of the alphabet. Could a song help remember the order of these letters? Most native English speakers would answer yes. The 26 letters of the alphabet put to the tune of “Twinkle, Twinkle, Little Star” have been sung countless times to help children learn the alphabet.

This chapter has been broken down into five sections and looks at the connections between songs, language learning, and enhancing productive vocabulary. The first section looks into how music has played a crucial part in cultures, religions, and societies. The next section provides an overview of recent developments in brain research in connection to music and learning. From there, the third section, looks at the many characteristics of music that can help foster language acquisition. After analyzing music’s affects on language acquisition, the next section addresses receptive and productive vocabulary. This section defines the two types of vocabulary, examines what
it means to “know” a word, and looks at the activities used for gaining new vocabulary and assessments used to test vocabulary knowledge. Finally the last section examines studies that have been done to find the connection between music and its possible benefits for enhancing language acquisition and particularly vocabulary growth.

Music and Culture

Music has long held an integral function in cultures all around the world. It is the one universal component found in every identified culture in the world (Kenneally, 2008; Wallin, Merker, & Brown, 2000). Music provides a sense of identity amongst peoples. Wallin, Merker, & Brown write, “[Music] is the quintessential human cultural activity, and music is an ubiquitous element in all cultures large and small” (2000, p. 1). Some studies have proposed that the rhythm associated with how a baby is carried or rocked within a culture may lead to the rhythmic characteristics of that culture’s music (Fox, 2001).

Music plays many roles in human culture. It can be used for cultural rituals. For example, in Brazil, boys who come of age learn songs as a rite of passage (Western music, 2008). Music plays a role of identity and social structure in religion also. In both Christianity and Judaism music is found in worship and religious celebrations. In Islamic tradition vocal recitations of the Qur’an are an important part of their faith (Ministry of Information, 2002). Music can also be used to promote coordination, cohesion, and cooperation within a social group (Wallin, Merker, & Brown, 2000). There are many examples of how music accomplishes this. A drum cadence plays a rhythm to
coordinate soldiers in their march into battle. Several bars of *Pomp and Circumstance* brings back memories of graduation ceremonies to American college and high school graduates. National anthems provide a cohesive bond between people from the same country.

The evolution of music and language are closely entwined (Wallin, Merker, & Brown, 2000). Oral tradition has used storytelling in the form of songs and musical poetry to pass down information from generation to generation. In the Middle Ages, *jongleurs*, singing minstrels, would go from town to town relating news and stories from the surrounding areas through the use of songs and poems (Grout as cited in Abbott, 2002). Poetry and stories, such as *Beowulf* and *The Pied Piper of Hamelin*, communicated the adventures and events of the stories using the oral tradition and were sometimes related with music (Obarow, 2004). Nearly all cultures at some point have produced a form of sung or oral tradition as a way of sharing events (Folk Literature, 2008).

Songs are productive in nature. To sing is to produce language orally in combination with a rhythm or melody. Music, specifically songs, have been used in world cultures. Songs can provide a relaxed atmosphere for students to become open to learning and producing new vocabulary words (Abbott, 2002; Kouri & Winn, 2006). Music and song are an innately human form of sharing information, expressing feelings, celebrating, and providing a sense of identity. The universality of using songs could allow for a familiar medium of expression while introducing new vocabulary.
Music has been a prominent part of cultures, religions, and societies around the world throughout history. It has played a principal role in passing down stories and sharing lessons from one generation to the next. There must be a reason for this. Could music have some affect on humans’ ability to learn and retain information? How does music affect the brain? The following section explores the answers to these questions.

Music and Brain Research

Recently, education has shown more interest in the connection between brain research and how various functions of the brain are involved in learning. Scientists know that the brain is divided into two hemispheres that have somewhat distinctive functions. The left hemisphere deals largely with language, arithmetic, and speech, while the right hemisphere deals mostly with music, visual patterns and emotional responses (Calvin & Ojemann, 1994; Cruz-Cruz, 2005; Obarow, 2004). Music can connect the two hemispheres—the left for language, and the right for musical intonations—through constant linking via the corpus callosum—the bridge that connects the two halves (Cruz-Cruz, 2005). In fact brain research contends that music uses both parts of the brain. One gifted amateur singer with an aneurysm could not sing the lyrics to a song he knew well but could speak them; other patients with Broca's aphasia can sing words that they can't speak (Calvin & Ojemann, 1994). Also research incorporating the use of an electroencephalogram (EEG) showed that brain waves changed when music was present, making the brain more receptive to learning (Rahman, n.d.). Memory retention can also be enhanced by stimulating both
hemispheres of the brain by combining music and language teaching (Wolfe, 2001; Obarow, 2004). In a study by Wallace (1994), students were exposed to 3 verses of text that was sung and the same text that was spoken. When the text was sung, the students had better recall of information. Wallace contends that song’s ability to chunk words and phrases, identify line lengths, and identify stress patterns can aid in learning and retrieving information. It appears that using songs during instruction to help increase brain activity in both halves of the brain may benefit language learners.

Many brain researchers argue about the simplicity of the right brain-left brain distinction. Hodges (2001) explains that the majority of neuromusical research shows that music is not found in only one side of the brain, but in both hemispheres. Likewise, Zatorre (1997) notes that each hemisphere does possess operational differences that are relevant to music, but agrees that the division between their functions is not as straightforward as others have reported. Although this is not a black-and-white issue, there still seems to be a strong tendency for music to activate the right side of the brain rather than the left and for language to increase activity in the left hemisphere.

To best promote intellectual growth, connections need to be made between the two hemispheres. According to Asher, a brain switch from left to right needs to occur before genuine learning can occur (as cited in Lake, 2002). Zatorre explains, “General classroom music activities that include singing and rhythm help enhance the development of auditory skills, including integration of letter sounds, syllabification, and pronunciation of words” (as cited in Cruz-Cruz, 2005, p. 28). In addition, music can
create a relaxed learning atmosphere that can help activate the two hemispheres, and
singing has been found to engage more areas of the brain than speaking alone (Cruz-
Cruz, 2005). Linking the verbal processing left hemisphere with the musical processing
right hemisphere can lead to a more rich educational experience (Newham as cited in
Abbott, 2002). This research seems to suggest that it is important to provide instruction
so that this cerebral cross-over can occur.

Another reason to use music is that human beings learn in many different ways;
therefore, instruction needs to differ in accordance with the different styles of learning.
Howard Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences identifies eight different intelligences
or learning styles: musical, spatial, linguistic, logical-mathematical, bodily-kinesthetic,
interpersonal, intrapersonal and naturalistic (Medina, 2002; The National Commission
on Music Education, 2000; Weatherford Stansell, 2005). Brain research has shown that
these intelligences seem to be processed independently of one another (Cruz-Cruz,
2005). Gardner’s theory suggests that teachers should use a variety of teaching
methods in order to ensure that all children’s needs are being met. According to
Rahman (n.d.), using songs in instruction could help reach students that have a strong
musical intelligence. Without making use of a variety of activities, a student that relies
more upon one learning style that is not being utilized may have difficulty achieving
success.
Music and Language Learning

There are many similarities connecting music and language (Saffran, 2003; Abbott, 2002). Rhythms, melodies, and tempos are all part of music and are characteristics also found in oral language. When people speak, each language has its own cadence—its own distinct rhythm, melody and tempo. Research supports the notion that music possesses many characteristics that can help language acquisition (Wallace, 1994; Weatherford Stansell, 2005). Language skills like rhyme, alliteration and repetition; memorization and retention; relaxation and motivation; and automaticity, intonation, and word segmentation are all areas that can be affected by the use of music (Allan, 2006; Abbott, 2002; Failoni, 1993; Schön et al., 2008; Wolfe, 2001). This section includes a discussion of these areas.

Rhyme, Alliteration and Repetition

Songs often set words to musical melodies and make use of language features, such as rhyme, repetition and alliteration, to communicate a thought, feeling or story. Children’s nursery rhymes are known to possess these features: rhyme and alliteration. *Peter, Peter, Pumpkin Eater* is a classic example of the use of rhyme (*Peter* and *eater*) and alliteration (*Peter, Peter, Pumpkin*). Song lyrics incorporate repetition regularly. Most songs have a refrain that repeats multiple times during the course of the song. This repetition may help ELLs by exposing them to forms, syntax, lexical items, segmentals, and suprasegmentals that appear in English (Wallace, 2004; Lems, 2001; Abbott, 2002). Recurring exposure to a language feature can foster language acquisition
(Beck et al. (2002); Fillmore & Snow, 2005). The repetition found in songs helps in the memorization of the song lyrics and could possibly lead to acquisition of other language features.

Memorization and Retention

Songs have the ability to enhance rote memory and retention. Advertisers are aware of the power music has on memorization and retention. Jingles are commonly used to stick in one’s head for easy recall and product distinction (Wolfe, 2001; Lake 2002). Given the prompt “Like a good neighbor…” many of us could complete the slogan “…State Farm is there.” Songs can help stimulate memory and learning (Cruz-Cruz, 2005; Lake, 2002). Allan (2006) conducted a study on the effect of using popular music in advertising. He discovered that song vocals served as an effective stimulus for attention and memory. Using songs with lyrics (versus only instrumentals) resulted in greater brand recall (Allan, 2006). Research has shown that music and rhythm can be used to enhance rote memorization and retention (Medina, 2002). Who can possibly forget the most widely memorized phone number in the 1980s? Tommy Tutone’s repetitive song, “867-5309” set these seven numbers to a catchy rhythm and melody, allowing millions of music lovers to commit those digits to memory.

Relaxation and Motivation

Songs also have the ability to motivate students by easing fears and gaining their attention (Abbott, 2002; Medina, 1990). When students are learning a new language, they often are anxiety-ridden and fearful. This anxiety may stem from a fear of making
mistakes or the uncertainty of their new cultural surroundings. A lack of self-confidence may inhibit a language learners ability to process and produce the target language. Krashen coined the term “affective filter” in his theory of second language acquisition. This affective filter is the wall that is built up when in high-anxiety, low self-confidence situations. Krashen suggests that lowering a student’s affective filter will allow the student to process information and allow for optimal learning (Krashen, 1982). Songs are one tool educators have to help lower ELLs affective filter.

Songs are found in all cultures and can evoke emotion in people regardless of their comprehension of lyrics or background. Sharing songs can be exciting, moving, or therapeutic and can lower anxiety levels (Abbott, 2002). Singing has a way of creating a relaxing atmosphere that alleviates fears and lowers inhibitions. Often students who are learning a new language are fearful of using it because their affective filter has been raised. Using songs to ease fears and provide a soothing atmosphere can help lessen inhibitions. Weatherford Stansell (2005) notes that ELLs often have difficulty connecting with the mainstream culture, but through the use of music they are free to express themselves without fear. Songs provide a fun and relaxing experience for students. This enjoyable experience can motivate students to become actively engaged in their language learning.

**Automaticity, Intonation, and Word Segmentation**

Using songs in the ESL classroom may help students with automaticity, intonation, and word segmentation in English. Schoepp (2001) argues that the main
reason for using songs in a classroom is to increase automaticity. Automaticity is the ability to produce language features in a rapid native-like manner. Songs can help with production of language features without pausing to search for the correct word, phrase, or structure (Schoepp, 2001). Using songs to help develop automaticity in a language could result in enhanced fluency.

Songs can help ESL students with pronunciation and intonation features of the English language. According to Lems (1996), this close relationship between rhythm, stress and intonation found in music and oral language promotes the use of songs as teaching aids in the ESL classroom. Songs can reinforce English rhythms and structures while allowing for greater phonological discrimination in English (Schön et al., 2008; Abbott, 2002). The ability to mimic the intonation and pronunciation patterns found in songs can lead to better pronunciation and intonation in the students' spoken language.

Distinguishing word boundaries of a new language can prove difficult for language learners. The structural properties of song can help students identify segments of the new language (Schön et al., 2008). Extracting words from what seems to be a constant string of connected sounds produces problems when acquiring a language. Separating syllables in speech evokes the same learning mechanism as used for tone sequence segmentation which suggests that language and music may possess a common learning device. Pitch is another characteristic of music that can be beneficial for language acquisition especially in regards to word boundary identification. The pitch changes in song can help students differentiate the boundaries between words and
phrases (Schön et al., 2008). It would seem that without being able to distinguish between word boundaries, vocabulary learning can be impeded.

