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Abstract

The purpose of this 20-week language-based after-school program was to develop a group of Hawaiian students’ English cognitive language skills while they learned a second language at their local youth center. The context, input, process, product evaluation (CIPP) model approach was used to evaluate the impacts of a structured language-based after-school program. A diverse sample of participants was evaluated through semi-structured interviews, surveys, class observations, feedback, and the students’ academic progress. After the collected data were triangulated, it was learned that the language-based after-school program has a positive outcome, which denotes a statistical significant improvement regarding the students’ English language skills. Further, a paired sample t-test revealed statistical improvement of the students’ pre- and post-reading, fluency, and comprehension diagnostic assessments. Qualitative data from interviews supports the cause to implement an on-going structured language-based after-school program at the local youth center.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The purpose of this program evaluation study was to explore and evaluate the design and implementation of a language-based after-school program. The intent of the language-based instruction offered in this program was to develop a group of Hawaiian students’ English cognitive language acquisition skills while they learn a second language at a local youth center.

The context, input, process, product evaluation model (CIPP) was used as a framework to evaluate the program. CIPP is a model approach developed by Stufflebeam (1971) and is widely used as a framework for program evaluation. CIPP also provides a systematic method of monitoring and modifying different aspects of a program. A mixed methods approach was used to answer the research questions guiding the study.

The development and implementation of the language-based after-school program is based on preliminary consultations with teachers, parents, and the director of the youth center. These consultations reveal common concerns regarding language development for elementary school students. The concerns were evidenced by the Hawaii Smarter Balanced Assessments results for the academic years 2014 thru 2016. The results of these assessments indicated that students in the State of Hawaii ranked between 48% to 51% proficiency in English Language skills (Hawaii State Department of Education, 2016). As a result of this initial investigation, a language-based approach was determined to be appropriate for this after-school program.

Further investigation into the literature revealed that after-school programs are most effective when they are well-structured (Little, Wimer, & Weiss, 2008). The term well- structured means that in order for these programs to be successful, they must be organized and provide quality programming tailored to students’ interests (Vandell & Reisner, 2004). Studies performed by the Afterschool Alliance (2008) indicate that the structure must be in alignment with the needs of the student population and the needs identified by the schools, which the students attend. A
strong partnership between families, stakeholders, schools and the community, is essential to the success and development of an organized and structured after-school program. Well-structured after-school programs also employ qualified staff to assist students with their homework, and have classrooms settings that are restricted from becoming a social “hang-out” meeting place for students, in order for them to show academic improvement (Afterschool Alliance, 2014; Teitle, 2012; Wallace Foundation, 2013).

The beginning of the 21st century has revitalized and renewed the interest and demand in learning foreign languages. Initial research suggests that there are many benefits of learning a second language or multiple languages. Learning a second language is beneficial for growth in first language skills, enhances career opportunities, promotes culture awareness and competence, improves cognitive and executive functions, prevents or delays mental illness, and facilitates travel (Murphy, Macaro, Alba, & Cipolla, 2015). Taking the initiative to learn a second language is helpful for English language speakers to improve their linguistic skills as they become literate in their native language (Kalia, Wilbourn, & Ghio, 2014; Lee, Shetgiri, Barina, Tilitski, & Flores, 2015; Sousa, 2011; Tillitski & Flores, 2015).

According to the “Regarding World Language Education,” NEA Research (2007), a lack of knowledge of foreign languages and its cultures is a threat to the United States’ national security and will contribute to the inability to compete in the global marketplace. There are many benefits to learning a second language, but the primary challenge is that student instruction in a second language begins too late in the public school’s instructional program to provide students with the full benefits of becoming bi-literate. Students miss their ideal time window to enhance their cognitive performance (Genesee, 2000; Kalia et al., 2014; Sousa, 2011).
Foreign language instruction in the United States generally occurs during the secondary school academic period. This time frame is outside the optimal language-learning window of opportunity, which is up to the age of 11 (Kim & Lust 2016; Sabourin, 2014; Sousa, 2011).

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework guiding this study is based on second language learning research, brain-based learning research, and studies of structured after-school programs. American students are generally neither academically competitive nor proficient in the English language (Bok, 2006; Conley, 2007; Greene & Foster, 2003). American students rank well below approximately 540,000 students from 72 other countries as per the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) in reading, math, and science (Clough, 2016).

According to Carlson and Meltzoff (2008), learning a second language at the elementary school level improves a child’s cognitive abilities, results in higher academic achievement, and may influence the achievement in other subjects. These three skills are key components for preparing students to enter college and careers and become competitive in an increasingly globalized economy, and world (Afterschool Alliance, 2010). However, beyond the age of 11, learning another language becomes far more difficult, as children no longer respond to different phonemic sounds, other than those constantly heard and repeated (Genesee, 2000; Murphy et al., 2015; Sousa, 2011).

There are substantial benefits from learning a second language as well as improvements in the literacy skills of students’ first language (Genesee, 2000; Kalia et al., 2014; Murphy et al., 2015). Well-structured after-school programs have been shown to have a positive effect on students’ academics, social development, and crime and dropout prevention—particularly for disadvantaged children (Afterschool Alliance, 2014; Wallace Foundation, 2011). For example, a structured after-school program may be one that focuses on meeting the linguistic needs of English
Language Learners (ELLs), “Activities for English Language Learners,” or a prevention program, “Drug and Violence Prevention, Counseling, and Character Education” (Wallace Foundation, 2011). A well-structured approach is used for the after-school program.

Statement of the Problem

The problem that formed the basis for the study is the low achievement in English Language Arts skills of students in the State of Hawaii. The Hawaii Smarter Balanced Assessments results for academic years 2014 through 2016 reveal that Hawaiian students scored between 48% to 51% proficiency in English Language skills. A significant percentage of Hawaiian students are ELLs, and their linguistic needs are not being met (Hawaii Language Initiative, 2013; Hawaii State Department of Education, 2016). Most of the participating students in this program evaluation study are ELLs who are not literate in their own native languages such as Spanish, Japanese, Samoan, Filipino, and Hawaiian, but instead choose to speak only English or Pidgin at home, and amongst their peers. Based on the initial investigation of the needs of the community, formal English language development is most critically needed.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this program evaluation study was to explore and evaluate the design and implementation of a language-based after-school program. The intent of the language-based instruction offered in this program is to develop a group of Hawaiian students’ English cognitive language acquisition skills while they learn a second language at the local youth center. The CIPP model was used as a framework to evaluate the program.

As previously mentioned, CIPP is a model developed by Stufflebeam (1971) and is widely used as a framework to evaluate programs. This model provides a systematic method of monitoring and modifying different aspects of the program. Further, a mixed methods approach was used to answer the research questions posed for the study.
Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What are the needs in the community, which provide a basis for the development of a structured after-school program for elementary school students?
2. What are classroom teachers’ perceptions of students’ formal language usages in the classroom after students participated in the after-school program?
   Sub question. What are parents’ and students’ perceptions of formal language usage in the classroom, after students participated in the after-school program?
3. What evidence was found in meeting the programs goals of developing literacy skills and global awareness, and what was the significance of the findings?

Significance of the Study

This program evaluation study provides a source for valuable insights into program development for after-school programs and the effectiveness of the program evaluation approach. The results of this study may be taken into consideration as a model for other unstructured programs. This study further provides guidance for designing, implementing, and evaluating after school programs.

Research Design

The CIPP model was selected for this program evaluation study because it provides the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information regarding how the after-school program at the youth center is being implemented. Through the use of this model, a formative evaluation was developed to determine the best method to modify or improve the program (Sancar, Baturay, & Fadde, 2013). Further, there are four evaluation functions included in the CIPP model,
which assist the researcher to make the best decisions regarding modifying and improving the program. Each of the four components of the CIPP model play a broader role as described by Stufflebeam (1971a) as follows:

1. **Context evaluation** serves planning decisions by identifying unmet needs, unused opportunities, and underlying problems, which prevent the meeting of needs or the use of opportunities.

2. **Input evaluation** serves structuring decisions by projecting and analyzing alternative procedural designs.

3. **Process evaluation** serves implementing decisions by monitoring project operations.

4. **Product evaluation** serves implementing decisions by determining the degree to which objectives have been achieved and by determining the cause of the obtained results. (p. 268)

This program evaluation study was designed to explore the implementation of an after-school program at a youth center located in one of the Hawaiian Islands. The research site for the study is located between an affordable apartment complex and a tropical island beach. Next to the youth center is a small Hawaiian church, and an ambulance and first responders’ station. This one-story building provides a safe environment for community children to meet after-school, and it serves 155 students between the ages of 6–17 (director of youth center, personal communication, January 23, 2017).

A flyer was distributed to students in grades 3–5 at the community elementary schools and the youth center to recruit students for the after-school program. The youth center has one classroom, which has been converted to a homework and computer room. It is in this classroom where the after-school program was conducted. The space in the homework and computer room is limited; therefore, the program accepted the first 20 students who enrolled.
A mixed methods approach, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative data, was used. The purpose for using the qualitative and quantitative data was to compare the data and further validate the findings to establish trustworthiness as suggested by Kolb (2012). This approach of analyzing qualitative and quantitative data provided opportunities to identify themes and patterns.

One of the instruments used for this program evaluation study included semi-structured interviews, which are the foundation of case study evaluation (Morra & Friedlander, n.d.). Parents were contacted by phone regarding their willingness to participate in a one-on-one interview. Additionally, they were given a paper survey to take home and return to this researcher in 2 weeks. Additional instruments were also used in this study.

**Semi-Structured Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews were used to determine parents’ perspectives of the implementation of an after-school program that provides students at the youth center an opportunity to improve their cognitive language acquisition skills and increases cultural awareness through the process of learning a second language. Semi-structured interviews are commonly used because they are the foundation of case study evaluation (Morra & Friedlander, n.d.). Parents were asked to select a convenient time and place for a one-to-one interview with this researcher. This researcher transcribed the interviews and then used member checking to further verify the accuracy of the data collected.

**Parent and Student Surveys**

Another instrument used for this case study was paper surveys. The surveys were administered to the students and their parents at the youth center to assess their perceptions of the after-school program.
Pre- and post- Diagnostic Assessments

Sube and Wonders’ pre- and post-diagnostic assessments of the after-school program were administered to the students during the course of the 20-week program. This is a language- and research-based program, which is appropriate for use with elementary school students. The instructor administered the assessments, which were hand delivered to the independent assessors. The pre- and post-test scores were coded, analyzed, and compared using a paired t-test and a significance level of p < .05.

Another strategy used was acquiring informal feedback from students and their parents during the program. As both the researcher and instructor for the program, a reflective journal was maintained throughout the evaluation process. Daily notes regarding the interactions between students, engagement of students throughout the after-school program, and any comments and suggestions made by students, staff members, and director of the youth center, were recorded and reflected on for analysis of the after-school program.

Feedback

Observation and summative feedback was provided by the director of the youth center and the staff member who was in the classroom on a daily basis.

Limitations of the Study

As with any study, there are potential limitations, biases, assumptions, and delimitations, which must be taken into consideration. The main limitation of this study was the small sample size, which was limited to one after school program site and which limited the generalizability of the study. This study also may not be generalized because of a unique island mindset and life style of the student and parent population in a unique single study site.

Another limitation was that this evaluation relied on student participation in taking pre- and post- assessments, completing surveys, and parent interviews. It was possible that the students and
parents who participated in the study may not have been willing to take assessments if they knew they do not have to or were unable to dedicate the time required because of conflicts.

The 23 students who enrolled to participate in the after-school program may not be consistent regarding attendance. This could be a limitation. Hawaiian students are generally known for chronic absenteeism (Hawaii State Department of Education, n.d.).

**Delimitation of the Study**

The delimitation of this study reflects that there were 23 students who represent three grade levels (third, fourth, and fifth grades). The youth center has only one classroom, which has been converted to a homework and computer room where additional students are present during the program. It is in this small and crowded classroom where the after-school program was conducted; therefore, other students may have caused interruptions, which may have distracted students in the program from their lessons.

**Ethical Issues**

Students and their parents who participated in the structured after-school program were eligible for participation in this study. Parents who agreed to participate were asked to sign a consent form, and students who have permission from their parents, were asked to sign an assent form. The form was read to the students, and they were assured that if they decided not to participate in this study that it would not affect them in any way.

The director of the program and the youth center staff member who work daily in the classroom where instruction will take place were also asked to sign a consent form. Additionally, two experienced educators from the Hawaii Department of Education were recruited to grade the collected data and were asked to sign a consent form.

Participants were informed of their rights to withdraw or not participate in the study without penalty. Contact information and the procedures to withdraw were provided to the participants, and
data from participants who withdraw from the study was deleted. No names were used during this study, and only codes will be used for data collection to further protect the participants. The names and codes were kept in a locked filing cabinet, and any link between student codes and personal information will be kept in a separate secure location. No one but this researcher will have access to the data collected. After 3 years, all data, consent forms, and any personal information linked to the participants will be destroyed.

Participants were informed that there would not be consequences for withdrawing from the study, and they also had the right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Participants were provided contact information and procedures for withdrawing from the study. This study would have still been conducted even in the event that only one parent and one student participated.

A conflict of interest existed in this study because the researcher, instructor, and developer of the program were the same person who also invested in supplies for the program. In order to control bias and the conflict of interest, the following practices were put in place:

Two professional educators with 15 years of teaching experience each were recruited to volunteer their time and talents to be independent assessors of student work for this program.

Intensive research of the literature was conducted to serve as a basis for formulating the program goals and aims for the after-school program.

- All curriculum material for the program was research-based.
- All instructional strategies used for the program were research-based.
- The instructor’s direct supervisor and the director of the youth center conducted an evaluation of the daily instruction and program goals.
- A youth center staff member was in place for all instructional sessions and provided daily feedback on the instructional engagement of students in the program.
- Member checking was used to validate the data from interviews.
• The coding methods were clearly specified.

• The youth center provided a letter of approval to this researcher for both the after-school program, and this study.

Definitions of Key Terms

*CIPP model:* The CIPP model is an evaluation model based on decision-making, regarding the improvement of the implementation of a program (Stufflebeam, 1971).

*Conceptual framework:* The conceptual framework is a roadmap which guides the researcher to investigate all of the initial preparation of a study in order to create, implement, and evaluate the intent of a study (Regoniel, 2015)

*Cultural awareness:* Cultural awareness is the understanding of the difference between oneself and people from other countries or backgrounds, especially differences in attitudes and values (Crawford & Kirby, 2008).

*Engagement:* With regards to education, engagement is defined as the degree of attention, interest, curiosity, and optimism students exhibit when they are learning or being taught (Sibold, 2011).

*English Language Learner (ELL):* An ELL is a non-native English speaking person with limited English proficiency (Murphy et al., 2015).

*Formal language:* Formal language is defined as the language which students require the ability to use the English order rules (i.e., lexicon and semantics in oral and written text) to successfully focus on the language and content of a subject area (Jasmer, 2010).

*Global awareness:* Global awareness refers to the understanding of concepts, which affect the world and encompasses, but is not limited to environmental, social, cultural, political, and economic relations (Crawford & Kirby, 2008).

*Language acquisition skills:* Language acquisition skills are defined as the ability to
understand, process, and produce language (Sousa, 2006).

*Language processing:* Language processing refers to the manner in which the brain processes the human expressions of feelings and ideas. This language process takes place in the parietal cortex of the brain (Sabourin, 2014).

*Pidgin:* Pidgin is defined as the formation of Creole language between diverse cultures, which does not share a common language (Punahu School, n.d.).

*Second language learning:* Second language learning is used to describe a language that is different from the primary or native language (Murphy et al., 2015).

*Well-structured after-school program:* A well-structured after-school program refers to a well-planned and highly organized program (Center for Youth Program Quality, 2008).

**Summary**

This chapter discussed the research problem and study design for a program evaluation study and evaluating the implementation of a structured after-school program. The CIPP model was discussed and was used as a framework in this study to evaluate the program. Chapter 2 discusses the review of literature pertaining to learning a second language and after-school programs.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

The literature reviewed for this study focused on research pertaining to a language-based program like the one implemented at the youth center located in one of the Hawaiian Islands in this study and the effect of second language learning on academic literacy. Studies performed by the Afterschool Alliance (2008) and the Harvard Family Research Project (2015) indicated that not only do after-school programs have to be structured, but they must also offer high quality, well-designed programs to enhance students’ academic success in school. Well-implemented and well-structured programs can have a positive impact on academic, social development, and crime prevention, particularly for disadvantaged children (Harvard Family Research Project, 2003).

After-school programs are designed to enhance academic performance, promote socio-emotional intelligences, develop social skills, and prevent inappropriate and risk-full behavior (Cross, Gottfredson, Wilson, Rorie, & Connell, 2010). The intention is to provide parents a safe haven for their children to spend after-school hours playing, or participating in fun activities.

Berstein-Yamashiro and Noam (2013) noted that students who attend after-school programs are potentially learning for approximately 15 extra hours per week. The students partake in activities for approximately 160–240 hours per year while guided by adult coaches, youth center staff members, or other non-teacher adults. It is important that these programs have qualified staff and local professionals from within the community to develop a strong relationship with the students.

Professional and non-professional volunteers need to communicate with the students’ teachers in an effort to provide the appropriate assistance. McGarrell (2007) endorsed the positive involvement of supportive adults and described the effectiveness of after-school programs as not only to improve academics and acquire 21st century skills, but also as crime prevention deterrents that assist young students to avoid involvement in group delinquency activities, and substance
abuse. He further asserted that students must feel that they are in a non-threatening environment. By creating interactive activities, the adults will motivate learning. According to Levine (2002), students role-play and rehearse through activities, games, music, visuals, and movement in order to strengthen their social and language skills.

