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ABSTRACT

IMPLEMENTING CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY RESPONSIVE STRATEGIES USING CHILDREN’S LITERATURE IN THE URBAN MULTICULTURAL PRESCHOOL: EXAMINING TEACHERS’ LANGUAGE DIALECT BELIEFS AND PRACTICES

Nicole Victoria Bailey Austin
Old Dominion University, 2015
Chair: Dr. Angela L. Eckhoff

This study examined preschool teachers’ implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies using children’s literature in an urban multicultural preschool. Through a qualitative phenomenological design, this research aimed to expand understandings of language dialect and achievement in early childhood education and examine preschool teachers’ knowledge, beliefs, and instructional practices regarding identified home languages—African American Vernacular English and Hispanic American English, Academic Language, and code switching. The phenomenon under investigation was early childhood professionals’ beliefs and frequency of home language dialect use within the classroom and implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies within the classrooms of an urban multicultural preschool before and after receiving targeted professional development using children’s books. The participants in this study included five preschool teachers and one preschool center director within the same private preschool center located in an urban city within the southeastern region of the United States. Semi-structured pre- and post-interviews, classroom observations using descriptive and reflective field notes, and targeted professional development sessions were conducted in order to capture the essence of the
phenomenon within this preschool setting and to develop textural descriptions of the participants’ engagement and experiences within the study. The investigation revealed that knowledge of home language features, academic language and code switching, the use of home language features and code switching, teacher perspectives regarding culturally and linguistically responsive instruction, and cultural and linguistic influence of parents and teachers are key factors in the frequency and nature of the implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies within the multicultural preschool. Further, as teachers’ language dialect knowledge of home language, academic language, and code switching increased, the nature of instructional practices shifted to an affirmative and validating perspective from an initial deficit/ non-affirmative perspective at the outset of the study. Implications for research and practice indicate the need to consider teachers’ foundational cultural and linguistic knowledge of the children in their classrooms when teachers are tasked with implementing culturally and linguistically diverse instructional practices.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

One of the key components of culturally and linguistically responsive instruction requires teachers’ awareness and understanding of children’s home languages or dialects. Home language or home dialect is the language (or the variety of a language) that is most commonly spoken by family members in the home and others in the community for everyday interactions (Nordquist, 2014; Hollie, 2012; Bardige, 2005). It is often also referred to as first language, native tongue, or mother tongue, because it is the language or languages that an individual has learned from birth that serves as a basis for personal, social and cultural identity (Boroditsky, 2001). As a result of America’s history, all Americans speak some version of a home language variety or dialect, in that our English language as we know it today is not in its “purest” form, therefore all of us speak one variety or another of the English language. Today, we have an academic language that is heavily influenced by Standard American English and has become the standard among schools and universities. Academic Language (AL) is the language utilized in the context of classrooms, textbooks, tests, and among teacher-student discourse. The majority of children’s literature in the United States is written predominantly in Standard American English or Academic Language, while in homes and neighborhoods across the country there are a variety of home languages or dialects being spoken that differ from the academic language that children are required to learn and understand in school.

Equipping teachers with culturally and linguistically responsive strategies that include using children’s literature that contain some of these home languages provides teachers
with the ability to be responsive to children from a cultural and linguistic perspective and encourages a “bridging” of home and school.

Varieties of home languages that have been identified include, African American Vernacular English, Hispanic, Chicano or Mexican American Language, Hawaiian American Language, and Native American Language (Hollie, 2012). African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Hispanic, Chicano or Mexican American English (HAE/CAE/MAE) are among the most prevalent home languages or dialects in many urban multicultural communities throughout the United States (Smitherman, 2000; Hollie, 2012; Fought, 2003; Wolfram, Carter, & Moriello, 2004). AAVE is a rule-governed variation of English spoken by many African Americans, and it is characterized by an expansive set of morphological, syntactic, semantic, phonological, and discourse features that differ systematically from the ways that the same meanings would be expressed in Academic Language (AL) (Craig & Washington, 2006). Smitherman (2000) suggests that more than 95% of all African Americans speak some aspect of AAVE and therefore supports the research of Craig & Washington (2002) that suggests that many African American children will speak AAVE at school entry, thereby suggesting that our youngest population of learners may benefit from such culturally and linguistically responsive strategies such as language code switching. Hispanic, Chicano or Mexican American English (HAE/CAE/MAE) is the systematic, rule-governed language spoken by the Hispanic, Chicano, and/or Mexican American community united by common ancestry (Hollie, 2012; Fought, 2003). If research suggests that such home languages are language varieties that children enter school knowing, then using cultural language as
funds of knowledge and cultural capital to help preschool teachers develop strategies that will encourage language code switching is important.

The research of Fought (2003) and Wolfran, Carter, and Moriello (2004) stresses the importance of mentioning that African American Vernacular English has influenced other home language varieties such as Hispanic, Chicano, and Mexican American English (HAE/CAE/MAE) that share overlapping features with African American Vernacular English (AAVE). Therefore, as teachers become culturally and linguistically responsive, it is important for them to be aware that there are features that are specific to not only one racial demographic of students, but for all students living within an urban multicultural environment and to create opportunities for their students to embrace their home language while also learning the language of school—Academic Language (AL). Children’s literature containing these home language features can provide teachers with the ability to engage children in culturally and linguistically responsive learning (CLR).

Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy (CLR) is “the validation and affirmation of the home culture and home language for the purposes of building and bridging the student to success in the culture of academia and mainstream society” (Hollie 2012, 23). There are a number of researchers who have suggested that teachers can use books to engage students in learning how to code switch (Hollie, 2012; Wheeler & Swords, 2006). However, there are limited documented attempts to extend the use of culturally and linguistically responsive books into the preschool years.

Providing preschool teachers with distinctive strategies that allow for code switching between home languages and AL is important to literacy and language development for young urban multicultural children as they learn to compare and contrast
the linguistic structure of two languages. While a large majority of urban multicultural
students will adopt AL, there is a percentage of home language or dialect speakers that
will find it difficult to ever develop the ability to language code switch between their
home language dialect and AL (Craig & Washington, 2006; Condron, 2009). Those
students who are able to make the switch are referred to as bidialectals or having the
ability to “code switch” (Craig & Washington, 2002). Bidialectalism or code switching
can be operationally defined as learning to shift to AL features and patterns from home
language features and patterns. In studies conducted by Craig and Washington (2002) and
Thompson, Craig and Washington (2004) results revealed that students who are able to
shift from one language variety to another—known as “shifters,” (Craig & Washington,
2002) given situational appropriateness are more likely to demonstrate academic
achievement. Baron (2000) and Doss and Goss (1994) conducted studies on
bidialectalism and found that improved economic and social mobility was the result for
bidialectal adults who had linguistic competence or the ability to code switch. In another
study, Donahue et al., (2003) found that the reading performance of those students who
are not able to shift to AL—defined by Craig and Washington (2002) as “nonshifters”—
were consistent with national data for African American and Hispanic American
elementary students who perform in the low normal range. This brings into question
whether “achievement gaps” in reading scores of home language or dialect speakers and
other children are truly “gaps” in achievement or rather differences in home culture and
language in relation to the culture of academia.

Culturally and linguistically responsive (Hollie, 2012) teachers have the ability to
validate and affirm students’ home languages with an intentional effort to reverse
negative stereotypes and bridge students to success in the culture of academia while also
teaching them how to use that language to add another variety; essentially this is the
premise for implementing linguistically responsive strategies such as code switching
skills. However prior to the implementation of these strategies, preschool teachers need to
become linguistically aware and examine their beliefs and practices regarding home
languages and dialects. Understanding home language or dialect features and the
phenomenon of language code switching is important because teaching these strategies
also requires an understanding of the home culture in order to validate and affirm
students. If early childhood professionals are unaware of the home languages or dialects
in their classrooms, they are also unaware of their own influence—positive or negative—
on their students' language and literacy development. Therefore, it is advantageous for
preschool teachers to be culturally and linguistically responsive in understanding the
impact they may have in facilitating the teaching and learning of culturally and
linguistically responsive strategies during the early years of schooling. This research aims
to contribute to the growing body of literature on language development and literacy
among urban multicultural children while also increasing preschool teachers' awareness
of literacy strategies and the role of dialect in language and literacy achievement for the
students they teach.

**Definition of Terms**

The following definitions are provided for terms used within this study and have been
presented for reader clarification and understanding:

1. AAVE or African American Vernacular English is a dialect that is distinctive to
   African Americans.
2. HAE/CAE/MAE or Hispanic, Chicano, or Mexican American English is the rule-governed language spoken by the Hispanic, Chicano, and/or Mexican American community united by common ancestry. The term HAE will be used throughout the remaining portion of the writing.

3. AL or Academic Language is known as the language of classrooms, discourse between teachers-students, the curriculum, tests, and texts.

4. Code switching or contrastive analysis has been used interchangeably and is the ability to speak and understand two (and sometimes more) languages or dialects and to switch back and forth between or among them.

5. Dialect is a particular form of language that is peculiar to a specific region or social group.

6. Shifters as defined by Craig and Washington (2004) are students who are able to shift from AAVE to other English language variety forms during verbal and written communication.

7. Non-shifters as defined by Craig and Washington (2004) are students who are unable to recognize and comprehend the differences between AAVE and other English language variety forms of verbal and written communication.

8. Linguistics is the scientific study of language and its structure including the study of morphology (how words are formed), syntax (word arrangement), phonetics (sounds), and semantics (word meaning).

9. Sociolinguistic and ethnolinguistic perspectives hold that derivation of the unaccepted languages is rooted in the social, historical, and linguistic
development of the people and that any understanding of the language has to be inclusive of these aspects.

10. Dialectologist or the dialect perspective identifies dialect on the basis of the systematic co-occurrence of particular linguistic features among groups of people.

11. Literacy is the ability to read and write.

12. Achievement Gap as explained in this study is the achievement differences among discussed cultures across disciplines but mainly literacy for this study.

13. Preschool is defined as the education of children prior to kindergarten entry or the term relating to the time before a child is old enough to go to grade school.

**Background and Significance**

There is a long history of research exploring the interchange of the role of language dialect and academia (Herskovits, 1941; Labov, 1972; Corson, 1997). This interchange has increasingly become a topic of discussion among researchers in the wake of what has been coined the “achievement gap” (e.g., Jencks & Phillips, 1998; Ainsworth, 2002; Ogbu, 2003; Condron, 2009) and whether this “achievement gap” may be misleading based upon children’s funds of knowledge and cultural capital. Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez (1992) defined funds of knowledge for teaching as a way for teachers to develop cultural connections with students based upon an understanding of children’s families and communities. Ultimately teachers can use students’ funds of knowledge to make their teaching practices more culturally responsive and inclusive as they connect with children’s everyday lived experiences with language. In doing so, teachers have the ability to engage students while accounting for the cultural richness that each child carries from their homes and communities. Moll et al. (1992) points out that
any school member has the ability to readily use students’ funds of knowledge through gathering information about students’ cultures, by talking with families, and by developing rapport with students. Equipped with an understanding of the cultural and linguistic funds of knowledge children present with is important in how teachers implement language development practices in the classroom.

While there has been an increased focus in the research community on the interchange of the role of language, academia, and its influence on literacy achievement across various ethnicities, the focus has primarily been devoted to upper elementary, middle and high school students (Brown, 2009; Rickford & Rickford, 2002; Wheeler & Swords, 2006). Researchers have yet to conduct in-depth studies regarding the interchange of the role of home language dialect—specifically AAVE/HAE, AL, and culturally and linguistically responsive teaching strategies to include early childhood educators and the children they serve. Engagement in such research will contribute to the discussion of understanding factors that influence teacher implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive instructional practices in the early childhood setting that encourage code switching and allow all children to have the same opportunity to achieve.