Receptive and Productive Vocabulary

The Continuum of Word Knowledge

A discussion on vocabulary cannot be truly understood until there is an understanding of what “knowing” a word really means. Does knowing a word mean that it is understood when other people use it in conversation or that it can be matched to its correct definition? Does it mean it is understood when it is read or used in writing? Does it mean having knowledge of its synonyms and antonyms? Does it mean that it can be used comfortably in conversation?

“Knowing” a word is not as simple as one might think. Beck, McKeown, and Kucan (2002) explained that it is not an all-or-nothing proposition. Instead it can be better described as a continuum—a progression of word knowledge. Many researchers have proposed various continua to illustrate this progression from no knowledge of a word to complete knowledge of a word. Dale (1965) included four stages in his continuum: a) “I never saw the word before,” b) “I know there is such a word, but I don’t know what it means,” c) “a vague contextual placing of the word,” d) “We know it. We would recognize it again if we saw it, as we are likely to remember it” (p. 898). Figure 2.1 illustrates a synthesis of the levels of word knowledge that Dale (1965), Carey (1987), Cronbach (1942), and Beck, McKeown and Omanson (1987) have previously proposed. From this figure it is possible to see that word knowledge seems to happen in
Figure 2.1: Researchers’ Divisions of Word Knowledge

Key:
- Purple  Dale (1965)
- Green   Cronbach (1942)
- Orange  Carey (1978)
- Blue    Beck, McKeown and Omanson (1987)

No Knowledge

- I’ve never seen it before.

General Sense

- I’ve heard it, but I don’t know it yet.

Narrow Context-bound Knowledge

- I recognize it. It has something to do with....

Knowledge of word, but cannot recall

- Application
- Generalization

Rich decontextualized Knowledge

- Precision
- Breadth
- Availability

Fast/quick mapping

Extended mapping

I know it well.
some type of order ranging from no knowledge to rich contextualized knowledge. For this study, I have synthesized the levels proposed by the previously mentioned researchers into four levels. Figure 2.2 describes these four progressive levels: 1) no understanding, 2) general sense, 3) partial knowledge and 4) complete knowledge. A student that is in the partial knowledge stage of acquiring a new vocabulary word might be able to recognize the word. If given a definition, the student may be able to match the word to the correct definition. When the student encounters the word orally in context, he or she would most likely comprehend its meaning. However, this student may not feel comfortable producing this word. This would not occur until the student reached the last stage in the continuum: complete understanding. Since the word “complete” is an absolute term, this stage suggests a complete or near complete understanding. In this stage, a student would be able to produce the definition, use the word in spoken discourse and written contexts, and have a solid understanding of its meaning and words associated with it.

**Definitions**

It is essential to make a clear distinction between the words receptive and productive when speaking of vocabulary acquisition. These concepts have also been described using the terms passive vocabulary and active vocabulary. Passive refers to words that would be understood orally or in readings; active refers to words that could be used in writing or speech (Waring, 1999; Webb, 2005). Carey (1978) describes
vocabulary in a different way. He identifies two areas of word knowledge as fast mapping and extended mapping. Fast mapping refers to the general sense of a word acquired from a quick encounter. In contrast, extended mapping notes the depth of understanding that comes after extended exposure to the word in various contexts. Passive vocabulary or fast mapping could also be called receptive vocabulary. They would fall under the Partial Knowledge stage of this continuum (Figure 2.2). Active vocabulary or extended mapping are more closely related with productive vocabulary. These would fall under the Complete Knowledge category (Figure 2.2). Drawing on the descriptions of word knowledge from Waring (1999), Corey (1978), Dale (1965) and Beck, et al. (2002), this study will define productive vocabulary as possessing the ability
to produce words orally or through writing in various contexts. Students who gain a productive vocabulary word would have near-complete understanding of that word.

For the purposes of this study, receptive vocabulary will be defined as limited or partial knowledge of words. Students with receptive knowledge will be unable to use words, but able to understand them when encountered contextually through speech or in reading.

Activities and Assessments

Before determining how to assess productive vocabulary, the vocabulary term must be thoughtfully selected. Stevens, Butler, and Castellon-Wellington (2000) and Beck, et al. (2002) identified three types of words. Stevens et al. (2000) identifies the first type as high frequency words that are used commonly in daily communication, the second type as nonspecialized academic words used across content areas, and the third type as specialized vocabulary that is used in specific content areas. Beck et al. (2002) classify words in terms of tiers. Tier One words are the most basic words, like cat or sad, that rarely require instruction for native English speakers. Tier Two words are described as “high frequency words for mature language users” (p. 16). Words like discover or enormous would be considered Tier Two words. Tier Three words are the more content specific words with infrequent usage. Evaporation or isotope would fall into this category. Beck et al. (2002) assert that Tier One words do not need instruction and classroom teachers should focus their instruction on Tier Two words. However, Beck, et al. are not referring specifically to the vocabulary knowledge of ELLs. Richard-
Amato and Snow (2005) note that the first two categories of words require an understanding of the subtleties of English vocabulary usage and, therefore, would need to be taught to ELLs. They also contend that words in the third category are often less troublesome since teachers and students easily identify these words as important and give them priority. From this it seems that the selection of vocabulary word to be taught needs to be done in a thoughtful manner. ELLs need vocabulary from all three categories, but there may need to be added focus on those high frequency academic words in Tier Two.

Measuring vocabulary knowledge is a difficult task. Beck, et al. (2002) write that if students are intended to fully understand and use words, then using synonym matching or multiple-choice definition examinations will not reveal whether or not this goal has been attained. Synonym matching or multiple-choice tests only result in finding out if the students have attained receptive, not productive knowledge.

When students' word knowledge is being assessed, the chosen activities or assessments usually require either receptive or productive vocabulary. There is a great difference between productive and receptive activities. Most typical vocabulary assessments require a receptive knowledge of target words. In order to determine productive vocabulary knowledge, assessments need to be carefully chosen. Activities like dictionary defining, matching words with their definitions, and matching words with their native language counterpart are receptive since they do not require students to produce the vocabulary word from their internal word bank. On the other hand, using
cloze activities or written tasks require students to produce answers using their own productive vocabulary (Webb, 2005; Waring, 1999).

Activities must be carefully chosen in order to facilitate vocabulary gains. Simply listening to songs will not increase language acquisition. Wilcox (2000) writes, “It is the doing in addition to the listening that offers the greatest positive benefit in all aspects of learning, especially in music” (p.11). Students must be actively engaged in their listening in order to stimulate brain development (Fox, 2001). If the goal is to gain productive vocabulary, instruction needs to facilitate productive learning. Learning words receptively most likely results in a student’s receptive gains; however, productive knowledge gains are more likely to occur if the instruction is productive in manner (Webb, 2005). In order to make musical activities meaningful, students need to be actively involved in their learning by participating in the songs. Using music as a productive activity could lead to more productive knowledge.

Using Music to Enhance Vocabulary

Multiple studies have been done to find the connection between music and its possible benefits for enhancing language acquisition and particularly vocabulary growth (Medina, 1990; Obarow, 2004; Cruz-Cruz, 2005; Schön et al., 2008). Examination of these studies will lead to further knowledge of the role music can play in enhancing vocabulary development. It is important to point out that most of these researchers did not make a distinction between receptive and productive vocabulary growth. When
they acknowledged vocabulary growth they could have been referring to either receptive, productive, or both.

The following two studies found that using music paired with illustrations during instruction could increase vocabulary growth and student learning. Medina (1990) studied music’s affects on second grade ELLs’ vocabulary acquisition. Forty-eight second graders with limited proficiency in English participated in the research. In addition to music, the use of visual illustrations was incorporated in some of their treatments. In Medina’s (1990) study, the participants were divided into four different groups that experienced differing treatments. One group’s lesson incorporated a spoken story and no illustrations were used. The second group also experienced a spoken story, but illustrations were used. The third group had the story sung to them, but no illustrations were used. The fourth group also had the story sung to them, but this time illustrations were used. Medina (1990) used a pre-test (prior to the reading), post-test (four days after the reading), and post-post-test (one and one half weeks after the reading) to determine vocabulary acquisition of her subjects. Medina used receptive tests (multiple choice pictures with questions presented orally) to measure the vocabulary growth of her students. Medina’s results indicated that the amount of vocabulary that was acquired when the story was sung was not significantly greater than when spoken. However, she noticed that the combination of music and illustrations during instruction resulted in the largest vocabulary growth (Medina, 1990). Obarow (2004) based her study on Medina’s, but changed the population to include kindergarten and first-grade
native English speakers. Obarow’s results resemble Medina’s findings. One other finding that Medina noted was that when her students were asked about whether they like the sung or spoken stories better, 100% chose the musical version over the spoken text (Medina, 1990). Both researchers found that using music in conjunction with visuals can increase motivation and may be a valuable instructional tool to aid in academic growth.

Cruz-Cruz (2005) conducted a similar study. She analyzed the effects of using music to teach certain grammatical elements and vocabulary to second-grade bilingual/ESL students. A control group and treatment group were used during this comparative study. The treatment group was exposed to grammar and vocabulary lessons which included songs as instructional tools. The control group was given a more traditional method of instruction. The results showed that the treatment group made more gains from the pre-test to the post-test. These results suggest that songs and music are beneficial for vocabulary and grammar instruction.

Songs were found to help facilitate language acquisition. Schön, et al. (2008) conducted a study comparing learning based on spoken sequences versus those from sung sequences. In this study three experiments were carried out. Three groups of 26 native French speakers were presented with either a string of nonsense words that were a) spoken, b) sung with matched linguistic and musical boundaries, or c) sung with unmatched linguistic and musical boundaries. For the experiment when words were sung with matched linguistic and musical boundaries, the nonsense words syllables
were always given the same pitch. Likewise, the pitches used for repeated words were always the same. For the experiment in which words were sung with unmatched linguistic and musical boundaries, the nonsense word syllables could be sung on varying pitches. The results suggested that both of the experimental groups that were exposed to sung versions of the nonsense words learned the words at a greater rate than those in the spoken group. Songs provided a learning environment that resulted in greater attention by the participants to acquiring the new nonsense words. In addition, tonal or pitch changes seemed to have helped indicate phonological boundaries—the space between words. Therefore, using songs in the language classroom could help students by capturing their attention and helping them distinguish word boundaries.

It is important to point out that the aforementioned studies did not differentiate between receptive and productive vocabulary. Both receptive and productive vocabulary may have been gained during the previous studies, but due to providing only receptive vocabulary assessments, this cannot be assumed. There seems to be a gap in research regarding a connection between song usage in the ESL classroom and specifically productive vocabulary gains. Therefore, the focus of my research is to look further into the role of music and its effects on the productive use of vocabulary. More specifically, the focus will be on productive vocabulary and how using songs as an instructional tool may enhance productive vocabulary development. A quasi-experimental design will be used to study 16 second-grade ELLs. A portion of these
students will make up the experimental group and the other part will be in the control group.

The hypothesis that motivates this study is that using songs to teach vocabulary will increase students’ productive vocabularies. I hypothesize that the experimental group, which will receive the musical vocabulary instruction, will gain and retain more productive vocabulary than the students in the control group, which will receive more traditional vocabulary instruction.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided a review of the literature that was key in guiding this research project on the use of songs to foster productive vocabulary growth. Music has been an important influence throughout history in cultures all around the world. It plays an important part in establishing identities of peoples’ cultures, religions, and societies (Wallin et al., 2000). Research has shown that there are connections between music, language learning, and enhancing productive vocabulary (Schön et al., 2008). Recent developments in brain research have noted connection to music and learning (Calvin & Ojemann, 1994; Zatorre, 1997). There are also many characteristics found in music that can help foster language acquisition (Schoepp, 2001; Abbott, 2002).