Regular participation in such after-school programs has narrowed the academic achievement gap between high-income and low-income students, improved academic behavior, and reduced school absences (Bacalu, 2011; Harvard Family Research Project, 2006). Additionally, such programs have a positive impact on academics, social development, the prevention of crime, and can lower the school dropout rate. Some communities have after-school programs with limited structure, which generally have minimal impact on students’ academic achievements (Burdumy, Dynarski, & Deke, 2007).

This study was designed to evaluate the implementation of a structured language-based after-school program. Research for this study consisted of related studies on bilingual education, language development, and well-structured after-school programs. The literature review consists of two parts. The benefits of a structured and organized after-school program, which provides students an opportunity to learn a second language, while congruently improving their English cognitive language acquisition skills, and the benefits of learning a second language at an elementary school age is part one. The strategies used to obtain pertinent information regarding this study include databases, which include internet sites such as Google Scholar, ERIC, Journal of Adolescence Sage Publication, Bilingual Journal, Applied Psycholinguistics, Journal of Cognitive Psychology, Journal of Experimental Psychology, CALdigest, Wiley Online Library, Taylor & Francis Online, JSTOR, International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, Economics, Management, and Financial Markets, and Concordia University Doctorate of Education Library is part two. Search terms for the literature review include: benefits of bilingual
education, economic value in bilingualism, structured after-school programs, brain research in bilingualism, global awareness, and PISA.

**Historical Overview of Language Education in Hawaii**

In November 3, 1910, the first Manoa Japanese after-school language program in Hawaii was established (Manoa Japanese School, n.d.). Soon after, other after-school language-based programs followed, which also taught foreign languages such as Chinese, Mandarin, and Korean that were established post-WWII (Atkinson, 1947). Their main purpose was to promote a foreign language in order to maintain their primary language, teach children to value the traditions of the culture. Further, the students would become the future leaders and ambassadors between their foreign country and the United States.

All foreign language schools in Hawaii were closed and remained closed when the United States entered WWII in 1941. Soon after the war several language schools attempted to reopen, but it proved to be difficult due to the restrictions and political post war demands (Atkinson, 1947; Conklin, 2005; Nakamura, n.d.). During the war, it was forbidden to speak the Hawaiian language, and several generations passed until the creation of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs in 1978. Table 1 shows the timeline of language in Hawaii.
Table 1

*Language Timeline in the Hawaiian Islands*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Language Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Public education system established by King Kamehameha III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Hawaiian Kingdom overthrown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Hawaiian Language banned in public schools; English only spoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Manoa Japanese after-school language program established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>All language schools (Japanese, Chinese, Korean) closed during/post WWII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Hawaii became the 50th State of the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Hawaiian State Constitution amendment – aimed at promoting Hawaiian culture, language, and history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Hawaiian Language Immersion Program established and language schools reopened (Japanese, Chinese, Mandarin, Korean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Hawaiian Language Immersion Program and Language Fluency approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Hawaiian Language Immersion Program and Language Fluency amended to establish the Office of Hawaiian Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Office of Hawaiian Education officially established under the Office of the Superintendent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conceptual Framework**

A conceptual framework is an organized “road map” which allows the researcher to investigate all of the initial preparation in order to create, implement, and evaluate the intent of a study (Regoniel, 2015). It guides the researcher to investigate the relationships between the conceptual frameworks’ components, which are interwoven within a study. The conceptual framework for this study was based on research which supported the implementation of the language-based after-school program.
According to Kalia et al. (2014), there are benefits in learning a second language at the elementary school level, as opposed to middle or high school. The instruction in a second language is shown to improve a child’s cognitive abilities, which results in higher academic achievement, and positively influences the achievement in other subjects (Cosden, Morrison, Gutierrez, & Brown, 2004; Stewart, 2005). Further advantages are learning a second language of advanced executive functions and multitasking skills, better cognitive functioning, enhanced creativity, and also delays in the development of Alzheimer’s and Dementia (Sabourin, 2014; Sousa, 2011).

After-school programs without structure have little effect on academic achievements (Burdumy et al., 2007). Figure 1 provides a theoretical road map of the benefits of a structured after-school program for elementary school age children to learn a second language and the contextualized effect of simultaneously obtaining global and cultural awareness.
There are substantial benefits of students learning a second language, as well as improvements in the literacy skills of their first language, as noted in a study by Victoria A. Murphy, Ernesto Macaro, Sonia Alba, and Claudia Cipolla, in 2013. These researchers investigated whether learning a second language (L2) at the primary school level, has a positive effect on the primary language (L1).

By mid-adolescence, the areas of the brain primarily involved in learning a second language are no longer responsive to foreign sounds, because the brain is no longer responsive to the phonemic sounds of different languages (Kalia, Wilbourn, & Ghio, 2014; Pelham & Abrams, 2014; Sabourin, 2014; Sousa, 2011). Therefore, it is preferable that students acquire a second language earlier in their lives, when the brain is actively creating phonemic sound and syntactic networks.

After-school programs with limited structure have little impact on academic achievements. James Burgomy, Dynanski, & Deke Kalia, Parramore, Wilbourn, & Ghio (2014) indicated that learning to speak a second language improves the functionality of a child’s brain, and also challenges the brain to recognize and negotiate meaning in problem-solving tasks.

Instruction in a second language is shown to improve a child’s cognitive abilities, which results in higher academic achievement, and positively influences the achievement in other subjects (Stewart, 2005; Cosden, Morrison, Gutierrez, and Brown, 2004). Further advantages are: learning a second language of advanced executive functions and multitasking skills, better cognitive functioning, enhanced creativity, and it also delays the development of Alzheimer’s and Dementia (Sabourin, 2014; Sousa, 2011).

The importance of Academic Language:
Both L1s and L2s require direct instruction using academic language, in order for students to acquire abstract concepts, multiple meaning words and content vocabulary (Sibold 2011)

Benefits of Second Language:
It improves students’ academics, cognitive abilities, and prevents mental illness. Carlson & Meltzoff (2008); Murphy, Macaro, Alba, & Cipolla (2013); Kalia, Wilbourn, & Ghio (2014); Sabourin (2014)

Literacy Requirements:
Students are not academically competitive, or proficient in English. Conley, (2011); Bok (2006); Greene & Foster (2005)

Music, dance, and games are used to teach a second language. Murphy, Marcaro, Alba, & Cipolla (2013)

Foreign language education is offered too late in public schools. Kalia, Wilbourn, & Ghio (2014)

**Figure 1.** Conceptual Framework: Language-based after-school program.

Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences has had a profound effect on the methodology of teaching young children, and it suggests that teachers deliver their lessons using a variety of engaging methods, in order to meet the unique intelligences of every student in their classrooms (as cited in Armstrong, 2009). Researchers such as Murphy et al. (2015) used games and music to engage their participants. Music, dance, songs, and games were also used in the after-school program evaluated for this study to engage the students who participated in learning a second language. The use of games, music, dance, and songs, are key components, which are commonly used in order to tap into the students’ multiple intelligences.

Most countries have accepted the English language as an international language standard, and it serves as lingua franca in a globalized world (Kormo & Middles, 2013). American students learn English first and then their English skills are advanced. But studies show that a significant
number of American students are neither academically competitive nor proficient in the English language, which they will require in order to compete internationally (Bok, 2006; Conley, 2007; Greene & Foster, 2003). Studies also show that there is a relatively small window of opportunity for children to learn multiple languages. Beyond the age of 7, learning another language becomes far more difficult because children no longer respond to different phonemic sounds other than those constantly heard and repeated (Chiswick, 2007; Hakuta, Bialystok & Wiley, 2003; Pufahl & Rhodes, 2011; Sousa, 2006, 2011). The research provides support for beginning instruction during earlier grades, as opposed to during secondary grades.

Although most American students are considerably technologically advanced, they are not sufficiently prepared to work with or for people of non-American cultures (Bok, 2006). American students, living in the 21st century generally have an inadequate academic and global awareness, which prevents them from becoming effective and productive global citizens or competitive professionals in order to overcome unforeseen challenges (Braskamp, 2008).

The requirements for mastering English language skills form the theoretical blueprint for preparing students for college and their careers. A broad range of metacognitive and cognitive capabilities are needed as well as effective reading, writing, speaking and listening skills, which will enable them to exhibit the expression of critical thinking, regarding specific content knowledge (Conley, 2007). Language instruction is important, so that students are able to develop these skills.

There are substantial benefits from students learning a second language and improvements in the literacy skills of their first language as noted in a study by Murphy et al. (2015). The researchers investigated whether learning a second language at the primary level has a positive effect on the primary language. A mixed methods approach was used, and pre- and post-tests were analyzed to measure the students’ linguistic competence. Levels of the students’ listening,
Speaking, reading, and writing skills were assessed as well as other grapheme and phoneme skills. Games and songs were used throughout the program to assist motivating the students to interact with each other while they were learning and improving their first language of Italian and their second language, French. The results of the study showed that there are substantial benefits from learning a second language and improvements in the literacy skills of students’ first language.

**Research Evidence from the Literature**

**Second Language Learning and the Brain**

Kalia et al. (2014) indicated that learning to speak a second language improves the functionality of a child’s brain, and it challenges the brain to recognize and negotiate meaning during problem solving tasks. Learning to communicate in the second language also improves first language skills. Although learning takes place in the brain through multiple sensory and sensorimotor experiences, not all individuals learn exactly the same way, or at the same time (Birchenall & Muller, 2014; Gardner, 1993; Sousa, 2011). Students who learn a second language improve their language acquisition when using words accompanied with gestures as opposed to listening and reading only. These gestures ignite sensory modality, which results in the motor system creating a very intricate representation of the brain’s networks and in improved language retention (Friederici & Warternburger, 2010).

There are immediate and lasting effects of music and second language training simply because they both use the same acoustic cues such as pitch, timing, and timber to process learning. Both musicians’ and bilinguals’ brains have the ability for strong cognitive development because they both use intensive memorization, multisensory coordination, and monitoring, which results in effective executive functions. Further research regarding multiple intelligences and how the brain is uniquely wired is necessary, in order to assist educators to effectively teach modern generations.
of students to abandon the narrow-minded teaching, which is motivated and driven by standardize testing (Moreno, Lee, Janus, & Bialystok, 2014).

**Language Processing and the Brain**

John Locke, a British philosopher, proposed that a person was born with all the brain cells that they would ever have, that the brain was born essentially empty and was later filled in by personal experiences. A newborn’s brain is a tabula rosa, which is also known as a blank slate (as cited in Lombardi, 2008). New research studies indicate that the brain has the ability to grow new dendrites and neural connections every time it learns something (Lombardi, 2008).

In a 1996 study by Diamond, rats were placed in two categories named “enriched environment” and “improvised environment.” The rats placed in the enriched environment showed an increase in the thickness of the cortex, which resulted in their brain cells increasing in amplitude and liveliness (as cited in Lombardi, 2008). Diamond also asserted that these brain cells lengthen the tips of their dendrites, which are the branches that receive messages from other cells. This increase in the dendrites surface area allows for increased communication with other cells, which multiply accordingly. The nerve cells can grow at any age in response to intellectual enrichment, and therefore it is believed that the same phenomenon is also true with humans.

The brain grows every time a person learns something new. The dendrites and neural connections are the branching process of a neuron that conducts impulses toward the cell, and grow (Salk Institute of Science, 2014). Neurons are constantly producing, particularly in the learning and memory areas, and therefore give birth to a new understanding of language acquisition. A combination of listening and vocalization results in a human connection, and it appears to be the most advantageous method of acquiring a second language (Genesee, 2000).

Language processing takes place in the parietal cortex of the brain. This area of the brain is a region in the left frontal lobe, now commonly referred to as the Broca’s area where language
processes word order and meaning and where the rules of grammar take place. An area located in the left inferior parietal cortex of the brain has also been found to be active, to some extent, in the process of language processing (Sabourin, 2014).

Noam Chomsky, an MIT linguist, theorized that young children could not possibly learn the rules of language syntax and grammar, merely by imitating adults. He proposed that language is pre-wired in the human brain at birth. Babies’ brains are capable of responding to the sounds of global tongues, but it is important to note that there is a considerable variation among individual children, because all children learn differently and at a different pace (as cited in Birchenall & Muller, 2014; Gardner, 1971; Sousa, 2011).

**Bilingualism and Effect on Language Development**

By mid-adolescence, the areas of the brain primarily involved in learning a second language are no longer responsive to foreign sounds because the brain is no longer responsive to the phonemic sounds of different languages. Therefore, it is imperative that students acquire a second language earlier in their lives when the brain is actively creating phonemic sound and syntactic networks. Teaching children a second language during their primary years, will most likely create fluent bilingual students (Kalia et al., 2014; Pelham & Abrams, 2014; Sabourin, 2014; Sousa, 2011). Language exposure during key maturational age periods is vital to achieve language proficiency, behavior mastery, and native-like language organization in the brain (Kovelman, Baker, & Petitto, 2008).

Children who are raised in bilingual families have the innate ability to acquire two languages simultaneously as a result of their environmental exposure. These children are referred to as *simultaneous bilinguals*. The bilingual brain shows an increase in brain activity in both the left and right hemisphere with greater activation in the right hemisphere’s equivalent of Broca’s
area. This is a region on the left frontal lobe that is believed to be responsible for processing vocabulary, syntax, and grammar (Sabourin, 2014; Sousa, 2011).

The right-hemisphere activity regarding language processing for simultaneous bilinguals as toddlers is not found in individuals who learned a second language later in life (Hull & Vaid, 2007). Bilingual language processing takes place in the Broca area as Sousa (2006) noted. Studies also demonstrate that additional regions of activation increase in the second language because word retrieval in second language bilingual speakers is more demanding (Sabourin, 2014; Sousa, 2011).

Not all researchers agree with the ideal time for learning a second language, which is generally considered to be birth to 11 years old (Souse, 2011). All children are different, they learn differently and at a different pace; they are considered to have unique intelligences and being “wired” differently (Birchenall & Muller, 2014; Howard, 1971; Macedonia, 2010). Older learners are more native-like in their second language pronunciation than younger learners. No age effects are shown for later learners of a second language (Hirsh, Morrison, Gaset, & Carnicer, 2003; Trofimovic & Baker, 2006). Early bilinguals induct left sensorimotor regions to perform the second language task while later bilinguals are more likely to activate and engage other regions of the brain (Waldron & Hernandez, 2013).

For people who learn a second language at an older age, the two language areas are spatially separated. This is because the second language is not a native language and not learned simultaneously as compared to the simultaneous bilinguals who learn a second language early in life (Sabourin, 2014). Recent research suggests that both the quality and timing of dual-language exposure play an important role in the different outcomes for bilinguals. Therefore, further research is required to determine the factors accounting for the differences in the density of grey matter of the brain in order to determine the neuro-cognition and language development between
early and late bilinguals (Kalia et al., 2014). Hence, the neural organization of both bilinguals and monolinguals is influenced by environmental experiences. These experiences in early childhood have the potential to yield a life-long impact on behavior as well as on brain organization (Kovelman et al. 2008).

**Teaching Bilingual Students**

The common goal of English proficiency is for students to find a purpose to engage with academic content within the academic context (Frantz, Bailey, Starr, & Perea, 2014). Classroom dialogue, demeanor, teacher’s choice of words, and sentence structure play a very important role in students achieving English proficiency (Sibold, 2011). Teachers who use syntactically highly structured language create an atmosphere that they are professional and knowledgeable experts in multiple subjects (Schleppegrell, 2004).

The best methodology for teaching a second language is to hire bilingual educators who are academically proficient in the second language they are teaching (Guerrero, 1997; Waldron & Hernandez, 2013). Minority teachers who teach dual-immersion programs generally achieve native-like proficiency in the target language. The instruction of phonemic awareness is important because it assists students with reading and comprehension (Sousa, 2011). It is vitally important that educators are well trained and able to incorporate global awareness within their foreign language lessons, including but not limited to their social studies and history lessons (Brakam, 2008). Global awareness has become a revolutionary paradigm shift in schools’ pedagogy (Dill, 2012).

Vocabulary is paramount during a second language acquisition, and students learning a second language must acquire a sizable amount of vocabulary to communicate at the basic level of the targeted language. By introducing a multitude of words, students should be able to
comprehend a broader range of their targeted language, and acquire the ability to communicate effectively (Wilcox & Medina, 2013).

Conflicting research was found regarding clustering vocabulary words in groups of words that are related semantically versus words that are unrelated. Also, some of the discipline mechanisms of first language word learning are applicable to second language vocabulary learning. Students require a significantly longer period to reach the desired assessment benchmark when tested on semantically related words compared to unrelated words (Wilcox & Medina, 2013).

**Listening Skills**

Listening is one of the four major skills of language acquisition, and it plays a vital role in effective communication and for communication to even be achieved. Skills in listening are important for a language learner, as they assist with pronunciation, word stress, vocabulary, and syntax, and the message conveyed by its tone of voice, pitch, and accent. Metacognitive strategies assist the language learner with listening, when using linguistic knowledge or prior knowledge (Renukadevi, 2014).

Listening comprehension is the most difficult skill to develop, especially for English Learners (Su & Liu, 2012). Students must be receptive to what is communicated during the processes of oral communication. In order to develop these skills, the teacher engages the students in the listening process and teaches listening strategies so that students may acquire a high level of listening skills. Students are provided with a variety of relevant materials related to the learner interest and background knowledge (Renukadevi, 2014; Su & Liu, 2012).

