switchboard
connecting resettlement experts

EVIDENCE SUMMARY
June 2024

What strategies are effective for English language acquisition in newcomer populations?

There is strong evidence that incorporating digital elements can be just as effective as fully face-to-face programs.

- A meta-analysis of computer-assisted language learning (CALL) indicated over two-thirds of included studies had comparable or more favorable results for digital modes of instruction.

- Using digital games or gamification techniques within digital settings has repeatedly succeeded in increasing English proficiency while maintaining high levels of satisfaction, enjoyment, and engagement.

Several other studies, including one source of strong evidence, provide guidance on which elements of English language programs may be most effective.

- There is evidence that implicit instruction may be more effective than explicit instruction, even when looking at delayed post-intervention assessments. Novice learners appear to gain the most benefit from English language programs.

- Three studies suggest that programs with higher levels of variety and activity, but not necessarily complexity, may be more effective and engaging for students.

Several sources of moderate or suggestive evidence indicate that incorporating other key learning topics into English programs may benefit both subject areas.

- Programs incorporating curricula on child development, health literacy, and workplace-specific language have successfully increased proficiency and confidence in both general English and the targeted topic.

Purpose of this summary

This document summarizes the state of available evidence regarding the impacts of different interventions on English language learning among newcomers. It seeks to answer two key questions:

- Are there certain elements of English language acquisition programs for newcomer populations that appear to be more effective or efficient than others?
- What role does technology play in the provision of English language learning programs?

What is meant by "English language learner"?

An English language learner (ELL) is an individual with limited English proficiency. In the context of this summary, the term is generally used to refer to individuals residing in a majority English-speaking country but who are still developing their English skills. Various terms are used for programs designed for ELLs including: English as a Second Language (ESL), English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), English as an Additional Language (EAL), and Multilingual Learner (MLL). Some ELLs may be deemed "preliterate," meaning that they do not have experience with reading or writing in any language.

What is meant by "implicit instruction" and "explicit instruction"?

In explicit instruction, the goal of a lesson (e.g., learning specific vocabulary or grammar rules) is made clear to learners, whereas in implicit instruction, the goal is not explicitly stated or otherwise made clear.

What is meant by "digital elements"?

In this context, "digital elements" refers to the use of computers or other technology-driven programs in an English language learning environment (e.g., video conferencing platforms for hybrid or fully remote classes). The following terms are examples of digital elements discussed in this evidence summary:

- Computer-assisted language learning (CALL): "an interactive method of instruction that helps learners achieve their goals of learning, at their own pace and ability" using computer technology "at all stages such as presentation, practice and feedback."[1]
- Digital simulation game: "a type of video game that presents players with realistic simulations of diverse real-world activities" and "do[es] not always have predetermined goals" (Peterson 2023, p. 944).
- Gamification: the use of elements of games in non-game situations "to create enjoyable, fun, and motivating learning experiences for learners" rather than using formal, developed games (Dehghanzadeh 2021, p. 936). Gamification may involve elements like points, levels, badges, competitions, and challenges.

What is meant by "synchronous" and "asynchronous" instruction?

Synchronous and asynchronous instruction refer to the timing of classes or information sharing. Synchronous instruction occurs when all members of the class meet at a set time, whereas asynchronous instruction occurs when the instructor provides a recording or other materials that students access on their own time.

What does the evidence show?

---

[1] Kumar, E. S., & Sreehari, P. (2009). Computer Assisted Language Learning. In *A Handbook for English Language Laboratories* (pp. 1–14). chapter, Foundation Books.

There is strong evidence that incorporating digital elements can be just as effective as fully face-to-face programs.