Vocabulary is an essential element of learning languages. Making a distinction between receptive and productive vocabulary is important when teaching language learners. Productive vocabulary is the ability to produce words orally or through writing in various contexts (Waring, 1999). Receptive vocabulary is the ability to understand
words produced by others, written or spoken, without possessing the ability to produce them from one’s own memory. There is a continuum of word knowledge and to fully know a word both vocabulary needs to be both receptive and productive (Corey, 1978; Dale, 1965; Cronbach, 1942; Beck et al., 2002). When teaching new vocabulary it is important to choose appropriate words (such as tier two words), determine appropriate activities, and assessments used for testing vocabulary knowledge (Beck et al., 2002; Fox, 2001; Waring, 1999; Web, 2005). Multiple studies suggest a connection between music and its possible benefits for enhancing language acquisition and particularly vocabulary growth (Medina, 1990; Obarow, 2004; Cruz-Cruz, 2005; Schön et al., 2008).

Chapter three will provide the methodology for this research project.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine how songs can be used as instructional tools to help English language learners acquire productive vocabulary. Abbot (2002) explains that using songs for vocabulary instruction can present meaningful contexts for students. I extended this idea by not focusing on vocabulary as a whole, but focusing on productive vocabulary. This greater challenge of productive vocabulary is more elusive to ELLs, and I wanted to know how using songs in the classroom may affect the productive vocabulary of second grade ELLs (Beck, et al., 2002).

I conducted a quasi-experimental study that utilized a control group and an experimental group of second-grade ELLs. Information needed to verify (or nullify) my hypothesis was collected through a pre-test, end-of-story production test, and a post-test. As the ESL teacher, I administered the instruction and the assessments for this study.

This study was designed to compare the changes in acquisition of two groups of students learning the same vocabulary but exposed to it in different ways. In this study I hypothesized that using songs to teach vocabulary would increase students’ productive vocabulary. This was determined through the analysis of the vocabulary production assessments. I also hypothesized that the experimental group would gain and retain more productive vocabulary than the students in the control group, which would receive more traditional vocabulary instruction. By comparing the results of the
assessments, I hoped to be able to find out if one group did significantly better than the other at producing the targeted vocabulary terms. I also looked at the post-test results in order to verify whether or not the retention of productive vocabulary was greater for the experimental group.

Overview of the Chapter

This chapter describes the methodologies used in this study. It discusses the rationale for the research design chosen. A description of the quasi-experimental study follows. This chapter begins with a description of the setting, participants, and data collection techniques used. Then it outlines the procedure used in this study. Information about the materials and testing measures is discussed. This chapter ends with a description of how the data was analyzed, the validity and reliability of the data, and ethical considerations.

Research Paradigm

The research design chosen for this study was a quasi-experimental model because the goal of this research was to establish a correlation, if there was one, between using songs in vocabulary instruction and productive vocabulary growth. The independent variable focused upon is the strategy of using songs to teach new vocabulary. The dependent variable was the students’ productive vocabulary and its change following the instruction. An experimental group was subjected to carefully planned vocabulary instruction with the use of songs, while a control group was
presented with more traditional vocabulary instruction. From the data collected from these groups I was able to test my hypotheses.

Data Collection

Setting

This study was conducted in one elementary school in a rural public school district in the upper Midwest during the 2008-2009 academic year. The school was one of four elementary schools that house students in grades one through five. The school chosen for this study had 455 students. Figure 3.1 shows a graphic representation of the school’s ethnic makeup. Of the total student population, a percentage of 15.3 is labeled LEP (Limited English Proficient) and there are six languages represented. Figure 3.2 shows the demographic breakdown of the students’ home languages.

For the 2008-2009 school year, fifteen second-grade students were divided into two ESL pull-out classes based on their placement in the mainstream classroom based on convenience—not their language proficiency. This school had four mainstream second grade classrooms. The ESL students in two of the mainstream classrooms were combined to make one ESL class and the ESL students from the other two mainstream classrooms made up the second class. These classes met for 45 minutes each day outside of their mainstream classroom. During this time, the Hampton Brown Avenues curriculum was used to help the ESL students advance their language skills. This curriculum incorporates into its lessons all language aspects: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. There are six thematic units in level C, the second grade
Figure 3.1 Demographic Breakdown of School’s Ethnicity

Figure 3.2 Demographic Breakdown of School’s Home Languages
curriculum. Each unit concludes with an assessment of the key vocabulary (a receptive multiple-choice test), grammar focus, and reading comprehension. These units are aligned with national standards not only in the area of ESL, but also connected to the standards for science and social studies.

Participants

As previously mentioned, the fifteen second-grade student participants were placed by the school in one of the two self-contained pull-out ESL classrooms based on their mainstream schedules—not random assignment. Again the placement of students was a grouping of convenience as no attempt was made to place the students in these classes based on their language proficiency. The first class, composed of seven students, was used as the control group. The second class of eight students served as the experimental group.

Although English language proficiency was not influential in determining classroom placement of the students, it is important to identify when comparing the two groups used for this study. English language learners’ language proficiency was determined in this school district based on scores from the *Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey—Revised*. At the beginning of the school year, September 2008, these students were given the *Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey—Revised* to determine the students’ placement in ESL programming. This test was used to determine if the students qualified for ESL instruction. From this assessment the second graders’ broad English ability (a compilation of oral, reading, writing, listening, and retelling) was labeled as
limited to fluent. A score of three is considered limited, four is considered fluent, and five is considered advanced. A student that achieves scores that are fluent or advanced (scores of fours and fives) in all areas of the Woodcock-Muñoz would be exited from ESL services. This test is divided into seven categories: picture vocabulary, verbal analogies, letter-word identification, dictation, understanding directions, story recall, and passage comprehension.

Table 3.1 shows the breakdown of the students’ scores determined by the Woodcock Muñoz Language Survey-Revised. Students 1-7 were part of the control group and students 8-15 comprised the experimental group. When looking at the results, the columns of greatest consequence are the Oral Language—Total and Broad Language—Total columns, as they show the average scores taken from those portions of the whole test. The Oral Language—Total results show that the students from the control group scored slightly lower than those in the experimental group. Five out of seven control group participants scored 3.5 with the other two scoring 3. In the experimental group all but one participant received a 3.5 with the other student obtaining a 4. Likewise, the experimental group also performed higher on the Broad language Ability—Total only two control group participants received a 4, while five experimental group participants received a 4 overall. The others received a 3.5. As a whole the students were very similar in their results; however, it is important to note that the experimental group did show some slightly greater levels of language proficiency.
Table 3.1

Students’ scores on the Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey—Revised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Oral Language—Total</th>
<th>Broad Language Ability—Total</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Oral Expression</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Language Comprehension</th>
<th>Applied Language Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this quasi-experimental study, the control group was comprised of seven students while the experimental group had eight students. Table 3.2 shows the following information about each student: assigned group, sex, age (as of January 1, 2009), birth country, English proficiency level, and home language. Fourteen of the students came from Spanish-speaking backgrounds and one student spoke Lao. Seven were born in Mexico, and seven were born in the US, but are of Mexican descent. One was born in the US, but is of Laotian decent. As of September 2008, they all had at least
Table 3.2

Participant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age (as of January 1, 2009)</th>
<th>Birth Country</th>
<th>English Proficiency</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Lao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

two years of formal education in a public school system in the United States. Although all the students were currently in the second grade, it is interesting to note that the experimental group had older participants as two of them were already nine years old.

Overview of Data collection

In order to collect the data for this study, three tests were given. The purpose of each test follows:

1. **Pre-test**: To establish a baseline for determining vocabulary growth throughout the instructional process. The students were asked to demonstrate knowledge
of all the vocabulary focused upon during the up-coming three stories of the unit by completing a cloze assessment and self-assessment.

2. *End-of-Story Production Tests*: To allow students to apply their newly learned vocabulary in an oral productive manner. These were taken after each story. There were three cycles.

3. *Post test*: To allow the students to show their productive vocabulary gains and retention throughout the process.

Each test is described in more detail in the following sections.

**Data Collection Technique 1**

The first data collection technique was the pre-tests which were administered to assess understanding of the key vocabulary words through a cloze test using the selection of vocabulary words addressed during the study and a self-assessment of their word knowledge. The pre-tests were given prior to any instruction on the target vocabulary words. These teacher-created exams (see Appendix A) were used to establish a baseline to ascertain growth over the course of the instruction. A self-assessment rubric (see Appendix C) was created based on the levels of word knowledge identified in Chapter Two. This rubric was used to score the self-assessment pre-test. The cloze pretest was scored simply by awarding a point for every correct answer and determining an overall percentage.
Data Collection Technique 2

Due to the stage of literacy development of second graders, native and non-native speakers struggle to express themselves in writing; therefore, individual oral language production tests were administered rather than using a written assessment to evaluate their productive vocabulary knowledge.

In order to discover what vocabulary the students were able to use productively, a one-on-one assessment took place in which the students exhibited their productive vocabulary knowledge. Following each of the three stories in the unit, an end-of-the-story oral assessment was given to each student. The students were presented with pictures from the story with the words omitted. They were then asked to retell the story remembering to use their new vocabulary words. Each assessment was recorded to allow for further review. A simple scoring system was used to evaluate these oral assessments. Zero points were given for students that were unable to produce the vocabulary word. One point was awarded to students that were able to correctly produce the target word.

Data Collection Technique 3

The post-test was a repetition of the pre-test procedure plus an additional oral language production test. The post-tests were given one and a half weeks after the final instructional period concludes. I used Medina’s (1990) study as a model as she used a one and a half week period following her instruction to assess retention of vocabulary in her ELL second graders. The results from this test were used to compare with the pre-
test results to determine productive vocabulary growth over the course of the instructional period. These tests also were used to determine if and to what extent retention of the targeted words had taken place. Along with the self-assessment and cloze vocabulary test, an oral production post-test was administered to discover productive vocabulary growth. On the oral production post-test the students were presented with pictures and short questions, or prompts, to elicit production of the target vocabulary words. This oral production post-test requires the students to produce the vocabulary word itself. All attempts were made to use pictures on the post-test that were an obvious example of the key vocabulary term to native speakers. Each oral production post-tests took about 10 minutes to complete.

Procedure

In order to do this research, it is important to determine which vocabulary words would be the focus of this study. As recommended by Beck et al. 2002, I focused on teaching mostly on Tier Two words for my intermediate level ELLs. I chose to center the vocabulary instruction around an animal theme based on the Hampton Brown Avenues series for second grade ELLs because the vocabulary that Hampton Brown has selected for instruction primarily includes Tier Two words. I did, however, choose to alter their word choices based on the needs of my students. Since I did not have any students at the beginning language proficiency level, I felt that some of the vocabulary was unnecessary to teach as my students would have already known those words. The chosen vocabulary terms and their definitions can be found in Appendix C. The next
task was finding songs that effectively incorporated the vocabulary theme. Some songs are included as part of this series and I chose to use one song from the series to elicit production of the target vocabulary. I created one song based on the story, *Red-eyed Tree Frog* and I also adapted a short paragraph used to teach vocabulary in the students’ textbook into a song for the experimental group (see Appendix E).

**Introduction to Assessment Procedures**

Lower elementary students often struggle to produce language, either oral or written, on demand. In order to ensure that the students were displaying their knowledge on the research assessments, practice was necessary. Prior to each new assessment instruction was provided. The students have had many opportunities to practice the cloze tests such as the fill-in-the-blank pre-test. The students practiced using self-assessments throughout the year to help them better determine their own understanding. This was helpful in preparing them for the self-assessment portion of the pre-test and post-test. Students were allowed to practice retelling earlier in the year to prepare them for the end-of-the-story oral assessments. These practices were used as trial runs in order to introduce the students to a similar version of the assessment tools so that they would be more comfortable with them during the actual study. By going through this process I was able to make sure that the instructions were clear and the students would be able to carry out the task to the best of their ability. During the study, we discussed the procedure and expectations prior to administering the individual tests. As a whole group, I gave examples of quality responses and
incomplete responses. This was done to help elicit better responses during the end-of-
story oral exams and oral production post-test.