Examining preschool teachers’ beliefs and practices of home language—AAVE/HAE, AL, and code switching within preschool teachers’ classrooms will help to inform teacher’s culturally and linguistically responsive instructional practice in order to help children to successfully code switch between home language dialect and AL. Armed with this information, researchers can build upon this study to gain further information regarding teachers’ instructional practice as it relates to code switching and literacy and language skill achievement gaps among children as early as preschool. Historically there
have been attempts to eliminate or narrow this gap especially among African American students in cases such as Brown vs. Board of Education (1954), where expectations of eliminating the gap rose with the desegregation decision. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) focused on inequality of school resources and the Civil Rights Act (1964) also spiked optimism for progress in education. Fishback and Baskin (1991) observed that the idea of an achievement gap has been long-standing as early as 1910.

Studies have found that the achievement gap can appear as early as school entry and that African American and Hispanic American students are more likely to perform at low levels on standardized reading achievement tests. The persistence of the gap over the past century has negatively impacted the quality of life for many children (Craig & Washington, 2006). While there has been a historical discussion regarding achievement gaps and school inequality (Fishback & Baskin, 1991; Ainsworth, 2002; Ogbu, 2003), many of the current researchers have turned the attention to cultural awareness and responsiveness (Hollie, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 2009; Gay, 2000; Condron, 2009; Craig & Washington, 2006) and have started to look for other answers to the issues of achievement across race and gender lines. Therefore, this research sets out to expand the research through finding answers for our future generation of scholars and to bring further awareness of factors that affect language and literacy achievement scores among African American and Hispanic American children. It also addresses the importance of helping the teachers that serve them, to design and implement effective strategies for optimal success.
Problem Statement

Research conducted on the topic of code switching, also referred to as contrastive analysis (Rickford & Rickford, 2002; Wheeler & Swords, 2006; Hollie, 2012), revealed that having the ability to code switch is a factor in student literacy and language achievement (Wheeler & Swords, 2006; Craig & Washington, 2006; Rickford & Rickford, 2002). While there are gaps in the research concerning teachers’ roles and perceptions in promoting code switching, there are even larger gaps in research targeted toward preschool teachers of multicultural children. Therefore developing and providing teachers with culturally and linguistically responsive professional strategies that show them how to embrace children’s cultural capital (AAVE or HAE) while also providing opportunities to embrace AL, may lead to children’s mastery of the skill of code switching and increased literacy and language achievement. This study was conducted in order to extend the knowledge, explore beliefs and perceptions, and instructional practice regarding home languages (AAVE and HAE), AL, and code switching in the direction of early childhood education among teachers of varying ethnic backgrounds serving approximately 50 preschoolers within an urban multicultural preschool.

Purpose of the Study

The impetus for this study grew from previous observations at this preschool center. I was inspired by the conversational relationships and the diversity in dialect that occurred between the teachers and the children. Home language features and code switching among teachers was observed while at the center. The purpose of this study was to build upon these observations by first examining the frequency, beliefs, and perceptions of home language dialect within preschool teachers’ classrooms and the
degree of code switching occurring between preschool teachers and preschoolers. While closely examining frequencies, beliefs, and perceptions throughout the study, I also provided intermittent professional development sessions to determine the degree to which the implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies provided during professional development led to changes in teacher beliefs and practice.

Theoretical Frameworks

As I studied the conversational relationships between teachers and children within this setting, I used as a guide Hollie’s (2012) Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching and Learning framework and the Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) professional development framework (Hyun & Marshall, 2003). These frameworks provided a basis for understanding that accounting for culture in teaching and learning includes accounting for language variety as well.

Sharroky Hollie (2012) developed a framework (Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching and Learning) that provides teachers with a model regarding the practice of culturally responsive teaching that also infuses the importance of home language. The roots of Hollie’s framework spread from Gloria Ladson-Billings’ (1994) Culturally Relevant Teaching pedagogy and Geneva Gay’s (2000) Culturally Responsive Teaching pedagogy. Ladson-Billings’ (1994) pedagogy is defined as “a pedagogy that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural and historical referents to convey knowledge, to impart skills, and to change attitudes” (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p.13). Geneva Gay (2000) added to this body of research and defined culturally responsive pedagogy as “the use of cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance learning styles of ethnically diverse
students to make learning encounters more relevant to, and effective for, them" (Gay, 2000, p. 31). Sharroky Hollie’s (2012) definition of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy (CLR) is “the validation and affirmation of the home (indigenous) culture and home language for the purposes of building and bridging the student to success in the culture of academia and mainstream society” (Hollie 2012, 23). In other words, the ability to engage in culturally and linguistically responsive teaching requires teachers to scaffold learning by “meeting” the students where they are through gaining an understanding of their home cultures and providing relatable instructional strategies that will help guide students to mainstream academic success.

Hollie (2012) further defines CLR as an approach versus a curriculum, in that, it is a “way of thinking about how to instruct and how to create an instructional experience for the students that validates, affirms, illuminates, inspires, and motivates them.” CLR employs a three-part formula necessary for successful implementation: 1. Establish a general pedagogical category, 2. Check for quantity, strategy, and quality of the pedagogy in the classroom, and 3. Infuse CLR elements (strategies and activities) into the teaching. Hollie (2012) has identified five general pedagogical categories that can be infused with CLR elements: 1. Responsive Classroom Management, 2. Responsive Academic Literacy (or use of text), 3. Responsive Academic Vocabulary, 4. Responsive Academic Language Instruction (or situational appropriateness), and 5. Responsive Learning Environment. For the purposes of this study, two established general pedagogical categories, Responsive Academic Literacy and Responsive Academic Language Instruction, were infused with CLR elements to guide preschool teachers with implementing CLR strategies using children’s literature.
As a basis for the culturally and linguistically responsive professional development component of this study, I used Hyun and Marshall’s (2003) framework, Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP). The DCAP framework incorporates Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP) standards from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) prepared by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). DCAP adds to these standards the students’ home culture, which in the case of this research study includes language and discourse styles specific to the children and families within the multicultural preschool—AAVE and HAE. Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice begins with critical pedagogy that allows for connections between classroom teaching and consideration of students’ everyday lives and experiences. The key element of DCAP is reflexivity and encourages teachers to ask questions such as: 1. What relationships do my students see between the activity or the work we do in class and the lives they live outside of our classroom?, 2. Is it possible to incorporate aspects of students’ lived culture into the work of schooling without simply confirming what they already know?, 3. Can this incorporation be practiced without devaluing the objects and relationships important to students?, and 4. Can this practice succeed without ignoring particular groups of students as “other” within a “dominant” culture? (Hyun, 1998; Hyun & Marshall, 2003). Proposing such questions requires teachers to self-reflect and design lessons that are developmentally and culturally inclusive.

Research Foci

Utilizing the above frameworks to guide this study, the following research foci were developed in order to meet the purpose of the study in exploring preschool teachers’
frequency, beliefs, and perceptions of home language dialect specific to the urban multicultural preschool—AAVE and HAE, Academic Language, and code switching and the resulting influence of targeted culturally and linguistically responsive professional development on preschool teachers’ instructional practices:

1. What do the pre-kindergarten teachers and the director know about the features of the home language dialects—AAVE and HAE, Academic Language, and the practice of code switching?

2. In what ways, if any, are the features of AAVE and HAE, AL, and the practice of code switching used between participants and students within the context of daily classroom life?

3. Does targeted CLR PD influence participants’ beliefs, perceptions, and practices regarding home language dialects and code switching in the classroom?

Limitations

This study was limited to the Hispanic American preschool director, three African American teachers, two Caucasian teachers, and the approximately 50 preschoolers of various ethnic origins at an urban multicultural preschool. For the purposes of building an in-depth case study, no preschoolers, teachers or administrators outside of the urban multicultural preschool were observed, interviewed, or provided targeted professional development for this study.

Overview of Chapters

This study was undertaken to: 1) examine the frequency, beliefs, and perceptions of home language dialect—specifically AAVE and HAE, AL, and code switching among preschool teachers in an urban multicultural preschool and, 2) observe whether there are
changes or adjustments in teacher instructional practice regarding early literacy and language as it relates to home language dialect and code switching, after having been provided with targeted culturally and linguistically responsive professional development. Chapter I provided an introduction to the phenomenon that will be discussed in this study and the basis for why this study was necessary. Researchers can further this study by examining parent beliefs of home language dialects and whether parents perceive the ability to code switch as significant to their child’s achievement. The statement of the problem and the research goals were the key factors that guided this study and provided a framework. A section on the limitations of the study provided the reader with details as to the parameters under which the research was conducted and allows for replication of the study in other contexts if necessary with the understanding that there were certain limitations. Additionally, in Chapter I, I provided a section with definitions of terms related to this study for a clear understanding of the information that will follow.

Chapter II provides a review of the relevant historical and current literature regarding the home language dialects specific to the urban multicultural preschool in this study—AAVE and HAE, code switching, national standards for developmentally appropriate practices in the field of early childhood education, and early childhood professional development practices using children’s literature. In addition, I will discuss factors that influence literacy and language development of multicultural children and the ability to code switch. Chapter III elaborates on the specific methods and procedures used to collect and analyze the data for the study. Chapter IV reports the findings from the collection and analysis of data. Chapter V includes the summary of the study, conclusions and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Preschool teachers’ beliefs and understanding of home language dialects—
African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Hispanic American English (HAE),
Academic Language (AL), and code switching may influence whether they incorporate
culturally and linguistically responsive language strategies that encourage code switching
as an extension of language development instruction and the extent to which they do so.
When teachers have favorable perceptions toward an idea or concept’s ability to
favorably impact student achievement, they are more likely to adopt the idea or concept
(Ladson-Billings, 2009; Harris & Graham, 2007). Understanding beliefs and perceptions
concerning home language, AL, and code switching first requires a historical review of
the literature regarding AAVE and HAE. While much of the research conducted in the
area of code switching has included primarily grades 4-12 (Brown, 2009; Rickford &
Rickford, 2002; Wheeler & Swords, 2006), my research will extend code switching
research to include preschool professionals. This review will explore the history of the
home languages—African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Hispanic
American English (HAE), the influence of socioeconomics and cultural home language
differences, the reading achievement gap, preschool teacher perceptions and awareness of
language, preschool teacher professional development in the area of language and literacy
development, and Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) pedagogy to include
children’s literature. These factors may influence preschool teachers’ beliefs and
perceptions of home language dialects and their willingness to implement culturally and
linguistically responsive strategies.

Understanding the history of the language style that is specific to students taught
within an urban multicultural setting will serve as the basis for providing early educators
with targeted lessons and activities that will encourage a co-existence of both home
language dialect and Academic Language as early as the preschool years. There is a long
history of research on the role of language—specifically code switching in relation to
student academic success and the “achievement gap” (Labov, 1972; Corson, 1997;
Ainsworth, 2002; Ogbu, 2003; Condron, 2009). There are various terms that have been
used specifically in the discussion of African American language and sociolinguists/
ethnolinguists who have studied language among African Americans have coined terms
such as African American English (AAE), Black Dialect, Black English, Black Idiom,
and Ebonics to describe the “voice of Black America” (Smitherman, 1977). The same
holds true in the discussion of the variations in Hispanic American language in that, there
are various terms that have been associated with the language dialect to include Chicano
English and Mexican American English. For the purposes of this dissertation, I will use
the term African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Hispanic American English
(HAE). African American Vernacular English (AAVE), has been defined as the
systematic, rule-governed language of African Americans that represents an infusion of
native West African languages and the American English language (Hollie, 2012,
Smitherman, 2000). Craig & Washington (2006) further defined AAVE as an expansive
set of morphological, syntactic, semantic, phonological, and discourse features that differ
systematically from the ways that the same meanings would be expressed in Standard
American English (SAE). Hispanic American English (HAE) is defined as the systematic, rule-governed language spoken by the Hispanic, Chicano, and/or Mexican American community united by common ancestry (Hollie, 2012; Fought, 2003). Speakers of these home language dialects need teachers who are aware of their cultural and linguistic patterns while also ensuring that children successfully incorporate the Academic Language necessary for success within the United States school system, which is the language of the classroom, texts, and standardized tests.