Teachers provide explicit listening activities through the method of pre-listening, listening, and post-listening assessments to assist learners to meet classroom expectations. It is important that the learners acknowledge their weaknesses and difficulties and learn from them. However, if
teachers also provide novel approaches to aid their students with the method to answer questions effectively, then the students’ achievement in taking listening comprehension tests improves (Renukadevi, 2014; Shao-Wen & Chung-Hsiang Liu 2012).

On the other hand, Rost (2014) claimed that every person is multilingual. His study supports other studies that claim a child’s brain lateralizes function by the age of 10 and it then becomes problematic to naturally acquire a second language using the method that a child does. The premise of his study is that we are all bound to the development of multilingual competence, but people will fall short of becoming proficient in listening.

Rost (2014) asserted that the primary reason for the lack of proficiency regarding listening skills is due to an obstruction by nature. There are multiple reasons why second language learners will not become proficient in listening skills. Feelings of intrusion and levels of stress that correlate with the lower levels of listening, comprehension, recall, inferential efficiency, and increased responses cause this scenario. Second language learners shift their identity in an attempt to form a meaningful connection with the culture of the targeted language, and the impact of the discomfort leads to poor performance. Despite these challenges, which a novice second language learner faces, he or she may become successful listeners through proper guidance, mindset, and determination (Renukadevi, 2014; & Rost, 2014).

**Phonemic Awareness**

Phonological awareness is critical to listening skills, because one can listen to the sounds of words (phonemes) and differentiate the sounds symbolically in order to read. Students acquire the ability to decode words and retrieve them from already achieved spoken lexicons. The Alphabetic Principle is defined as the understanding that words are made up of letters, and when students learn the letter to sound association, they are in the primary phases of becoming readers in their native language (Goldenberg et al., 2014).
Phonemic awareness is directly connected to the process of learning how to read, because it is composed of three components that consist of linguistic skills, conscious awareness, and the ability to unequivocally manipulate language. Learning a language is an unconscious process that only requires the immersion of an active linguistic environment. Teachers of young children need to encourage play with spoken language to broaden their literacy curriculum. During the skill development of the creating words phase, it is important that students begin to associate the meaning behind these new words. This vocabulary acquisition will assist students to accurately use words when performing oral and written communication (Hoover, 2002).

In Mexico, it is not part of the curriculum to teach students phonemic awareness, and their general language acquisition level in first grade is well below that of students in Spanish instruction classrooms in the United States (Goldenberg et al. 2014). In 2 years, these same students have caught up or surpassed American students who used phonemic awareness instruction in reading. One explanation for this surprising result is that the Mexican students are surrounded by the Spanish language at home, in all subjects, and in their community, whereas American students learning Spanish have limited exposure to the language and culture either at home or school. The authors suggested that further research should be conducted to better understand why phonemic awareness is not necessary when teaching the Spanish language and also to investigate if American educators are misusing their time when teaching the students irrelevant skills.

**Comprehension and Culture**

Once students develop the skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening, they will acquire the ability to not only read text, but also to understand its meaning, which will result in effective comprehension (Sousa, 2011). Literary culture is based on an understanding of culture as a structure for comprehension, and educators must be actively mindful of understanding their students’ culture. This is essential to the delivery of instruction, and therefore when students are
learning a second language, it is important to have them read literature that they can relate to, in order to assist them to connect with their native culture for effectiveness (Rowan, 2001; Guerrero, 1997; Swidler, 1986). Further, it is suggested that through multi-sensory experiences, students may come to understand traditions, customs, and religion of other cultures during holidays (i.e., Dia De Los Muertos, and All Souls Day). Students may become acquainted with other cultures belief systems while learning to read, write, speak, and listen (Rowan, 2001).

Despite the admirable intentions of educators to cultivate a global community within the classroom, Dill (2012) warned of a cultural ideology that may be unconsciously present in classroom methodologies. Educators must balance their individualized perspectives associated with western world liberalism. According to Sousa (2011), it is recommended that students be allotted sufficient time to practice their newly learned reading, writing, speaking and listening skills, in both their native and second languages.

Parents and Bilingual Education

Parents have different perspectives concerning raising bilingual children, but generally, they have strong beliefs and feelings regarding the concerns of bilingualism and language delay. Both monolingual and bilingual students acquire their language development at similar times (King & Fogle, 2006). Some bilingual parents (Spanish/English) favor English-only classes for their children. They firmly believe that by learning English, their children will attain better economic opportunities in their future. They also prefer that their children learn their “native tongue” at home (Lee et al., 2015).

The difficulty with such a scenario is that not all parents are sufficiently academically literate in their native language; therefore, they may not be properly teaching reading, writing, and speaking a non-English language accurately, which adds to the challenges in learning English as a second language (Guerrero, 1997; Lee et al., 2015). Other bilingual parents maintain that it is
admirable and valuable to have the ability to speak two or more languages, and it is also an important method to maintain one’s family culture and language (King & Fogle, 2006). Those who speak and read the local language within their communities will generally acquire employment, and will also most likely be more productive. However, there are no guarantees that they will be directly compensated for their ability to communicate with others in two or more languages, because the primary language for doing business is English.

Language and Diversity Policies

The states within the United States, which passed English Only laws, such as Proposition 203, 2000 (Arizona) and Proposition 227, 1998 (California), requiring English to be taught as the primary language, currently serve the largest ELL population in America. The English Only movement contradicts the evidence, which conveys the benefits of bilingual education (Borden, 2014). In order to protect the rights of second language learners, a lawsuit, *Lau v. Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563, 94 S. Ct. 786 (1974), was brought before the United States Supreme Court. The court ruled that students who do not speak English are being denied their constitutional rights regarding acquiring a quality education comparable with other students. Therefore, the court ordered educational institutions to reform their practices (as cited in Leal & Hess, 2000).

Bilingual education policies are not generally discussed in Singapore (Tan & Ng, 2011), and its multi-ethnic makeup consists of 74.2% Chinese, 13.4% Malay, 9.2% Indian, and 3.2% others. Policies require that all students attending national schools (public schools) focus on learning English and secondly on their native language (Chinese, Malay, Mandarin, and Tamil). In Singapore, English is highly valued. According to government policy, proficiency in the English language provides students with economic opportunities and career advancements. On the other hand, its native languages are viewed as a depository of ancient knowledge (Tan & Ng, 2011).
Tan and Ng (2011) went on to posit that individuals whose native language is not English should not be treated as second class citizens or their identity stereotyped solely because the English language does not come naturally to them. Singapore has been experiencing a large influx of immigrants, which is making the country more diverse. Lee (2012) noted that the government is moving proactively towards the improvement of their schools’ educational curriculum by implementing character development for students to learn to become confident individuals, self-directed learners, active contributors, and concerned citizens.

Implementing the four language skills (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) in a child’s native language facilitates higher levels of achievement in English (August & Shanahan, 2006; Lin, 2007). Over a period of time, such skills and abilities will also place bilingual students at an advantage over monolingual peers. Language acquisition is a process that takes place over the span of several years, and it is virtually impossible for anyone to become proficient in a new language within a year (Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000; Guerrero, 1997).

Allowing bilingual students only a year to become proficient in English or a second language is not an effective approach to develop college and career ready students. It would be prohibitive for these students to confidently pass the mandated standardized assessments (Wright, 2012; Wright & Choi, 2006; Wright & Pu, 2005). Segregating students from their peers based on language barriers negatively affects the social and cultural well-being of students and the manner in which educators address their students, which has a strong effect on the students’ self-esteem and how they will respond to learning (Bacalu, 2011; Guerrero, 1997; Waldron & Hernandez, 2013).

Many second languages are currently being spoken in American schools due to the growing and diverse immigrant population (Bartolomé & Trueba, 2000). This phenomenon challenges bilingual teachers to develop cohesive educational programs (Bartolomé & Trueba, 2000; Sanchez
A cohesive educational program is a program in which teachers hold shared beliefs in similar instructional goals and practices (Fuller & Izu, 2010). For example, several challenges schools face includes a lack of qualified bilingual teachers to meet the linguistic needs of bilingual students. Schools often struggle to define an effective vision or mission regarding the best methodology for bilingual instructional goals and practices because of different pedagogic beliefs (Guerrero, 1997; Lee et al., 2015; Waldron & Hernandez, 2013).

**International Concerns Regarding Bilingual Education**

The challenges being faced by bilingual education programs include hiring highly qualified bilingual teachers who can effectively meet the needs of bilingual students and also developing effective and balanced pedagogical and methodological practices (Lee et al., 2015). Schools in the United States generally suffer from inadequate teacher preparation and professional development support, which would assist the teachers with the ongoing process of teaching bilingual or immersion classes. Teachers have reported that they lack a sufficient understanding of cultural differences and expectations. Most importantly, however, is the lack of available bilingual resources in order to apply appropriate instructional support, assessments, and interventions (Bacalu, 2011; Fortune, n.d.; Lee et al., 2015).

The state of the Hawaiian public school system does not provide bilingual education or immersion language programs for its diverse student population. Kamehameha Schools is another statewide Hawaiian educational system, which serves only native Hawaiian, orphaned, and indigent students who successfully pass their entrance exams. In these schools, English is not introduced until the 4th grade, and the programs focus on native language and culture.

Research from the Kamehameha Schools Research and Evaluation Division (n.d.) indicate that the “one-size fits all” bilingual and immersion language programs produce inconsistent academic achievements and inconclusive literature. The overall success of students is due to the
large network of “aunties,” “uncles,” and grandparents who are involved in the students’ lives in one academic form or another. Such activities and interactive learning is aligned with the Montessori Schools’ hands on method, which includes music, storytelling, and excursions. Although Hawaiian students show academic progress, in a national report they generally still rank as below average, when compared to their peers on the continental USA (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d.).

The State of Arizona has faced many challenges with the implementation of bilingual and immersion programs. Proposition 203 claims that Arizona’s public school system has failed their immigrant students because of the limited bilingual and immersion programs. The method used to teach bilingual students attending immersion schools is to instruct first grade students 75% of the time in Spanish, 70% in Spanish during the second grade, and 50% in Spanish during the third grade. Reading instruction is taught in Spanish only, while English and Spanish are alternated weekly or monthly in all other subjects. Studies show that bilingual students consistently outperform limited proficiency English students in English-only programs and monolingual students (Kali et al., 2015; Krashen, Park, & Seldin, 2000; Pelham & Abrams, 2014).

The State of California initiated Proposition 227, which eliminated bilingual education, and their schools were required to teach all students in “English-only” unless parents signed a waiver for their child to attend an immersion school where students are taught in both Spanish and English. After the passing of Proposition 227, English-only became the precedent for the rest of the nation. On November 8, 2016, Proposition 58 was introduced to the residents of California in order to repeal English-only education, and later, Californian residents voted to approve bilingual education.

California immersion school programs use the primary language 50% of the time for instruction in core subjects such as language arts and math while using Spanish 50% of the time.
while teaching technical subjects such as science and social studies. Research shows advantages and challenges regarding bilingual education. Overall, studies consistently show that bilingual students perform at a higher level than monolingual students, and these students acquire better cognitive flexibility and problem solving skills, while also exhibiting higher self-confidence (Fortune, n.d.).

**Global and Culture Awareness**

Global awareness requires respecting and valuing the diversity of cultures and also an understanding that everyone has a role as a world citizen. American students must acquire effective communication skills and have the ability to collaborate with others in order to solve problems, have the ability to make critical decisions, and therefore will acquire an alternative view of the world (Braskamp, 2008). Although there are many diverse international cultures with significant differences, most generally value a high moral code of ethics and peace and respect for themselves and others (Helterbran & Strahler, 2013).

Teaching any language requires the understanding of its symbolic function and the cultural landscape in which it is being taught. Educators either focus on state mandated exams or do not have textbooks or current curriculum to teach social studies. American students generally learn very little about world history and geography (Braskamp, 2008; Helterbran & Strahler, 2013). Mastery of these subjects will be a requirement to succeed in global markets, but will also prepare them with the cultural anthropology skills needed to improve their intellectual capital and live their personal and professional lives in a global world (Chamberlin-Quinliskand & Senyshyn, 2012). Schools need to acquire the abilities and skills which they will develop in students, in order to prepare them for college and careers readiness (Richardson, 2016).
Second Language Learning

The benefits of bilingualism include maintaining cultural identity while developing an understanding of another culture (King & Fogle, 2006; Lee, et al., 2015). Fluent bilingual students have shown to possess high self-esteem and abstract thinking skills and generally achieve academic success (Han, 2012). However, other studies show perceived disadvantages of bilingualism, which include language delay due to mental confusion, low self-esteem, and mistaken interpretation of others’ cultural beliefs and practices (Lee, Shetgiri, Barina, Tilitski & Flores, 2015).

Research shows that learning a second language will not only provide students with an understanding of different cultures and their practices, but also may offer opportunities for professional economic gains in the new global market (Gandara & Acevedo, 2016; Helterbran & Strahler, 2013). Other research reveals that there may be limited financial compensation for bilingual employees within the United States, because English is the primary language when doing business. In 1992, the specialized occupations made up only approximately 7% of the American work force. Bilingual employees use their bilingual or multilingual skills freely to communicate with foreigners or new migrants (Fry & Lowell, 1992). However, the rise of technology in the 21st century requires employees to be bilingual or multilingual in multinational corporations and import/export businesses (Gandara & Acevedo, 2016).

A second language will become an asset throughout the twenty-first century and will be considered as a qualification to obtain future employment in a global market. However, some states have denied students the opportunity (California’s Proposition 227) to learn another language, which has resulted in making American students generally less qualified to compete globally (Friedman, 2007; Gandara & Acevedo, 2016). With the recent passing of Proposition 58 in California, which allows public schools to provide bilingual education, there is hope that future
generations of American students will become fluent bilinguals and will also acquire the language proficiency necessary to compete locally, nationally, and globally.

**Methodological Literature**

Organizations such as Afterschool Alliance, Harvard Family Research Project, Wallace Foundation, and the only government funded program, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, have proven that structured after-school programs are a positive alternative at which students may spend their after-school time. Such programs have promoted positive development in children’s lives despite their unique home life circumstances and have provided improvement in closing the academic gap between high and low socioeconomic students (Afterschool Alliance, 2015; Harvard Family Research Project, 2003, Wallace Foundation, 2011). Literature shows that the use of case studies and the mixed methods approach for the implementation of any program strengthens its validity; therefore, case studies are appropriate in the implementation of a program (Creswell, 2013).

The focus of this study was to demonstrate the value in implementing the after-school language-based program at a youth center located in one of the Hawaiian Islands. Traditional school days are not sufficient in meeting the linguistic needs of Hawaiian students who score 51% proficiency in literacy (Hawaii State Department of Education, 2016). Studies suggest that a language-based after-school program has a positive effect on students’ primary language through the process of learning a second language (Afterschool Alliance, 2006; Murphy et al., 2015; Pelham & Abrams, 2014).

The methodology used by research entities such as the National Regional Educational Laboratory, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the Charles Steward Mott Foundation, all in partnership with Afterschool Alliance organization and other after-school organizations who are committed to improving and supporting after-school programs, reviewed
and researched numerous case studies associated with keywords related to literacy, after-school programs, and ELLs in their research. They used polls, surveys, questionnaires, experiments, and interviews to gather valuable data. The limitation to their research methods, however, is the limitation of case studies related to literacy in after-school programs (American Institute for Research, 2006).

These organizations and their research teams use polls, surveys, semi-structured interviews (face-to-face and telephone), and experimental methods to gather pertinent information to answer the research questions. The valuable information they acquire is used to adjust or implement programs within the organizations, which will engage students throughout their academic years. For example, a Gallup Student Poll conducted by the Afterschool Alliance organization, revealed that a student’s engagement in after-school programs while they are in school decline as the student becomes older. According to the poll, 76% of elementary school students say they are engaged in school, 61% of middle school students say they are engaged in school, while 44% of high school students say they are engaged in school: a majority say they are bored. The correlation to this poll is that students who are engaged in school are most likely to attend and actively participate in after-school programs (Afterschool Alliance, 2015).

Through the same methodology used by the Afterschool Alliance organization in partnership with 21st Century Community Learning Center, the State of Hawaii ranks 10th out of the top 10 states that provide quality after-school programs. Through the use of surveys, questionnaires, and polls, 47% of the parents are satisfied with the after-school programs, 79% of the parents are satisfied with the quality of care in the programs, 70% of the parents are satisfied with the quality of activities, 70% of the parents are satisfied with the cost, and 44% of parents agree that after-school programs in their area provide high quality of care (Afterschool Alliance, 2014). Further study is needed to determine current results in specific islands because each island
has a different demographic population. After-school programs in a more populous island do not represent the reality of others in less populous islands.

**Methodology Issues**

A case study evaluation method allows the researcher to fully understand the details of how the evaluated program works (Creswell, 2013). This evaluation allows for opportunities to investigate and evaluate the influence of the program. Case study evaluations enable researchers to answer the classic investigator’s questions of who, what, when, where, and why. There are several types of case study methods, which a researcher may implement when evaluating programs (Morra & Friedlander, n.d.). The data collected from the case study is used to answer the basic questions in an effort to draw a generalization regarding the phenomenon that will take place in the program (Creswell, 2013).

There are several different types of case studies. For example, the explanatory case study is used to explore and describe the components within the case (Ivankova, Creswell, & Stick, 2006). Descriptive case studies have a narrow focus on a study’s program or strategy. A combined methodology study provides a cumulative overview. In a combined methodology study, findings are gathered from other case studies to answer an evaluation question (Morra & Friedlander, n.d.). Another is the program evaluation study, which is the method used for single subject research for evaluating interventions (Warne & Price, 2016).