Preparing for the instruction and assessment process was essential for ensuring a successful study. Instruction on various testing strategies was also important to make sure that the students understood what was being asked of them during the study. It was especially important to practice the retell procedure as certain students are naturally better story tellers than others. By practicing, students were able to understand what was required and how to do their best retell—making sure they did not miss any crucial parts of the story! This practicing allowed for eliciting better answers during the study.

Materials

Quite a few materials were needed to conduct this study. Finding and creating songs that incorporate the target vocabulary words was essential. It was also important to make sure that these words were appropriate for second grade ELLs. Finding visual materials was also important as it is well established that ELLs obtain vocabulary better when provided with visual representations (Medina, 1990; Obarow, 2004). The end-of-story oral assessments were recorded using a microphone and computer. Materials needed for the oral production post-test included a computer to display the post-test which was delivered via PowerPoint and microphone to record the student responses onto the PowerPoint. The audio recording was necessary for further evaluation of the students’ oral production.
Before the start of the research it was crucial to identify vocabulary words that would be the focus of the study. Using the Hampton Brown *Avenues* curriculum (level C) for second grade ELLs, I chose words that are included in their stories and are a focus of their unit. These words usually would be classified as Tier Two words. I also will select a couple additional Tier One words—to make sure they are a comfortable part of their vocabulary and Tier Three words—to further challenge the students.

Three songs are used for instruction of the vocabulary with the experimental group. These can be found in Appendix E. The first story’s song was created using the teacher-chosen vocabulary words from various tiers (mostly Tier Two) and the story *Red-eyed Tree Frog*. The second story’s song is a variation of a poem found in the *Avenues* level C text book. I adapted the poem to fit the tune of a known song Frère Jacques. The poem/song incorporates all of the target vocabulary for that portion of the unit. The final story has a song that was included in the student text and a teacher big book. All of these songs were connected to stories in the unit. The control group was exposed to these songs as poems, in the spoken form, while the experimental group learned to sing the songs together in class.

**Pre-test**

The start of the study began with a pre-test which included two parts: a self-assessment and cloze vocabulary test. These tests were given to the classes in a whole group setting. I administered the pre-test to determine if students had any understanding of the vocabulary.
Table 3.3:

Example of Self-assessment chart used during the pre-test and post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I don’t know the word. I’ve never seen the word before.</th>
<th>I have seen the word before.</th>
<th>I kind of know what the word means</th>
<th>I know the meaning of the word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predator</td>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>Try hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enemy</td>
<td>Enemy</td>
<td>Secret</td>
<td>Hungry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>Hide</td>
<td>Smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tongue</td>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>Scared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Dale, 1965 Vocabulary measurement: Techniques and major findings.

During the self-assessment portion of the pre-test the students were asked to place words that were written on an overhead transparency in the following categories:

I don’t know the word, I have seen the word before, I kind of know what the word means, I know the meaning of the word (Dale, 1965). An example of this can be found in Table 3.3. These words were read aloud by the teacher one at a time to avoid reading ability influencing the results of determining vocabulary knowledge.

The scoring of this test used a three point rubric based on the levels of word knowledge established in Chapter Two. Students received points for words in each category. They received 3 points for any words found in the I know the meaning of the word category, 2 points for words found in the I kind of know what the word means category, and 1 point for the I have seen the word before category. No points were
given for words left in the *I don’t know the word* category. The points were totaled to get the overall score.

The second portion of the pre-test included a cloze assessment where the students needed to complete the sentences with the correct vocabulary word found in the word box. Each correct answer received one point and an overall percentage was taken.

**Instructional Period**

The vocabulary instruction period was spread out over twenty-two lessons. Ten of the lessons specifically addressed the key vocabulary terms that were central in this study. The other lessons focused more on the other areas of language instruction needed for ELLs. During this instructional time the two groups were exposed to varying vocabulary instruction. The control group was given vocabulary instruction using more traditional method, while the experimental group was given vocabulary instruction with the aid of songs. The length of time spent on vocabulary instruction was approximately the same; however, the activities differed. Both groups were given the same visual representations and the focus of the lessons was not be only on receptive vocabulary gains, but productive also. All of the lesson plans of the two groups can be found in Appendix D.

**End-of-the-Story Tests**

At the end of each of the three stories during instructional period an oral production post-test took place. During these end-of-the-story tests the students met
individually with me to demonstrate their productive vocabulary knowledge. The students were presented with pictures from the story with the words removed. They were then asked to retell the story remembering to use their new words. Each retell was recorded.

Post-test

The Post-test was administered one and a half weeks following the final end-of-the-story test. The post-test included three parts: the self-assessment, cloze test, and oral language production test. These tests were used to determine the retention of the students by comparing their results with those of the previous tests. The self-assessment test and cloze test were identical to the pre-test that was administered prior to any vocabulary instruction. The only difference was that the cloze test questions were altered so it is not a replica of a previously taken exam. The third part of the post-test was the oral language production test. This was administered individually with pictures and question prompts on a PowerPoint to elicit the key vocabulary words. Each oral production post-test was recorded for analysis later on. This was the last step in the data collection procedure.

Data Analysis

The first data collected was during the pre-test. This test was used as a starting point to determine productive vocabulary growth throughout the course of the study. In order to analyze the results from the self-assessment pre-test a rubric (see Appendix C) was established using a three point system based on level of word knowledge.
Receiving the full three points on any word would show that the student believed that they had attained the word and could use it productively. The cloze test was the second portion of the pretest that allowed for further analysis of their understanding of the vocabulary words. One point was given for each correct answer.

Following the pre-test was the vocabulary instruction period, which spanned twenty-two lessons. After the vocabulary instruction was completed for each of the three stories, the students took their end-of-the-story test which required each student to retell the story using the targeted vocabulary. There were three end-of-the-story tests in all. These tests were recorded and the recordings were listened to by two people who scored the responses. The use of two evaluators helped establish reliability.

One and a half weeks after the instructional period concluded, the post-test took place. The same procedure was used for the self-assessment and cloze portion as used for the pre-test. The same scoring procedure was again used to analyze the results. The oral language production test was administered one-on-one with each participant. Given a prompt the students were asked to produce one of the targeted vocabulary words. A point was given for each correct answer.

Verification of Data

It is crucial to establish validity within this research. In order for the finding from this study to have external validity and be generalized to the wider population, a random sample would have to be used (McKay, 2006). Therefore, this quasi-experimental study does not have external validity, but does attempt to attain internal
validity. By having a control group that is exposed to vocabulary instruction without songs and an experimental group exposed to the vocabulary through the use of songs, the variable should be the use of songs in the instruction.

Establishing reliability is also an essential part of this study. I attempted to generate internal reliability by having a colleague analyze the oral language data (end-of-the-story tests and oral language production post-test). During the post-tests, a rubric was used by two people (a colleague and I) that evaluated each student on their productivity. Any variation would be reviewed and one result agreed upon. Having a peer evaluate the data should help establish inter-rater reliability.

Generalizability was not possible in this research since the population sample was limited and not randomly selected. This quasi-experimental approach will only allow a correlation to be made between the condition presented and the results obtained.

Ethical Considerations

Any time research is being conducted on humans, it is important to take into consideration ethical concerns. This research utilized the following safety measures to ensure the rights of the students involved in the study:

1. The parents were advised of the objectives of the research being conducted through written notification. These letters were presented in both their native language and English. The research was discussed at a monthly Hispanic parents meeting to make certain the parents understood its purpose.
2. A written consent form was obtained from the parents or guardians of all students participating in the study. They were given the opportunity to decline participation.

3. The anonymity of the students was protected during the study and the school was never identified.

Through these measures, I believe that the rights of the students and their families were protected.

In this chapter, descriptions of the methods used for this research were discussed. A quasi-experimental study was chosen using a control and experimental group on which to conduct the research. The data collection methods were established using a pre-test, end-of-story tests, and post-test formula. The pre-test consisted of a self-assessment and cloze assessment. The end-of-story assessments were oral retells, of each of the stories, conducted individually. The post-test replicated the pre-test and added an oral assessment component to elicit the production of the targeted vocabulary. Chapter Three also included a discussion of the study’s validity, reliability, and generalizability. External validity could not be attained due to the population, but the study attempts to attain internal validity by having only the experimental group exposed the use of songs during vocabulary instruction. Reliability was established by using two evaluators on the oral production exams in order to create inter-rater reliability. Generalizability was not possible to establish due to the limited population sample and not having randomly selected participants. Finally the ethical
considerations were acknowledged. Chapter Four presents the results that were obtained from this study.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine how songs can be used as instructional tools to help English language learners acquire productive vocabulary. This chapter presents pre-test results, end-of-story production assessment results, and results from the three-part post-test. Comparisons are made between the pre-test and the post-test results. The chapter concludes with a discussion of general findings.

Pre-test Results

At the start of this study, I gave my second-grade ESL students a pre-test that consisted of two components: the cloze test and the self-assessment. These were used to determine a baseline of their understanding of the key vocabulary terms. This allowed for a comparison between the groups and for the ability to assess progress throughout the course of the study.

The results from the cloze assessment portion of the pre-test can be seen in the bar graph in Figure 4.1. The cloze assessments were scored with each word receiving a point. The overall percent was then calculated. The control group as a whole performed lower on the cloze assessment with the average student score of 62.3 percent. The experimental group averaged 82.0 percent overall with one student scoring 100 percent. The average difference between the cloze pre-tests of the two groups was a fairly significant 19.7 percentage points.
The control group’s self-assessment results were more similar to those of the experimental group than the cloze test results. Using the self-assessment rubric (see Appendix C) to evaluate their self-assessments, each student was given a score out of 51—seventeen vocabulary words worth a possible three points each. The students then were given an overall percent. Figure 4.2 shows the pre-test self-assessment results for the control group and the experimental group. The average score for the control group was 63.9 percent, while the experimental group averaged 69.1 percent. No student in
either group felt 100 percent confident in his or her knowledge of the targeted vocabulary. The scores for the control group ranged from 47.1 to 78.4 percent, while the experimental group had a much larger range of 23.5 percent to 98.0 percent.

End-of-Story Production Assessment Results

The end-of-story production assessments consisted of oral retells following the instruction of the selected stories. Each student had practiced retelling stories in lessons throughout the school year and immediately preceding this study to insure that they were comfortable with the retelling procedure. This study included three stories with five or six key vocabulary words targeted during the instruction of each story. Each retell was recorded for further evaluation. There are many ways to say the same thing in English, so the expectation is not for the students to produce 100 percent of the words during the retell. The purpose was to see how the two groups performed comparatively on their story retells.

The first set of six vocabulary terms were taken from the story *Red-eyed Tree Frog* by Joy Cowley. The control group was given instruction on the vocabulary using traditional vocabulary instruction strategies, while the experimental group was exposed to the vocabulary as part of a song. The students each retold the story at the end of the instructional period. Of the six targeted vocabulary words the control group produced an average of 2.9 words compared to the experimental group’s average production of 3.4 words. Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show the students results from the end-of-story production test for *Red-Eyed Tree Frog*. Interestingly, every student was able to
### Table 4.1

**Red-Eyed Tree Frog—Production Test Results—Control Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hungry</th>
<th>Wake up</th>
<th>Slither(-ing/-s)</th>
<th>Poisonous</th>
<th>No longer</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>TOTAL CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student #1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* attempted, but used incorrectly

### Table 4.2

**Red-Eyed Tree Frog—Production Test Results—Experimental Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hungry</th>
<th>Wake up</th>
<th>Slither(-ing/-s)</th>
<th>Poisonous</th>
<th>No longer</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>TOTAL CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student #8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
produce the term “poisonous” on their retell. On the other hand, none of the participants in the control group used “no longer” correctly during his or her retell. One did attempt it by producing the phrase “no more longer.” However, this was not counted since it was a grammatically incorrect utterance. Although it is difficult to determine why some words were produced more easily than other, there are some possible answers. “No longer” is a phrase that is rather abstract and not central to the story. Conversely, “poisonous” was a word that was crucial and without its use, one situation in the story would have been difficult to understand.