There are broad perspectives on “nonstandard” languages or dialects in general; however, the views fall primarily under two perspectives: socio-/ethnolinguistic and dialect. The socio-/ethnolinguistic view aligns more with the idea of validating and accepting students’ cultural capital, while the dialect view has been viewed as more of a deficit perspective because the rules of the unaccepted or “nonstandard” language are always explained in juxtaposition to the accepted or “standard” English language (Hollie, 2012). I primarily aligned with the socio-ethnolinguistic perspective (language code-switching or contrastive analysis). Language code switching, better known as contrastive analysis in academia, is the practice of comparing and contrasting the linguistic structure of two languages (Hollie, 2012). A majority of home language dialect speaking students will adopt AL through observational learning, but there is a percentage that will find it difficult to ever successfully recognize the differences in use and context between their home language dialect and AL (Condron, 2009; Craig & Washington, 2006). Those students who gain this skill have been referred to as having the ability to “code switch”/dialect shift. These terms have been used interchangeably throughout research conducted in this field of study (Craig & Washington, 2006; Condron, 2009; Hollie,
2012). However the terms, “language code-switching” and “contrastive analysis” are more widely accepted within the socio/ethnolinguistic perspective, while the terms, “bidialectalism” and “dialect shifting” are more aligned with the dialect perspective. In this study, I primarily used the term “code-switching.” However in my descriptions of AAVE and HAE, I used both “language” and “dialect” for all-inclusive purposes with the understanding that geographical regions can also influence language that would result in language dialects. While the information expressed throughout this study was grounded from primarily a socio-ethnolinguistic perspective, this review of literature was inclusive of the history of the home languages addressed in the study, cultural and socioeconomic influences, academic opportunity gaps, teacher perceptions of language, early childhood teacher preparation and professional development in language development, and culturally and linguistically responsive children’s literature and strategies.

If teachers can begin to view home language dialects as true and legitimate language varieties, progress can be made in terms of how educators plan and implement culturally and linguistically responsive language and literacy learning within their classrooms, possibly leading to complete classrooms of children who are linguistically successful and able to use the most situational appropriate language variety given the setting or context. This research study focuses on an examination of the beliefs, perceptions, and frequency of home language dialects practices among preschool teachers in an urban multicultural preschool and an examination of preschool teachers’ implementation of instructional practices after receiving targeted culturally and linguistically responsive strategies during professional development.
History of Home Language Dialects

Among the most prevalent home languages spoken within urban multicultural communities are African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Hispanic American English (HAE) (Smitherman, 2000; Hollie, 2012; Fought, 2003; Wolfram, Carter, & Moriello, 2004). Both have a long history in the United States. The Spanish language in the United States has been traced back to 1513 when the Spanish first arrived on the present-day Florida peninsula. Between 1520 and 1570, the Spanish explored and established colonies on the Atlantic coast, specifically in the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, and along the New England coast. They eventually realized greater potential in the unexplored West and Southwest of the present-day United States, where they left a long-lasting significant cultural and linguistic influence.

As groups representing different regions of Spanish-speaking populations settled in the present-day United States territories, they brought unique varieties of Spanish. They began to learn English and like other learners of a new language, they spoke a non-native variety that included sounds and grammatical constructions from their first language, Spanish. As families grew, children learned both Spanish and English simultaneously and created a new dialect of English and today linguistic features of contemporary dialects can be traced to the number of dialect differences at the time when these groups initially settled in the United States. Now there are a number of Spanish varieties throughout the United States, however there are some features that are constant across varieties that encompass Hispanic American English. Variations of the Spanish language in the United States are due to sociolinguistic variables such as ethnicity, socioeconomic status, age and gender. In addition, in some geographical regions home
languages have historically influenced each other and features overlap as noted in Anisman's (1975) research regarding aspects of code switching in New York Puerto Rican English.

The structure of African American Vernacular English can be traced back to the years when the first Africans arrived in America, through the civil rights era, and into modern-day African American communities. As Africans were brought to America, their various languages also came along for the journey, leading to a “melting pot” of languages and the inability to effectively communicate with each other, as there were many different dialects and languages for various tribes and villages. Upon arriving in Colonial America, Africans developed a Pidgin, which was a language of transaction. This Pidgin eventually became widespread and evolved into a Creole that included the same basic structure and idiom that characterized West African language patterns but involved the substitution of English words for West African words. West African language patterns such as the construction of sentences without a form of the verb “to be” can still be found in present-day AAVE (Smitherman, 1977). Therefore, we realize that as Africans attempted to learn the language of America, they tried to fit the words and sounds of the new language into their native language resulting in a language variety of their own. Storytelling and everyday conversation also took on their own variations of Standard American English that led to the formation of an English language variety that became distinctive to African Americans including features such as “call and response” used in many African American churches today (Vernon-Feagans, 1996).

Throughout American history both AAVE and HAE have evolved just as Standard American English has evolved in its variety. During these various periods of
American history, Hispanic Americans and African Americans learned the dominant English language variety of the period, thereby allowing for infusion to occur between language varieties. This study offers a lens into this phenomenon of home language as it is spoken in today's urban multicultural homes and communities, the factors that influence teacher beliefs and perceptions, and how implementing culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in the preschool environment is perceived among children's earliest teachers.

**Research on Cultural Differences and Socioeconomic Influence**

Teacher consideration and understanding of the cultural differences and the influence of socioeconomics on students are key elements in examining teachers' language beliefs and practices. The frameworks used as a guide for this study—1. Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching and Learning (CLR) and 2. Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP), both require teacher awareness of students of different races, cultures, and languages in their particular contexts (Hyun, 1998; Hollie, 2012).

For decades, there have been documented academic success differences between African American, Hispanic American, and Native American students in relation to Caucasian American students on reading and mathematic standardized achievement tests. As social and economic variations persist, disparities in educational outcomes remain an especially significant barrier. Schools appear to exacerbate racial disparities in learning while simultaneously slowing the growth of social class gaps. According to Condron (2009) it is well known that students from disadvantaged social class backgrounds are placed into lower/slower learning groups than their advantaged peers, and that these
students are placed lower than Caucasian American students. Lower group placement inhibits learning, while higher group placement promotes learning, compared with non-grouped instruction. These kinds of groupings or classifications help to perpetuate academic opportunity gaps.

The role of cultural difference is also influential in early literacy skill development and academic achievement. Prior to school entry, many home language dialect speakers have primary exposure to literacy practices that differ from their mainstream peers (Craig & Washington, 2006). Therefore, early classroom instruction and foundational skills embedded in Academic Language are unfamiliar to them and they have limited prior preparation. However some research has shown that a better alignment with home and school can produce significant benefits for African American and Hispanic American children through the use of home book programs (Connor & Craig, 2006; Robinson, Larsen, & Haupt, 1996). These and other minority reading programs can aid in improving the relationship between home and the young African American and Hispanic American student’s readiness for literacy practices in school. Even with these possible benefits to resolving the problems of young children’s literacy, the resolution of economic disparity is less hopeful and has a strong influence on student achievement (Jensen, 2009; Ferguson, Bovaird, & Mueller, 2007; Darling-Hammond & Post, 2000). According to the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, in 2010, 39 percent of African American children, 35 percent of Hispanic American children and 12 percent of Caucasian American children lived in poverty and the rates have increased annually since 2006. Therefore, scholars and educators must consider both cultural differences and socioeconomic status in an attempt to understand home language dialect
without making judgments and classifying students and work to implement culturally and linguistically responsive strategies for these students.

**Home Language Dialects and Academic Opportunity Gaps**

The first experiences with language occur during early formations in our mothers’ wombs. We hear the language of our home environment and become most familiar with this style and its discourse features. As children develop and prepare to enter the traditional school systems in the United States, they enter school with the style and features characteristic of their home language and it becomes increasingly important for them to understand the “language of school”—otherwise known as Academic Language (AL) (Hollie, 2012). The roles of culture and home language are related to academic success in that, if children are able to make connections between home and school cultures with the guidance of culturally and linguistically responsive teachers, the perceived achievement gaps in reading, writing, and mathematics may decline particularly between home language dialect speaking students and students who speak primarily mainstream American English when given necessary and culturally appropriate tools (Hollie, 2012; Gay, 2000; Hollins, 2008).

It has been documented that children’s understanding of this new language of school is directly related to their success on reading and writing assessments (Craig & Washington, 2002; Braun, Wang, Jenkins & Weinbaum, 2006). It has also been noted that using alternative assessments of reading and writing, especially with children who speak various English dialects, reveal that children actually exhibit comprehension but interpret the information differently as they use the rules and discourse features of their home language to make decisions on standardized assessments (Wheeler & Swords,
2006; Hollie, 2012). The Culture and Language Academy of Success (CLAS)—a charter school in Los Angeles dedicated to the implementation of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) pedagogy—has maintained high achievement results specifically in English/Language Arts when compared to its local district and the state. As of 2010, the Federal Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) report card revealed that nearly 60% of CLAS students were advanced or proficient in reading/English language arts. Three of the key pedagogical areas identified by Hollie (2012)—Responsive Academic Literacy, Responsive Academic Vocabulary, and Responsive AL—are directly related to the role of home language (AAVE and HAE) and the CLAS students' proficiency in reading/English language arts.

Connor and Craig (2006) examined the relationship between African American preschoolers' use of AAVE and their achievement on language, vocabulary and emergent literacy skills assessments in an effort to better understand the perplexing and persistent difficulties many African American children experience while learning to read proficiently. Results indicated that students who used AAVE features with greater or lesser frequency demonstrated stronger sentence imitation, letter-word recognition, and phonological awareness skills than did preschoolers who used AAVE features with moderate frequency when researchers controlled for preschoolers' initial vocabulary skills assessed during the fall of their preschool year. Fewer preschoolers used AAVE features during the sentence imitation task with explicit expectations for AL than they did during an oral narrative elicitation task with implicit expectations for AL. The nonlinear relation between AAVE use and emergent literacy skills suggested that some preschoolers are already capable of engaging in code switch skills between AAVE and
AL, therefore preschool teachers can and should be culturally aware of how this skill can be implemented in their classrooms for optimal success with their African American preschool students and other home language dialect speakers in their classrooms.

Lopez and McEneaney (2012) analyzed reading achievement data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress of Hispanic elementary students across states with varying policies on language acquisition. They found that states with stronger emphasis on dual-language learning revealed higher reading achievement for all Hispanic students. Another finding from the study was that states with increased pre-service teacher training and professional development on language issues showed significant effects on reading achievement among Hispanic students. Historically researchers have advocated for changes in teacher language practices as seen in Solórzano and Solórzano’s (1995) study that offered ideas for restructuring existing educational frameworks that would encourage effective schools in Hispanic communities thereby increasing academic achievement. The findings in these studies support the need to provide teachers with professional development that encourages the implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies that can help guide students to higher levels of reading achievement.

Studies have found that the achievement gap in reading scores among children can appear as early as school entry and increases over time (Ainsworth, 2002; Craig & Washington, 2002; Ogbu, 2003). Researchers have conducted studies where results revealed a “school readiness” gap between Caucasian American and both Hispanic American and African American children prior to entering kindergarten (Magnuson & Waldfogel, 2005; Fryer & Levitt, 2004; Ramey & Ramey, 2004). According to Braun et
al. (2006) less attention has been paid to the achievement gap and how it correlates with language and literacy success during early childhood years, particularly before kindergarten. In their study, Braun et al. used published data on the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort, and found statistically significant differences in language knowledge and skills, literacy knowledge and skills, and mathematics knowledge and skills between African American children and Caucasian American children, Hispanic American children and Caucasian American children, and Asian American and Caucasian American children as early as 4 years old. The largest achievement gap was found between Hispanic American children and Caucasian American children, followed by the gap between African American children and Caucasian American children. Therefore it is important to take the persistent achievement gap in language knowledge/ skills and literacy knowledge/ skills assessments into consideration when studying factors that influence preschool teachers’ beliefs and perceptions of the home languages—AAVE and HAE, Academic Language and whether teachers will implement or to what extent will they implement culturally and linguistically responsive strategies with children.