Multiple data sources, such as interviews, surveys, observations, and other related references, are used for case studies in order to evaluate programs. These sources assist with providing a detailed and descriptive report, which may be shared with others who may be interested in program evaluation. Having the flexibility to be able to use multiple sources to obtain pertinent data in a case study allows for the triangulation of data. Through the process of triangulating data, there is a check and balance process of data interpretation, in order to compile a
comprehensive analysis. In addition, this process enables those reading the case study to form their own judgment of the unique case study program evaluation (Balbach, 1999).

Every research method has inherent limitations. By using the mixed methods approach in case studies, innate biases are counterbalanced (Creswell, 2013). The purpose for using this method is to check and balance the data collected to ensure that the data is true and correct with the goal of establishing trustworthiness (Kolb, 2012).

A mixed methods approach can be used with the program evaluation study to validate and qualify the program studied. This approach of analyzing qualitative and quantitative data, including sample surveys, provides opportunities to identify themes where generalization can take place (Creswell, 2013). Instruments used for case studies include semi-structured interviews, which are the foundation of case study evaluation (Morra & Friedlander, n.d.). The inclusion of surveys and data analysis allows for triangulation of data to provide the validity and reliability of the methods and instruments selected for this study (Creswell, 2013).

CIPP Model

The CIPP model was developed by Stufflebeam (1971) and is widely used as a framework to evaluate programs. Originally, the CIPP model was developed in the 1960s to assist in acquiring accountability with school reform projects, and to confront the limitations of previous evaluation systems (Stufflebeam, 1971). The CIPP model provides a systematic method of monitoring and modifying different aspects of a program. This model was chosen for the evaluation of the implementation of the language-based after-school program because it provides an inclusive framework to guide summative and formative program evaluation (Stufflebeam, McKee & McKee, 2003). The CIPP model implores the evaluator of the program to ask questions to modify or alter any methods and to determine if the program was successful in meeting its goals (Stufflebeam, 1971).
There are four evaluation functions to the CIPP model, which assist the researcher to make the best decisions with modifying and improving the program. Each of the four components of the model play a broader role as described by Stufflebeam (1971a) as follows:

1. **Context evaluation** serves planning decisions by identifying unmet needs, unused opportunities, and underlying problems, which prevent the meeting of needs or the use of opportunities.

2. **Input evaluation** serves structuring decisions by projecting and analyzing alternative procedural designs.

3. **Process evaluation** serves implementing decisions by monitoring project operations.

4. **Product evaluation** serves implementing decisions by determining the degree to which objectives have been achieved and by determining the cause of the obtained results. (p. 268)

**Synthesis of the Literature**

Studies indicate that teachers in the United States are not sufficiently trained or prepared to take on the new demands, challenges, and diversity of cultural understanding (Bok, 2006; Conley, 2007; William & Fortune, n.d.). While students may learn a second language in as little as two years, it takes approximately five to seven years for a child to acquire the de-contextualized language skills which are necessary to function successfully in an all English classroom. Allowing bilingual students only a year to become proficient in English or monolinguals to learn a second language in the same timeframe is not an effective approach to developing college and career ready students (Wright, 2012; Wright & Choi, 2006; Wright & Pu, 2005).

In order for ELL students to become proficient in English, it is essential that they first become proficient in their native language. School districts must hire teachers that are well trained and understand the students’ cultural background. These students must make an emotional
connection with their teachers to develop a trustworthy relationship with them (Bacalu, 2011; Guerrero, 1997; Waldron & Hernandez, 2013). Effective two-way dual immersion programs, where English Learner students and English speaking students learn together through a second language, is the most effective practice to close the academic gap. Several benefits of the dual immersion program include the development of meta-linguistic awareness, improved divergent thinking, a greater understanding of culture, outperformance of monolinguals, and that 21st century bilinguals/multi-linguals have improved economic opportunities (Thomas & Collier, 2003).

**Critique of the Literature**

The topic of bilingual education regarding teaching English as a second language versus English only has been an ongoing debate. As previously noted, The Supreme Court in “Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563, 94 S. Ct. 786 (1974) ruled that students who do not know the English language are being denied their constitutional rights regarding acquiring a quality education comparable to English speaking students. Therefore, the court subsequently ordered educational institutions to reform their practices (as cited in Leal & Hess, 2000).

There continues to be an ongoing debate concerning bilingual education as the optimal choice of language acquisition as well as paranoia over academic performance. Opponents to bilingual education fail to understand that timing is critical, as research has consistently proven that the most advantageous period to learn a second language is during the elementary school years of a child’s life (Grandar & Acevedo, 2016; Torres-Guzman, 2002). Bilingual/multilingual employees and entrepreneurs are increasingly in demand because they represent the business sector in the global market. This phenomenon is creating a significant shift in attitude regarding bilingual education in the 21st century (Gandara & Acevedo, 2016; Haas, 2009).
Summary

The focus of this chapter was on the research regarding the benefits of bilingualism, and maintaining and improving a group of Hawaiian students’ English language acquisition skills. Research indicates that bilingual students demonstrate superior performance when accomplishing nonverbal tasks of executive function, and also outperform monolinguals in other standardized tests (Kalia et al., 2015; Pelham & Abrams, 2014). Further research shows that the use of diverse languages is steadily increasing within the United States, and it is in our best interest that children are taught a second language during their elementary school years (Devlin, 2015; Sanchez, 2017; The Harvard Family Research Project, 2006).

Chapter 3 discusses the methodology used in this study to evaluate the implementation of an after-school language-based program.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this program evaluation study was to explore and evaluate the implementation of a language-based after-school program. The intent of the language-based instruction offered in this program was to develop a group of Hawaiian students’ English language acquisition skills while they learned a second language at their local youth center. The design for the after-school program was based on preliminary consultations with teachers and parents as well as the director of the youth center.

This investigation revealed common concerns regarding language development for elementary school students. This was evidenced by the Hawaii Smarter Balanced Assessments results for the academic years 2014 through 2016. These results indicate that Hawaiian students ranked between 48% to 51% proficiency in English Language skills (Hawaii State Department of Education, 2016). As a result of this initial investigation, a language-based approach was determined to be appropriate for the instruction, at the youth center.

Studies conducted by the Harvard Family Research Project, the Afterschool Alliance, and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, which is the only federally funded program, revealed that well-implemented and structured after-school programs may have a positive effect on academics, social development, and crime prevention; particularly for disadvantaged children. The process of learning a second language also allows the students to preserve their native language and culture and to have access to advanced career opportunities (Alvarado, 2013; & Hermina, 2014). Additionally, students who are bilingual generally attain above average academic achievement when compared to monolingual students (Lee et al., 2015). The learning goals for the program are to address the needs of the second language learners and students’ second language learning.
Problem and Purpose Overview

The problem that forms the basis for the program evaluation study is the low achievement in literacy skills of Hawaiian students. A significant percentage of Hawaiian students are ELLs, and their linguistic needs are not being met (Hawaii Language Roadmap Initiative, 2013). The statistical report “Detailed Languages Spoken at Home in The State of Hawaii” conducted by the Research Economic Analysis Division (2015) reported that there are at least 25 languages other than English spoken at home on the Hawaiian island where the youth center is located.

According to the Hawaii Language Roadmap Initiative (2013), more must be accomplished regarding developing linguistic proficiency so the State of Hawaii can continue to strive for economic success during the 21st century. As previously mentioned, the Hawaii Smarter Balanced Assessments results for the academic years 2014 through 2016 reveal that Hawaiian students scored between 48% to 51% proficiency in English Language skills (Hawaii State Department of Education, 2016). Based on the initial investigation into the needs of the community, language development is most critically needed.

The purpose of this program evaluation study was to explore and evaluate the implementation of a language-based after-school program. The intent of the language-based instruction offered in this program was to develop students’ English language acquisition skills while students learned a second language. Examined was the extent to which students develop their English language acquisition skills according to third through fifth grade reading, writing, speaking, and listening standards, which are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

Research Procedure

The CIPP model approach developed by Stufflebeam (1971) was used to evaluate the language-based after-school program in this study. As previously noted, CIPP is a four-stage evaluation process, which can be used in a summative and formative evaluation. Each of the four
components of the CIPP model play a broader role as described by Stufflebeam (1971a) as follows:

1. **Context evaluation** serves planning decisions by identifying unmet needs, unused opportunities, and underlying problems, which prevent the meeting of needs, or the use of opportunities.

2. **Input evaluation** serves structuring decisions by projecting and analyzing alternative procedural designs.

3. **Process evaluation** serves implementing decisions by monitoring project operations.

4. **Product evaluation** serves implementing decisions by determining the degree to which objectives have been achieved and by determining the cause of the obtained results. (p. 268)

The CIPP model was the appropriate model to use for the implementation and evaluation of the language-based after-school program, as it is based on the premise to improve, but not to prove, the effectiveness of a program (Stufflebeam, 1971). Further, Stufflebeam stressed the importance of evaluation by stating that programs cannot be improved unless the problems are known. Any implementation of a program must be of value to the needs of the people who its intended to serve. For example, Mingo (2012) applied the CIPP model to evaluate a Beginning Teacher Induction Program and its impact on retaining novice teachers in a rural school district in northwest North Carolina. The CIPP model allowed for constructive feedback and data collection through surveys, interviews, and focus groups discussions. The study provided valuable information, which the school district used to strategically make effective decisions to improve their BTIP program.

The results of this study will assist the youth center director and its stakeholders to acquire useful information needed to make future decisions concerning which programs to implement at the youth center and to best serve and support the students’ interests and overall academic growth.
Through the use of the CIPP model, the research questions were developed and answered.

**Research Questions**

The research questions for this study were:

1. What are the needs in the community that provide a basis for the development of a structured after-school program for elementary school students?

2. What are classroom teachers’ perceptions of students’ formal language usages in the classroom, after students participated in the after-school program?
   
   Sub question. What are parents’ and students’ perceptions of formal language usage in the classroom, after students participated in the after-school program?

3. What evidence was found in meeting the programs goals of developing literacy skills and global awareness, and what was the significance of the findings?

**Study Site**

The research for the program evaluation study took place at a youth center with a physical location between an affordable apartment complex and a tropical island beach. Next to the youth center is a small Hawaiian church, and an ambulance and first responders’ station. This one-story building provides a safe environment for community children to meet after-school, and it serves 155 students between the ages of 6–17 (director of youth center, personal communication, January 23, 2017).

The youth center has one classroom, which has been converted to a homework and computer room. It is in this classroom where the after-school program was conducted. The youth center also has a large open concept community area where students may socialize, play board games, and eat their snacks. Outside the building, there is a basketball court where most of the older students spend their time.
The youth center serves as a safe, positive community resource for students who are in need of having a positive environment that is a drug free location, to socialize and receive minimal homework assistance. According to the Hawaii Socio-Economic Census Data, the socioeconomic status of the families of students who attend the youth center ranges from low ($20,074.00 - $33,407.00 per annum), to medium ($33,408.00 - $46,741.00 per annum), (University of Hawaii, n.d.). Most of the parents of these students have two or more jobs in order to meet the high cost of living expenditures, which are typical of a popular tourist destination. Students attending the after-school program were able to participate in after-school activities such as ukulele, arts and crafts, hula, and they also had access to computers that have Internet access to assist them with completing their homework.

**Population and Samples**

The population for this program evaluation study was from the two elementary schools located in the same community as the youth center. There are approximately 150 students who attend the youth center. The students recruited for the after-school program were students from the ages of 8–11, attend the elementary schools in the community, are active members of the youth center, and 23 enrolled in the after-school program. The sample population for this study was from students, parents, staff members, and the director of the youth center. Students and their parents, who participated in the after-school program, were eligible for participation in the study.

To recruit students for the after-school program, a flyer describing the language-based after-school program was distributed to the third through fifth grade students at the elementary schools in the community and at the youth center. Flyers were given to the teachers and parents of both elementary schools in the community for distribution to any student interested in participating in the program. Additionally, the director of the youth center verbally announced to the youth center students that an after-school program titled “Spanish Club 101” would be conducted at the
youth center, and anyone interested in participating could obtain a flyer at the office. Flyers were
distributed by the director of the youth center, to any student or parent who inquired about the
program.

**Academic After-School Program Instruction**

An English and Spanish curriculum was selected based on the initial investigation of the
program evaluation study needs. The McGraw-Hill English Language Wonders Curriculum and
the Spanish Sube Program, were used in the language-based after-school program. The Wonders
curriculum was used for the English instruction in the after-school program along with the pre- and
post- diagnostic assessments. This English Language curriculum had been adopted by the State of
Hawaii and is used in the schools. This curriculum is aligned with the Common Core State
Standards and provided the validity of placement of each student and an accurate diagnostic
interpretation of their test scores.

The Spanish Sube program was selected for the language-based program evaluation. This
program is utilized in bilingual classrooms and after school programs to support Spanish Speaking
Learners and dual language programs. The Sube program is a multisensory language program to
teach students to listen, speak, read, and write through art, music, activities, and informal
conversation.

**Instruments**

According to Creswell (2003), all research methods have limitations. However, the use of
any single qualitative or quantitative method results in innate bias, which is counterbalanced when
using a mixed methods approach. There are several advantages to this approach, and using it for
data sources allows for triangulation of the data. This approach provided opportunities for
incorporating different levels of interpretations of the study and also provided an effective means
to incorporate the best of both quantitative and qualitative data in a study to best understand this study.

The instruments used were semi-structured interviews, parent and student paper surveys, pre- and post- diagnostic assessments, feedback, and subjective reflection. Both qualitative and quantitative data were used to answer the research questions. Using this method allows for triangulation and further validates the findings necessary to establish trustworthiness (Kolb, 2012). This approach of analyzing qualitative and quantitative data, including sample surveys and semi-structured interviews, provided opportunities to identify themes where generalization took place.

The semi-structured face-to-face interviews were the foundation of the program evaluation (Morra & Friedlander, n.d.). This researcher contacted all participants by phone to inquire if they would agree to participate in a semi-structured, one-to-one interview. The goal of the interviews was to provide parents an opportunity to express their thoughts and opinions regarding a language-based after-school program at the youth center in an attempt to understand their perception.

Pre and post diagnostic assessments for English reading fluency and English reading comprehension were administered to the students using the Wonders Language Arts Diagnostic and Placement Assessment created by McGraw-Hill to collect pertinent data regarding the effectiveness of a language-based after-school program.

**Semi-structured Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews were used for this program evaluation study to determine the parents’ perspectives of the implementation of an after-school program. Interviews provided a two-way communication experience, which allowed the flexibility and freedom to communicate only the information the interviewer and interviewee agreed to share. Three important strategies considered for semi-structured interviews, to effectively acquire authentic responses, are rapport building, thought-provoking interjections, and critical event analysis. These strategies allowed this
researcher the ability to create a non-threatening environment for the interview (Pathak & Intratat, 2012).

**Parent and Student Surveys**

Another instrument used for this program evaluation study was the inclusion of paper surveys. These surveys were administered to the students and their parents at the youth center to assess their perceptions of the after-school program, which provided elementary school aged students at the center an opportunity to improve their English language acquisition skills and increase Spanish culture awareness through the process of learning a second language.

**Pre- and Post-Diagnostic Assessments of Student Language Learning**

Pre- and post- diagnostic assessments provided by the publisher of the selected research based curriculum, Wonders and Sube, were administered to the students during the course of the 20-week program. This is a language and research based program, which is appropriate for use with elementary school students. The Wonders diagnostic assessment has two components: reading fluency and comprehension. The instructor (who was also this researcher) administered the assessments. Upon completion, the assessments were collected and hand delivered to independent assessors. The pre- and post- diagnostic scores were analyzed and compared using a paired t-test. A significance level of $p < .05$ was sought.

**Feedback**

The director of the youth center and a staff member also provided observation and summative feedback.

**Reflection Journal**

Another instrument used was acquiring informal feedback from the students and their parents during the program, which naturally focused on their personal existence and participation. This researcher maintained a reflective journal throughout the evaluation process. Daily notes
regarding the interactions between students, engagement of students throughout the after-school program, and any comments and suggestions made by students, staff members, and director of the youth center were recorded and reflected on for analysis of the program. The progress toward the program goals was monitored by reflection on consultation and evaluations based on observations of the after-school program instruction by the students, the director of the youth center, staff member, and parents. Ongoing modifications to the program instructions were made based on the feedback and observation.

**Data Collection**

An invitation letter and consent form was extended to all 23 registered students’ parents inviting them to participate in the evaluation program study. Parents who agreed to participate were asked to sign a consent form, and students who had permission from their parents were asked to sign an assent form. The form was read to the students, and they were assured that if they decided not to participate in the study that it would not affect them personally or academically. The researcher met with the director of the youth center, a staff member, classroom teachers, and parents to discuss this study and to request that they participate in it.

All participants were told that throughout the study there would be no penalty to withdraw; participation was voluntary. Participants were informed that their names would not be used during the study, and only codes would be used for the data analysis. All data collected from participants was held strictly confidential, and a separate file linking the codes to names on the forms was kept in a locked file cabinet. Only this researcher had access to the collected data, and all of the data will be destroyed after 3 years. Contact information and the withdrawal procedures were provided to the participants. Data from participants who withdrew from the study were deleted.

Students, their parents, and their classroom teachers were asked to complete a brief paper survey, which contained quantitative and qualitative sections. The quantitative section consisted
of a Likert scale survey regarding students’ feelings and opinions concerning learning a second language at an after-school program, and about the after-school program. The Likert scale had answers ranging on a scale from 1 – 5, with 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree.

The quantitative section of the student language diagnostic assessments provided data regarding students’ English language reading fluency and comprehension skills. There were additional baseline assessments that also included world and state maps. The qualitative section of the survey posed open-ended questions regarding participants’ feelings and opinions concerning the structure of the after-school program.