- Sharifi et al. (2018) conducted a meta-analysis of CALL programs for English instruction from 1990 to 2016, focusing on reported effectiveness in comparison to face-to-face instruction. Their search resulted in 140 studies that met inclusion criteria, **including learners from kindergarten to adulthood**. The researchers calculated effect sizes and recorded variables such as date of publication, learner demographics, communication mode, length of program, and type of assessment. Results showed that **67% of the studies resulted in a positive effect,** indicating a favorability towards CALL, but the range of effect sizes was large. The interventions were split between traditional CALL instruction and newer web-based instruction. The average effect size for web-based instruction was slightly larger as compared to CALL instruction (0.54 vs. 0.47). The group of articles published after 2010 had better outcomes than those published earlier. **Combining synchronous and asynchronous instruction was more effective than either synchronous or asynchronous instruction alone,** which shared very similar average effect sizes. Many of the coded study qualities exhibited differences between CALL and more traditional instruction methods, but the differences were not particularly notable. For example, **interventions that included instructor-developed or -adjusted tools were slightly more effective than programs that only used commercially developed tools**. Heterogeneity in the articles' study populations, methods, and outcomes was a slight challenge in creating thorough comparisons.

- Peterson (2023) conducted a systematic review of literature focused on the use of digital simulation games in second or foreign language learning. (Eleven of the studies involved English language learning; the remainder focused on Japanese, German, and Arabic as foreign languages.) A total of 15 articles met inclusion criteria. **Most of the participants were university students.** Ten of the articles included a digital simulation game as the only element of the intervention. The rest incorporated gameplay as part of a broader conventional classroom course. The majority of studies used pre- and post-tests to measure language gains, and four studies included a follow-up test to measure the longevity of gains after the conclusion of the instruction. The most frequently used game was *The Sims*, including the original and versions three and four. Vocabulary learning was the most frequent outcome of interest, followed by listening, writing, reading, affective factors, and experiential learning. **In vocabulary learning, students exposed to game learning consistently had greater improvements than control groups**. Incorporating teacher-designed supplementary material was successful in three different studies. Activities included written assignments incorporating game vocabulary, an online dictionary with study notes, and quizzes. As far as developing other skills, such as listening comprehension, improvements were not as remarkable, but **learner feedback was consistently positive**. Combined results indicate that the ability to interact with real-world situations—with real-time feedback on performance and correct language use, as is available through these types of games—can enhance engagement. Results indicate that **vocabulary was successfully transferred into real-world contexts**. Learners reported that gameplay was enjoyable and low-stress. They also felt motivated by game achievements to continue engaging with the games. Overall, the authors concluded that areas of language learning outside of vocabulary lack sufficient evidence on incorporating digital simulation games.

- Dehghanzadeh et al. (2021) conducted a systematic review of programs that used gamification in digital ESL contexts. A total of 22 articles met inclusion criteria, all published between 2014 and 2019. Most of the studies occurred in **high school settings** with intervention dosage ranging from 10 minutes to six months, with anywhere from five to 144 participants. Thirteen articles specifically mentioned positive learning experiences in gamified environments. The rest did not use sentiment-specific words like "positive," "negative," or "neutral," **implying that there were no specifically negative findings for learning experiences across the included programs**. Analysis of the included studies did not indicate that any specific game elements were most useful or

successful. Participants reported that having "a sense of control over actions, progression, and pervasiveness" contributed to their enjoyment and engagement (p. 948). **Vocabulary learning, student engagement, motivation, and satisfaction were the learning elements most positively impacted**. Most of the studies used self-reports for data collection instead of standardized English proficiency tests, so it is difficult to obtain a full picture of gamification's potential impact on language learning.

Several other studies, including one source of strong evidence, provide guidance on which elements of English language programs may be most effective.