The second story, *What Do You Do When Something Wants to Eat You?* by Steve Jenkins contained five targeted vocabulary words. Again the students were presented with the end-of-story test asking them to retell the story given the pictures in the book without the words. Tables 4.3 and 4.4 present the individual student results from the end-of-story production test for *What Do You Do When Something Wants to Eat You?*. Notable, is the term “surprise” where the control group had much more success with the production of this vocabulary word. Only one of the students in the experimental group produced the word “surprise”, while four out of seven students in the control group were able to produce this term. “Surprise” was the least produced word for the experimental group, while “attack” was the least produced word for the control group to produce. Only one person in each group missed the word “predator.” The control group averaged 2.6 words correct overall while the experimental group averaged 2.9 words correct overall. The difference of 0.3 is statistically insignificant.
### Table 4.3

**What Do You Do When Something Wants to Eat You?—Production Test Results—Control Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predator</th>
<th>Prey</th>
<th>Surprise</th>
<th>Protect</th>
<th>Attack</th>
<th>TOTAL CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student #1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #7</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.4

**What Do You Do When Something Wants to Eat You?—Production Test Results—Experimental Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predator</th>
<th>Prey</th>
<th>Surprise</th>
<th>Protect</th>
<th>Attack</th>
<th>TOTAL CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student #8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While comparing the students that scored highest in the first end-of-story test to those of the next end-of-story test, it was surprising to find there was little correlation. For example, Student 7 was the highest scoring student in the control group for the *Red-Eyed Tree Frog* end-of-story test—producing five out of six of the vocabulary terms. However, this same student ended up producing the least number of vocabulary words for the *What Do You Do When Something Wants to Eat You?* end-of-story test.

Likewise, Student 1 produced the highest score on the *What Do You Do When Something Wants to Eat You?* end-of-story test for the control group, yet he or she produced the least number of words on the *Red-Eyed Tree Frog* end-of-story test.

The vocabulary for the last part of this study came from the story *Grandpa Toad’s Secret* by Keiko Kasza. During the lessons, the students were exposed to six targeted vocabulary words. The end-of-story production assessment results were very similar in both the control and experimental group. The average number of words that students in the control group produced during their retells was 3.7. The students in the experimental group produced a slightly higher average of 3.8 words correct out of the maximum of five. This difference between the two groups was statistically insignificant. Table 4.5 and 4.6 compare the students’ individual performances on each vocabulary word. Every student produced the term “scared” in their retell, while the terms “humongous” and “enemy” were hardest to elicit for both of the groups.
Table 4.5

*Grandpa Toad’s Secret—Production Test Results—Control Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scared</th>
<th>Brave</th>
<th>Enemies</th>
<th>Secret</th>
<th>Hide</th>
<th>Humongous</th>
<th>TOTAL CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #2</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #3</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #4</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #5</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #6</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #7</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6

*Grandpa Toad’s Secret—Production Test Results—Experimental Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scared</th>
<th>Brave</th>
<th>Enemies</th>
<th>Secret</th>
<th>Hide</th>
<th>Humongous</th>
<th>TOTAL CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #8</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #9</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #10</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #11</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #12</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #13</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #14</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #15</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When looking at the results from all three of the end-of-story oral production assessments, we notice that in every case the experimental group produced a slightly higher average number of the targeted vocabulary terms. The first story had the largest difference with the experimental group averaging 0.5 words more in each retell. On the other hand, the third story had nearly equal results with the experimental group out-producing the control group by an insignificant margin (0.1). Figure 4.3 below, shows a graph representing the average number of words produced by each group for the three end-of-story production assessments.

Figure 4.3. End-of-story Oral Production Test result comparisons for the Control Group and Experimental Group
Post-Tests Results

A post-test was conducted at the end of this quasi-experimental study. This post-test contained the same two tests as the pre-test: the cloze test and the self-assessment. Replicating these tests allowed for a comparison between the students’ vocabulary production prior to the vocabulary instruction and after the completion of the vocabulary instruction. An oral production post-test was also added as a third component to the post-testing series. During the oral production post-test, students were presented with pictures and short questions, or prompts, to elicit oral production of the target vocabulary words.

On the post-test cloze assessment the control group performed slightly below that of the experimental group. Figure 4.4 below shows a visual representation of the results from the cloze assessment portion of the post-test. The control group as a whole performed lower on the cloze assessment with the average student score of 94.9

Figure 4.4. Post-test Cloze Assessment Results for the Control Group and Experimental Group
Figure 4.5. Self-assessment results for the Control group and Experimental Group on the Post-test

percent. Every student in the experimental group scored 100 percent on the cloze assessment. The difference between the control group and experimental group’s average results on the cloze post-test was 5.1 percentage points.

The self-assessment was conducted in the same manner as during the pre-test. Again the students in the experimental group performed better than the students in the control group. The average result for a student in the control group was 79.8 percent, while the students in the experimental group averaged 93.4 percent. One interesting note was that no student in the control group felt 100 percent confident in their knowledge of all the targeted vocabulary words, though two students came close at 98 percent. In the experimental group six of the eight students felt that they had complete understanding of the targeted vocabulary and scored themselves at 100 percent.
Table 4.7

Oral Production Post-test Results-Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID#</th>
<th>Hungry</th>
<th>Wake up</th>
<th>Slither(-ing/-s)</th>
<th>Poisonous</th>
<th>No longer</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Predator</th>
<th>Prey</th>
<th>Surprise</th>
<th>Protect</th>
<th>Attack</th>
<th>Scared</th>
<th>Brave</th>
<th>Enemies</th>
<th>Secret</th>
<th>Hide</th>
<th>Humongous</th>
<th>TOTAL CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8

Oral Production Post-test Results-Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID#</th>
<th>Hungry</th>
<th>Wake up</th>
<th>Slither(-ing/-s)</th>
<th>Poisonous</th>
<th>No longer</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Predator</th>
<th>Prey</th>
<th>Surprise</th>
<th>Protect</th>
<th>Attack</th>
<th>Scared</th>
<th>Brave</th>
<th>Enemies</th>
<th>Secret</th>
<th>Hide</th>
<th>Humongous</th>
<th>TOTAL CORRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ • In a few cases the target word was used correctly elsewhere in the test, rather than being produced on the page soliciting the word. As long as it was used correctly, it was counted.
The third component of the post-testing series was the oral production post-test. Each student was given this oral exam individually. The targeted vocabulary was elicited by giving picture prompts and probing questions (see Appendix B). The results from the control group can be found in Table 4.7 and the experimental group’s result are shown in Table 4.8. On average the control group produced 11.6 words out of 17 correctly. The experimental group scored an average of 12.3 words correctly. This is 0.7 words more than the control group produced on average. One thing to note, is that certain students produced a vocabulary word during the oral production post-test, but not following the picture and question that was being used to elicit the word. These words were still counted as correct even thought they were not produced at the anticipated spot on the test. These instances are noted by an asterisk (*) next to the check in tables 4.7 and 4.8 on the previous page.

Data Comparison: Pre-test and Post-test Results

Conducting a pre-test and a post-test allowed for a comparison between the students’ initial knowledge and their word knowledge at the end of the study. The cloze assessments and self-assessments conducted were the same test at the beginning and the end of the instructional period. The only difference was the order of the vocabulary words in the cloze assessment.

When comparing the cloze assessments prior to and following the instruction, both the control group and experimental group had significant growth. Five of the seven students in the control group scored 100 percent, while all eight students in the
Figure 4.6. Pre-Test and Post-test Cloze Assessment Results for Control Group

![Control Group Pre-Test & Post-test Cloze Assessment](image1)

Figure 4.7. Pre-Test and Post-test Cloze Assessment Results for Experimental Group

![Experimental Group Pre-Test & Post-test Cloze Assessment](image2)

The experimental group scored 100 percent. Figures 4.6 and 4.7 show the cloze pre-test compared to the cloze post-test of the control group and experimental group.
respectively. The control group averaged 94.9 percent on the cloze post-test. This was a 32.6 percent gain from the start of the study. The experimental group averaged 100 percent on the cloze post-test, which was a gain of 18 percent (Figure 4.8). This was a smaller gain than the control group, but since every participant in the experimental group scored 100 percent, they were incapable of making greater gains.

The second area to conduct data-comparison was with the self-assessment pre-test and post-test. The student scored themselves, indicating their understanding and comfort in using the key vocabulary. The individual gains (or in one case, loss) for the control and experimental group can be viewed in Figures 4.9 and 4.10. Overall, the control group evaluated themselves at an average of 63.86 percent at the onset of the unit. On the post-test they re-assessed their knowledge and understanding of the

![Figure 4.8. Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Cloze Assessment Result for the Control and Experimental Groups](chart)
words. Their average score was 79.8 percent—an average gain of 15.9 percent. The experimental group scored themselves at an averaged 69.1 percent on the pre-test. Whereas on the post-test they evaluated themselves at an averaged 93.39 percent. This was an average gain of 24.3 percent. Overall the experimental group scored themselves 8.4 percent higher on average than the students in the control group. Individually, the lowest gain in the control group was a negative two percent. Student 10 evaluated himself or herself two percentage points lower than at the start of the study. The lowest gain by an individual in the experimental group came from Student 14 who only gained two percentage points from the pre-test to the post-test. However, this minimal growth can be attributed to a high initial scoring of 98 percent. The highest individual gain in the control group was made by Student 1 who climbed 25.5 percentage points over the course of the study. The highest individual gain in the experimental group came from Student 8 who gained 43.2 percentage points from the pre-test to the post-test.

![Control Group--Self Assessment Pre-test & Post-test](image)

*Figure 4.9. Pre-test and Post-test Self-Assessment Results for Control Group*
It is important to note that when using self-assessments with young students, the results may not demonstrate what they really know, instead they present the student’s perception of what they know. Students that give themselves high scores are showing confidence in their knowledge of the vocabulary. Conversely, students that rate themselves poorly are showing uncertainty in their knowledge of the terms. It is likely that a student that has confidence in his or her knowledge will use the words productively, while students that feels uncertain with his or her knowledge will be hesitant to use the words productively.

**General Findings**

Both the students in the control and experimental group made gains in their productive vocabularies over the course of the study. On every assessment (two-part pre-test, three end-of-story production tests, and three-part post-test) the students that
were exposed to the vocabulary instruction that incorporated songs (experimental group) did score slightly higher than the students that were not exposed to songs during their instruction (control group). However, the pre-test cloze assessment scores of the experimental group were substantially higher than those of the control group. This initial discrepancy between the two groups causes difficulty when analyzing the results of the end-of-story tests. Did the experimental group perform better because the songs helped them learn and produce the vocabulary terms, or did they already have some knowledge of the targeted vocabulary prior to the start of the study which gave them an advantage?

One area where the data is not affected by the initial discrepancy between the two groups is the self-assessment. When comparing the pre-test self-assessment to the post-test self-assessment, one can see that following the instruction using songs, the experimental group had much greater confidence in their knowledge and ability to use the targeted vocabulary. Six of the eight students felt like they had complete knowledge of all the vocabulary terms. None of the students in the control group evaluated themselves this high. On average the experimental group evaluated their word knowledge 8.4 percent higher than the control group.

Chapter Five presents the major findings of this study. It looks at the implications, limitations, and need for further research. It concludes with a summary of my professional growth during this research project.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine how songs can be used as instructional tools to help English language learners acquire productive vocabulary. In this chapter I will present the major findings of this study, address the implications, identify the limitations, and make recommendations for further research. I will conclude with a summary of my growth throughout this study and how my instruction of vocabulary has been altered in my ESL classroom.

Major Findings

Through careful analysis of the data collected during this study, I determined there to be three major findings:

1. The results of this study are inclusive. This initial difference in group ability provided difficulty in presenting clear findings throughout the rest of the study.

2. There was not a great difference in production of vocabulary between the students that were taught words using songs or more traditional instruction.

3. Songs did not inhibit the acquisition of new vocabulary.

Initial Discrepancy

The first major finding was determined by the pre-test which was given at the beginning of this study to determine the participants’ initial knowledge of the key vocabulary words. The results showed that the experimental group had a greater understanding of the targeted vocabulary words than the control group. This initial
discrepancy between the two groups made it difficult to draw accurate conclusions about the benefits of using songs to enhance vocabulary production.