The classroom teachers were asked if they noticed a difference in their students’ English language acquisition skills after their students participated in the program. A hard copy consent form was sent to all participants, and all questions in the surveys were written in English. Additionally, a hard copy assent form was read to and signed by the students.

A semi-structured interview was held with two parents who volunteered for the interview. These interviews had a duration time of approximately 30–45 minutes per parent, and they were also asked to select a convenient time and place for a one-to-one interview with this researcher. This researcher transcribed the interviews and then used member checking to further verify the accuracy of the data collected. The parents were given an opportunity to read, review, and make any modifications to their responses, if required.

The director of the program and the youth staff member, who worked daily in the classroom where the instruction took place, were also asked to sign a consent form. The director and staff member observed the lessons and provided summative feedback, support, and assistance. Two independent, well qualified, elementary school educators, with over 30 years of combined
teaching experience, were also asked to sign a consent form, and were recruited to grade the collected data.

**Data Analysis**

All students’ assessment data collected was exported from Easy Grade Pro software, which many educators and institutions use to manage students’ grades, attendance, and other information. Students’ pre- and post-assessments for writing, listening, reading, and speaking, were compared using a paired $t$-test. A significance level of $p < .05$ was sought for the correlation between the research questions and hypotheses. Additionally, a paired $t$-test was used to reveal the strength of the correlation between the program participation and the improvement of English language acquisition skills through learning a second language at the $p<.05$ level.

Gosset introduced statistical methodologies to the brewing industry. He worked as a chemist at the Guinness brewing company in Ireland where he was involved in the analysis of the brewing process of beer (as cited in Zink, 2013). Along with Fisher, they helped refine Gosset’s $t$-test methodology by using a small sample compared to a large sample, which was commonly used at that time. Therefore, a paired $t$-test is generally used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the mean of two groups (as cited in Adams & Lawrence, 2015).

The $t$-test requires one independent variable and one dependent variable in order to compare the two means. During Gosset’s time, the $t$-test was developed to test previously developed hypothesis and large data samples. Today, $t$-tests are used to measure the difference between large or small data samples (as cited in Zink, 2013).

Using $t$-tests, the scores of the pre- and post--tests are frequently compared to determine their significance. This method was used in a study by Brown, Shellman, Hill, and Gomez’ (2012), which focused on youth behavior at an after-school program. The differences in scores between year-round academic calendar students and traditional academic calendar students were
studied. Additionally, the paired $t$-test method was used to compare the behavior of participants, to that of non-participants.

The $t$-test was also the procedure used in a study examining the academic performance of year-round and traditional school year academic calendar students’ overall academic performance, including behavior patterns (Sexton, 2003). Further, a paired $t$-test was used for this study to calculate the before and after academic scores of reading, writing, listening, and speaking for the students participating in the after-school program. Using the $t$-test method for this study was appropriate, as it allowed for assessing student achievement in the after-school program. The independent variable was the language instruction, and the dependent variable was the results of the language scores.

The data analysis coding method used for analyzing the interview data for this study was based on the Grounded Theory approach, which was developed in 1967 by Glaser and Strauss. This approach provided a roadmap for collecting, improving, and analyzing data qualitative (as cited in Kolb, 2012). Kolb noted that the constant comparison and analysis of the data is the basis of the Grounded Theory approach. Ideally, there should be a continuous interplay between the data collection and the analysis.

The data from interviews were transcribed and coded to gain an understanding of the perceived impact on the participants’ feelings concerning the program’s implementation. Open coding of data was used to analyze the data from the transcripts and to identify themes. A coding process analyzed all collected responses, and the responses were then categorized by themes. Interview transcripts contained marginal remarks, notes, labels, phrases, and questions, and were also be filed with pre-set codes until final codes could be established.

It is important to provide reliable data and to use the process of data coding of studies that gather semi-structured interviews and other qualitative data (Campbell, Quincy, Osserman &
Pedersen, 2013). Coding, which novice researchers who lack experience in data collection methods and self-coding qualitative data perform, is a significant concern. Obtaining reliable data is important to qualitative work; therefore, coders must have extensive background knowledge in the related subject matter to be able to interpret their participants’ responses. Independent novice coders must demonstrate consistency in their collection process to establish inter-coder reliability.

Seasoned, knowledgeable, and experienced coders must be able to reproduce the same code for the same elements of text. There is no straightforward or factual method to generate reliable qualitative analysis, as there is limited literature available for direction. Therefore, researchers must thoroughly understand their subject matter. Campbell et al. (2013) recommended using software applications to assist researchers with their analysis process of qualitative data. The Nvivo coding software application was used for this study.

Table 2 describes how the CIPP model approach was used as a framework to implement and evaluate the language-based program, which was implemented at the youth center.
Table 2

*CIPP Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Methodological Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Context     | What are the needs in the community, which provide a basis for the development of a structured after-school program for elementary school students? | • Consult with director of the youth center  
• Demographic data to assess population  
• Archived-DOE-State Exam results  
• Assess the setting  
• Consult with teachers  
• Consult with parents |
| Evaluation  |                                                                                   |                                                                                          |
| Input       | What are classroom teachers’ perceptions of students’ formal language usages in the classroom after students participated in the after-school program? | • Semi-structured interview with director of the youth center  
• Learning a foreign language  
• Review literature for exemplary programs  
• Review literature in general  
• Consulted with ELL teacher and other teachers |
|             | What are parents’ and students’ perceptions of formal language in the after-school program? |                                                                                          |
| Process     |                                                                                   | • Informal assessments  
• Observe  
• Maintained a journal for self-reflection  
• Checking in with students  
• Feedback from youth center Director  
• Youth center staff in classroom feedback  
• Informal feedback from parents during the program |
| Product     | What evidence was found in meeting the programs goals, and what was the significance of the findings? | • Voluntary commitment to the program by the students  
• Students voluntary performed all tasks and assessments  
• Director program feedback and assessment  
• Surveys  
• Questionnaires  
• Semi-structured interview |

**Expected Findings**

The pre-diagnostic assessment given to the students before the commencement of the lessons could have revealed that although most students exhibit average oral reading fluency, they
lack a depth of reading comprehension. Students may also exhibit poor writing skills, which displays a lack of focus and coherence, organization, ideas and support, word choice, sentence fluency, and conventions. Furthermore, data may have shown inadequate listening skills and may reveal students’ lack of ability to articulate the main idea, main characters, or summarize a story that was read aloud to them.

The parental interviews could possibly have revealed their strong support for their child to learn a foreign language at the elementary school level and at an after-school program. Students participating in the study may have generally experienced an improvement in their reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills, in both English and Spanish. However, after analyzing the findings, this researcher expected that there would not be a difference in students’ English literacy scores but instead an improvement in their Spanish literacy after having received instruction in a second language.

**Operationalization of Variables**

The focus of the instruction in this study was on maintaining and improving English as the primary language, teaching Spanish as a second language, or improving native language skills. The surveys, which the participants received and completed, were designed to reveal their thoughts, opinions, and feelings about learning a second language at the elementary school level as opposed to middle or high school. The interviews also uncovered participants’ opinions regarding implementing structured after-school programs at the youth center. The goal was the data collected from this study would assist with improving the language-based after-school program for elementary school students.

**Limitations of the Research Design**

As with many studies, there are limitations, biases, assumptions, and delimitations, which must be taken into consideration. One limitation of this program evaluation study was that several
of the students who registered declined to participate or attend the program inconsistently, which could have skewed the data results. The relatively small sample size limits the generalizability of the study. Another limitation is that the study took place in one location. The quantitative data results of the students are only of great value in concurrence with the qualitative data results contributed by surveys, interviews, and feedback.

Another limitation was that the language lessons were taught in isolation and 1 day per week for 20 weeks due to limited time and space at the youth center. Studies have shown that to effectively learn a foreign language, students must have the ability and opportunity to be immersed in the language within a meaningful context and in a variety of social settings (Alvarado, 2014; & Herminia, 2013).

It was critical to generate fair and balanced questions in an effort to eliminate biases in the survey and interviews. It was also important to acquire honest responses in the surveys and interviews, which were necessary to have accurate data. The delimitation of this study was that there were 11 students in grades 3–5 from a single after-school program school site. The results of this study may not represent a true and accurate representation of data for any other population of students in the after-school program. Relatively inexperienced researchers have limited tools, with which to conduct a study at a graduate level, and with the limitations of these research tools, a single study may not be definitive, because it is impossible to study everyone in a population (Adams & Lawrence, 2015). Further research and modifications will be required to establish a well-structured after-school program at the youth center that teaches a foreign language.

**Trustworthiness, Validity, and Reliability**

Internal validity reveals an accurate relationship between two variables. One variable is caused by the changes of another, which results in the cause and effect relationship (Adams & Lawrence, 2015). Studies show that there are commonalities between after-school programs.
Studies conducted by Afterschool Alliance, Harvard Family Research Project, and the National Association of Elementary School Principals consistently show that students who attend after-school programs show positive outcomes ranging from prevention of criminal activities to building self-confidence. However, it is the superiorly structured after-school programs that generally exhibit students’ growth in academics and acquired skills. Therefore, it is reasonable to predict that students will show measurable linguistic growth, even in a semi-structured after-school program.

There are factors that put the validity of any study at risk, and novice researchers must be aware of the risks, which threaten the validity of a study. Examples of risk include experimental mortality (the loss of subjects), testing anxiety (the effects of taking a test), instruments (methods used), and maturation (passage of time); these risks may jeopardize the internal validity of a study (Chong-ho Yu, 2017). The main perceived threat to the internal validity of this study was experimental mortality and English test anxiety.

Experienced researchers have suggested that novices should check and balance their ideology and biases. This method assists with providing a valid and reliable analysis of the multiple data samples collected to give an accurate interpretation of the findings of each mixed method used within a study. The procedure of triangulation of data is used as a justification regarding studies using the mixed methods approach (Mertens, & Hesse-Biber, 2012). This mixed methods approach used in this study consisted of the comparison of the data results to the semi-structured face-to-face interviews, surveys, and the students’ scores.

Researchers have an ethical responsibility to attempt to influence change in the world based on their research and the interpretation of their data. They must provide reliable data to positively promote and not negligently damage the development within communities, states, and the world. Seasoned researchers and their experiences must continue to be included in modern discussions, in
order to encourage new dialogue, and must also attempt to define the roles that are assigned to triangulation methods; past, present, and future (Mertens & Hesse-Biber, 2012).

In this study, trustworthiness was addressed using several methods. One method was through the triangulation of data, which was attained from surveys, semi-structured interviews, member checking, and subjective reflection from those participating in the study. The member checking process provided participants an opportunity to ask questions, to clarify the collected data, review the data, and acknowledge that the data was a true and correct interpretation of their participation.

This researcher understood the conflict of interest because of my multiple roles as researcher, instructor, and developer of the program, and who had invested in supplies for the program. To compensate for any potential bias, the following controls were established:

1. Two professional, experienced educators, with over 15 years’ teaching experience, were recruited to volunteer their time and talents and to be independent assessors of student work for the program.

2. This researcher conducted intensive reviewing of the literature to serve as a basis for formulating the program aims and goals for the after-school program.

3. All curriculum material for the program was researched based.

4. Instructional strategies used for the program instruction were research based.

5. This researcher’s direct supervisor and the director of the youth center conducted the evaluation of the daily instruction and program goals.

6. A youth center staff member was in place for all instructional sessions and provided daily feedback on the instructional engagement of the students in the program.

7. Member checking was used to validate the data from interviews.

8. This researcher clearly specified methods to be used to code the data.
Ethical Issues in the Study

Participants were fully informed regarding the objectives of the program evaluation study. There were no known potential risks to participants, as the research study was conducted at a youth center, which these students have attended for years. Participants were familiar with the homework and computer room where the lessons took place, and they felt comfortable and safe at the youth center. A youth center staff member was present each day the program was in session.

Confidentiality during this study was a priority. Both students and parents were assured that their names and responses would remain strictly confidential, and the data would be collected only for academic purposes to fulfill the requirements of this study. Participants were fully informed that their participation in this study was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time or for any reason without consequence.

All students’ data was grouped by grade level; the data and consent forms were kept confidential and will be held in storage for 3 years by this researcher. Any link between the students’ codes and their names was kept in a separate file, and all data will be destroyed after a period of 3 years.

Only fictitious names were used when reporting data responses from interviews. The data for this study was stored off-site in a secured and locked file cabinet. Only this researcher can access the data.

The completed surveys were anonymous when administered. This researcher assigned a number to identify each participant. The numbers are only known by this researcher and will be kept strictly confidential.

Summary

This chapter described the details concerning the methods used to study and examine the effectiveness of the after-school program, which was designed to improve English literacy through
teaching a second language. An analysis and interpretation of the data collected from the program evaluation is presented in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

The purpose of this program evaluation study was to explore and evaluate the implementation of a language-based after-school program. The intent of the instruction offered in the program was to develop a group of Hawaiian students’ English language acquisition skills while they learned a second language at the local youth center. The CIPP model was used as a framework to evaluate the implementation of a structured language-based after-school program. The implementation followed the Sube Spanish language curriculum, which included learning activities critical to the design of the program. The program’s design and implementation focused on the improvement of students’ literacy skills, while learning a second language.

This chapter first addresses the research questions followed by the descriptions and demographics of the sample population and then presents the analyzed data. Also discussed in this chapter are the opinions and perceptions of parents, teachers, students, and staff members of the youth center regarding learning a second language, literacy, social versus formal language and global awareness.

Study Site

The research for the program evaluation study took place at a youth center whose physical location is between an affordable apartment complex and a tropical Hawaiian island beach. Next to the youth center is a small Hawaiian church, and also an ambulance and first responders’ station. This one-story youth center building provides a safe environment for community children to meet after-school, and it serves 155 students between the ages of 6–17. It has one classroom, which has been converted to a homework and computer room where the after-school program was conducted. The youth center also has a large open concept community area where students socialize, play board games, and eat their snacks while other students congregate outside.
Research Design

The CIPP model was used to systematically evaluate the effects of the implementation of a structured language-based after-school program at a youth center in the State of Hawaii. The improvement of literacy at a language-based after-school program required an evaluation approach to consider the perspectives of parents, teachers, students, and community. Hence, the evaluation of the program represented a commitment to a structured, quality education, and a willingness to address students’ literacy needs.

The CIPP model was also implemented as an evaluation tool to answer the research questions. As noted by Stufflebeam (1971), the model provided context evaluation to inform decisions, process evaluation to support implementation, input evaluation to serve structuring decisions, process evaluation to support implementation decisions, and product evaluation to revisit prior decisions throughout the evaluation process.

Evaluation Process

The following research question was used for context evaluation:

1. What are the needs in the community, which provide a basis for the development of a structured language-based after-school program for elementary school students?

The following research questions were used for input evaluation:

2. What are classroom teachers’ perceptions of students’ formal language usages in the classroom, after students participated in the after-school program?

   Sub question. What are parents’ and students’ perceptions of formal language usage in the classroom, after students participated in the after-school program?

The following research question was used in product evaluation:

3. What evidence was found in meeting the programs goals, and what was the significance of the findings?
Qualitative data was collected to determine the participants’ perception of learning a second language at the elementary school level as opposed to middle or high school. The quantitative data is expressed in descriptive form to acquire a deeper understanding of participant’s perception and experience throughout the program, and to answer the research questions.

The evaluation of a language-based after-school program required collaboration between teachers, parents, and the local youth center to explore the worth and merit of the program. The intent of the evaluation was to acquire useful information aimed to improve the program and useful information for decision-making regarding its effectiveness as suggested by Stufflebeam (1971).

**Participants**

The participants were 23 students who enrolled in the after-school program at the youth center. These students range from the ages of 8–11 and attend grades 3–5. According to the students’ report cards, most of the student population ranked as developing proficiency, which equates that students are approaching acceptable achievement of the targeted standard (55% to 64% school-wide grading scale). Other students scored below proficiency, which equates to students not demonstrating acceptable achievement of the targeted standard (10% to 54% school-wide grading scale). Only a few students from the sample demonstrated that they met proficiency, and demonstrated acceptable achievement of the targeted standard (65% to 74% school-wide grading scale) in reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

Of the 23 students who enrolled in the after-school program, 12 were eventually eliminated from the study due to their attendance inconsistency. Sports leagues practices, and the after-school program often took place simultaneously, which created a conflict. Some students were required by their parents to remain in sports, while others preferred to participate in sports rather than the language-based after-school program. The remaining students in the program who consistently attended and participated are the students identified in this study.
Eleven students who were enrolled in the after-school program and their parents were eligible for participation in the study. Additionally, two independent, well-qualified educators, who have been teaching elementary school students for over 15 years each, were recruited to grade the data collected. This procedure was implemented to provide a means for an unbiased assessment of students’ work and further validated the study results.

At the end of the after-school program, two out of eleven parents agreed to participate in a semi-structured interview, which required approximately 30–45 minutes to conduct. The remaining nine parents who agreed to participate, were asked to fill out a 10-question, open-ended paper survey. The students were also asked to complete a 10-question, open-ended paper survey, and a five question Likert Scale Survey. The intent of the surveys was to explore and understand parents’ and students’ perceptions of the program and their perception of the youth center and its after-school programs.

Lastly, six classroom teachers of the students who participated in the language-based after-school program were asked to participate in the study and sign a consent form. Four of the six teachers agreed to participate in the study. These teachers were asked to complete a one-question open-ended paper survey regarding their observation and perception of their student’s post-academic behavior after their students participated in a language-based after-school program at the youth center. The teachers’ results identified an important factor and theme, which was hypothesized for this case study and also answered research question 2.