- Kang et al. (2019) conducted a meta-analysis of research on instructed language acquisition (ISLA). A total of 54 studies were included. Variables related to the instructional method (i.e., implicit vs. explicit instruction or computer-mediated vs. face-to-face), outcome measures (i.e., type of response), and methodological features (e.g., linguistic target, educational setting, duration, and intensity) were recorded. While the included studies were published between 1980 and 2015, over half were published between 2006 and 2015, indicating an increased focus on the field of late. Only 28% of the studies were conducted in a second language setting (where the target language of instruction is the one spoken in the area); however, the authors did not analyze these separately. Almost two-thirds of the studies focused solely on face-to-face instruction. An additional 27% used computer-based instruction, with 7% using blended instruction modalities. **A majority of the studies focused on adults (56%), with adolescent (18%) and young (13%) learners making up a smaller proportion** of studies. A small number of studies (6%) followed a combination of adult and adolescent participants. Of the included studies, 37 included **follow-up tests that indicated a high retention rate, with those from implicit instruction outperforming explicit instruction**. Computer-provided instruction had very similar effect sizes as face-to-face instruction. Results indicated that using a variety of assessment measures may better capture changes in proficiency, since the **programs which used both oral and written measures post-intervention had greater effect sizes than those which only used a written assessment**. Programs focusing on syntax also exhibited greater effect sizes than programs focusing on either pragmatics or morphology. Longer or more intense instruction did not have obviously superior results over programs that were shorter or less intense. These effects may be influenced by the differences in program type, as shorter programs were more likely to be lab-based, while longer ones were more often classroom-based. Lab-based studies occur in more controlled environments, where the participants only receive instruction relative to the study intervention. Of note: less than a third of included studies were conducted in contexts that are comparable to newcomer English learning experiences. Yet, the findings offer insights into language acquisition more broadly.

- Smyser and Alt (2018) conducted a within-subjects randomized trial to test different practices to increase English spelling among refugee students. The researchers tested whether high-variability/high-complexity or high-variability/low-complexity was most effective in learning how to spell classroom words. Twenty-eight participants, **aged 18 years or older** and resettled within the last five years, completed three baseline spelling tests and three progress tests across 10 weeks of daily classes. All students were deemed preliterate in English. The participants acted as their own controls as they were assigned two lists of 10 target words: one list was used in the intervention and classroom teaching, and one was taught normally. High-variability/low-complexity consisted of a series of PowerPoint slides targeting one word at a time, with various font, color, size, and location combinations and an audio file reading the word. Each word had a dosage of 1.5 seconds at a time across 24 instances during the intervention period. High-variability/high-complexity used the same variability conditions but placed the target vocabulary in short (no more than six-word) sentences with the same audio reader. Where each target word fell within each sentence varied between slides. Each sentence was visible for two seconds, and each word had 24 sentences during the intervention. **Results indicated that the high-**

variability/low-complexity version of the intervention was the most effective, with a 5.53 mean difference score of correctly spelled words versus 3.27 for control words. The high-variability/high-complexity group did not display a notable difference in scores between the treated and control words. Even with the marked differences, **only three of the students consistently spelled all five of their treatment words correctly**, and the overall average of correctly spelled control words was 1.49 out of five.

- McAtamney (2021) evaluated one case of a school-based, drama-focused program for **high school** refugee students. The program, *School Drama*, incorporated six hours of teacher professional development and seven student workshops, each lasting two hours. The goal of the program was "a dual focus of developing individual teachers' professional learning and improving literacy and engagement for students" (p. 116). During the professional development, teachers were taught about four areas of focus, one of which they would choose when implementing the workshop with their students: inferential comprehension, confidence in oracy[2], vocabulary development, and imaginative writing. The teachers also collaborated with Teaching Artists (actors, drama educators) while conducting the workshops for their students. This study evaluated a program focusing on confidence in oracy for 13 students from Iraqi and Syrian refugee backgrounds with intermediate English proficiency. The intervention implementation evaluated in this study had some difficulties adhering to the *School Drama* curriculum but, overall, the program was considered successful by the teacher and researcher. Students were tested on their oracy skills through "hot-seating," where they chose an object of interest to them and a character from a story to which they had been exposed—and then had three to four minutes to talk about their character's relationship with the object while their classmates asked them questions. The post-program hot seat focused on the story in the curriculum. All of the students exhibited progress between the pre- and post-program assessments, with **language outcomes increasing between 9% and 41% overall. Vocabulary increased an average of 11%**. Imagination and creativity increases were reflected in benchmark scores (average increases of 26%) and interview data where **students expressed the ability to think more creatively and imaginatively**. Participants expressed greater overall confidence in speaking English at the end of the program, mentioning in particular their **confidence in sharing their opinions and contributing in class**.