**Little Difference in Production**

The second major finding of this study was that there was little difference in the results of the two groups regardless of the teaching methods used. The results from the end-of-story production assessments found that the students that were given vocabulary instruction using songs performed slightly better on every end-of-story oral production test (see Figure 4.3). This could lead one to conclude that using songs are beneficial in the productive use of vocabulary. The analysis is not that clear, however. It is important to remember that the experimental group started the study having a higher understanding of the targeted vocabulary words and, therefore, the findings become less conclusive. The best conclusion that can be made is that using songs to develop productive vocabulary may be a useful tool, but the extent of its value in comparison to more traditional vocabulary instruction is still in question. More research needs to be done in this area to allow for a more definitive conclusion.

**Songs don’t hurt!**

The study did determine that the use of songs during instruction does not inhibit productive vocabulary performance. From the data collected, the experimental group performed at or above the level of the control group. We may not be able to conclude that songs are a better tool for increasing productive vocabulary acquisition, but we can determine that they do not hinder it.
There is some evidence that songs not only do not hurt students’ growth, but may also help students’ confidence in their word understanding. The self-assessment pre-tests and post-tests were identical examinations that were used to compare the growth of the two groups from the start of the study to its conclusion. An interesting finding occurred when comparing how much higher the experimental group scored on the pre-test self-assessment and the post-test self-assessment than the control group. On the self-assessment portion of the pre-test the experimental group felt 5.2 percent more confident in their knowledge of the targeted vocabulary. On the self-assessment post-test they evaluated themselves 13.1 percent higher than the control group. This result seems to reveal that the students that were exposed to the targeted vocabulary during song usage felt more confident in their understanding of the new words.

Implications for Teaching

Songs may be useful instructional tools. This study cannot determine that they are better tools than other instructional approaches, but this does not mean that they are not beneficial. When working with the experimental group, the students were engaged in the singing of the songs. I noticed that these students enjoyed singing the songs before or after class. As noted earlier, comparing the self-assessment pre-test results and the self-assessment post-test results provided some evidence that experimental group had greater confidence in their vocabulary learning. Three-fourths of the experimental group evaluated themselves as having complete understanding of all the targeted words compared to none of the students in the control group. After the
research period was completed, I informally inquired about whether or not they liked having songs in the ESL classroom. They all responded, “Yes!” Overall, it seemed that their enjoyment in learning and possibly their confidence was enhanced by the use of songs.

When determining the best way to teach something it is important to determine what excites the teacher. Teacher preference is not something that should be overlooked. The saying, “When mama ain’t happy, ain’t nobody happy!” can be related to teachers also. When teachers are not engaged their teaching, students are not engaged in their learning. Using songs during instruction is something I find fun and my students share in my enthusiasm. One instructional style does not fit every person or every situation. It is important to determine the teacher’s instructional preference and the students’ learning preferences when determining if using songs is a good choice for a given lesson.

One unforeseen implication for teaching pertains to student needs versus curriculum mandates. When planning this study, I needed to work my research design into the ESL programming already in place. Our district uses Hampton Brown’s Avenues curriculum in the elementary schools and it is encouraged that all the teachers use this. One reason is that often our students move between the elementary schools and they should be able to fit into another ESL classroom with ease. We also progress monitor the students based on the unit assessments. This progress monitoring is one data point used when determining when to exit a child from ESL services. When the students were
given the pre-test, it was clear that a large number of students already had knowledge of the majority of the targeted vocabulary terms. Should teachers be teaching curriculum that student may already know simply because it is in the curriculum, or should they be focusing on what the students need to learn? The answer seems fairly clear. Teachers are there to teach students new concepts, not things they already know. Teachers need to be given the leeway to assess the needs of their students and determine if they need to spend more or less time on the instruction of a certain concept. Curriculum mandates should not get in the way of student needs.

Limitations

There are several limitations in this study that should be considered. First, this study did not involve a random sampling. The subjects participating in this study were selected from a sample of convenience. The grouping of these students in each class was based on a classroom assignment which was done at the beginning of the school year. All second graders were placed into 4 different classrooms. Language proficiency was not taken into consideration other than having a similar number of ELL students in each class. Then ESL students from two of the mainstream classrooms were placed together for pull-out ESL instruction and the ESL students from the other two classes were placed together for ESL instruction. This grouping was based on their classroom schedule only. The pre-test indicated that the experimental group may have a higher vocabulary level than that of the control group. Therefore, comparing the two groups is
difficult and making generalizations based on the results is problematic. Also, the results cannot be easily generalized due to the limited number of participants.

Second, testing students on their ability to produce a targeted word on call is a difficult, if not impossible, task. I believe some students knew some of the words, but did not produce them on the test. As noted in chapter 4, during the oral production post-test (see tables 4.7 and 4.8) certain students used the targeted vocabulary correctly during other parts of the test, rather than producing it on the page soliciting the specific words I wanted them to use. When students are presented with the prompt to illicit the word *humongous*, but they produce *big, large, or huge* does not mean that they do not know how to produce the word; instead, it simply indicates one of two possibilities: they cannot produce the word *humongous* or that in this particular instance they did not choose that word.

Assessing the students over three cycles attempted to allow for greater reliability of the test results. However, in order to truly determine if using songs promotes better gains in productive vocabulary, one must conduct a longer more in-depth study that would include a larger random population sample. Insuring that the students in the sample groups are of the same proficiency level at the start of the study would allow for more generalizations to be made.

One other area of concern is the validity of the retell procedure. When listening to my students retell the story, I began to wonder how much of it was authentic productive knowledge versus recall. Since I was using the pictures from the story
without the words to aid the students during their retell, some students tried to recall the story word for word. Another tried to recall phrases from the song. This begs the question as to whether this task elicited true understanding and production of the vocabulary or was it simply a memorization of words that may or may not have had meanings attached. I may be able to recall the words to the Russian folk song “Kalinka,” but having virtually no knowledge of Russian I have no ability to produce them in a meaningful way outside of that context.

Further Research

Each year more and more ELLs are entering the United States. As more students are in need of English language instruction, more research needs to be done to determine the best practices in this area. Vocabulary is one of the key components in learning a language and finding new strategies that will better meet the needs of our ESL students is imperative (Beck, McKeown, and Kucan, 2002). Specifically regarding this study, more research needs to be done to fully determine if the use of songs can enhance the production of targeted vocabulary words for second-grade ELLs. Finding ways to eliminate the limitations of this study could allow for greater generalizability and understanding of the extent that songs can help in language production.

Professional Growth

Vocabulary has always been an important part of instruction in my ESL classroom. Students cannot learn a language without knowing the components—vocabulary being a major one. The problem that I noticed in my classes was that my
students were not producing the words that they “knew” according to their multiple choice vocabulary tests. This eventually led me to ask the question: how can I enhance productive vocabulary? After all, a person would be very limited if they only knew a language in the receptive form? I began to wonder if songs—that require production—could be beneficial in enhancing language production.

Prior to the start of this research, I always loved using songs in my classroom. I felt that they were a fun way to help students with their language development. However, I never considered their effect on productive vocabulary until I read research articles about productive vocabulary. This piqued my interest and the idea for this research began.

Since the completion of this research, I have continued to use songs in my classroom, but in a different way. In the past, I did not always focus on the vocabulary found in the songs; instead, I used it as a fun introduction to content—an anticipatory set. Now, the songs are not just an “extra” in my lessons, but more of a focus. They are taught in a more deliberate manner and, hopefully, allow my students the opportunity to enhance their productive vocabulary while enjoying themselves.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know the meaning of the word.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I kind of know what the word means.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have seen the word before.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know the word. I have never seen the word before.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: _____________________
Pre-test—Cloze exercises

Directions: Use the words from the box to fill in the blanks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>slithering</th>
<th>no longer</th>
<th>predator</th>
<th>attacks</th>
<th>enemy</th>
<th>hide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>poisonous</td>
<td>hungry</td>
<td>prey</td>
<td>protect</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening</td>
<td>wake up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The boy was very ___________ . He didn’t cry when the bee stung him.
2. The ________________ monster was bigger than a house!
3. The ________________ hunted the mouse in the field. It wanted to eat it for lunch.
4. The sun goes down every ________________.
5. The rat died from the snake bite because it was ________________.
6. I quietly whispered to my sister. I didn’t want her to tell anyone my ________________.
7. The bear did not eat all day so he was very ________________.
8. The snake was ________________ down the hill.
9. After a long nap, the tree frog was ________________ tired.
10. The eagle likes to eat fish. Fish are the eagle’s ________________.
11. The little girl was ____________ of the big tiger.
12. The cat and the mouse are not friends. They are ________________.
13. In the morning, I ________________ and get ready for school.
14. The shark _________ the little fish in the ocean.
15. The scared frog likes to ________________ in the tall green grass so that no one can see him.
16. The turtle uses it shell to ________________ itself when it thinks it is in danger.
17. The boy was very ________________ when the rabbit suddenly jumped out from behind the bushes.
Post-test—Cloze exercises

Directions: Use the words from the box to fill in the blanks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attacks</th>
<th>enemy</th>
<th>humongous</th>
<th>poisonous</th>
<th>protect</th>
<th>slithering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brave</td>
<td>evening</td>
<td>hungry</td>
<td>predator</td>
<td>scared</td>
<td>surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hide</td>
<td>no longer</td>
<td>prey</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td>wakes up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The turtle did not eat all day so he was very ________________.
2. I was ________________ when I saw the monster!
3. The snake was a ________________. It was hunting the gliding frog. It wanted to eat it for lunch.
4. The monster and the toads are not friends. They are ________________.
5. Grandpa Toad quietly whispered to Little Toad. He didn’t want anyone to hear his ________________.
6. The snake was ________________ through the tall grass.
7. The ________________ monster was bigger than a tree!
8. The boy was very ________________ when the rabbit suddenly jumped out from behind the bushes.
9. Be careful! The rattle snake has a bite that is ________________.
10. Little Toad was very ________________. He helped save his grandpa from the monster.
11. In the morning, the mom ________________ the sleeping child.
12. The hawk likes to eat mice. Mice are the hawk’s ________________.
13. The shark ________________ the little fish in the ocean.
14. When Little Toad is scared, he likes to ________________ in the tall green grass so that no one can see him.
15. The turtle uses it shell to ________________ itself when it thinks it is in danger.
16. The sun goes down every ________________.
17. After sleeping for a long time, I was ________________ tired.
Assessment:
Oral Production Post-test

Post-test

Name: ____________________
What does this boy want? Why?
Why does she have an alarm clock?
(How does it help her?)

What is this woman doing?
Explain how a snake moves.
Explain why you do not want to play with these animals?
Explain how the boy changed. How does he feel at the end?

(He is _____ _______ hungry.)
When does this family eat supper?
What do you call an animal that wants to eat another animal?
What do you call an animal that other animals want to eat?
Tell about what is going on in the picture. What is the woman feeling?

Wow! I didn’t know that everyone was coming!
How does the crossing guard help the girl?

Why does the man wear a helmet (hard hat)?

What do fire fighters and police officers do for us?
What is happening in this picture?

(What is the fox doing to the snake?)
Tell about the boy in this picture.
Tell me about this knight.

(How is he like Little Toad?)
The two men are not friends. The are

__________________.
What are the girls doing in these pictures?
What are these kids going to do?

What is the man doing?
The man think the monster is *big*.

What are some other words to describe the monster?