The director and a staff member of the youth center provided valuable information throughout the program’s implementation process. The constructive criticism and feedback regarding their observation and perception of the implementation process of the language-based
after-school program allowed for minor changes in the classroom environment. The feedback also contributed to modifications of the program and answered research question 3. Table 3 represents the students who participated in the study by grade, ethnicity, and gender.

Table 3

*Student Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total participants 6 5

*Instrumentation*

Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected to answer the research questions; this also allowed for the triangulation of data. The rationale for using both qualitative and quantitative data was to compare the data and further validate the findings to establish trustworthiness (Kolb, 2012). This approach of analyzing qualitative and quantitative data also provided an opportunity to identify data themes and patterns such as the awareness of formal language, lack of global awareness, and the value of learning a second language.

Four significant instruments were used as data sources for this program evaluation, which contributed to the themes and patterns, revealed in this study and also answered the research
questions. The four instruments used were the semi-structured interviews of parents, surveys of both parents and students, pre- and post- assessments of students’ reading fluency and comprehension, and constructive feedback from the youth center director and a staff member.

Research Results and Findings

Parent Survey

The parent survey revealed that 44.4% of the parents participating in this study support the concept of giving elementary school aged students an opportunity to learn a second language as opposed to middle or high school. The remaining 55.6% did not answer the survey question. Forty-nine percent of the parent participants agreed that an after-school program held at their local youth center would be the ideal location for children to learn a second language (See Appendix D). Some of the comments made by some parents included, “Very important. Young children retain language better than older kids and adults, so it is important to start young” (parent #6). Parent #7 said, “I agree that the younger, the better before other distractions come along.” Parent #8 explained, “It is very important for any age American students to learn a second language. They are sponges in their early years and will retain the information.” Parent # 9 added, “Earlier exploration to appreciate our beautiful world—languages are always a bonus.”

Student Survey

During the survey, the student participants were asked 10 open-ended questions regarding their opinions and perception of the language-based after-school program. Results of the survey revealed that 63.7% prefer to learn a second or third language at the youth center whereas 36.3% prefer to learn a second language at school (See Appendix C). Student #3 said, “Too much pressure at school.” Student #4 replied, “We don’t have work that will be graded or tests to study for.” Student #5 added, “We don’t have to do homework.” Student 6 concluded, “It’s funner (sic) because we just have fun learning, and no homework or no tests.”
Oral Reading Fluency Placement and Diagnostic Assessment

After the students participated and were assessed, they demonstrated a .44% improvement in their reading fluency. However, it is important to note that the improvement was also the result of the classroom teacher’s instruction. The instruction students received at the after-school program, regarding reading fluency and comprehension, reinforced their classroom teacher’s instruction method. Table 4 illustrates students’ reading fluency results.
Table 4

*Student’s Reading Fluency Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Fall CWPM Pre</th>
<th>Spring CWPM Post</th>
<th>Fluency % Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>72/76</td>
<td>75/78</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>92/92</td>
<td>105/106</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>164/164</td>
<td>183/183</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>77/77</td>
<td>86/88</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>93/96</td>
<td>94/96</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>64/68</td>
<td>74/76</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>111/111</td>
<td>117/119</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>70/72</td>
<td>79/81</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>91/94</td>
<td>95/99</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>104/106</td>
<td>117/119</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>85/89</td>
<td>98/99</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: .44

**Oral Reading Comprehension Diagnostic Assessment**

The results of the oral reading comprehension diagnostic assessment for the students revealed a 2.5% improvement. Table 5 shows the students’ comprehension results. It is important to note that the improvement is the result of collaboration between the classroom teacher and the after-school program teacher.
Table 5

*Reading Comprehension Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Fall CWPM Pre</th>
<th>Spring CWPM Post</th>
<th>Pre Fall Reading Level Comprehension</th>
<th>Post Spring Reading Level Comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>72/76</td>
<td>75/78</td>
<td>1 Low</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>92/92</td>
<td>105/106</td>
<td>3 Medium</td>
<td>3 Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>164/164</td>
<td>183/183</td>
<td>4 High</td>
<td>4 High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>77/77</td>
<td>86/88</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>93/96</td>
<td>94/96</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>64/68</td>
<td>74/76</td>
<td>1 Low</td>
<td>1 Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>111/111</td>
<td>117/119</td>
<td>3 Medium</td>
<td>3 Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>70/72</td>
<td>79/81</td>
<td>1 Low</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>91/94</td>
<td>95/99</td>
<td>1 Low</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>104/106</td>
<td>117/119</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
<td>3 Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>85/89</td>
<td>98/99</td>
<td>2 Low</td>
<td>3 Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average | 2.0% | 2.5% |

**Themes**

There were three themes identified as the result of coding this data from the interviews. The themes were Formal Language, Global Awareness, and Interest in Learning a Second Language.

**Formal language.** The first theme was Formal Language. The teacher surveys and informal feedback from students revealed that students recognize the difference in speech and language between their classroom lessons and their lessons at the after-school program. The students requested information from their classroom teacher regarding formal language in the
classroom. The teachers described the students’ comments about formal language after participating in the after-school program. Teacher 1 said:

No! My student’s primary language is English and he is a very bright student. However, he did mention to me that he was learning to speak Spanish at the youth center. He also mentioned to me that it would be a good idea that we do our best to use academic language throughout the day in our classroom, so that we can improve our proper English communication skills. I found this impressive and therefore, made adjustments in our daily language practices in our classroom. My students were asked to assist each other in using academic language as opposed to island casual conversation. What I mean by this is for example, Academic Language: “I do not understand what the predicate of the sentence is.” Casual Island Language: “I dono (sic) the back part of the sentence.” My student learned to speak Spanish and learned to appreciate and improve his English communication skills.”

Teacher 2 responded:

“My student who attended the Spanish Club is a good student and English is her first language, so I did not notice a significant change in her literacy skills. Instead, I noticed her excitement about learning to speak Spanish. I recall her telling her friends about Spanish Club, and also taught them and me some Spanish words. However, I do recall my student correcting me one day in class by asking me if I was using academic language (proper English). In Hawaii, it is common to use the word “yay” at the end of most sentences. So, I must have said, “yay” after a sentence and she asked me if that was a proper English sentence in an academic setting. I was impressed with her question and I asked her where did she learn about academic language and setting. Her response was, “At Spanish Club.”
Global awareness. The second theme was Global Awareness. The geography baseline assessment and student feedback regarding the location of the countries studied for this evaluation program study revealed that most students do not know the location of Spain. For example, some students’ comments were, “I dono (sic) where Spain is?” Another student stated, “It’s in Africa.” Another student commented, “No, it’s in Europe.”

Through informal instruction and in a small group setting, the students appeared to naturally participate in all formal and informal literacy diagnostic assessments and task activities, which included studying the globe, singing, and dancing. The students further initiated dialogue regarding world geography when one of their lessons required them to learn about the geographical location and culture of Spain and Mexico. Student 1 stated, “We don’t learn about the globe in school.” Student 5 explained, “Wow! I didn’t know how far Argentina was from America. It’s in a different hemisphere.” Student 8 added, “Why is it winter in Australia and summer here?”

Interest in learning a second language. The third theme that emerged was Interest in Learning a Second Language. To assist the students in learning Spanish vocabulary words, the instructor played songs. Student 9 responded, “I like the songs because they have a catchy tune and it’s fun to sing, yay.” Student 10 said, “The songs are cool and fun to sing even though I dono what it says the first time I listen to it.”

Research Questions Results

Research Question 1

Research question 1 asked, “What are the needs in the community, which provide a basis for the development of a structured after-school program for elementary school students?”

An initial investigation into the needs of the community suggested that language development is critically needed. The Hawaii Smarter Balanced Assessments results for academic
years 2014 through 2016 revealed that the students in the State of Hawaii rank between 48% and 51% proficiency in English Language skills (Appendix B). A language-based approach was determined appropriate for the instruction, and the learning goals for the program were to address the needs of the second language learners and students’ second language learning.

**Research Question 2**

Research question 2 asked, “What are classroom teachers’ perceptions of students’ formal language usage in the classroom, after students participated in the after-school program?” It also followed up with sub question, “What are parents’ and students’ perceptions of formal language usage in the classroom, after students participated in the after-school program?”

The purpose of the surveys was to acquire classroom teachers’, parents’, and students’ perspectives of a language-based after-school program at the local community youth center. Several parents in the program evaluation study requested that the surveys be a paper survey because they did not have a computer at home. And as previously mentioned, only two parents agreed to face-to-face semi-structured interview questions. To maintain consistency, paper surveys were given to the remaining nine participating parents, the participating students, and four classroom teachers. All nine surveys from the remaining parents were returned. All surveys of the participating students were returned, and all four classroom teachers returned their survey as well. The semi-structured interviews and the surveys gauged the impact of the commonality of parents, students, and teachers, regarding their support of implementing structured after-school programs at the local youth center.

**Teacher survey.** Four classroom teachers were provided with one open-ended survey question asking them if they noticed a difference in their student’s literacy skills after their students participated in a language-based after-school program. The teacher’s responses answered research question two. All four teachers responded that they did not notice a significant difference
in their student’s literacy skills; however, all teachers commented that they noticed their students’ awareness of formal language usage. One teacher realized that she was not consistent in her use of formal language in her classroom after she was questioned by one of her students. Another teacher made adjustments in her daily language practices in her classroom based on a student’s suggestion regarding the usage of formal language in their classroom.

The data provided by the classroom teachers supported the findings from the student achievement data scores, which answered research question two. Teacher 1 said:

No! My student’s primary language is English, and he is a very bright student. However, he did mention to me that he was learning to speak Spanish at the youth center. He also mentioned to me that it would be a good idea that we do our best to use formal language throughout the day in our classroom, so that we can improve our proper English communication skills. I found this impressive; therefore, made adjustments in our daily language practices in our classroom. My students were asked to assist each other in using formal language as opposed to island casual conversation. What I mean by this is for example: Formal language: “I do not understand what the predicate of the sentence is.” Casual island language: “I dono (sic) the back part of the sentence.” My student learned to speak Spanish and learned to appreciate and improve his English communication skills.

Teacher 2 replied:

My student who attended the Spanish Club is a good student, and English is her first language, so I did not notice a significant change in her literacy skills. Instead, I noticed her excitement about learning to speak Spanish. I recall her telling her friends about Spanish Club and also taught them and me some Spanish words. However, I do recall my student correcting me one day in class by asking me if I was using formal language (proper English). In Hawaii, it is common to use the word “yay” at the end of most sentences. So,
I must have said, “yay” after a sentence and she asked me if that was a proper English sentence in an academic setting. I was impressed with her question and asked her where did she learn about formal language and setting. Her response was “at Spanish Club.”

The additional data collected for this evaluation study was gathered in the form of two semi-structured question interviews, ten open-ended question surveys, and five Likert scale questions regarding parents’ and students’ experiences, perspectives, and opinions regarding the language-based after-school program at the youth center.

**Parent survey.** The survey results revealed that 72.8% of these parents acknowledge that it is important for their children to learn a second language. The two parents who participated in the semi-structured interview reported that it was a benefit for their children to learn English and a second language, and that it was just as important that their children become aware of the world around them. Parent 11 shared, “Es un beneficio para nuestro hijos sí aprenden el inglés, van a seguir adelante. Sí es muy importante qué nuestro hijos aprenden del principio buenos modos, culturas de otros, y sí se puede, tambien él lenguaje.” The translation is, “It is a benefit for our children to learn English, they will advance. Yes, it is very important that our children to primarily learn good manners, about other cultures, and if possible, also the languages.” Parent 10 added:

**Mis hijos aprendieron el español y el inglés al mismo tiempo. En casa yo les hablo en español y nuestros amigos, sus amigos, y en la escuela mis hijos hablan el inglés. Si, creo qué es muy importante qué los niños aprenden otro idioma para poder cominicarse con otros del paiz.**

Translation:

My children learned Spanish and English at the same time. At home, I speak Spanish, and our friends, their friends, and in school, my children speak English. I believe that it is
very important that the children learn another language so that they may communicate with others from different countries.

**Student survey.** The students were asked 10 open-ended questions regarding their opinions and perception of the language-based after-school program and the community youth center where they spend approximately 1.5 hours, 1 day per week for 20 weeks after-school. However, it is important to note that several of these students did not attend the youth center on a regular basis. The only reason they attended the youth center was to participate in the after-school program.

The students’ survey revealed that 63.7% of them prefer to learn a second or third language at the youth center and 36.3% prefer to learn a second language at school. Student #3 commented, “Too much pressure at school.” Student #4 stated, “We don’t have work that will be graded or tests to study for.” Student #5 said, “We don’t have to do homework.” Student #6 added, “It’s funner (sic), because we just have fun learning and no homework or no tests.”

Through informal instruction and a small group setting at the youth center, the students appeared to naturally participate in all formal and informal literacy assessments and task activities, which included singing and dancing. The students further initiated dialogue regarding world geography when one of their lessons required them to learn about the Spanish and Mexican culture.

**Research Question 3**

Research question 3 asked, “What evidence was found of meeting the program goals, of developing literacy skills and global awareness, and what was the significance of the findings?” The progress toward the program’s goals was monitored through daily journal reflection, consultation with the students and their parents, and evaluations based on observations of the after-school program instruction by the director and staff member of the youth center. Ongoing
modifications to the program’s instruction were made based on several strategies. These included ongoing feedback from the youth center director and the staff member who was in the classroom throughout the program.

Another progress strategy used was informal feedback from participants in the study. For example, the youth center director and staff member observed how crowded the program was in the computer classroom; therefore, they removed some of their materials and supplies boxes, which were crowding the area in which lessons were being conducted. After the learning area was rearranged, the students felt less confined and more comfortable to participate in the activities, which required body movement while singing certain songs, and dancing.

The instructor conducted informal formative assessments of the students’ Spanish work using the Sube curriculum generated assessment, which could be either teacher or student directed. These assessments revealed the students’ abilities to learn a second language, thus additional Spanish topics were introduced and taught to the students (See Appendix I).

Lastly, daily notes were taken regarding the interactions between students, the engagement of students throughout the after-school program, and with any comments or suggestions made by students, parents, staff members, or director of the youth center. The notes were recorded and reflected upon for analysis of the program. For example, the director of the youth center stated the following:

We don’t have the classrooms to properly and academically teach students, but regardless of the small area in the computer room, the students appeared to be having fun learning Spanish, yay. I suppose a child learns regardless, so as long they have a good teacher, yay. Thank you.

The staff member said:
I can’t believe how the kids were reading in Spanish in just a couple of days, yay. It was unbelievable to witness that they didn’t know the continents or even where Spain is located, yay. But, I’m also learning Spanish just by listening to you. Daily interaction with the students also provided guidance regarding modifications of the lessons. In one instance, a topic was introduced to the students, and they practiced listening, speaking, reading, and writing certain Spanish vocabulary words related to the topic. After the lesson, the instructor played a topic-related song provided by the Sube Spanish program for vocabulary reinforcement, and the students requested that the songs be played before their lessons. The students explained that it was easier for them to remember Spanish vocabulary words, through the beat and rhythm of Spanish music. One student said, “I like the songs because they have a catchy tune and it’s fun to sing, yay.” Another student explained, “The songs are cool and fun to sing to even though I don’t know what it says the first time I listen to it.” Based on students’ comments, suggestions, and enthusiasm to learn a second language, procedures in learning vocabulary were modified to meet each student’s Spanish cognitive language acquisition skills.

The students were then given a basic geography pre-assessment to collect baseline data on global awareness to determine their background knowledge regarding the physical location of continents, oceans, imaginary lines of the world, and the location of the U.S. states. The students were further asked to label all of these physical locations on maps. The Hawaii Content and Performance Standards for Social Studies K-12 was retrieved from the Hawaii Public Schools website, and it stated the following:

Standard 7 Geography: World in Spatial Terms – Use geographic representations, to organize, analyze, and present information on people, places, and environment, and understand the nature and interaction of geographic regions and societies around the world. (Hawaii State Department of Education, 2017)
According to the Hawaiian Social Studies Geography Standards, kindergarten to fifth grade students should have been introduced to, taught, and mastered the basic geography skills regarding reading and labeling maps, which consist of land masses and imaginary lines. The students should also be able to identify all of the 50 U.S. states.

Map 1 consists of a blank flat world map, and Map 2 consists of a blank U.S. state map (See Appendix F). The students were asked to identify to the best of their ability the 18 numbered items on Map 1 and the 50 items on Map 2. The test items regarding the flat map consisted of identifying continents, oceans, and imaginary lines. Map 2 consisted of a blank map of all 50 U.S. states. Students were asked to identify all of the states to the best of their ability. Of the participating students, one third grade student answered all of the questions correctly on Map 1 and Map 2. Table 6 reveals the results of students’ mastery of the Hawaiian Content and Performance Standards Social Studies Standard 7.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>World Map</th>
<th>U.S. States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/18</td>
<td>1/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/18</td>
<td>1/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18/18</td>
<td>50/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>1/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0/18</td>
<td>1/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0/18</td>
<td>1/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1/18</td>
<td>3/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/18</td>
<td>1/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12/18</td>
<td>1/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7/18</td>
<td>8/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0/18</td>
<td>1/50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance of this assessment was to collect baseline data on global knowledge for
the purpose of studying the students’ background knowledge. It was important to determine how much understanding of world geographical locations and of their own country the students had for them to have gained a basic understanding, respect, and tolerance of global and cultural awareness. In summary, the percentage of the students who successfully mastered map skills were 4.1%, whereas 2.6% of the students knew all the locations of the 50 U.S. states.