Several sources of moderate or suggestive evidence indicate that incorporating other key learning topics into English programs may benefit both subject areas.

- Sommer et al. (2023) reported the results of a randomized control trial of an ESL program targeting parents whose children were enrolled in Tulsa Head Start's two-generation education program—meaning that it focuses on supporting **parents' and children's learning simultaneously**. Head Start's English instruction was contextualized to children's development by including units on public schools and developmental domains, including role-playing parent-teacher conferences. The program had four broader elements: (1) coordinated parent and child school schedules; (2) class sizes of about 15; (3) nine hours of instruction per week for 16 weeks and parent meetings with a coach once per week; and (4) additional supports, such as free child care during adult classes and financial incentives for participation. The sample consisted of 197 families, of which 128 were randomized into the treatment group and 69 into the control. The control group involved normal Head Start programming for the children and no English classes for the parents. About a quarter of the families had immigrated to the U.S. within the previous five years, and 87% identified as Latino/a. English proficiency was tested with the Basic English Skills Test (BEST) Plus assessment before the intervention, and participants were placed into beginner, intermediate, or advanced level classes. Participants could participate in a total of two rounds of

---

[2] The ability to express oneself fluently and grammatically in speech (Oxford Languages, n.d.)

the curriculum over a 12-month period; 74% completed at least one semester, but only 42% completed two semesters. For those who **completed one semester, 74% advanced their BEST Plus rating by at least one level. Of those who completed two semesters, 81% advanced their BEST Plus rating by at least one level**. When looking at the different starting skill levels, 93% of the beginner proficiency participants improved by at least one level, while 43% of the intermediate and advanced groups advanced at least one level, indicating that gains at higher levels of proficiency require greater intervention. **Parents also reported higher English reading skills and more engagement with their children's teachers**. Beginner English proficiency parents were able to use children's books to improve their English skills while engaging with their child. A potential barrier to more advanced English speakers gaining more skills was the lack of an advanced curriculum— advanced participants had to repeat a level if they wanted to continue in the program.

- Soto Mas et al. (2015) conducted a randomized controlled trial to test the ability of an adapted conventional ESL curriculum to improve health literacy among Spanish-speaking **adults.** The Health Literacy & ESL Curriculum was developed specifically for low-to-intermediate level English speakers, aiming to familiarize students with language common in health care settings and make navigating those settings more manageable. The final curriculum consisted of 12 units to be taught over six or 12 weeks. This study evaluated two six-week courses offered across three different locations in the El Paso, Texas area. One teacher taught all of the intervention groups, who received the adapted ESL curriculum, and one teacher taught all of the control groups, who received the standard ESL curriculum from which the intervention version was adapted. The standard ESL program included material on health and health literacy but did not cover the subject in depth. Participants completed the English version of the Test of Functional Health Literacy in Adults (TOFHLA) in a group setting before and after completing the intervention. Only participants with an attendance rate of at least 75% were included in the analysis, which left a sample of 155 (77 intervention, 78 control). **The average TOFHLA score change was a 13-point improvement for the intervention group, and an eight-point improvement for the control group, out of a 100-point scale. However, the overall average post-test TOFHLA scores were not notably different between the two groups (73 for intervention and 74 for control)** due to group differences at pre-test despite randomization. The number of **participants rated at the inadequate functional health literacy level decreased by 30% for the intervention group and 11% for the control group**.