**Early Childhood Teacher Perceptions of Language Development and Achievement**

There are a limited number of researchers who have ventured into the interchange of preschool, home language dialects and code switching and even more rare is research on preschool teacher perceptions in regard to AAVE or HAE language, specifically. Teachers’ perceptions toward an idea or concept influence the likelihood that they will adopt the idea or concept (Ladson-Billings, 2009; Harris & Graham, 2007). The research that has been conducted with early childhood teachers’ perceptions of language
development has been rooted primarily in research from the field of speech-language pathology. Shaughnessy, Sanger, Matteucci, & Ritzman (2004) conducted a survey to explore kindergarten teachers' perceptions of early childhood language and literacy, the roles and responsibilities of speech-language pathologists, and teacher-delivered interventions to support students' language development. Survey responses were collected from 737 kindergarten teachers regarding their knowledge of aspects of typical and delayed language development during early childhood, interventions to support students' linguistic growth, and the role of speech-language pathologists in providing services. The findings suggested many of the teachers had some understanding of oral language development and its implications for literacy development. Responses revealed that teachers acknowledged the importance of phonemic awareness activities and children's experiences with environmental print, books, and other literacy materials. Teachers believed that children with weak phonemic awareness are likely to have difficulty learning to read and that children who have difficulty learning to read should be assessed for language problems. In addition, findings indicated that professional development in language development would benefit teachers of young children. While the findings in this survey informed the field of speech-language pathology, the results included teachers' perceptions of language and literacy development that transcend the field and inform the overall field of early childhood education as well.

Ferguson (2003) evaluated how schools can positively influence the cultural disparities of students entering kindergarten with weaker reading skills than their Caucasian American counterparts by examining two potential sources for this difference: teachers and students. The study provided evidence for the proposition that teachers'
perceptions, expectations, and behaviors interact with students’ beliefs, behaviors, and work habits in ways that help to perpetuate academic opportunity gaps and that teachers have higher expectations from Caucasian American students (Ferguson, 2003). Another study by Uhlenberg and Brown (2002) suggested that before solutions can be implemented personal assumptions and biases should be understood. Teacher perceptions and expectations become generally inflexible after only a few weeks of interactions with their students and perpetuate self-fulfilling expectation effects on students (Ferguson, 2003). This can be unfavorable for students in need of increased interventions to move from one achievement level to the next. These beliefs and perceptions can potentially influence whether teachers will implement culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in the classroom.

**Early Childhood Teacher Preparation**

There are a number of routes for individuals who wish to prepare for a teaching career in early childhood education. One example is through local departments of Social Services, many of which provide an early childhood endorsement program to meet the need for highly qualified early childhood education and childcare. Through these departments, training is offered on the care, development, health, and safety of young children. These endorsement programs have progressively become partnerships between local Social Services departments, Community College Systems, and Workforce Alliances.

The average schooling for an early childhood teacher can vary depending on the desired credential or degree. Individuals preparing for early childhood teaching can earn an endorsement that can take between one and two semesters to complete, an associates
degree in early childhood education (approximately two years), a bachelors degree in the field (approximately four years). Every early childhood program provides preparation that specifically includes at least one language development course in addition to other pertinent content necessary for success in the early childhood field. Such courses as, “Beyond Babble: Exploring Early language Development,” “Language Arts in Early Childhood,” and “Language Development in Young Children” serve as a foundation for understanding early childhood language development. However, many of these courses fail to integrate the factor of home language dialects (specifically, AAVE and HAE) for teachers who serve in urban multicultural settings. Therefore, professional development beyond course work is necessary as early childhood teachers meet the needs of language and literacy development for young children.

**Early Childhood Teacher Professional Development—Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) and Language Development**

As varied are the number and types of early childhood teacher preparation programs so are the types of early childhood professional development opportunities. In the United States, early childhood teacher education programs prepare individuals for the field using National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards prepared by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) that discuss the necessity of addressing Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP) along with multicultural education in early childhood teacher education programs (NCATE, 1994; Bredekamp, 1987; Bredekamp & Copple, 1997). DAP is a philosophical framework and pedagogy in early childhood education that emphasizes three core considerations: age appropriateness, individual appropriateness, and social and cultural
appropriateness when planning programs for young children. The latter has inspired the
design of Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) to address the
need for inclusion of culturally appropriate practice in teacher preparation.

Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) allows for
connections between classroom teaching and consideration of students’ everyday lives
and experiences (Hyun & Marshall, 2003) and it incorporates reflectivity as a key
element, such that teachers have to ask themselves reflective questions regarding their
teaching practices and strategies as they relate to the students they are serving. Essentially
these questions require teachers to be purposeful in making connections in what they are
teaching to how the activity/lesson may relate to students’ culture and lives outside of the
successful early childhood education, preparation, and professional development rely
more on consistency between home and school cultures than on formal education at any
other level. Therefore, maintaining cultural congruency between young learners’ home
and school experiences is the core of early childhood critical pedagogy for DCAP (Hyun

The framework for Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP)
can serve as an effective approach for creating meaningful early childhood professional
development that accounts for young learners’ home language. The DCAP framework
incorporates Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP) and the students’ home
cultures, which in the case of this research study, includes African American and
Hispanic American language and discourse styles. The DCAP framework was utilized as
a basis for the culturally and linguistically responsive professional development
interventions that early childhood professionals gained through this study. In addition to consideration for the most appropriate professional development model, the research on cultural differences and socioeconomic influence are also important to the discussion of home languages.

Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Children’s Literature

Success in almost any subject area requires strong literacy skills. The ability to read, write, listen, and speak are paramount to achieving success. Literacy practices for young culturally and linguistically diverse children should include opportunities to access culturally and linguistically responsive literature that will celebrate and respect children’s culture and language. There is a positive relationship between having access to literacy materials and enhancement of literacy (Ezell et al., 2000). In most classrooms, it is difficult to find children’s literature that is both culturally and linguistically responsive (Hollie, 2012). While the cultural choices of children’s literature has grown considerably since the 1970s (Fox & Short, 2003; Henderson & May, 2005), teachers still need to be selective as they choose literature that will encourage affirmation and validation of children’s cultures. The selection process of culturally and linguistically responsive children’s literature requires teachers to have an understanding of cultural authenticity and the types of cultural texts available (Fox & Short, 2003; Hollie, 2012). Hollie (2012) asserts that culturally specific texts are the most authentic in capturing the experience of a group from a cultural perspective rather than a racial one as these texts address the traditions and beliefs of the culture of focus. Culturally generic and culturally neutral books fall short of authenticity in that while they feature people of varying ethnicities, they do not address culturally and linguistically specific customs or beliefs. Preschool
teachers rely heavily on children’s literature as a resource in their teaching. Therefore it is important that once teachers gain an awareness of the cultural diversity within their classrooms that they then become selective in how to choose books that will help them implement culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in practice.

While the selection of books is important in the implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive practice, the availability of these books is also of equal importance. According to a longitudinal database managed by the Cooperative Children’s Book Center at the University of Wisconsin, Madison since 1985, there has been a steady estimate of about 4,000 to 5,000 children’s books published yearly in the United States since 1989 to 2014. Of the estimated 5,000 children’s books published in 2014, 84 were written by African Americans with 180 written about African Americans and 59 books were written by Latinos with 66 written about Latinos (CCBC, 2015). The success of teachers’ implementation and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching also relies on the availability of responsive resources that will aid teachers in becoming aware and gaining an understanding of children’s cultural and linguistic characteristics.

**Linguistically Responsive Strategies Using Children’s Literature**

Culturally and linguistically responsive children’s literature can be used by teachers to implement responsive strategies such as code switching or contrastive analysis that includes activities such as sentence lifting, retellings, role playing, and teachable moments (Hollie, 2012). Much of the research regarding the use of children’s literature being used along with these strategies and activities include emphasis on children in elementary and secondary academic settings (Brown, 2009; Rickford & Rickford, 2002; Hollie, 2012; Wheeler & Swords, 2006). While there has been research
on incorporating multicultural children’s literature in the early childhood classroom, there has not been specific research emphasis widely on using culturally and linguistically responsive children’s literature in the preschool setting to engage children in linguistic strategies that promote the affirmation and validation of their home language dialects (AAVE and HAE) while also encouraging the use of the language of school (Academic Language).

Linguistically responsive terms such as "code switching" and "contrastive analysis" have both been used to describe the process of making connections from home language dialects (AAVE and HAE) to other language varieties or dialects (AL). Code switching is evidence of a child’s increasing linguistic competence and usually begins as the child is exposed to formal schooling (Manning & Baruth, 2000). The literature in the area of code-switching and bidialectal skills as it relates to the differences in academic opportunity gap is not expansive. However, scholars seem to acknowledge that home language dialects must play a contributing role to students’ literacy skill success (Hollie, 2012; Wheeler & Swords, 2006; Craig & Washington, 2002). If this is the case, then providing preschool teachers with practical linguistically responsive strategies to use with children’s literature—one of their most widely used teaching tools—may influence teacher beliefs and practices regarding language dialect and language development. Preschool teachers’ beliefs and perceptions can provide insight into how culturally and linguistically responsive practice coupled with early childhood teacher professional development using developmentally and culturally appropriate practice may positively influence a narrowing of academic opportunity gaps across cultures.
Summary

The review of literature presents a broad spectrum of information related to cultural and linguistic responsiveness, teacher beliefs and cultural awareness, and the academic success of all urban multicultural preschool students. The literature reveals a gap in preschool language development research as it relates to home language dialect and teacher responsiveness, in that there is limited research that has been conducted among scholars to build a dialogue regarding culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in the preschool environment. While there are several issues that must be explored and studied further, the literature presented can serve as a foundation for a subsequent dialogue. The pattern of relationships discovered in the review of literature offered information that revealed the need to acknowledge differences among cultures when implementing strategies for culturally and linguistically diverse students. Early childhood teacher professional development opportunities aimed at addressing the issues of language and dialect among urban multicultural children are necessary in order to identify effective strategies, rather than continuing with the current strategies that allow for persistent disparities. Thereby supporting the two-fold purpose of this study in: 1) examining teachers’ beliefs and perceptions of home language dialect, the frequency of AAVE and HAE, AL, and code switching between preschool teachers and preschoolers in an urban multicultural preschool and 2) observing whether there are changes or adjustments in teacher practice and implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies having been provided with targeted professional development. Chapter III provides information regarding the specific methods and procedures used to collect and analyze the data for the study. Chapter IV contains the reported findings from
the collection and analysis of data and Chapter V summarizes the study while providing conclusions and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER III
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

Culturally and linguistically diverse students who master the skill of code switching between home language dialect and academic language tend to achieve greater overall success in school (Brown, 2008; Smitherman, 2000; Wheeler & Swords, 2006). Therefore, the overarching aim of this study was to explore preschool teachers’ beliefs and perceptions of language dialect and the frequency of home language dialect and code switching in their classrooms. As a secondary aim, this research examined preschool teachers’ perceptions and the extent to which they implemented Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) strategies with culturally and linguistically responsive children’s books in their practice. Specifically the children’s books contained the most commonly used home language features of the children within the urban multicultural preschool—African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Hispanic American English (HAE). These home language varieties of English were included in this study as they are the home language dialects most specific to the population of children attending this preschool and some of the features of both of these varieties overlap (Holli, 2012; Wolfram, Carter, & Moriello, 2004; Fought, 2003). As a result, one feature in particular that overlaps between the two home languages, the multiple negation feature, was explored in this study. In order to fulfill the aim of this study, I had to first determine the frequency use of the home language features between the preschool director/teachers and the students. Specifically, I observed in their classrooms before and after receiving professional development, for the quantity, strategy, and quality of Responsive Academic
Literacy and Responsive Academic Language Instruction through using children's literature. Information regarding teachers' beliefs and perceptions of home language dialect and code switching in relation to culturally and linguistically responsive practices was also collected. In the discussion that follows, I will address the use of culturally and linguistically responsive children's books in teacher professional development sessions to include a discussion about the selection of children's books and the criteria used in making selections. Additionally, the discussion will contain the methods and procedures I used for conducting the study including the sample population, research design, the methods of data collection, interventions, data analysis, limitations and a summary.