These findings, based on a small sample of population, support the National Assessment of Educational Progress (2014), which reported that American students are less than proficient in the subjects under the umbrella of Social Studies; and specifically, geography. NAEP further reported that there was no significant difference in these students’ scores, compared to American students’ scores dating back to 1994. These findings further support other authors and researchers such as Bartolomé and Trueba (2000), Bok (2006), Dill (2012), Friedman (2005), Richardson (2016), and Sanchez and Ek (2008) that American students are not currently prepared to compete in the global market.

It was evident that the participating students’ geography skills required improvement, and the staff member in the classroom mentioned her observations to the director of the youth center. A globe was then placed in the after-school program area by the following class. Five minutes before the end of the language lessons, the instructor reviewed basic regions of the globe with the students. By the end of the after-school program, most students had learned all of the continents’, oceans’, and imaginary lines’ locations, and the difference between the earth’s hemispheres. One student commented, “Wow! I didn’t know how far Argentina was from America. It’s in a different hemisphere. Wow!” Another student questioned, “Why is it winter in Australia and summer here?” Another student exclaimed, “We don’t learn about the globe in school.” The students’ inquiries regarding the globe, the world, and the distances between continents were unlimited. Through the after-school program, most students realized that there is so much to learn about the
world around them and also the value of learning a second or multiple languages.

As a result of the analysis of student pre, and post diagnostic test scores, there was a significant improvement in students’ literacy scores, after having received instruction in a second language. These results were analyzed using the McGrall Hill Reading Fluency Scale (See Appendix J). All participating students, with the exception of one third grade student, were below standard grade level reading fluency and reading comprehension.

The pre- and post- diagnostic assessment results further revealed an increase of students’ global awareness, and the value of formal language. It also included their excitement concerning learning a second language and its culture. The language lessons were taught 1 day per week, for 20 weeks. These students successfully learned to read, write, speak, and listen to, the Spanish language at the basic level in the relatively short duration of the program. With the implementation of an ongoing language-based after-school program at the youth center, it is most likely that students will improve in their English language literacy skills, and they may also become fluent in speaking, reading, and writing Spanish.

The pre- and post- reading fluency and comprehension diagnostic scores were analyzed using a paired t-test calculator and a significance level of p < .05 was sought. The results of the paired t-test revealed a significance level of p < .0002, therefore, it was statistically significant. The mean of Group 1 minus Group 2 equaled -9.09. The intermediate values used in the calculations were $t = 5.66$ and $df = 10$. Table 7 provides the paired t-test itemized data results.
Table 7

**Paired t-test Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired t-test</th>
<th>Pre Test</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>102.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>30.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stufflebeam (1971) recommended that a combination of assessment analysis methods be employed to obtain the most comprehensive perspective in product evaluation. The results of these analysis methods showed a significant improvement regarding reading fluency and comprehension. However, this difference could be interpreted as a result of collaboration between the students’ classroom teacher and their after-school language-based teacher.

In a state where students are ranking from 48% to 51% literacy level, this growth is significant. Further, students’ informal assessments, personal feedback by the students, parents, and youth center staff members, and students’ enthusiasm for learning a second language provided a comprehensive perspective concerning product evaluation of the after-school program. These results inspired the youth center stakeholders, parents, teachers, and students, to improve the type of programs implemented at the youth center to enhance students’ overall academic growth.

**Summary**

The CIPP model program evaluation method allowed for decision-makers to refer to the research information to implement and improve after-school programs at the youth center. The language-based after-school program was a new program designed for this youth center, and it was carefully implemented and evaluated to benefit the participating students’ literacy skills. The
primary function of the program evaluation was to determine the worth and potential continuation of it. The CIPP model program evaluation method was used as a framework to evaluate an alternative program at the youth center to assist students with improving and further developing their literacy skills.

Chapter 5 consists of an overall summary of the language-based youth center after-school program. Addressed is the analysis of the research questions results based on the CIPP model evaluation outcomes.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this program evaluation study was to explore and evaluate the design and implementation of a language based after-school program, in one of the Hawaiian Islands. The outcome of the Hawaii Smarter Balanced Assessment results for the academic years 2014–2016 revealed that students in the State of Hawaii ranked between 48% to 51% proficiency in English Language skills (Hawaii State Department of Education, 2016). The intent of the language-based instruction offered in this program was to develop students’ English cognitive language acquisition skills while they learned a second language. This study emerged based on the initial investigation into the needs of the community and formal English language development, which was most critically needed.

Stufflebeam’s (1971) CIPP model was used as a framework to evaluate the program, and it offered an evolutionary process which required a continuous checks and balance process. Reflections on the findings included highlighted areas for consideration regarding improvement and recommendations for further evaluation researchers and practitioners. A mixed methods approach was used to answer the research questions posed for the study. These results capitalized on the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research mixed methods, which consisted of the collection of the responses from interviews and surveys indicating participants’ perceptions of a structured language-based after-school program.

Summary of the Results

The students developed relationships within the “Spanish Club,” and were able to feel comfortable and confident to explore new language skills, including formal language, without fear of being judged or ridiculed. These language skills laid the foundation for literacy development and helped support academic achievement. Additionally, the students learned the importance of being respectful of the native languages brought to the after-school program, and the trust and
mutual respect created with the instructor prompted modifications to the program. Further, the powerful tools of music, games, and hands-on activities reinforced students’ vocabulary, and their understanding of new Spanish vocabulary. Hence, students truly enjoyed learning their experience in the language-based after-school program as long as it was not in a test-based environment, and they were not overwhelmed with homework.

Seven data sources (semi-structured interviews, surveys, pre- and post- assessments, journal reflection, and feedback) were used in this study. This resulted in the triangulation of data in support of the research question, and thus increased the trustworthiness of the findings regarding participants’ perceptions of implementation a language-based after-school program at a local youth center. The CIPP model was the appropriate instrument to use for the implementation and evaluation of the language-based after-school program, as it is based on the premise of valuing improvement and not to prove a program (Stufflebeam, 1971). This model allowed the flexibility for the researcher to pose questions to all participants to evaluate the progress of the after-school program. This flexibility created a check and balance process to effectively make the necessary modifications regarding implementation of the program. In this study, the model assisted with answering the research questions as follows:

- **Content.** The identified community need was the improvement of English literacy skills therefore a language-based approach was determined appropriate for the instruction. It was also appropriate for the goals for the program to address the needs of the second language learners, as well as students’ second language.

- **Input.** Based on the survey results for students, it can be inferred that the majority of the students felt that the relaxed atmosphere of the after-school program, without tests and homework, helped them feel more comfortable, and they preferred this type of learning. Additionally, the parents felt that it would be beneficial for their children to have an
opportunity to learn a second language during their elementary school years as opposed to middle or high school. These parents also believed that an after-school program held at the youth center would be the ideal location for their children to learn a second language.

- Process. The results of implementing findings from journal reflection, feedback from students, parents, and teachers, director, and staff of the program revealed that students preferred to listen to music and participate in hands-on activities before every lesson as opposed to starting a lesson with worksheets. Modifications to the lessons were made to accommodate the students’ engagement. Before commencing these lessons, music was played to introduce the new theme of the lesson as opposed to teaching introduction of the lesson using a worksheet. Hands-on activities and games relating to the lesson were given to the students, so they could practice their new vocabulary, i.e. puzzles, bingo, flash cards. Lastly, the students felt comfortable to work on their new vocabulary lesson worksheet of the day. Parents requested basic bilingual Spanish/English books to read at home with their child, which included reading aloud using bilingual books not provided by the curriculum. This researcher then acquired bilingual level readers for the students to read at home with their parents and at the after-school program. Further, at the suggestion of the youth center staff member, students colored worksheets were developed, and students practiced saying the colors in Spanish. The youth center director allowed for the use of the computers in the homework/computer room and for Google Translation, Doulingo, and Babbel.

- Product. Based on the journal reflection, after the delivery of instruction, the learning trends that were noted were that the students demonstrated a .44% improvement in oral reading fluency and a 2.5% improvement in reading comprehension. The positive results of this study were not necessarily the sole contributing factor regarding the students’ literacy improvement. These improvements were likely based on both the collaboration
between the students’ classroom teachers’ and the instruction at the after-school program. Additionally, on occasions, the students caught themselves using informal language and would self-correct their language. Hence, the students demonstrated a genuine interest in reading and writing in Spanish, as well as translating into English.

Students’ enthusiasm concerning learning a second language, despite the compact location in which the lessons were conducted, later inspired the decision to restructure the classroom to provide a comfortable learning environment. Through informal assessments and discussions with participants, some lessons were modified to meet the learning needs and for engaging the students. The CIPP model allowed for a checks and balance methodology to adjust instruction modifications throughout the implementation and evaluate the themes which were discovered.

**Discussion of the Results**

Several themes emerged from the analysis of the data, which illustrated the participants’ experiences during the language-based after-school program, which include the use of formal language, increased global awareness, and learning a second language. These themes uncovered the need for a structured separate classroom and program for the students to acquire a positive and effective learning experience with a qualified instructor, an awareness of formal language, the knowledge of geography, and the value of learning a second language, which lacked in traditional classroom instruction.

The results of this program provided the youth center staff with practical information grounded in research, which was useful in developing future after-school program designs and evaluating programs for the youth center. Studies reveal strong results regarding structured after-school programs with qualified educators consistently assisting the students to acquire the necessary 21st century skills to compete in the local and global market (After School Alliance, 2014; Butler et al., 2004; Frantz et al., 2014; Schleppegrell, 2004; Soderman, 2010). The
promotion of the after-school program revitalized the youth center’s interest in addressing the need to restructure the homework and computer room so that students could experience positive learning experiences in a structured classroom.

The youth center director’s observation of the students’ engagement in learning a second language convinced the director of the importance of acquiring a qualified educator to teach academic programs. The director stated, “We do not have the funds to hire a tutor or teacher with credentials to teach and support our students with homework, but we can only do our best with what we have.” Studies conducted by the Afterschool Alliances (2009), Armstrong (2008), and Murphy et al. (2015) indicated that students who are taught by qualified educators of the same culture or who speak the same language, will be more effective in assisting students attain academic growth. As the evaluation evolved, the youth center director emphasized the importance of providing a proper classroom setting, which does not impede the comfort and learning environment of the students. She further acknowledged the value of a qualified educator to tutor or teach the students. The director said:

I could see how uncomfortable the kids were when they were trying to participate in the music activities and yet, they were so engaged. I had the staff remove and relocate the boxes that were in the classroom, so that you and the kids could have more room, yay.

This study focused on students’ improvement, regarding their primary English language acquisition skills and learning a second language, including cultural awareness of the origin of the second language learned. Studies conducted by Braskamp (2008), Chamberlin-Quinlisk and Senyshyn (2012), and Helterbran and Strahler (2013) noted that American students generally learn very little about world history and geography. Learning a second language encourages students to learn about the origin of the language, its culture, and the geographical locations where the language is generally spoken. This study revealed that 4.1% of the students in the after-school
program successfully mastered map skills, and 2.6% of the students have learned the location of the 50 U.S. states. These results raised further questions, such as “What must we do to further educate our students about the geographical regions of the world? Why are our students not learning sufficient geography in school?”

Two main reasons geography is virtually not being taught in schools are the narrowing of curriculum due to federally mandated tested subjects such as math, language arts, and science, and many elementary teachers do not feel sufficiently confident to teach the subject due to lack of training they have received in their own education (Bok, 2006; Friedman, 2005; National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2014). Regarding the subject of geography, to move forward, further research is necessary to implement an effective global awareness after-school program at the local youth center.

Most of the participating students in this program evaluation study were ELLs who are not literate in their own native languages such as Spanish, Filipino, Japanese, Hawaiian, and various languages of the southern Pacific islands, but instead choose to speak English only. They may also speak Hawaiian Pidgin, also known as Hawaiian English Creole, at home, at school, and among their peers. This study further revealed that students could learn a second language and become aware of the difference between everyday “island language” versus formal language usage in academic settings. For example, when the students learned the topic “La Familia” (The Family), they realized that there is a proper way of speaking and writing when identifying a family member in the English and Spanish language. Table 9 illustrates the listening and speaking learning process in which some students in the after-school program experienced.
Table 9

Listening and Speaking Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Pidgin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keola is my brother.</td>
<td>Keola es mi hermano.</td>
<td>Keola my bradda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rianna is my sister.</td>
<td>Rianna es mi hermana.</td>
<td>Rianna my sista.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawena is my mother.</td>
<td>Kawena es mi madre.</td>
<td>Kawena my madda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lika is my father.</td>
<td>A lika es mi padre.</td>
<td>A lika my fadda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 describes the complete spoken and written English and Spanish sentences, which contain a verb, whereas in the Hawaiian Pidgin and English Creole language, a verb is missing when the sentence is spoken, and some words are spelled differently. The development of the Hawaiian Pidgin and English Creole language originated in the late 1800s when the first sugarcane plantations were established. Many laborers were imported from different countries such as the Philippines, Spain, Portugal, Japan, China, and Korea. With such a diverse group of people, a common language was needed; therefore, the Hawaiian Pidgin, also known as the Hawaiian English Creole language, was developed and established by the 1900s (Hawaii State Department of Education, n.d.). The Hawaiian Pidgin language became the primary language of the many diverse cultures, which thrived on the Hawaiian Islands. This language continues to strive in the diversity of modern day Hawaiian cultures within all islands and their local and native Hawaiian population.

In the State of Hawaii, most students learn and adopt the Hawaiian Pidgin and some native classroom teachers use it to “connect” with their students. A classroom teacher stated, “I do recall one of my students correcting me one day in class by asking me if I was using formal language.” Another classroom teacher said:
I work hard trying to get all of my students to use formal language on a daily basis. Knowing that there was a qualified teacher at the youth center teaching the same language skills we teach in school was a bonus. Students frequently use Hawaiian Pidgin words such as “dono” for “I don’t know;” “nat” for “not,” “tree” for “three,” and “yay” after most sentences.

Studies conducted by Guerrero (1997) and Waldron and Hernandez (2013) asserted that the methodology for teaching a second language is to have bilingual educators teach ELLs. Thus, throughout the lessons, the students in the after-school program practiced repetition of complete sentence structure and became aware that there is a time and place for casual island language conversation, and a time for proper formal language. For example, one student said, “Oh, now I know what my teacher means about formal language.” Another student replied, “No wonder some tourists at da beach dono (sic) what I say to them when dey (sic) ask me question about our island.”

The teachers’ perspectives provided important and relevant data regarding their students’ English language skills after their students participated in the language-based after-school program. Of the six teachers who were asked to participate, four agreed, and all four acknowledged that they had not observed their students’ English language improve because their students’ first language is English. However, these teachers also asserted that they did notice an interest and appreciation of learning a second language, and the usage of formal language in proper settings such as in the classroom and out in public.

The parents’ perspectives provided additional support for the language-based after-school program and recognized the economic value in learning a second language. All 11 parents who were eligible to participate in the study maintained that it is an economic necessity to have the ability to speak two or multiple languages and learn about other cultures, including maintaining
their own culture and language. These results support studies conducted by Guerrero (1997), King and Fogle (2006), and Rowan (2001).

Interestingly, the parents additionally shared their personal frustrations regarding their children making the conscious decision to speak English only, and the children showed no interest in learning their native language, yet they joined the youth center after-school program “Spanish Club” because they wanted to learn Spanish to communicate with many of their friends at school. One parent commented, “My daughter wants to learn Spanish because she wants to understand what her friends at school are talking about.” Another parent said, “Yo les hablo en español, y me responden en Ingles.” Translation: “I speak to them in Spanish and they respond to me in English.”

The overall results of this study suggest that learning a second language is beneficial for elementary school age students. Further, it is just as important for students to improve their English language skills, as both have an economic value.

**Discussion of the Results in Relation to the Literature**

The findings of this research were also consistent with findings in the literature concerning the value of learning and speaking a second language to compete in the global market (Butler et al., 2004; Frantz et al., 2014; Schleppegrell, 2004; Soderman, 2010). According to the study, parent responses indicate that they support the idea of their children improving their English and second language literacy skills for both economic advancements and maintaining their cultural identity. Research demonstrates that learning a second language will not only provide students with an understanding of different cultures and their practices, but may also offer opportunities for professional economic gains in the new global market (Gandara & Acevedo, 2016; Helterbran & Strahler, 2013).
Other research reveals that there may be limited financial compensation for bilingual employees within the United States, because English is the primary language when doing business, and in 1992, the specialized occupations made up only approximately 7% of the American workforce. Bilingual employees use their bilingual or multilingual skills freely to communicate with foreigners or new migrants (Fry & Lowell, 1992). Nonetheless, with the rise of technology during the 21st century, employees will likely be required to be bilingual or multilingual in multinational corporations and import/export businesses (Gandara & Acevedo, 2016).

The benefits of bilingualism include maintaining cultural identity while developing an understanding of another culture (King & Fogle, 2006; Mosty et al., 2013). Fluent bilingual students have been shown to generally possess high self-esteem, abstract thinking skills, and generally achieve academic success (Han, 2012). However, other studies show perceived disadvantages of bilingualism, which include language delay due to mental confusion, low self-esteem, and mistaken interpretation of others’ cultural beliefs and practices (Lee et al., 2015).

During the 21st century, a second language will continue to be an asset and will also be considered as a qualification to acquire future employment in a global market (Gandara & Acevedo, 2016). However, some states in the United States have previously denied students the opportunity (i.e., Proposition 227 in California) to learn another language, which resulted in making American students generally less qualified to compete (Friedman, 2007; Gandara & Acevedo, 2016). Nevertheless, the recent passing of Proposition 58 in California, which allows public schools to provide bilingual education, there is hope that future generations of American students will become fluent bilinguals and will also acquire the language proficiency necessary to compete locally, nationally, and globally.
Limitations

One limitation encountered in this study was the small sample size due to the inconsistency of attendance by a portion of the 23 students who initially enrolled in the program. Frequent absenteeism from school is chronic in Hawaiian schools (Hawaii State Department of Education, n.d.). Twelve of the 23 students were eliminated from the study due to lack of attendance, which therefore resulted in a smaller study population in a single unique site. The experimental mortality was also a threat to the internal validity of the study. Participants self-selected into the study and may not have been representative of the population.