- Soto Mas et al. (2018) also conducted a randomized controlled pre-/post-test study of a version of the Health Literacy and ESL Curriculum with a more specific focus on cardiovascular disease (CVD) education and prevention with **adults.** "Salud para su Corazón," a curriculum developed by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, served as the main resource for the CVD education portion. The team used a Spanish version of the Cardiovascular Health Questionnaire (Cuestionario de Salud Cardiovascular, CSC), the English version of TOFHLA, and the standardized computerized Combined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA) to test cardiovascular health behaviors, health literacy, and English language skills, respectively. A total of 155 participants attended at least 75% of the program session and completed pre- and post-tests. The control and intervention groups were slightly unbalanced demographically, with controls having lived in the U.S. for longer and less likely to have received a high school education, although the authors do not state how this may have impacted results. **The control and intervention groups had notable increases in their CSC scores** from pre-test to post-test, but the **difference for the intervention group was greater** when analysis controlled for potential confounding factors. The **intervention group also had greater improvements in their TOFHLA scores** in the same analysis. However, no relationship between CVD knowledge increases and English language proficiency increases were found. Limitations of the study include a lack of clarity on the control condition—other than descriptions of "conventional" English programming— and a lack of detail regarding the intervention program, including curriculum topics and the amount of time spent in class.

- Neff, Negoescu, and Vanek (2021) evaluated a pilot of the "English as Work" initiative, which aimed to bring "industry-contextualized English instruction to workplaces" (p. 83). The standard version of this program includes 40% face-to-face instruction and 60% self-paced online modules, whereas this pilot study adapted the face-to-face instruction into a fully remote offering with live, synchronous classes. This program was piloted with Whole Foods Market **adult** employees in 2019. The implementation team made a specific effort to reduce inessential text and features from the digital classroom platform, making it easier for non-native English speakers to navigate where they needed to be online. Reducing the number of clicks required to get into the virtual classroom and self-paced modules was also a focus of streamlining. The curriculum aimed to integrate digital literacy skills into class instruction by including vocabulary such as "log in/log out, mute/unmute, microphone, headset, chat, and poll" (p. 85). The program had dedicated tech support staff conducting active outreach with students, rather than waiting for students to submit support requests. Students were assessed with pre- and post-tests and **growth was comparable to students in the original hybrid model**. An unexpected benefit of the fully remote platform was students' ability to creatively solve problems and communicate with one another. For example, if one student expressed having a technical issue, other students would jump in to offer solutions and support them. Researchers gathered perspectives from employers on their employees' growth. **Managers overwhelmingly reported clear progress in areas of employee morale, job confidence, interactions with customers, understanding of safety guidelines, participation in workplace trainings or workshops, and communication with colleagues and supervisors**.

What are the implications for practice and research?

"Computer-assisted language instruction is now a staple in the field of language education."

(Sharifi, 2018)

Gaming and gamification can be effective enhancements to English language learning programs.

- Computer-based games, even those not specific to language learning, were rated as engaging and helpful, especially for building vocabulary. Additionally, if formalized computer games are inaccessible, adding gaming elements into digital English instruction (e.g., point systems, badges, levels, challenges) can also encourage engagement and enjoyment.
- Digital simulation games have been widely well-received among students, especially because they allow students to practice real-world interactions and receive instant feedback on their performance. Research also indicates that coupling digital simulation games with teacher-created supplemental materials can have a stronger positive effect on vocabulary acquisition.

Targeted interventions can help increase confidence and proficiency in the targeted area.

- Interventions that included a targeted topic area (i.e., health literacy, child development, workplace language) reported increased scoring on post-tests for topic-specific measures. These interventions also reported higher levels of confidence in areas such as interacting with coworkers and teachers.
- Targeted skill interventions (e.g., vocabulary and oration) reported positive outcomes. Smyser and Alt (2018) found that a targeted vocabulary intervention correlated with increased spelling scores, without the need for high levels of complexity or exposure. McAtamney (2021) also found that focusing on oracy skills in a focused, supportive environment increased speaking confidence in other situations.

Research in this area is quickly expanding, but could benefit from more focused approaches.