Aim of the Study

This study assessed two related issues concerning the preschool teachers and the director's beliefs and frequency use of home language features of AAVE and HAE at a small preschool center in the coastal southeastern region of the United States. Using a qualitative, phenomenological approach provided an opportunity for examination of the frequency use of specific AAVE and HAE features along with the degree of language code switching occurring between the preschool teachers, the director and the preschoolers. This examination allowed me to gain insight regarding the preschool director and the teachers' perceptions of features of AAVE and HAE through pre-observations and pre-interviews. Secondly, I provided the preschool director and teachers with four, one-hour long professional development sessions related to Responsive Academic Literacy and Responsive Language Instruction based on the frameworks—Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Practice (CLR) and Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) (Hollie, 2012; Hyun & Marshall, 2003).
Following each professional development session, I observed the director and teachers for the quantity, strategy, and quality of Responsive Academic Literacy and Language Instruction used with culturally and linguistically responsive children's literature in the classroom. I observed teachers for the frequency use of specific AAVE and HAE features and code-switching occurring among themselves and students during established times throughout the day—morning/afternoon circle times, story time, centers and transitions to explore the ways teachers implemented the strategies I provided during targeted professional development. Finally, I revisited the director and the teachers' perceptions of home language and code switching during post-interviews after having been engaged in the study.

**Research Foci**

To guide this study the following research questions were considered:

1. What do the pre-kindergarten teachers and the director know about the features of the home language dialects—AAVE and HAE, Academic Language, and the practice of code switching?

2. In what ways, if any, are the features of AAVE and HAE, AL, and the practice of code switching used between participants and students within the context of daily classroom life?

3. Does targeted CLR PD influence participants' beliefs, perceptions, and practices regarding home language dialects and code switching in the classroom?

In the matrix that follows, I provide an overview of how each research question would be addressed within the data collection and analysis process.
Data Collection/ Analysis Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Objective</th>
<th>Measure (s):</th>
<th>Data Collection Method (s):</th>
<th>Time Frame for Collection:</th>
<th>Data:</th>
<th>Data Analysis Method (s):</th>
<th>Time Frame for Analysis:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question 1:</strong> What do the pre-kindergarten teachers and the director know about the features of the home language dialects—AAVE and HAE, Academic Language, and the practice of code switching?</td>
<td>To establish a baseline for determining awareness and knowledge on cultural home languages, AL, and code switching</td>
<td>Pre-Interviews, Reflexivity component of PD sessions; Post-Interviews</td>
<td>Initial Interviews &amp; Post interviews with teachers</td>
<td>Approximately 30-45min with each teacher; 1-week period each for conducting interviews</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>Every 15 min of recorded data (30-45min interviews)=3 hours each; Total=21 hours (2-3 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question 2:</strong> In what ways, if any, are features of AAVE and HAE, AL, and the practice of code switching used between participants and students within the context of daily classroom life?</td>
<td>To gain insight of teachers’ classroom practices using AAVE or HAE, AL, and code switching throughout study</td>
<td>Pre- and Post-Interviews/Observations</td>
<td>Initial Interviews, Reflectivity portions of targeted PD sessions, Wrap-up Interviews</td>
<td>Total 6-8 weeks of Collection</td>
<td>Transcription; Observation Protocol; Interview Protocol</td>
<td>Over 2 week intervals (3x) for a total of 6-8 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question 3:</strong> Does targeted CLR PD influence participants’ beliefs, perceptions, and practices regarding home language dialects and code switching in the classroom?</td>
<td>To determine whether there are possible frequency differences during the study/connections</td>
<td>Initial &amp; Final Observations during circle time, story time, centers, and transitions; PD sessions</td>
<td>Observation Protocol</td>
<td>Total of 2 weeks (4 obs. at varying times/ days for one week during initial &amp; final phase)</td>
<td>Observation Protocol; Field Notes</td>
<td>Over 2 week intervals (2x: initial &amp; final) for a total of 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

Design

Through a qualitative, phenomenological approach, I employed traditional qualitative measures and frequency counts along with semi-structured pre- and post-interviews, classroom observations using descriptive and reflective field notes, professional development sessions, horizontalization of data, and textural and structural descriptions for a phenomenological case study design. The phenomenon studied was the frequency of home language dialect use within the classroom, participants’ beliefs and perceptions of language dialects, and degree of teachers’ home language dialect (AAVE and HAE) use and implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies within the classrooms of an urban multicultural preschool before and after receiving targeted professional development using children’s books. I selected this center purposefully for this study as a result of my involvement with this preschool during a smaller scale qualitative project where home language features between teachers, parents and children were observed while in the environment. Therefore, I consider this to be insider research (Hays, & Singh, 2011; Hellawell, 2006; Merton, 1972) wherein I, as the principal investigator, was not a part of the phenomenon of language discourse within the preschool center, but rather I had prior knowledge of the phenomenon occurring within the preschool center. I conducted all of the teacher observations, semi-structured interviews, and professional development sessions within the preschool center at the participants’ convenience.

I selected a case study design due to the small number of participants and a focus on a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context (Yin, 2009). Participants
included one director and five preschool teachers who were observed using home language features and code switching within the preschool center. Case study designs allow for an explanatory, exploratory, and descriptive picture which yields a rich detailed account of the study environment and participants. Case studies’ propositions allow for pointing attention and suggesting possible links between phenomena (Yin, 2014). In this research, my objective was to provide the director and the teachers with a cultural awareness to features of specific home language dialects—AAVE and HAE, language code switching, and to provide linguistically responsive strategies to implement in their classrooms with culturally diverse children through receiving targeted professional development that may influence long-term literacy achievement for culturally and linguistically diverse children.

**Sample and Participants**

The participants in this study included five female preschool teachers and one female center director teaching/directing in a center-based preschool, and they make up the full-time teaching staff within this preschool. Three of the preschool teachers identified themselves as African American and two teachers identified themselves as Caucasian American. The center director identified herself as Hispanic American. Each teacher had comparable background education in the early childhood field with varying years of experience averaging 10 or more years of teaching experience. All teacher participants were at minimum high school graduates, averaging within ten to thirty years in age of each other (between 20-50 years old), were considered the lead or primary teacher for children between the ages of 2-5 years during instructional operating hours. The center director has a master’s degree in early childhood education and has worked in
the early childhood field for over 20 years. All teacher participants were Virginia natives. The center director is a native of Pennsylvania who spent her formal schooling years in Puerto Rico, but has lived in Virginia for over 14 years. The participants were not paid for their participation in this study. However, they received professional development opportunities and learning materials pertinent to the identified home languages and culturally and linguistically responsive literacy and language instruction.

The preschool is a state licensed child day care center in a southeastern coastal city and has a maximum capacity of 58 children. The center has been licensed through the state’s department of social services’ division of licensing programs for the past 10 years and does not have any religious affiliations. The school has an affiliation with the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and is currently 4-star rated on a 5-star scale through the state’s voluntary quality rating and improvement system where the highest rating of quality is a 5-star. At the time of this study, there were 48 children enrolled in the center with a student-to-teacher ratio of 9:1. The center accepts children ages 2 years to 12 years 11 months, as they also provide before and after school care for school-age children. However the focus of this study consisted of children between ages 2-5 years. There were approximately 9-10 children in each of five preschool classrooms with children between the ages of 2 years to 4 years. African American students account for 75% of the student enrollment, with Hispanic American and Caucasian American students each accounting for 12.5%, respectively. The center utilizes the “Creative Curriculum” as a guide to implementing a developmentally appropriate program that promotes children’s social-emotional development and learning in the core areas of literacy, mathematics, science and social studies. The teachers are
given the freedom to supplement with other activities or strategies. Spanish and sign language are also provided as alternative communication and cultural engagement opportunities. The school's philosophy is that children learn and develop at their own rate and the mission is to provide a curriculum that identifies goals in all areas of development: social, emotional, cognitive and physical. Days of operation are Monday through Friday and normal operating hours are from 6 am to 6:30 pm.

**Children's Literature in Early Childhood Professional Development**

Children's literature serves a number of purposes. In this study, I used children's literature with preschool teachers in professional development as a resource for language development (Zhang & Alex, 1995), and a vehicle for addressing culturally linguistic diversity (Jetton & Savage-Davis, 2005). The use of children's books in professional development settings allows for early childhood teachers to become familiar with quality children's books and develop meaningful ways to use them (Morris, 2013). Children's books should be used with purpose and intention thereby increasing the effectiveness of the learning experience for teachers. Using children's books in professional development trainings should not substitute for teaching theory and practice, but the use of books can make the difference in retention, attentiveness, and application of intended strategies (Morris, 2013).

**Selecting Children's Literature for Professional Development**

I examined each book carefully for its cultural and linguistic responsiveness toward the population of children that these pre-kindergarten teachers teach and the use of each book had to be planned with intention. Looking at the research on the criteria for selecting children's books, I found that organizations such as the National Association for
the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and many researchers (Derman-Sparks & Edwards, 2010; Morris, 2013; Santora & Staff, 2013) studying children's literature have developed specific criteria to consider when selecting books for children:

1. Do the illustrations complement the text?
2. Does the story have universal or personal appeal?
3. Does the author avoid stereotyping based on gender, race, culture, and profession?
4. Is the information accurate and current?

As I reflected on these questions during my initial search, I also considered the following questions as I specifically searched for children's books that were culturally and linguistically responsive to the students of the teachers who would receive the professional development (Hollie, 2012):

1. Does the story address cultural traditions or themes specific to the cultures represented at the preschool?
2. Are the linguistic features consistent with contemporary home language discourse?
3. Does the text contain characters that the children at the preschool will identify with?
4. Do the selections provide details that define the main characters culturally?

**Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Children's Books**

Culturally responsive books are those that embrace or discuss specific cultural practices, norms, or traditions of a particular group of people. Linguistically responsive books have the added feature of using linguistic characteristics that are specific to the particular culture of focus. Hollie (2012) asserts that there are three different types of
culturally responsive texts: culturally specific, culturally generic, and culturally neutral.

Culturally specific books are considered the most authentic in showing the cultural experience of a group as the text focuses on the groups' cultural norms, traditions, and customs. Culturally generic texts feature characters of various racial groups and the story plot could translate to any culture or race of people. Culturally neutral books are considered the least culturally responsive as these books are primarily informational books or revised versions of traditional fairy tales that now contain characters from cultural groups that differ from the original cultural group. Overall, it is important for culturally and linguistically responsive educators to understand these differences as they use books in their teaching of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies. As I started my search for the specific children's books that would be used with the teachers during professional development, I considered the fact that I wanted the teachers to be able to extend the use of the books with their students. Therefore I had to consider that the book would provide what was necessary for teachers to learn and gain an understanding themselves, while also being appropriate to use with students at this preschool center. As I selected the most appropriate books, I followed tips offered by Harris (1999):

1. Critically analyze how the characters are portrayed in the story, how the facts are presented, and in what context they are presented.

2. When applicable, analyze the author's use of (home language) for authenticity and thoroughness.

3. Carefully examine the illustrations for appeal, ethnic sensitivity, and authenticity.

4. Choose well-known authors, illustrators, publishers, and sellers who have already developed solid reputations for producing culturally appropriate materials.
Choosing Books for Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) Teaching

As I chose books for each set, I conducted an in-depth online library search. In each set, one book contained the identified home language feature and the other book contained the academic language equivalent of the home language feature in order to engage teachers in code switching skills. I chose each book within the set for similar cultural and community themes to show how language can be used differently within cultures and communities. In addition, each book set contained identifiable cultural characters, with one book in the set containing a girl as the main character and the other book featuring a boy as the main character. My online library search was then followed by weeks of reading children’s books in local children’s libraries. Each book had to be categorized under the “easy” section at each library in order to meet the age requirement for the children who would eventually interact with the book as a result of the professional development with their teachers. The “easy” section of each children’s library contains books that are designed for children of all ages. This collection contains books to read aloud to children or to be read independently as children learn to read. These books contain pictures that usually cover the majority of the page and work with the text to tell the story. By using children’s books that were age-appropriate and culturally responsive to this population of preschoolers, teachers could use the books to promote code switching skills and class discussion. The books I chose were all written within five years of each other and all books except two were written after the year 2000 in order to capture how home language features are being used in more recent children’s literature containing culturally responsive characters.
Each book I used for the professional development met the culturally responsive criteria. During each professional development session, I used two culturally responsive books—one contained the identified home language feature (linguistically responsive) and the other contained the academic language 'version' of the identified home language feature that I discussed during the professional development session. Hollie (2012) prescribes that when infusing CLR practices, teachers should always have a culturally responsive text to go along with a mainstream title or topic and it is from this idea that I made the decision to provide two books during each session to show teachers how to make language comparisons in the text and use this as a teaching tool for code switching strategies using activities such as: sentence lifting, retellings, role plays, and teachable moments with their students.