Another limitation was the use of one study site for the study, which inhibits the ability to generalize the findings. Studies have demonstrated that to effectively learn a foreign language, students must have the ability and opportunity to be immersed in the language within a meaningful context and in a variety of social settings (Alvarado, 2014; Guerrero, 1997; Herminia, 2013). The computer and homework classroom is not designed to be a traditional classroom where related subject posters, materials, and equipment could be incorporated to create a foreign language-learning atmosphere.

Due to the remote geographical location of the Hawaiian Islands, there is a limited availability of available reliable professionals, for research participation. As a result, this researcher was also the instructor and developer of the language-based after-school program. To control for possible bias, outside personnel were recruited to grade students’ work and assessments. A youth center staff member was also recruited to attend all classroom lessons to provide ongoing feedback.

Implications of the Results for Practice

This study suggests that the implementation of a language-based after-school program for elementary school aged students may improve students’ primary English language acquisition
skills. The students demonstrated a .44% improvement in oral reading fluency and a 2.5% improvement in reading comprehension. All participants in this study were able to share their positive experiences resulting in the overall success of the program.

The positive results of this study are not necessarily the sole contributing factor regarding the students’ literacy improvement. These improvements are likely based on both the collaboration between the students’ classroom teachers’ reading instruction, reinforcement of reading strategies at the after-school program and the relaxed and non-test based environment, which was conducive to learning. The positive outcomes of this study and the continued support of the parents, teachers, students, and the community should be the starting point for future successful programs.

For any successful youth center after-school program to develop, the director must be visible and engaged in all aspects of the process. He or she must make an effort to have inclusive conversations with all stakeholders and collaborate with them regarding future academic after-school programs, which will support the community students.

In summary, when academic-related after-school programs are designed properly, they significantly assist parents, teachers, school administrators, and community members toward implementing relevant programs at the local youth centers, which will enrich and promote students’ overall academic achievements. Failing to support the results of this particular language-based after-school program and the youth center director, who works diligently to meet the needs of the students, would disrupt the positive momentum of this study.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

While this study adds to the currently available research results, it also highlights the need for further research. This study highlights the requirement for an in-depth, regional analysis of after-school programs in the Hawaiian Islands. Every Hawaiian school is under the management
and jurisdiction of only one school district, which has its own unique challenges and strengths. The same language-based after-school program used for this study may be used for other after-school programs whether the language is Spanish, or another.

It is important to note that the language-based program choice would vary by island, and also the specific location within each island. The islands, and their towns and villages, are culturally diverse from each other, thus various language curriculums must be researched to meet the specific learning needs and engagement of each language-based after-school program. Another area of focus for future research is language other than Spanish, which would also expand the contribution of this study.

This study focused on the evaluation of the design and implementation of a language-based after-school program. This study also revealed that the majority of Hawaiian students lack sufficient geography skills. Implementing a geography or social studies after-school program will benefit students statewide.

Structured after-school programs have proven to meet students’ personal and academic growth, especially underprivileged students. Many students appear to face increasing emotional and mental challenges such as coping with abusive or absentee parents, incarcerated parents, blended families, multiple blended families, single parents, poverty, cyber bullying, and loneliness. All of these emotional factors may hinder students’ learning process (Jensen, 2009). Further, the teaching profession has evolved, and educators must remain current with their methodologies and pedagogical techniques to support these modern family dynamics, which affect teachers’ teaching and students’ learning. Thus, to surmount these challenges and conditions, qualified teachers at structured after-school programs are required.

One final area of focus for required future research is the learning outcomes from different schools regarding literacy skills. This study demonstrated that although students may attend
different schools, there is no direct evidence that their language academic performance in the after-school program was affected, but the program increased their formal language awareness. Future research could focus on two related questions.

First, to what degree do the factors of school curriculum and philosophy impact academic achievement for Hawaiian students, such as school staff, culture, curriculum, and student family life? Second, how do these factors of school context affect after-school programs? Understanding as much as possible regarding the relationship between all Hawaiian after-school programs, schools, teachers, and academic achievement is vitally important to the education of the vast number of students who participate in local after-school programs each year.

Conclusion

The purpose of this program evaluation study was to explore and evaluate the design and implementation of a language-based after-school program, in one of the Hawaiian Islands. The focus on literacy as a basis for the structured after-school program was the needs of the community and language development, which were most critically required. Stufflebeam’s (1971) CIPP model was used as a conceptual framework to evaluate the program, and it offered an evolutionary process, which required a continuous checks and balance process to determine the value and potential continuation of the program. A mixed methods approach was used to triangulate the data and answer the research questions posed for the study and to establish validity and reliability.

Reflections on the results of this study reveal considerations for improvement and recommendations for further evaluation by researchers and practitioners. Overall, the success of the completed language-based after-school program and study has inspired the promotion of other structured programs for the ongoing, effective, and relevant program, which will soon be implemented at the youth center. One of the indirect results of implementing the after-school program and study was to open the lines of communication and collaboration for school
administrators, teachers of all school communities, and parents. Additionally, the staff of the after-school program was inspired to work together in an effort to assist all students who attended the center to have access to a qualified educator to assist them with their homework. Further, an educator will be hired to teach current academic programs, which will engage the students at the center to participate and benefit from such programs.
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Appendix A: Statement of Original Work

The Concordia University Doctorate of Education Program is a collaborative community of scholar-practitioners, who seek to transform society by pursuing ethically-informed, rigorously-researched, inquiry-based projects that benefit professional, institutional, and local educational contexts. Each member of the community affirms throughout their program of study, adherence to the principles and standards outlined in the Concordia University Academic Integrity Policy. This policy states the following:

**Statement of academic integrity.**

As a member of the Concordia University community, I will neither engage in fraudulent or unauthorized behaviors in the presentation and completion of my work, nor will I provide unauthorized assistance to others.

**Explanations:**

*What does “fraudulent” mean?*

“Fraudulent” work is any material submitted for evaluation that is falsely or improperly presented as one’s own. This includes, but is not limited to texts, graphics and other multi-media files appropriated from any source, including another individual, that are intentionally presented as all or part of a candidate’s final work without full and complete documentation.

*What is “unauthorized” assistance?*

“Unauthorized assistance” refers to any support candidates solicit in the completion of their work, that has not been either explicitly specified as appropriate by the instructor, or any assistance that is understood in the class context as inappropriate. This can include, but is not limited to:

- Use of unauthorized notes or another’s work during an online test
- Use of unauthorized notes or personal assistance in an online exam setting
- Inappropriate collaboration in preparation and/or completion of a project
- Unauthorized solicitation of professional resources for the completion of the work.
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## Appendix B

2014–2015

SMARTER BALANCED ASSESSMENT

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS & MATHEMATICS

STATEWIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N Tested</th>
<th>N Proficient</th>
<th>Met/Exceeded Achievement Standard</th>
<th>N Tested</th>
<th>N Proficient</th>
<th>Met/Exceeded Achievement Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>14,061</td>
<td>6,525</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>14,110</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>13,995</td>
<td>6,739</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14,001</td>
<td>6,487</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>13,805</td>
<td>7,431</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13,830</td>
<td>5,857</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>13,188</td>
<td>6,151</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13,237</td>
<td>5,073</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>12,610</td>
<td>5,517</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>4,740</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>11,634</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11,611</td>
<td>4,558</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>9,999</td>
<td>5,302</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>9,983</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>89,292</td>
<td>43,095</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>89,372</td>
<td>36,705</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2015–2016
### SMARTER BALANCED ASSESSMENT
#### ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS & MATHEMATICS
##### STATEWIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>N Tested</th>
<th>N Proficient</th>
<th>Met/Exceeded Achievement Standard</th>
<th>N Tested</th>
<th>N Proficient</th>
<th>Met/Exceeded Achievement Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>14,424</td>
<td>7,116</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>14,439</td>
<td>7,742</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>13,978</td>
<td>7,016</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14,017</td>
<td>6,623</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>14,045</td>
<td>7,874</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>14,069</td>
<td>5,979</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>13,319</td>
<td>6,877</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>13,336</td>
<td>5,280</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>12,728</td>
<td>6,001</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>12,717</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>12,243</td>
<td>5,991</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>12,231</td>
<td>4,595</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>10,038</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9,977</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>90,775</td>
<td>46,475</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>90,786</td>
<td>37,974</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Student Paper Survey Results

1. What do you like the most about the youth center you attend after school?

2. How many days per week do you attend the youth center?

3. If you could change anything about the youth center, what would that be?

4. What language do you speak at home?

5. Have you ever thought about learning another language?

6. What language other than English, would you like to learn to speak, read and write, and why?

7. If you speak a second language, please tell me which language, and can you read and write in your second language?

8. What language do you speak at school with your friends?

9. How do you feel when you hear someone, or perhaps a friend, spoke a different language?

10. If you could learn a second language, where would you like to learn it? At school or at an after-school program at the youth center? Please tell me why.
Appendix D

Parent Paper Survey Results

1. What are your thoughts about giving elementary school students an opportunity to learn a second or third language at an after-school program, as opposed to learning it at school? Please explain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Center</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Irrelevant</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is your opinion of the local youth center?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Like</th>
<th>Don't Like</th>
<th>Irrelevant</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What is your opinion of the importance of American students learning a second or third language at the elementary school level, as opposed to middle or high school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Do you speak a second or third language? Do you believe that there is a value in learning a 2nd language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speak 2nd Language</th>
<th>Believe in Value</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you feel the community, teachers and parents, have a strong relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do you think it is important to have qualified staff members, non-qualified staff members, or volunteers at the youth center, to assist students with the homework? Please explain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualified</th>
<th>Non Qualified</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What programs would you like to see at the local youth center and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Music/Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Do you assist your child with Language Arts homework that is sent home on a daily basis by the teacher? Please explain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What time do you pick up your child from the youth center?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4:00pm</th>
<th>4:30pm</th>
<th>5:00pm</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. If there is anything you would change about the youth center, what would it be, and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>Engaging Activities</th>
<th>Spanish Club</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Music/Arts</th>
<th>Misc</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Oral Reading Fluency

Why Bears Sleep All Winter

Long ago in the winter, Bear laughed at Turtle for being slow.

"I am fast!" Turtle exclaimed. "We should race around the lake. You can run, and I will swim."

"Ice covers the water," Bear said. "How will I know if you are swimming around the lake?"

"I will look out of some holes as I swim," Turtle answered.

So Bear and Turtle met the next morning. Bear yelled,

"Go!" and started jogging. Soon Turtle's head popped up through the first hole.

"I'm ahead of you!" Turtle called.

Bear ran faster. Turtle's head popped up again. "You are slow!"

Bear raced as fast as he could. Finally, Turtle's head popped up through the last hole, and he shouted, "I won!"

Bear was so tired that he ran home and slept the rest of the winter. Turtle tapped on the ice, and a green head popped up through each hole.

"Thank you, cousins," Turtle said. "We may move slowly, but we do not think slowly."

To this day, bears sleep all winter so they will not have to race turtles.

Why do Bear and Turtle race? [Cross response]

How does Turtle win the race? Refer to Todus/Rabbit story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words Read</th>
<th>Errors</th>
<th>WCPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall (71 WCPM)

Winter (62 WCPM)

Spring (107 WCPM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WCPM / Words Read</th>
<th>Accuracy %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75 / 78</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROSODY

- Reading in Phrases
- Pace
- Syntax
- Self-correction
- Intonation
Appendix F

The Physical World
Continents and Oceans

Name the Continents
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Name the Oceans
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
## Appendix G

### After-school Spanish Program Reflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>I arrived early at the Youth Center in order to set up and prepare for the commencement of the After School Spanish Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I assisted a student with a grammar worksheet while I waited for the students to arrive. Eight students arrived early while the other three arrived fifteen minutes later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students slowly began to enter the computer/homework room to participate in the ASSP. I know all but two students and was eager to meet them and learn a little about them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using a megaphone, a staff member made an announcement to all students about the Spanish Program was in session and anyone who signed up must report to the computer room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I introduced myself to all old and new students, and the students introduced themselves. All students knew each other. I reviewed class norms, explained my purpose for conducting a Spanish Program, and asked the students if they still wished to participate. All students said yes and so I proceeded. I reviewed our schedule:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
➢ **Introduction** – Provided basic English/Spanish greetings – a daily norm
➢ **Phonemic sounds of English/Spanish alphabet** – a daily norm
➢ **Flash Cards** - English/Spanish animal words
➢ **Bingo Game** – The Animals/Los Animales
➢ **Los Animals worksheet** – practice for reinforcement
➢ **Geography Assessment** – flat map and 50 U.S. Maps

**Introduction** - All students introduced themselves in English and Spanish. Students were given a worksheet that illustrate the basic greeting phrase. For example – Hello. My name is ___. What is your name? Hola, me llamo _____. ¿Como te llamas?

**Phonemic sounds of English/Spanish alphabet** – I used Sube’s flash cards to model sounds of each letter. Students repeated the sounds after listening to me sounding them out. I gave the students the flash cards and they pronounced the sounds of each letter as placing them in order and learned that the alphabet flash cards revealed a colorful snake/culebra. They enjoyed this activity.

**Flash Cards** – I used flash cards that showed a picture of an animal in each card. I stressed the initial sound of the letter that represented the animal pictured on the card. For example: “pa” for pajaro. Students enjoyed this activity because they felt it was easy and fun to speak Spanish.

**Bingo Game** – I provided bingo cards that have pictures of the animals we reviewed using flash cards. I also provided the colorful chips they needed in order to place a
marker on any animal they may have on their Bingo card. Students enjoyed this game.

**Los Animales worksheet** – I handed out Los Animales vocabulary words and greeting phrases worksheet to place in their Spanish folder. Students were encouraged to practice their Spanish vocabulary and greeting with family and friends until our next class.

**Geography Assessment** – Students were given two maps. Map 1 was a flat map that required them to identify the continents, oceans, and imaginary lines. Map 2 was a blank U.S. 50 State map. Students were asked to label all the parts of the maps they knew. Reassured them that it did not count for any grade. The purpose for the map assessment was so that I know what they know about the world.

All students participated in taking the assessment. Students were dismissed once they turned in the assessments. All but three students remained at the Youth Center until their parent(s) pick them up between 5:00 pm – 5:30 pm. The students who were in the classroom periodically interrupted the lessons with jokes, laughter, and making fun of the students participating in the Spanish program. The staff member redirected several times.
Appendix H

Prueba de la unidad—Animales

1. Dibuja un círculo alrededor de la vaca.

2. Dibuja un círculo alrededor del animal que vive en el bosque y le encanta comer miel.

3. Dibuja un círculo alrededor de un animal que es pequeño, gordo y tiene la manzana.

4. Dibuja un círculo alrededor del animal que se encuentra en el agua.

5. ¿Qué letra EMPIEZA el nombre de este animal?

6. ¿Qué palabra describe el dibujo?

7. ¿Cómo te sentirías si tuvieras una amiga nueva? Dibuja un círculo alrededor del dibujo que corresponda.
Prueba de la unidad—Animales

Nombre: Teacher Directed: Peaco

Reading assessment / Pronunciation assessment

Check (✓) box if student reads /pronounces correctly. Mark (✗) if student attempts with some success. Leave blank if word cannot be read.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gato</th>
<th>Oveja</th>
<th>Peto</th>
<th>Perro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z oso</td>
<td>Z oso</td>
<td>Z oso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z pequeño</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z pequeño</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speaking assessment / Reading assessment

Check (✓) box if student reads the word correctly and clearly. Mark (✗) if student attempts with some success. Leave blank if student cannot repeat the word(s) or uses a language other than Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perro</th>
<th>Oveja</th>
<th>Oso</th>
<th>Un oso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z oso</td>
<td>Z oso</td>
<td></td>
<td>Z un oso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z oso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z pequeño</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Qué animal de los que estudiábamos fue el mejor?</td>
<td><em>perro</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuéntame algo de este animal</td>
<td><em>amigo</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Qué animal crees que es más grande?</td>
<td><em>oso</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listening assessment / Reading assessment

Existiendo un animal tiene cuatro patas, una trompa larga y orejas grandes. ¿Es un animal del mar? ¿Qué animal estoy viendo?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caballo</th>
<th>Un oso</th>
<th>Un perro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Marks: ✓ Task correct, blank ( ) if student attempts with some success, leave a blank if student cannot repeat the word(s) or uses a language other than Spanish.

Writing assessment / Speaking assessment

Mira el dibujo. Escribe algo acerca de él. Usa palabras que describan cómo es este animal y qué puede hacer entre otras cosas.

sapo salta
Appendix I

Oral Fluency Scale

**Level 1**  The student reads word-by-word, with some longer phrases; does not phrase meaningfully or with an appropriate rate of speed; reads the passage excessively slowly.

**Level 2**  The student reads mainly in two-word phrases, with some longer phrases and at times word-by-word; may group words awkwardly and not connect phrases to the larger context of the passage; reads sections of the passage excessively slowly or quickly.

**Level 3**  The student reads in three-and four-word phrases; reads primarily in phrases that preserve the passage’s syntax and structure; attempts to read expressively; generally reads at the appropriate rate of speed.

**Level 4**  The student reads in large, meaningful phrases; may occasionally repeat words or short phrases, but the overall structure and syntax of the passage is not affected; reads at an appropriate rate of speed with expressive interpretation.