- The included meta-analysis and systematic reviews represent an increase in available studies from the last several years, indicating a higher level of focus on the area of late.
- Although there are a growing number of studies, the heterogeneity of research designs and curricular approaches still makes it difficult to pinpoint what specific elements are most effective. Authors of multiple meta-analyses and systematic reviews call for higher levels of methodological consistency in order to enable more efficient comparisons.

How did we identify evidence for this summary?

Included Studies

The Switchboard evidence database includes the following types of studies, categorized by the strength of their evidence:

Strong Evidence

Meta-analyses: systematic analyses of sets of existing evaluations of similar programs

Systematic reviews: syntheses of the best available evidence on specific research questions that use narrative synthesis, focused on evaluations of the impacts of at least one specific policy, program, or intervention

Moderate Evidence

Published individual **impact evaluations** using randomized controlled trials (RCTs/C-RCTs), natural experiments, quasi-experimental techniques such as difference-in-difference (DID), instrumental variables (IV), regression discontinuity design (RDD), and propensity score matching (PSM) or other forms of synthetic matching, as well as fixed effects techniques with interaction terms.

Suggestive Evidence

Published studies using methods including non-systematic literature review, uncontrolled before and after tests, post-test only, interrupted time series (ITS), cross-sectional regressions, longitudinal panels, cohort and case-controls, and purely qualitative techniques.

Excluded Studies

The Switchboard evidence database excludes case studies, unpublished suggestive research, opinion papers, descriptive studies, and unpublished literature reviews.

Search Protocol

Studies included in the database focused on high-income or upper middle-income countries, including but not limited to the U.S. Studies included must have been published since 2012. To identify evidence, we searched the following websites and databases using the following population, methodology, and target outcome terms:

Websites and Databases	Population Terms[3]	Methodology Terms	Target Outcome Terms
EBSCOHost ERIC Google Scholar	refugee OR immigrant OR "unaccompanied minor" OR asylee OR "temporary protected status" OR "victims of traffick*" OR "traffick* victims" OR T-Visa OR U-Visa OR Cuban OR Haitian OR Amerasian	evaluation OR impact OR program OR intervention OR policy OR project OR train* OR therapy OR treatment OR counseling OR workshop OR review OR meta-analysis OR synthesis	"English language learning" OR "English as a second language" OR "Toefl" OR "tesol" OR "English class*" OR "English tutor*"

For databases or websites that permitted only basic searches, free-text terms and limited term combinations were selected out of the lists above, and all resultant studies were reviewed for relevance. Conversely, for databases or websites with advanced search capability, we made use of relevant available filters. All terms were searched in the title and abstract fields only, in order to exclude studies that made only passing mention of the topic under consideration.

After initial screening, Switchboard evidence mapping is prioritized as follows: first priority is given to meta-analyses and systematic reviews, followed by individual impact evaluations when no meta-analyses

---

[3] An additional search was conducted without these population terms to gain a better sense of the evidence on teaching English to speakers of other languages more broadly. This search yielded three of the included studies.

or systematic reviews are available. Evaluations that are rated as impact evidence are considered before those rated as suggestive, with the latter only being included for outcomes where no evidence is available from the former.

Studies Included

Database and website searching identified 441 studies. After removing duplicates, 349 studies were then screened. Of these, 321 were determined to be irrelevant to this search. Twenty-eight full-text articles were assessed for eligibility. Eighteen full-text articles were excluded due to not meeting one or more of the inclusion criteria pertaining to resettlement country, year of publication, population, methodology, or target problem. Ten studies were eligible for inclusion. They are listed below, with hyperlinks to the abstracts or full text (when available).

Meta-Analyses and Systematic Reviews

Dehghanzadeh, H., Fardanesh, H., Hatami, J., Talaee, E., & Noroozi, O. (2021). Using gamification to support learning English as a second language: A systematic review. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 34*(7), 934–957. Abstract.

Kang, E. Y., Sok, S., & Han, Z. (2019). Thirty-five years of ISLA on form-focused instruction: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research, 23*(4), 428–453. Abstract.

Peterson, M. (2023). Digital simulation games in CALL: A research review. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 36*(5–6), 943–967. Abstract.