I used sentence lifting, retellings, role-plays, and teachable moment activities during each professional development session. I provided the teachers with these activities using the specific strategies that Hollie (2012) describes that can be applied with students to promote code switching skills:

1. **Sentence lifting**: The use of literature to address specific contrasts of home- and target- language rule forms.

2. **Retellings**: A story is presented in the target language (academic language) and then the home language (AAVE/HAE) is used to retell the story.

3. **Role-playing**: Teachers can use this strategy to give the students the opportunity to practice situational appropriate discourse through acting and calling upon the students to make decisions about language based upon the environment and audience.
4. Teachable moments: This occurs while the stories are being read wherein the teacher will elicit students’ responses and allow for discussion, creating immediate opportunities for code switching development and situational appropriateness.

**Children’s Book Set Selection and Order**

While many of the cultural themes presented in these book selections transcend to other cultural groups living in the United States and the home languages that are culturally relevant to them, I chose the book sets for culturally specific themes that tap into the norms, traditions, and customs of African American and Hispanic American culture. In order to maintain consistency across gender, each set contained a representation of both a boy and girl as the main character. I presented the book sets in the order below as a result of my research looking at the most common home language features of AAVE and HAE. Among some of the more common AAVE and HAE features are: “Be” understood and Multiple negation (Smitherman, 2000; Wheeler & Swords, 2006; Hollie, 2012). “Be” Understood (mainly occurs in instances in which the *is* and *are* forms of the verb to be do not appear in specific sentence structures: You smart= You *are* smart; We the best team=We *are* the best team; They going to school=They *are* going to school; He eating in the classroom=He *is* eating in the classroom.) and “Multiple Negation” (refers to the use of multiple negative words in a sentence: She *won’t never* help nobody=She never *ever* helps anybody; He *don’t have* nothing=He doesn’t have *anything*; You *don’t never* have no *money!=You don’t *ever* have *any* money!). While there are many other features, these two features are among the most commonly occurring regardless of geographical or regional location/dialect. I
decided to cover the "Be" understood feature over the course of two professional development sessions as it is among the most frequent feature in discourse (Smitherman, 2000; Wheeler & Swords, 2006; Hollie, 2012). Over the course of two professional development sessions, I showed the teachers how the “Be” understood feature could be found in discourse in two different ways—within the sentence and at the beginning of the sentence. The “multiple negation” feature also occurs frequently and was covered during the last professional development session, as it is always seen or heard in the same way in language discourse using multiple negative words within a sentence.

**Introductory Books**

At the beginning of the first professional development session, it was important for me to provide teachers with an initial overview and historical look at how home language dialect has changed through the years. My objective for the overview was to promote an understanding of cultural relevancy and why the books used in the book sets were more culturally responsive to the generation of students they teach. The books that I used during this introduction period were, *Peter’s Chair*, *She Come Bringing Me That Little Baby Girl*, and *My Brother Fine With Me*. Each book follows a similar theme and contains culturally responsive characters. In addition, the books show representations of both boys and girls experiencing similar situations.

*Peter’s Chair* (Ezra Jack Keats): This book was chosen for its ability to be used for contrastive analysis when comparing the linguistic structure of academic language and home language dialect. This book uses academic language to convey Peter’s (African American main character) dilemma as he now has a new baby sister and is having difficulty accepting that his old
baby items are being passed on to his new sibling. This book was written in the late 1960s (1967).

*She Come Bringing Me That Little Baby Girl* (Eloise Greenfield): The story is told from the perspective of a young African American boy using AAVE home language throughout the story to express his disappointment and jealousy over his new baby sister. The text was written in 1974.

*My Brother Fine With Me* (Lucille Clifton): A young girl uses both AAVE and HAE features throughout the story to explain that her younger five-year old brother has decided to run away and how she is glad about his decision because she will regain all of her parents’ attention. The story was written in 1975.

Through the use of the books above, I provided a foundation for the teachers to begin using the following book sets to interact with home language features and the culturally and linguistically responsive strategies and activities: sentence lifting, retellings, role-playing, and teachable moments.

**Book Sets for Professional Development Sessions**

**Book Set #1/ PD Session #1: Introduction to Home Language and Code Switching**

*Say Hello!* (Rachel Isadora): Girl-Main Character  
*Yo, Jo!* (Rachel Isadora): Boy-Main Character

*Say Hello!: This book emphasizes the diversity and languages found in America’s neighborhoods. In this story Carmelita is on her way to visit her grandmother. As she walks through her neighborhood with her mother and her dog, she greets various people in her community using the language of*
the various members of the community saying hello in Spanish, Arabic, French, a host of other languages and using code switching skills to suit the situation when she greets her peers. This book was used with teachers as an introduction tool alongside its companion book, Yo, Jo!, to begin demonstrating the idea of code switching and situation appropriateness.

*Yo, Jo!*: The common theme in this book continues with neighborhood greetings as Jomar and his brother sit on their stoop waiting for their Grandpa’s arrival. As they wait, friends and neighbors come by and Jomar has a greeting for everyone—primarily using home language dialect. However, when his Grandpa arrives, Jomar initially greets him using home language dialect. After his Grandpa questions his greeting, Jomar realizes that his Grandpa is requiring him to make a “switch” as he addresses him. This book uses a greater amount of home language dialect and teachers used this book to engage in sentence lifting, role-playing, retelling, and teachable moments.

Book Set #2/ PD Session #2: Exploring the “Be” Understood Home Language Feature Within Sentences

*Honey Baby Sugar Child* (Alice Faye Duncan): Mother-Son
*Snug in Mama’s Arms* (Angela Shelf Medearis): Mother-Daughter

*Honey Baby Sugar Child*: This book is a mother’s expression of her overwhelming love for her son. The author uses home language dialect in this poetic picture book, making the book representative of linguistic responsiveness and the theme of expression of love depicted in this book can transcend culture. The specific home language feature, “Be”
understood, used within a sentence occurs four times throughout the book. The use of this book during professional development provides teachers with multiple opportunities for learning how to engage children in code switching activities.

Snug in Mama’s Arms: Used as a companion book, there are five occurrences of the academic language ‘version’ of the home language feature, “Be” understood, found within sentences. This book also follows the theme of a mother’s expression of love for her daughter and the security that snuggling in Mama’s arms brings.

Book Set #3/ PD Session #3: Exploring the “Be” Understood Feature at the Beginning of Sentences.

Bippity Bop Barbershop (Natasha Anastasia Tarpley): Boy
I Love My Hair (Natasha Anastasia Tarpley): Girl

Bippity Bop Barbershop: Barbershops have held a special place in the African American community for decades. It has been the place where men gather to find out the latest happenings, talk about sports, and ultimately leave feeling better than when they arrived. The main character, Miles, is going to get his first haircut at the barbershop and he will experience all of this and more first hand. The author is able to capture both cultural and linguistic features within this book told from the little boy’s perspective. Specifically, the “Be” understood feature at the beginning of a sentence is highlighted using this book during the PD session as an opportunity for teachers to see the feature being used in various ways.
I Love My Hair: This is the companion book for Bippity Bop Barbershop as it is about a little girl’s perspective of the process of taking care of her hair. This book provides teachers with the opportunity to extend their learning and interaction with the “Be” understood feature by looking at different ways in which the feature can be used.

Book Set #4/ PD Session #4: Exploring the Multiple Negation Feature

*If The Shoe Fits* (Gary Soto): Boy
*Red Dancing Shoes* (Denise Lewis Patrick): Girl

*If The Shoe Fits*: The main character, Rigo, is the youngest of four brothers and he usually has to wear his brothers’ hand-me-downs but on his birthday his mom gives him a new pair of loafer shoes. Rigo is so excited as he walks through his neighborhood in his new shoes until he has a ‘run-in’ with a neighborhood bully that changes his perception of the shoes and Rigo soon learns a lesson in cherishing gifts. This is also where the multiple negation home language feature is seen in context. This book provides children with the opportunity to see Hispanic characters using their home language features. Teachers interacted with the books using each of the code switching strategies—sentence lifting, retelling, role-playing and teachable moments.

*Red Dancing Shoes*: The theme of receiving and cherishing a present is revisited in this story as the main character receives a new pair of red dancing shoes from her grandmother after her grandmother returns from a trip. The young girl walks through her neighborhood with her big sister to show off her new shoes and she soon takes off running and falls into some mud.
There are four sentences within the story that provide opportunities for exploring the academic language ‘version’ of the multiple negation feature using sentence lifting, retelling, role-playing, and teachable moments.

Summary of Books Used for PD

It was important for me to provide the teachers with books that were culturally and linguistically responsive to their students. During the first professional development session I introduced teachers to home language within children’s books and the concept of code switching. The books I used as an introduction were, *Peter’s Chair*, *She Come Bringing Me That Little Baby Girl*, and *My Brother Fine With Me*, with one book having been chosen for its Academic Language features (*Peter’s Chair*) and the other two books being chosen for its home language features. I also introduced teachers to differences in features and showed them how to engage in culturally and linguistically responsive code switching strategies such as sentence lifting, retelling, role-playing, and teachable moments to make language comparisons. These books were not used by the teachers with the children and were only intended to be used as my introduction for the teachers, as the features included within these books showed historical and generational features of home language through the 1970s and 1980s. Considering the generational differences among the teachers’ ages, it was important to provide a foundational understanding of home language and code switching that all teachers would understand.

The first set of books (*Say Hello!/ Yo, Jo!*) I used during the initial PD session were chosen for thematic similarity and as a platform for teachers to use for introducing culturally and linguistically responsive strategies to their students. Both books followed the theme of using appropriate greetings. However, the second book, *Yo, Jo!*, was used to
introduce the idea of using “situational appropriate” language—a concept that is necessary for successful language code switching (Craig & Washington, 2004). In the next three PD sessions I introduced the director and teachers to culturally and linguistically responsive children’s books containing the specific home language features of AAVE and HAE that were used throughout the study (Snug in Mama’s Arms/Honey Baby Sugar Child; Bippity Bop Barber Shop/I Love My Hair; If the Shoe Fits/Red Dancing Shoes). I paired each book that contained identified home language features with another similar-themed culturally responsive book containing the AL equivalent features to provide teachers with an understanding of language code switching between the home language features and academic language features.

Data Collection

The study took place over a three-month period. The first week began with the pre-observation period followed by the first of a total of six observation periods. I conducted each observation using observation protocols (Appendix A) within each classroom during morning/afternoon circle times and story time to examine the frequency of home language features and degree of language code switching strategies to include validating or non-affirming instructional practices occurring within the preschool environment. After the first observation period, I conducted pre-interviews with the teachers and the director using pre-interview protocols (Appendix B and C) in order to gather data concerning participants’ beliefs and perceptions of the identified home languages and their beliefs and perceptions of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies using children’s literature prior to receiving targeted professional development. During the week following the pre-interviews, the first professional development (PD)
session occurred wherein I provided teachers with a historical context for home languages and introduced them to the concept of implementing culturally and linguistically responsive strategies using the children’s books mentioned in the previous section. In each PD session, I focused on using the set of two books to show teachers how to use specific words and sentences with the identified home language features along with another similar-themed book with AL features to show how the same idea could be expressed in two different ways through the activities of sentence lifting, retellings, role playing, and teachable moments.