If building A is big. What is Building B?
## Self-assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t know the word. I’ve never seen the word before.</td>
<td>I have seen the word before.</td>
<td>I kind of know what the word means</td>
<td>I know the meaning of the word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Predator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Protect</strong></td>
<td><strong>Surprise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Try hard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Enemy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secret</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hungry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sharp</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Smart</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Tongue</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tongue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Scared</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This student would have received 3 points each for *try hard, hungry, smart,* and *scared*; 2 points for *surprise, secret, hide,* and *tongue*; and one point each for *protect, enemy,* and *sharp*. No points would have been awarded for *predator* or *prey*. The total score for this student would be 23 points.
Lessons for Enhancing Productive Vocabulary

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP:
BOOK ONE-- *Red-Eyed Tree Frog*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1*</th>
<th>DAY 2*</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Characteristics</td>
<td>Preview and Share Red-Eyed Tree Frog</td>
<td>Cause and Effect</td>
<td>Writing Captions with animal characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read through objectives:</td>
<td>Read through objectives:</td>
<td>Read through objectives:</td>
<td>Read through objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Today we will sort animals by their characteristics.</td>
<td>--Today we will review our vocabulary.</td>
<td>--Today we will reread the story.</td>
<td>--Today we will write captions for pictures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Today we will learn new vocabulary.</td>
<td>--Today we will read a story.</td>
<td>--Today we will identify cause and effect.</td>
<td>--Today we will review animal characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make a graphic web of different animal characteristics</td>
<td>Build background:</td>
<td>Discuss meanings of cause and effect.</td>
<td>Explain what a caption is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read through and sing Here’s a [ANIMAL]</td>
<td>• What do you know about frogs?</td>
<td>Make a Cause and Effect chart.</td>
<td>Model writing a caption by showing the picture of a lion and having the kids help tell about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point out and discuss vocabulary words</td>
<td>• I know that frogs are _____</td>
<td>Use events from the story to fill in the causes and effects. e.g. Effect: (What happens?) The frog wakes up. Cause: (Why) It is time to eat.</td>
<td>Write the caption below the picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mane</td>
<td>Go on a picture walk through the story.</td>
<td>Do practice book page 92 to apply cause and effect identifying strategies.</td>
<td>Students will cut out animal pictures from magazines and write captions below them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Webbed-feet</td>
<td>Read the story and discuss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flamingo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Skinny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sharp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates a day where instruction is different for the experiment and control groups*
**EXPERIMENTAL GROUP:**
**BOOK ONE-- Red-Eyed Tree Frog**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 5</th>
<th>DAY 6</th>
<th>DAY 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TESTING</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 mini-lessons:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Present Tense Verbs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Questioning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Animal Homes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing Captions with animal characteristics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Read through objectives:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Read through</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Read through objectives:</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Today we will ask and answer questions.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objectives:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>--Today we will write captions for animal pictures using animal characteristics.</strong></td>
<td>- <strong>Today we will discuss animal homes.</strong></td>
<td><strong>--Today we will find action words.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Go over instructions again.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Physical Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explain that during this time individual oral testing will be done.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Students ask each other questions about the story.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Read sentences about animal actions. (E.g. The tree frog sleeps. The caterpillars crawl.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Complete the fill-in-the-blank activity in the Big Book p. 34</strong></td>
<td><strong>Act out animal actions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Animal homes:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discuss when we say crawl vs. crawls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Read poem about animal homes in Big Book p. 35</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Look at Big Book p. 35 and tell what the animal(s) in the picture do.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Discuss animal homes.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Play “Simon says” using animal actions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTROL GROUP:
BOOK ONE-- *Red-Eyed Tree Frog*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1*</th>
<th>DAY 2*</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Preview and Share Red-Eyed Tree Frog</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cause and Effect</strong></td>
<td><strong>Writing Captions with animal characteristics</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Read through objectives:  
  -- *Today we will sort animals by their characteristics.*  
  -- *Today we will learn new words.* | Read through objectives:  
  -- *Today we will review our vocabulary.*  
  -- *Today we will read a story.* | Reread the story.  
  Discuss meanings of *cause* and *effect.* | Read through objectives:  
  -- *Today we will review our vocabulary.*  
  -- *Today we will reread the story.*  
  -- *Today we will identify cause and effect.* |
| Go through picture cards of animals | Review vocabulary from yesterday by reading the pocket chart sentences.  
  Build background:  
  • What do you know about frogs?  
  • I know that frogs are _____.  
  Go on a picture walk through the story. | Make a Cause and Effect chart.  
  Use events from the story to fill in the causes and effects.  
  e.g. *Effect:* (What happens?) The frog wakes up.  
  *Cause:* (Why) It is time to eat.  
  Do practice book page 92 to apply cause and effect identifying strategies. | Review vocabulary by rereading pocket chart sentences.  
  Explain what a caption is.  
  Model writing a caption by showing the picture of a lion and having the kids help tell about it.  
  Write the caption below the picture. |
| Make a graphic web of different animal characteristics | Read the story and discuss. | | Show model and give instructions for tomorrow’s lesson:  
  Cut out animal pictures from magazines and write captions below them. |
CONTROL GROUP:
BOOK ONE-- Red-Eyed Tree Frog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 5</th>
<th>DAY 6</th>
<th>DAY 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TESTING</td>
<td>2 mini-lessons:</td>
<td>Present Tense Verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Captions with animal characteristics</td>
<td>-Questioning</td>
<td>Read through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read through objectives:</td>
<td>-Animal Homes</td>
<td>Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Today we will write captions for animal pictures using animal characteristics.</td>
<td>Read through objectives:</td>
<td>--Today we will find action words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go over instructions again.</td>
<td>--Today we will ask and answer questions.</td>
<td>Total Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain that during this time individual oral testing will be done.</td>
<td>--Today we will discuss animal homes.</td>
<td>Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning:</td>
<td>Read sentences about animal actions. (E.g. The tree frog sleeps. The caterpillars crawl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Look at the words: does, what, will</td>
<td>Act out animal actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students ask each other questions about the story.</td>
<td>Discuss when we say crawl vs. crawls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete the fill-in-the-blank activity in the Big Book p. 34</td>
<td>Look at Big Book p. 35 and tell what the animal(s) in the picture do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal homes:</td>
<td>Play “Simon says” using animal actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read poem about animal homes in Big Book p. 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss animal homes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EXPERIMENTAL GROUP:**

**BOOK TWO-- *What Do You Do When Something Wants to Eat You?***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1*</th>
<th>DAY 2*</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New vocabulary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Preview and Read <em>What Do You Do When Something Wants to Eat You?</em></strong>**</td>
<td><strong>Reread and Classify</strong></td>
<td><strong>Present Tense Verbs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Read through objectives:  
--*Today we will learn new words* | Read through objectives:  
--*Today we will review our vocabulary.*  
--*Today we will read a story.* | Read through objectives:  
--*Today we will reread the story.*  
--*Today we will classify animals.* | Read through objectives:  
--*Today we will review vocabulary.*  
--*Today we will identify action words with and without the –s ending.* |
| Read through song. | Review vocabulary by singing song again. | Reread the story with CD  
Pause to identify how the animals protect themselves. | Sing song to review vocabulary.  
Discuss definitions. |
| Sing song | Preview: go for a picture walk through story. | Make classification chart  
Classify animals by ways they protect themselves. (e.g. octopus and leaf insects hide) | Place sentences on pocket chart.  
-Read through them.  
-Identify verbs.  
-Sort verbs into those with –s endings and those without.  
-Discuss why some have the –s ending and other do not. (singular vs. plural subjects) |
| Identify new vocabulary: define, give examples, show visuals | Read: Read story, pausing to answer comprehension questions, clarify details, discuss vocabulary... | Have students complete their own chart. | Individual practice:  
students complete Practice Book page 99 |
| Sing song multiple times. | | | |
| Identify predators and their prey using graphic organizer | | | |
| Individual practice:  
students complete Practice Book page 95 | | | |
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP:
BOOK TWO-- *What Do You Do When Something Wants to Eat You?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 5</th>
<th>DAY 6</th>
<th>DAY 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classify Animals</strong>&lt;br&gt;Read through objectives: <em>Today we will classify</em>&lt;br&gt;Give students animal picture cards.&lt;br&gt;Have students group physically themselves.&lt;br&gt;Discuss why they are grouped in such a way.&lt;br&gt;Find other ways to group animals. (e.g. animals with feather, animals that eat plants...)&lt;br&gt;Read through passage in Practice Book page 102. Discuss and answer question on page 103 together.</td>
<td><strong>Ask and Give information</strong>&lt;br&gt;Read through objectives: <em>Today we will ask questions and give answers.</em>&lt;br&gt;Review animal classifications. Make classification webs on the board.&lt;br&gt;Tape a picture card to each student’s back.&lt;br&gt;Have students ask questions (similar to the 20 Question game) to each other to find out what kind of animal they are.</td>
<td><strong>TESTING</strong>&lt;br&gt;Read through objectives: <em>Today we will participate in writing, reading, and classifying centers.</em>&lt;br&gt;Centers:&lt;br&gt;#1) Writing—Sticker stories (choose 4 stickers from the sticker box and write a story that incorporates the stickers)&lt;br&gt;#2) Reading—Free reading in the reading nook&lt;br&gt;#3) Classifying—Group pictures into different categories&lt;br&gt;Explain that during this time individual oral testing will be done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTROL GROUP:
BOOK TWO-- *What Do You Do When Something Wants to Eat You?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1*</th>
<th>DAY 2*</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New vocabulary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Preview and Read What Do You Do When Something Wants to Eat You?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reread and Classify</strong></td>
<td><strong>Present Tense Verbs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read through objectives: --Today we will learn new words Read through vocabulary paragraph in <em>Avenues</em> book p. 268. Identify new vocabulary: define, give examples, show visuals Reread paragraph multiple times (alone, with partner, whole group) Identify predators and their prey using graphic organizer Individual practice: students complete Practice Book page 95</td>
<td>Read through objectives: --Today we will review our vocabulary. --Today we will read a story. Review vocabulary by rereading vocabulary paragraph p. 268. Preview: go for a picture walk through story. Read: Read story, pausing to answer comprehension questions, clarify details, discuss vocabulary...</td>
<td>Reread the story with CD Pause to identify how the animals protect themselves. Make classification chart Classify animals by ways they protect themselves. (e.g. octopus and leaf insects hide) Have students complete their own chart.</td>
<td>Read through objectives: --Today we will review vocabulary. --Today we will identify action words with and without the –s ending. Read through vocabulary paragraph to review vocabulary. Discuss definitions. Place sentences on pocket chart. -Read through them. -Identify verbs. -Sort verbs into those with –s endings and those without. -Discuss why some have the –s ending and other do not. (singular vs. plural subjects) Individual practice: students complete Practice Book page 99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTROL GROUP:  
BOOK TWO-- What Do You Do When Something Wants to Eat You?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 5</th>
<th>DAY 6</th>
<th>DAY 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classify Animals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ask and Give information</strong></td>
<td><strong>VOCABULARY TESTING</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Read through objectives:  
--*Today we will classify* | Read through objectives:  
--*Today we will ask questions and give answers.* | Read through objectives:  
*Today we will participate in writing, reading, and classifying centers.* |
| Give students animal picture cards. | Review animal classifications.  
Make classification webs on the board. | Centers:  
#1) Writing—Sticker stories (choose 4 stickers from the sticker box and write a story that incorporates the stickers)  
#2) Reading—Free reading in the reading nook  
#3) Classifying—Group pictures into different categories | |
| Have students group physically themselves. | Tape a picture card to each student’s back. | Explain that during this time individual oral testing will be done. |
| Discuss why they are grouped in such a way. | Have students ask questions (similar to the 20 Question game) to each other to find out what kind of animal they are. | |
| Find other ways to group animals. (e.g. animals with feathers, animals that eat plants...) | |
| Read through passage in Practice Book page 102. Discuss and answer question on page 103 together. | |
### EXPERIMENTAL GROUP:
#### BOOK THREE—Grandpa Toad’s Secrets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1*</th>
<th>DAY 2*</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Background**  
Knowledge/ New vocabulary | **Preview and Read**  
Grandpa Toad’s Secrets | **Reread and Map Story Elements** (goal, events, outcome) | **Present Tense Verbs**  
Read through objectives:  
--Today we will review vocabulary.  
--Today we will reread the story as a Readers’ Theater.  
--Today we will map parts of the story.  
Sing song to review vocabulary. Discuss definitions.  
Make T-chart of *Now and In the Past*  
Write a sentence in the present and ask them how to change it into past tense.—ed endings.  
Look at pages 332-333  
Individual practice: students complete past tense Practice Book page 112. |
| Read through objectives:  
--Today we will talk about families.  
--Today we will learn new words | Read through objectives:  
--Today we will review our vocabulary.  
--Today we will read a story. | Handout Goal and Outcome map. Place on overhead. Explain what we will be looking for while we are reading.  
Assign characters. Reread the story as a Readers’ Theater.  
Discuss Goal, Events, and Outcome as a whole group.  
Write them down on Goal and Outcome map together. | |
| Background: “Family members learn a lot from each other. What do you learn?”  
-discuss  
-record ideas on chart paper | Review vocabulary by singing “Smart Move” page 294. Identify and define vocabulary words.  
Preview: go for a picture walk through story. Make predictions on each page.  
Read: Read story, pausing to answer comprehension questions, clarify details, express opinions, discuss vocabulary... | |
| Introduce new song—“Smart Move”—read through together and sing multiple times with CD.  
Identify new vocabulary: define, give examples, act out the story | |
| Individual practice: students complete vocabulary Practice Book page 106 | | | |
**EXPERIMENTAL GROUP:**