Sharifi, M., Abu Saeedi, A. R., Jafarigohar, M., & Zandi, B. (2018). Retrospect and prospect of computer assisted English language learning: a meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 31*(4), 413–436. Abstract.

Impact Evaluations

Smyser, H. & Alt, M. (2018). Developing mental orthographic representations in refugee spellers with low literacy: How much input is too much? *Journal of Research in Reading, 41*(3), 455–474. Abstract.

Sommer, T. E., Tighe, L. A., Sabol, T. J., Chor, E., Chase-Lansdale, P. L., Yoshikawa, H., Brooks-Gunn, J., Morris, A. S., & King, C. T. (2023). The effects of a two-generation English as a second language (ESL) intervention on immigrant parents and children in Head Start. *Applied Developmental Science,* 1–20. Abstract.

Soto Mas, F., Ji, M., Fuentes, B. O., & Tinajero, J. (2015). The health literacy and ESL study: A community-based intervention for Spanish-speaking adults. *Journal of Health Communication, 20*(4), 369–376. Abstract.

Soto Mas, F., Schmitt, C. L., Jacobson, H. E., Myers, O. B. (2018). A cardiovascular health intervention for Spanish speakers: The health literacy and ESL curriculum. *Journal of Community Health, 43*(4), 717–724. Full Text.

Suggestive Studies

McAtamney, O. (2021). School drama: Using drama for oracy in an EAL/D classroom. *nj: Drama Australia Journal, 45*(2), 113–127. Full Text.

Neff, V., Negoescu, A., & Vanek, J. (2021). Workplace ESOL goes digital: Expanding opportunities for English language learning. *COABE Journal, 10*(1, pt. 2), 82–89. Abstract.

Supplemental Resources

The following studies did not meet the criteria to be included in the evidence summary but may provide additional context, guidance, or understanding of the topic.

Adamuti-Trache, M., Anisef, P., & Sweet, R. (2018). Differences in language proficiency and learning strategies among immigrant women to Canada. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 17*(1), 16–33. Abstract.

Aydin, A. M. & Çakir, N. A. (2022). The effects of a game-enhanced learning intervention on foreign language learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 70*, 1809–1841. Abstract.

Boland, D. (2021). *The use of video games in teaching EFL students to write arguments*. (Publication No. 9075). [Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida]. Digital Commons @University of South Florida. Full Text.

Britton, E. R. & Austin, T. Y. (2023). "Keeping words in context": Language policy and social identification in an immigrant job training program. *Journal of Language, Identity, & Education, 22*(2), 137–152. Abstract.

Burton, J. & Van Viegen, S. (2021). Spoken word poetry with multilingual youth from refugee backgrounds. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 65*(1), 75–84. Abstract.

Chamorro, G., Garrido-Hornos, M. del C., & Vázquez-Amador, M. (2020). Exploring ESOL teachers' perspectives on the language learning experiences, challenges, and motivations of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 61*(2), 201–226. Abstract.

Clifford, V., Rhodes, A. & Paxton, G. (2014). Learning difficulties or learning English difficulties? Additional language acquisition: An update for paediatricians. *Journal of Paediatrics & Child Health, 50*(3), 175–181. Abstract.

Cruz, C. (2022). The learn act: A bipartisan legislative proposal to advance educational opportunities for immigrants and English learners. *Harvard Journal on Legislation, 59*(1), 223–256. Full Text.

Dávila, L. T. (2015). Diaspora literacies. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 58*(8), 641–649. Abstract.

Dávila, L. T. (2019). "J'aime to be funny!": Humor, learning, and identity construction in high school English as a second language classrooms. *Modern Language Journal, 103*(2), 502–514. Abstract.

Eberharter, K., Kormos, J., Guggenbichler, E., Ebner, V. S., Suzuki, S., Moser-Frötscher, D., Konrad, E., & Kremmel, B. (2023). Investigating the impact of self-pacing on the L2 listening performance of young learner candidates with differing L1 literacy skills. *Language Testing, 40*(4), 960–983. Full Text.