To guide teacher reflectivity in this research, I utilized the Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) model as a guide because this allowed teachers to reflect on how the children they teach might see relationships between the activities they do in class and the lives they live outside of the classroom. These opportunities for teacher reflectivity were provided as a key component of each PD session. I also provided corresponding activities during each PD session in order to equip teachers with tools to further reinforce the code switching skill and help their pre-kindergarten students make community and cultural connections. For example, the book set, *If The Shoe Fits* and *Red Dancing Shoes*, had corresponding activities using the “multiple negation” feature. One of the activities was called “Shoes Up!” where the students “step” into the book prior to the reading by the teacher giving each child a pre-cut “shoe” while sharing the sentences with the home language and academic language features (“There ain’t no style like that!”/ “They didn’t look pretty anymore.”). Then an “Ah-ha!” moment was created for the children during the reading at such time they were able to raise their pre-cut shoe signs or say, “Shoes Up!” signaling that they heard the pre-identified sentence
(Hollie, 2012). I incorporated these activities into the professional development sessions to provide teachers with opportunities to reinforce the home language features and implement culturally and linguistically responsive strategies by giving students the Academic Language equivalent of the sentence or vice versa. Another corresponding activity that I provided for teachers during each PD session was the “Anticipation/Reaction Clouds” where children drew “thought clouds” of what they thought would happen in each story based upon the cover/title of the book and then children drew how they felt about the story or their favorite part of the book after listening to the book.

Each professional development session week (a total of 4) was followed by an observation period week (a total of 6 including the initial observation and post observation period) to continue to collect data on: 1) the frequency use of the identified features of the home language dialects between the director, the teachers and the children during identified times of the day—circle time, story time, centers and transitions and 2) the extent to which teachers implemented the tools received during the PD sessions during identified times of the day—circle time/story time. I used post-interview protocols (Appendix D and E) to conduct post-interviews during the final week of the study to examine participants’ beliefs and perceptions of the home language dialects and the culturally and linguistically responsive strategies used with the children’s literature after their engagement in the study.

Instruments

Observation Protocol

I, as principal investigator, conducted unobtrusive observations (Appendix A) in a naturalistic observer role along with descriptive and reflective field notes during the first
week of the study. I conducted a total of six unobtrusive observations for each teacher over the course of a three-month period. I conducted each of these observations, except for the initial and the final observation, in the immediate week after the professional development session and the observations occurred either during story time, circle time, centers, or transitions. Observations took place over 45-60-minute intervals depending on the activity being observed. The first unobtrusive observation was followed by a semi-structured individual interview the following week.

I conducted the initial unobtrusive observations to examine the frequency of home language features and degree of language code switching strategies to include validating or non-affirming instructional practices occurring within the preschool environment. In the unobtrusive observations I conducted that followed each PD session, I continued my examination of the frequency use of the home languages and identified the extent to which the quantity, strategy, and quality of PD tools were being implemented by the teachers during specific times of the day—circle time, story time, etc. The observation protocol for the initial observation contained a checklist that included a list of home language features specific to AAVE and HAE, along with an area to notate the frequencies of the features being used during circle time, story time, etc. I chose these features to observe as they have been found to be among the more commonly occurring features of the identified home languages (Smitherman, 2000; Wheeler & Swords, 2006; Hollie, 2012). The protocol I used for the observations that occurred in the weeks following each professional development session contained the same checklist for frequency use of home language features; the protocols also contained sections that would help me to examine whether professional development strategies were being
implemented, how often they were being used during circle time, story time, etc., and whether preschool teachers' instructional practices were validating or affirming in response to children's use of home language dialect in the classroom.

The semi-structured observation protocol also allowed for insertion of other home language dialect features that may have surfaced during observations. Through the observed spoken interactions in the classrooms, I examined the frequency of teachers' practice of validation of children's home language through responding to the child using the child's home language, providing contrastive analysis or language code switching strategies/opportunities through sentence lifting, role play, retelling, or teachable moments, versus teacher's practice of non-affirmation of children's home language using deficit terminology such as fix it, correct it, speak correctly, or that doesn't make sense. Finally, facial expressions can be approving or disapproving and I attempted to include a range of expressions specific to the identified home languages and what the literature on these home languages have referred to as, signifying. I decided that the range of expressions would be open to removal or addition based on the data collected during the actual observations.

Pre-Interview Protocols

I used my developed interview protocol to maintain a level of consistency between the interviews. The pre-interview protocol (Appendix B) contained ten open-ended questions designed to meet the goal of obtaining the teachers' beliefs and perceptions of home language dialect and language code switching. I designed the questions to elicit teachers' familiarity with cultural and linguistic terms, skills, and strategy concepts that they would encounter during the study. I designed an additional
protocol (Appendix C) for the director that contained ten open-ended questions regarding her beliefs/understanding of home language, language discourse styles within the school between herself and teachers, students and parents, as well as her perceptions of language discourse styles between teachers-teachers, teachers-students, and teachers-parents. I conducted each of these interviews within one week and they were completed within 25-30 minutes in the center director’s office. I recorded the interviews with participants’ permission using an audio recorder and then I later transcribed the data.

**Scripted Professional Development Sessions**

After the initial observations and pre-interviews, I conducted the first of four audio recorded hour long professional development sessions on home language, Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) Literacy and Language Instruction, and Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) with all teachers and the director. Each professional development session was audio recorded to allow me to capture participants’ reflectivity exercises, questions and comments. The first professional development session started the week after the pre-interviews were conducted. It included a brief historical background of the home languages specified for this study, an introduction to specific features, teacher-participation in the roundtable reading of three culturally responsive children’s books (one identified AL and two identified home language) to introduce teachers to the features and the concept of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies and activities such as sentence lifting, retellings, role-playing, and teachable moments. After I shared these introductory culturally and linguistically responsive books, I presented the teachers with their first book set along with culturally and linguistically responsive strategies and activities to
implement with their students. The goal of each PD session was to provide teachers with culturally and linguistically responsive children’s literature that they could use in their everyday practice, increase teacher’s cultural and linguistic awareness and to have that awareness translate into teacher implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in their instructional practice the following week. I scripted the first session as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD Session 1: Introduction to CLR, DCAP, Home Languages and Code Switching (45m-1hr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives/Goals:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Director and teachers will demonstrate understanding of CLR teaching/learning following a brief lesson on the definition of CLR and related practices/strategies through their reflectivity responses regarding CLR and how they might use these practices in their teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Director and teachers will work together to gain better understanding of home language features through collective readings of books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Director and teachers will use code switching strategies during and after readings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Director and teachers will reflect on their thoughts/perceptions of the information presented through the DCAP reflectivity exercise toward the end of the session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Using Hollie’s (2012) CLR framework, I will begin by asking the director/teachers what do they think of when they hear the term <em>culturally responsive teaching</em> and then have the teachers consider some statements and whether they agree or disagree:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) African American English and Hispanic American English are simple versions of Standard English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Teachers have an obligation to accommodate students’ home language in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Definition of CLR and clarification will follow if necessary and then specifics will be given as to why CLR will be used in this study of home languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DCAP framework will be introduced and an explanation of teacher reflectivity exercises will be given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The definition of home language will be given and then the home languages specific to this study will be introduced. A brief history of AAVE/HAE, how AAVE and HAE have changed throughout US history, and information on home language across cultures in the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Specific features will be mentioned but not thoroughly discussed at this time—&quot;Be understood” and “Multiple negation.” I will also mention other features such</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as the “Habitual be” and “do/does.”

6. Three books—Peter’s Chair by Ezra Jack Keats, She Come Bringing Me That Little Baby Girl by Eloise Greenfield, and My Brother Fine With Me by Lucille Clifton—will be introduced to the director and teachers asking them to take mental notes of home language features as the books are read. (NOTE: These books are for the purpose of providing an intro to teachers and they are not meant to be used with the children during the course of this study.)

7. I will either ask for three teachers to volunteer to read one of the three books as the other teachers follow along with their own copy of the book or suggest that the teachers take turns reading pages of each book.

8. After each book, I will ask teachers to share any home language features that they were able to identify.

9. I will then introduce the culturally and linguistically responsive code switching activities: sentence lifting, retellings, role-plays, and teachable moments.

10. I will show the teachers an example of each activity.

11. Sentence lifting will be done by taking exact sentences using home language features and having teachers do translations.

12. Retellings of the story will help teachers to see how they would ‘sound’ translating the story in their own words.

13. Role-plays examples will be given as to how teachers can have children role play ideas found in the stories.

14. Teachable moments are opportunities for teachers to discuss how a character in the story could’ve expressed something differently or how the story may relate to their students’ real life situations creating opportunities to discuss situational appropriateness.

15. I will follow with discussion and clarification from me if necessary.

16. Say Hello! and Yo, Jo!, both authored by Rachel Isadora —The first set of CLR books will then be introduced and the rationale for the use of these books with children will be explained to the teachers (ex. introducing children to CLR terms of greeting others and affirming/validating their cultures).

17. Teachers will read both books and then given the DCAP reflectivity exercise that will have them reflect on how they believe their students may connect with the books the following week.

18. Brief discussion and end session

After this first PD session, I conducted the second observation period using the developed observation protocol (Appendix A). The data collection process continued in this manner with a professional development session occurring one week and an observation period occurring the following week for a total of four professional development sessions and
six observations to include the initial and final observation period for each teacher conducted during class time.

The second professional development session included an initial opportunity for teacher reflectivity to briefly discuss the previous week’s activities, a focused lesson on a specific home language feature, the reading of the second set of children’s books to be used the following week, and corresponding code switching activities to be used with the books. I scripted the second session as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD Session2: Home Language (Feature: “Be Understood”) Part 1: 45min-1hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective/Goals:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Using children’s books, the director and teachers will learn about a specific home language feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Director and teachers will be able to identify code switching activities that can be used after reading the books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Director and teachers will be able to reflect on how the books may affirm/validate their students’ cultural experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Begin with DCAP reflectivity exercise and have teachers reflect on how they believed their students responded to the books and activities during the previous week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide teachers with the first of the two lessons on the feature, “Be understood” using examples to explain the differences in where the feature can be found in a sentence/phrase/question. In this lesson we will focus on the feature being found within the sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The set of books will be introduced—one book has the identified home language feature while the other has an AL equivalent of the feature—(Honey Baby Sugar Child by Alice Faye Duncan and Snug in Mama’s Arms by Angela Shelf Medearis) and the rationale for the use of these books with children will be explained to the teachers (ex. Mother/son, mother/daughter, loving/caring theme, identifiable characters, language discourse differences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers will read both books aloud among each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. They will work together to identify the “Be understood” features within the book containing the home language features and look for the Academic Language equivalent within the other book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I will then introduce the culturally and linguistically responsive code switching activities: sentence lifting, retellings, role-plays, and teachable moments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I will show the teachers an example of corresponding activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sentence lifting will be done by taking exact sentences using home language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
features and having teachers to do translations. For example, with the feature, "Be understood" the following sentence is correct—"You my favorite patty-cake." The Academic Language equivalent would be—"You are my favorite patty-cake."

9. Retellings of the story will help teachers to see how they would ‘sound’ translating the story in their own words.

10. Role-plays examples will be given as to how teachers can have children role play ideas found in the stories.

11. Teachable moments are opportunities for teachers to discuss how a character in the story could’ve expressed something differently or how the story may relate to their students’ real life situations. I will offer teachers an activity they can use with their students where the children can share some of the nicknames that their parents, grandparents, etc. have given them as in the story, “Honey Baby Sugar Child.”

12. Teachers will then be given the DCAP reflectivity exercise that will have them reflect on how they believe their students may connect with these books during the following week.