**BOOK THREE—Grandpa Toad’s Secrets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 5</th>
<th>DAY 6*</th>
<th>DAY 7</th>
<th>DAY 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Present and Past Tense Verbs</em>&lt;br&gt;Read through objectives:&lt;br&gt;–Today we will use <em>is, are, was, and were</em> to discuss things in the present or past.&lt;br&gt;Write <em>is, was, are, were</em> on the board&lt;br&gt;Discuss when to use each.&lt;br&gt;Give multiple examples.&lt;br&gt;Game: throw around a beach ball with the four words written on each color. Use the word of the color that your right thumb is on in a sentence.&lt;br&gt;Individual practice: students complete Practice Book page 109</td>
<td><em>Prefixes and Suffixes (un- and –ly)</em>&lt;br&gt;Read through objectives:&lt;br&gt;–Today we will identify prefixes and suffixes.&lt;br&gt;–Today we will review our vocabulary words.&lt;br&gt;Sing vocabulary song. Have students use vocabulary words in a sentence.&lt;br&gt;Introduce prefixes and suffixes (un-/–ly)&lt;br&gt;Have student work with partners to generate a list of words with these prefixes and suffixes&lt;br&gt;Compile list and define</td>
<td>VOCABULARY TESTING&lt;br&gt;Read through objectives:&lt;br&gt;–Today we will participate in sequencing, reading, and grammar centers.&lt;br&gt;Centers:&lt;br&gt;#1) Sequencing—Take cards and place them in order of events.&lt;br&gt;#2) Reading—Free reading in the reading nook&lt;br&gt;#3) Grammar—Prefixes and Suffixes matching game&lt;br&gt;Explain that during this time individual oral testing will be done.</td>
<td>Review Day&lt;br&gt;Read through objectives:&lt;br&gt;–Today we will review for our unit test&lt;br&gt;Play PowerPoint game to review for tomorrow’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**VOCABULARY TESTING**

---

**Review Day**

---
CONTROL GROUP  
BOOK THREE—*Grandpa Toad’s Secrets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1*</th>
<th>DAY 2*</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Background**  
Knowledge/ New vocabulary  
Read through objectives:  
--Today we will talk about families.  
--Today we will learn new words  
Background: “Family members learn a lot from each other. What do you learn?” -discuss -record ideas on chart paper  
Introduce “Smart Move” page 294—read through together multiple times.  
Identify new vocabulary: define, give examples, act out the story  
Individual practice: students complete vocabulary Practice Book page 106 | **Preview and Read Grandpa Toad’s Secrets**  
Read through objectives:  
--Today we will review our vocabulary.  
--Today we will read a story.  
Preview: go for a picture walk through story. Make predictions on each page.  
Read: Read story, pausing to answer comprehension questions, clarify details, express opinions, discuss vocabulary...  
Reread and Map Story Elements (goal, events, outcome)  
Read through Objectives:  
--Today we will reread the story as a Readers’ Theater.  
--Today we will map parts of the story.  
Handout Goal and Outcome map. Place on overhead. Explain what we will be looking for while we are reading.  
Assign characters. Reread the story as a Readers’ Theater.  
Discuss Goal, Events, and Outcome as a whole group.  
Write them down on Goal and Outcome map together. | **Present Tense Verbs**  
Read through objectives:  
--Today we will review vocabulary.  
--Today we will identify action words with and without the –s ending.  
Read “Smart Move” to review vocabulary. Discuss definitions.  
Make T-chart of Now and In the Past  
Write a sentence in the present and ask them how to change it into past tense.—ed endings  
Look at pages 332-333  
Individual practice: students complete past tense Practice Book page 112 |
## DAY 5

*Present and Past Tense Verbs*

Read through objectives:

--Today we will use *is*, *are*, *was*, and *were* to discuss things in the present or past.

Write *is, was, are, were* on the board.

Discuss when to use each.

Give multiple examples.

Game: throw around a beach ball with the four words written on each color. Use the word of the color that your right thumb is on in a sentence.

Individual practice: students complete Practice Book page 109

## DAY 6*

*Prefixes and Suffixes (un- and –ly)*

Read through objectives:

--Today we will identify prefixes and suffixes.

--Today we will review our vocabulary words.

Review vocabulary by reading through words and having students use them in a sentence.

Introduce prefixes and suffixes (un-/ly)

Have student work with partners to generate a list of words with these prefixes and suffixes

Compile list and define

Individual practice: students complete Practice Book page 110

## DAY 7

**VOCABULARY TESTING**

*Centers*

Read through objectives:

--Today we will participate in sequencing, reading, and grammar centers.

Centers:

#1) Sequencing—Take cards and place them in order of events.

#2) Reading—Free reading in the reading nook

#3) Grammar—Prefixes and Suffixes matching game

Explain that during this time individual oral testing will be done.

## DAY 8

*Review Day*

Read through objectives:

--Today we will review for our unit test

Play PowerPoint game to review for tomorrow's Unit Test.
Songs for Enhancing Productive Vocabulary

Story 1:
Red-Eyed Tree Frog
By Joy Cowley

Key Vocabulary
- evening
- wakes up
- hungry
- slithering
- poisonous
- no longer

The Red-Eyed Tree Frog
(sung to the tune of “Alouette”)

Refrain: (following verse three)
In the **evening**, when we are sleeping
Will he eat a ____________?
the red-eyed tree frog **wakes up hungry**
He will eat a ________________.
______________, ____________, ohh...

*Will he eat a(n) ______?*

*He won’t eat a(n) ________.*

_____________, ____________, ohh..., (refrain)

Coda (following verse four):

*In the morning, when we are waking,*

the red-eyed tree frog is **no longer** hungry.

Verse One: iguana

Verse Two: poisonous caterpillar

Verse Three: slithering snake

Verse Four: crunchy moth
Story 2:
What Do You Do When Something Wants To Eat You?
by Steve Jenkins

Key Vocabulary
- Predator
- Prey
- Surprise
- Protect
- Attack

Attack of the Predators
(sung to the tune of “The Ant Go Marching One by One”)

A *predator* looks for animals to eat

*They are called its* *prey*.

Sometimes predators *surprise* their prey

*But sometimes the prey sneaks away.*

Try hard, prey!

Their looking for you.

Hide yourselves,

It’s what you must do
to *protect* yourselves from the

*attack* of the predators.
Story 3:
Grandpa Toad’s Secrets
By Keiko Kasza

Key Vocabulary:
• Humongous
• Scared
• Enemy
• Brave
• Secret
• Hide

Smart Move
by Shirleyann Costigan (Schifini et. al., 2004)

Don’t be **scared**

Here’s what to do

If a **humongous enemy**

Wants to eat you!

Protect yourself from

That awful beast.

Here’s the **secret**.

**Hide** underneath

A bigger beast

With bigger teeth!

What a **brave** thing to do!
December 2008

Dear ESL Parents or Guardians:

I am currently completing my Masters in ESL through Hamline University and as part of this process I will be conducting research within my classroom. The results from this research will be made public and ultimately be printed and shelved in Hamline’s Bush Library and available online. It may be published or used in other scholarly ways.

The purpose of my study is to determine how effective the use of songs is in helping students enhance their English vocabulary. Research will be conducted during regular ESL classes. I will study the second grade students and introduce them to new vocabulary words using songs. I will also assess them to see if the instruction was successful. I will be compiling this data through oral and written vocabulary tests. Your child’s responses may be tape recorded. The results will be used in my final research paper. I hope the results of this study will assist teachers in helping English language learners learn more new vocabulary.

If your child is used in my study, his or her identity will be protected and remain confidential. I am asking for your permission to allow your child to participate in this study. Participation is strictly voluntary and you are not obligated to consent. Withdrawal from the study is possible at any time.

If you are in need of additional information or have questions about your child’s data privacy, please contact me, Nicole Winter, at nwinter@austin.k12.mn.us or by phone at 507-440-4027. You may also contact Chris Picha at cpicha@austin.k12.mn.us or by phone at 507-433-0968. To speak with a Spanish language interpreter, please contact Valentina Gallegos at vgallegos@austin.k12.mn.us or by phone at 507-433-4624.

I have received permission to conduct this research from Chris Picha at Austin Public Schools and Andreas Schramm, from Hamline University. I appreciate your help in this study. I look forward to exploring new ways to help your child gain English more effectively.

Sincerely,

Ms. Nicole Winter
ESL Teacher
Southgate Elementary School

I, _______________________ , hereby allow my child _______________________________ to participate in Ms. Nicole Winter’s research study on vocabulary instruction.

Signature:     Date:
Deciembre 2008

Estimados Padres o Personas Responsables de Estudiantes en ESL:

En la actualidad me encuentro terminando mi licenciatura superior en ESL (ingles como segunda lengua) a través de la Universidad Hamline y como parte del proceso estaré dirigiendo una investigación con mi salón de clase. Los resultados de este proyecto se harán públicos y al final impresos y colocados en las repisas de la Biblioteca Bush de Hamline y disponibles en la web. También puede ser publicado y usado por otros con fines educativos.

El propósito de mi estudio es determinar si el uso de canciones es efectivo para ayudar a los estudiantes a mejorar su vocabulario en inglés. La investigación se va a llevar a cabo durante el horario normal de las clases de ESL. Yo haré mi estudio con los estudiantes de segundo grado y les presentaré nuevo vocabulario usando canciones. Los evaluaré para ver si la instrucción fue exitosa y estaré recopilando esta información por medio de exámenes orales y escritos. Las respuestas de su hijo pueden ser grabadas. Los resultados pueden ser usados en mi trabajo de investigación final. Yo espero que este estudio pueda asistir a los maestros en la enseñanza de nuevo vocabulario en inglés.

Si su hijo es utilizado en mi proyecto, su identidad será protegida y permanecerá confidencial. Yo le solicito permiso para que su estudiante pueda participar en este estudio. La participación es estrictamente voluntaria y usted no esta obligado a dar su consentimiento. También es posible retirarse en cualquier momento.

Si usted necesita información adicional o tiene preguntas sobre la privacidad de los datos de su hijo, por favor comuníquese conmigo, Nicole Winter, a mi correo electrónico [nwinter@austin.k12.mn.us] o por teléfono al [507-440-4027]. También puede contactar a Chris Picha por correo electrónico a [cpicha@austin.k12.mn.us] o llamando al [507-433-0968]. Para comunicarse con nuestra intérprete en español, Valentina Gallegos, puede hacerlo por correo electrónico a [vgallegos@austin.k12.mn.us] o por teléfono al [507-433-4624].

Para realizar este proyecto yo he recibido permiso de Chris Picha en las Escuelas Públicas de [ ] y de Andreas Schramm, en la Universidad de Hamline. Yo le agradezco mucho su colaboración. Estoy deseosa de explorar nuevas maneras de ayudar a su hijo a que aprenda inglés mas efectivamente.

Atentamente,

Srita. Nicole Winter
Maestra de ESL
Escuela de Primaria [ ]

Yo, ______________________ , autorizo a mi hijo ___________________________ a participar en la investigación de la Srita. Nicole Winter sobre enseñanza de vocabulario.

Firma: ___________________________ Fecha: ___________
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