

Merrimack College

Merrimack ScholarWorks

Honors Program Contracts

Honors Program

Spring 2020

English Language Learner's Inequities and the Social Reproduction Theory

Cintia Khouzami

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.merrimack.edu/honors_component



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)



HONORS PROGRAM

English Language Learner's Inequities and the Social Reproduction Theory

Cintia Khouzami

Rory Tannebaum: EDU2130-Education, Diversity & Social Justice

Social Reproduction Theory

"Those on top stay on top"

- System plays role in keeping differences in social classes & other groups
- Society reproduces social class inequity
- The type of education someone receives impacts the rest of their life
 - Higher Education, Employment, Income, Criminality rates

Abstract

This poster explores the Social Reproduction Theory and connects it to the experiences of English Language Learners (ELL). The research looks into the inequity of resources and opportunities that ELL students receive and how it impacts the rest of their life.

Methods: Through interviews with ELL District Coordinators and ELL Alumni, the quality of education for ELL students will be assessed. Information from scholarly articles, charts and course content will be used to further the findings and conclusions in the research.

Common Inequities

- Not enough appropriately ESL trained teachers
 - One on one time limited
- Inadequate facilities
- Intense segregation associated to high risk for educational failure
- Access to appropriate measures of assessment
- Unable to receive college prep programs/extra curricular

Hypothesis:

The U.S finance system plays a role in reproducing social class inequities by disproportionately funding districts serving a higher percentage of low income students which impacts opportunities they have both during and after formal education

Examples of Evidence



2. Statistics **₁

Score variation among high/low ELL & high/low poverty districts

TABLE 1
Summary statistics for low- and high-ELL and FRL districts and all other districts, 2012-13

	ELL FRL	Low Low	High Low	Low High	High High	All other districts ^a	Total
<i>Number of Students</i>							
Urban	0	404,049	1,969	2,992,755	6,615,983	10,014,756	
Suburban	164,575	907,882	46,247	2,712,902	11,950,066	15,781,672	
Rural	144,625	17,968	110,480	287,911	2,674,961	3,235,945	
Total	309,200	1,329,899	158,696	5,993,568	21,241,010	29,032,373	
<i>Number of Districts</i>							
Urban	0	34	2	114	310	460	
Suburban	112	75	43	353	1,999	2,582	
Rural	257	35	281	260	2,227	3,060	
Total	369	144	326	727	4,536	6,102	
<i>District and student characteristics</i>							
% ELL	0.04%	15.82%	0.01%	27.39%	4.75%	7.17%	
% FRL	22.30%	23.84%	78.64%	81.38%	47.39%	51.03%	
% Asian	1.0%	13.5%	0.3%	2.4%	2.2%	2.4%	
% Black	1.4%	3.3%	10.2%	8.1%	6.3%	6.4%	
% Hispanic	4.4%	28.0%	6.7%	61.7%	17.4%	21.6%	
% Native American	1.6%	1.2%	21.7%	5.0%	2.9%	4.1%	
% White	88.2%	48.6%	55.8%	20.6%	67.2%	61.8%	
% multirace / other	3.4%	5.5%	5.3%	2.2%	3.9%	3.8%	
Dist. Enroll.	838	9,235	487	8,244	4,683	4,758	
Cost of Wage	1.38	1.64	1.26	1.42	1.37	1.38	
<i>Standardized exam scores</i>							
Grade 3 ELA	0.602	0.380	-0.607	-1.322	-0.016	-0.161	
Grade 3 Math	0.595	0.189	-0.478	-1.035	0.033	-0.088	
<i>District funding</i>							
Total PPR	\$14,724	\$13,168	\$12,752	\$11,938	\$12,508	\$12,602	
St./local PPR	\$14,126	\$12,485	\$10,687	\$10,216	\$11,556	\$11,527	

1. Funding Disparity & Consequences

- High ELL/Poverty districts receive 27% less funding
- Impacts performance & achievement gap**₁
 - High ELL/Poverty score lower than all schools
 - Low ELL/Poverty outperform all other schools
- 10% increase in funds improves likelihood of success
 - Increase probability of HS graduation by 11.6%
 - Higher adult income by 12.3%
- As population of low-income students rise, funds decrease
 - Lower staff salaries and less trained ESL teachers
 - Limited resources, eg. tutors, books, laptops, clubs

3. Interviews

Middle Class School, ESL Coordinator ('20)

- Free extended day programs
 - Tutoring, extra curriculars, field trips
 - English Learner Parent Advisory Council
- Increased funding with rise of ELL
 - 9 ELL teachers
 - PreK-12, 4 more hiring
 - Rigorous Curriculum
 - Math Books & Vocab support
 - Teacher training often
 - College prep
- Teacher Translator for homework

Working Class School, ELL Alumna ('90)

- Language Barriers created obstacles
 - unable to attend extra curriculars & sports
 - Parents were unaware of conferences
- Inadequate funding
 - 1 ESL teacher for all students
 - Less individualized time
 - Expected to translate work on their own and not given extended time on tests
 - Outdated resources
 - Class only with ESL Students

Findings & Conclusions

ELLs tend to go to schools with less funding, Why?

State school finance systems intensify inequities by under-funding higher-need districts, which tend to have large minority populations. The students are not at fault for their under-resourced schools, but instead, the system in charge of distributing funds to them. In general, these schools have lower academic success, graduation rates, and adult incomes due to a lack of resources given to these students starting as early as kindergarten. All while, districts with students from wealthier backgrounds get funding advantages, and in turn, the rich get richer and those on top stay on top. The lack of social mobility reproduces the same outcomes for generations to come who fall victim to the inequities of the current system.

Future Studies

Should assess the differences of outcomes in life between such students of low and high funded schools through longitudinal study

References

Scholarly Articles

Collins, J. (2009). Social Reproduction in Classrooms and Schools. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 38(1), 33–48. doi: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.37.081407.085242

Knight, D. S. & Mendoza, J. E. (2017). Compounded inequities: Assessing school finance equity for low-income English language learners. CERPS Working Paper 2017-2. University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX.
https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/cerps_wp/5

OECD (2012), Equity and Quality in Education: Supporting Disadvantaged Students and Schools, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264130852-en>

Websites

Leung, J., & Lim, R. (2014, January). Disadvantages of ELL Curriculum. Retrieved from <http://ellinquiry.weebly.com/room-for-debate/disadvantages-of-ell-curriculum>

Chen, G. (2009, April 7). Inclusion or Exclusion? The ESL Education Debate. Retrieved from <https://www.publicschoolreview.com/blog/inclusion-or-exclusion-the-esl-education-debate>

Jodyhanson. (2018, August 5). What Is ELL? The Complete Introduction to ELL Students, Objectives and Program Types. Retrieved from <https://www.fluentu.com/blog/educator-english/what-is-ell/>

Partnership, G. S. (2013, August 29). English-Language Learner Definition. Retrieved from <https://www.edglossary.org/english-language-learner/>