Feuerherm, E. & Oshio, T. (2020). Conducting a community-based ESOL programme needs analysis. *ELT Journal, 74*(3), 327–337. Abstract.

Finn, H. B. (2015). A need to be needed: The intersection between emotions, apprenticeship, and student

participation in an adult ESL literacy classroom. *Journal of Research & Practice for Adult Literacy, Secondary & Basic Education, 4*(1), 36–47. Full Text.

Gobel, P. & Kano, M. (2014). Implementing a year-long reading while listening program for Japanese university EFL students. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 27*(4), 279–293. Abstract.

Gunderson, L. (2017). *English-only instruction and immigrant students in secondary schools: A critical examination.* Routledge. Abstract.

Guo, Y. (2015). Language policies and programs for adult immigrants in Canada: Deconstructing discourses of integration. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education, 2015*(146), 41–51. Abstract.

Kim, H., Barron, C., Sinclair, J., & Eunhee Jang, E. (2020). Change in home language environment and English literacy achievement over time: A multi-group latent growth curve modeling investigation. *Language Testing, 37*(4), 573–599. Abstract.

Kim, Y. K., Hutchinson, L. A., & Winsler, A. (2015). Bilingual education in the United States: An historical overview and examination of two-way immersion. *Educational Review, 67*(2), 236–252. Abstract.

Komariah, E., Hidayat, M., & Nurlaili. (2019). Blended learning program: An alternative solution to improve students TOEFL score. *Al-Ta'Lim Journal, 26*(1), 38–43. Full Text.

Lee, M. W. (2014). A participatory EFL curriculum for the marginalized: The case of North Korean refugee students in South Korea. *System, 47*, 1–11. Abstract.

Li, J. (2018). A resource-oriented functional approach to English language learning. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 74*(1), 53–61. Abstract.

Linares, R. E. (2024). Factors shaping bilingual and ESL teachers' perceptions of successes and barriers in meeting emergent bilingual students' needs. *Journal of Latinos & Education, 23*(1), 220–237. Abstract.

Montero, M. K., Newmaster, S., & Ledger, S. (2014). Exploring early reading instructional strategies to advance the print literacy development of adolescent SLIFE. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 58*(1), 59–69. Abstract.

Payant, C. (2020). Exploring multilingual learners' writing practices during an L2 and an L3 individual writing task. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 76*(4), 313–334. Abstract.

Salvo, T. & de C Williams, A. C. (2017). "If I speak English, what am I? I am full man, me": Emotional impact and barriers for refugees and asylum seekers learning English. *Transcultural Psychiatry, 54*(5/6), 733–755. Abstract.

Sharifian, F., Sadeghpour, M., Barton, S., Barry, J., Barton, G., & Yilmaz, I. (2021). English language learning barriers of Afghan refugee women in Australia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 31*(1), 65–78. Full Text.

Shiffman, C. D. (2019). Supporting immigrant families and rural schools: The boundary-spanning possibilities of an adult ESL program. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 55*(4), 537–570. Abstract.

Sommer, T. E., Gomez, C. J., Yoshikawa, H., Sabol, T., Chor, E., Sanchez, A., Chase-Lansdale, P. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2020). Head start, two generation ESL services, and parent engagement. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 52*, 63–73. Abstract.

Vidal, H., Hockstein, L., Ahern, J. & Stein, K. (2019). Learning communities finding common ground for the common good. *Journal of Museum Education, 44*(1), 53–68. Abstract.

Wilson, V. E., Le Brocque, R., Drayton, J., & Hammer, S. (2024). Understanding responsiveness in the trauma-informed adult ESL classroom. *The Australian Educational Researcher,* n.p. Full Text.

Xu, Y., Farver, J. M., & Krieg, A. (2017). The home environment and Asian immigrant children's early literacy skills. *Parenting: Science & Practice, 17*(2), 104–123. Abstract.