13. Brief discussion and end session

I started the third professional development session with a brief discussion for teachers to reflect on implementation and practice, the second part of the session focused on the specific home language feature, followed by the reading of the third set of children’s books to be used the following week, and corresponding code switching activities that can be used with the books. I scripted the third session as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD Session3: Home Language (Feature: “Be Understood”) Part2: 45min-1hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective/ Goals:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Using children’s books, the director and teachers will learn about a specific home language feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Director and teachers will be able to identify code switching activities that can be used after reading the books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Director and teachers will be able to reflect on how the books may affirm/validate their students’ cultural experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Begin with DCAP reflectivity exercise and have teachers reflect on how they believed their students responded to the books and activities during the previous week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide teachers with the second of the two lessons on the feature, “Be understood” using examples to explain the differences in where the feature can be found in a sentence/phrase/question. In this session we will focus on the feature being found at the beginning of the sentence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The set of books will be introduced—one book has the identified home language feature while the other has an AL equivalent of the feature—(Bippity Bop Barbershop by Natasha Tarpley and I Love My Hair by Natasha Tarpley) and the rationale for the use of these books with children will be explained to the teachers (ex. Cultural/ community connections, similar themes, identifiable characters, language discourse differences)

4. Teachers will read both books aloud among each other.

5. They will work together to identify the “Be understood” features within the book containing the home language features and look for the Academic Language equivalent within the other book.

6. I will then introduce the culturally and linguistically responsive code switching activities: sentence lifting, retellings, role-plays, and teachable moments

7. I will show the teachers an example of corresponding activities.

8. Sentence lifting will be done by taking exact sentences using home language features and having teachers to do translations. For example, with the feature, “Be understood” the following is correct—“You up?” The Academic Language equivalent would be—“Are you up?”

9. Retellings of the story will help teachers to see how they would ‘sound’ translating the story in their own words.

10. Role-plays examples will be given as to how teachers can have children role play ideas found in the stories. Using a very short prepared skit that I will provide, teachers will observe a role-play.

11. Teachable moments are opportunities for teachers to discuss how a character in the story could’ve expressed something differently or how the story may relate to their students’ real life situations. I will offer teachers an activity they can use with their students where the children can share stories related to the book.

12. Teachers will then be given the DCAP reflectivity exercise that will have them reflect on how they believe their students may connect with these books the following week.

13. Brief discussion and end session

The fourth professional development session commenced with a brief discussion for teachers to reflect on implementation and practice, another lesson on the specific home language feature, the reading of the fourth set of children’s books to be used the following week, and corresponding code switching activities that can be used with the books. I scripted the fourth session as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD Session4: Home Language (Feature: “Multiple Negation”) 45min-1hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective/ Goals:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Using children’s books, the director and teachers will learn about the specific home language feature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Director and teachers will be able to identify code switching activities that can be used after reading the books.
3. Director and teachers will be able to reflect on how the books may affirm/validate their students' cultural experiences.

Steps:

1. Begin with DCAP reflectivity exercise and have teachers reflect on how they believed their students responded to the books and activities during the previous week.
2. Provide teachers with the lesson on the feature, “multiple negation” along with examples from (Hollie, 2012; Wheeler & Swords, 2006; Wolfram, Carter, and Moriello, 2004)
3. The set of books will be introduced—one book has the identified home language feature while the other has an AL equivalent of the feature—(If The Shoe Fits by Gary Soto and Red Dancing Shoes by Denise Lewis Patrick) and the rationale for the use of these books with children will be explained to the teachers (ex. Cultural/community connections, similar themes, identifiable characters, language discourse differences)
4. Teachers will read both books aloud among each other.
5. They will work together to identify the “Multiple Negation” features within the book containing the home language features and look for the Academic Language equivalent within the other book.
6. I will then introduce the culturally and linguistically responsive code switching activities such as sentence lifting, retellings, role-plays, and teachable moments
7. I will show the teachers an example of corresponding activities.
8. Sentence lifting will be done by taking exact sentences using home language features and having teachers to do translations. For example, with the feature, “multiple negation,” the following is correct—“There ain’t no style like that!” The Academic Language equivalent would be—“There’s no style like that!”
9. Retellings of the story will help teachers to see how they would ‘sound’ translating the story in their own words.
10. Role-plays examples will be given as to how teachers can have children role play ideas found in the stories. Using a very short prepared skit that I will provide, teachers will observe a role-play.
11. Teachable moments are opportunities for teachers to discuss how a character in the story could’ve expressed something differently or how the story may relate to their students’ real life situations. I will offer teachers a suggested activity they can use with their students where the children can share stories related to a time when they really wanted something but they had to wait or were told no.
12. Teachers will then be given the DCAP reflectivity exercise that will have them reflect on how they believe their students may connect with these books the following week
13. Brief discussion and end session
**Post-Interview Protocols**

Following the PD sessions and observations, I conducted a semi-structured post-interview with each teacher and the director using the respective post-interview protocols for the teachers and the director. The post-interview protocol (Appendix D) for teachers contained nine open-ended questions that I designed to elicit comparisons of teachers' perceptions of home languages prior to and after engagement in the study and to account for feedback/perceptions from the targeted professional development. The director’s post-interview protocol (Appendix E) contained ten open-ended questions that I designed to help facilitate comparisons of awareness and perceptions prior to the study and at the conclusion of the study. I included an open-ended question in both post-interview protocols for participants to provide any additional comments regarding their experiences in the study. Upon completion of each portion of the study I compiled the responses and analyzed the responses through horizontalization. I constructed tables to indicate the frequency use of home language features and code switching along with the quantity, strategy, and quality of Responsive Literacy and Language Instruction that was implemented in teachers' classrooms after each professional development session.

**Analytic Strategy**

I collected data through observations, professional development sessions, and individual interviews with the preschool teachers and the center director and I used descriptive and reflective field notes to capture details of the setting and personal reflections. I conducted individual semi-structured interviews and professional development sessions with an audio recorder and later transcribed the data. I used coding and reporting strategies suitable for a phenomenological data analysis to include the
transcription of interviews, margin notes, textural and structural descriptions similar to that of open and axial coding processes, and theme/pattern formations (Moustakas, 1994; Corbin & Strauss, 2008). I changed all names to pseudonyms and no identifying data were included.

Throughout the data collection and data analysis, I underwent the process of bracketing, accounting for researcher bias and assumptions, through methods of writing personal memos and reflective journaling as a means of examining and reflecting upon my engagement with the data (Tufford & Newman, 2010). This process also allowed me to reflect on such things as: my reasons for undertaking this study, my assumptions regarding the phenomenon of language dialect and code switching, and my personal value system as it related to the study. The process of coding for the interviews was conducted using textural description similar to an open coding process followed by structural description similar to an axial coding process, referred to as horizontalization in phenomenological data analysis (Hays & Singh, 2011; Patton, 2002). I coded the observation using the same coding processing method (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). After the transcription process I listed and completed a preliminary grouping of all expressions relevant to the participants’ experience of language dialect and culturally and linguistically responsive strategies (horizontalization). Managing the textural and structural descriptions helped me to label and refine the data into core themes of the participants’ experience.

Since the study was conducted by a lone researcher inter-rater reliability was achieved by utilizing an independent researcher who coded a subset of the data that included a subsection of pre-interviews, professional development reflections and post-
interview data, representing 22% of the data (Carey, Morgan & Oxtoby, 1996; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Weber, 1990). After inter-coder analysis, an agreement rate of 88% was determined. A discussion of the passage was conducted when there were differences and coder consensus was reached, resulting in 100% coder agreement on the subset (Hays & Singh, 2011). To further validate the findings, I implemented a weekly member checking process wherein weekly field notes were discussed with the participants during the weekly reflective segments of the professional development sessions and allowed for opportunities to review the presentation of data as the study progressed (Creswell, 2008; Hays & Singh, 2011). These ongoing member checks refined the analysis by strategically establishing trustworthiness and accurately portraying participants’ experiences throughout the research process to increase the validity of the study’s findings (Hays & Singh, 2011; Guba & Lincoln, 1989). The weekly field notes and observations were analyzed using constant comparative data analysis where I continuously looked for recurring themes related to the research questions and then shared these findings through the member checks (Creswell, 2008).

Limitations

A major limitation of the study is the ability to generalize to a larger population due to the case study design and the small sample size of teachers and children. However, in case study research, the purpose is to generalize to theoretical propositions, not to population as in other statistical research (Yin, 2009). Another limitation is the use of the observation method as there is a possibility of observer bias anytime data are obtained from observations. However, the observations were conducted during specified time frames (story times, circle times, centers, and transitions) using a structured observation
protocol to alleviate observer bias. In addition, my ongoing bracketing and member checking process served as another means for accounting for bias.

As this is a descriptive study, another limitation or internal validity threat can be maturation, where natural changes in the participants may occur between observations that influence the observation measurements (Creswell, 2008). These were controlled by conducting consistent observations only during the pre-determined time frames for every teacher as participants’ self-reported perceptions of home language and code switching, and their feelings at any given time during the course of the study could affect how they may have responded to questions, observations, and the professional development interventions.

Summary

This chapter outlined the method and procedures I used in this research study. I designed, completed, and analyzed observation and interview protocols to address the study’s research questions. The professional development model included Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching and Learning (CLR) and Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) to teach preschool teachers about the historical relevance of home languages, provide realistic, culturally and linguistically responsive hands-on tools (children’s books/activities) that the preschool teachers can implement during the school day, and ultimately encourage language code switching skill mastery for the urban multicultural population of children they teach, thereby increasing opportunities for increased academic engagement and future overall academic success.

The data collected will be presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V will follow with a summary and provide conclusions and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this research, I utilized a phenomenological case study design which allowed for the observation of the frequency and the examination of the beliefs and perceptions of the home languages—African American Vernacular English (AAVE), Hispanic American English (HAE), Academic Language (AL), and culturally and linguistically responsive (CLR) strategies to include code switching. The study design also allowed for an examination of the resulting influence of targeted culturally and linguistically responsive professional development using children’s literature being implemented in preschool teachers’ practice. In this chapter, I will present a discussion of relevant findings uncovered during analysis and the findings will be discussed in the order of each phase of the study—pre-intervention phase, intervention phase, and post-intervention phase. I have chosen to present the study findings in the order of study activity occurrences as this underscores the progression of participant knowledge building and instructional implementation throughout the process. This presentation is central to understanding the phenomenon as it relates to teacher practice. I will begin with a brief introduction of the research questions and specific participants’ demographics. Secondly, I will present findings related to the pre-intervention phase to include pre-observations and pre-interviews. Next, I will present the intervention phase data from the observations I conducted following each professional development session and also participant reflections from each PD session. This chapter concludes with a presentation of data and findings from the post-intervention phase to include post-reflections, post-observations and post-interviews.
Introduction

This research included a small number of participants in order to provide an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon occurring within this urban preschool setting. As such, the phenomenological case study design is most applicable because of the number of participants and a focus on the phenomenon within its real-life context (Yin, 2009). To provide a broader understanding of the findings of this study, the research questions are revisited below and a presentation of the demographic profile of each participant follows.

The following research questions grounded the analysis of data:

1. What do the pre-kindergarten teachers and the director know about the features of the home language dialects—AAVE and HAE, Academic Language, and the practice of code switching?

2. In what ways, if any, are the features of AAVE and HAE, AL, and the practice of code switching used between participants and students within the context of daily classroom life?

3. Does targeted CLR PD influence participants’ beliefs, perceptions, and practices regarding home language dialects and code switching in the classroom?

Participant Demographics

The participants in this study included 3 African American teachers, 2 Caucasian American teachers and 1 Hispanic American preschool center director within the same private preschool center located in an urban city within the southeastern region of the United States. These demographics represent the entire population of lead teachers at this school. Each teacher participated in every facet of the study. At the outset of the study, I assigned pseudonyms for every participant. Teacher participants’ educational
backgrounds range from high school graduates to associate degree level and each is considered the lead or primary teacher for children between the ages of 2-5 years. The preschool center director holds a master's degree in early childhood education. See Table 1 for an expanded description of participants. In the section below, I present brief demographic profiles for each participant to provide context for a deeper understanding of participants’ beliefs and practices. Prior to the start of the classroom observations and professional development sessions, I collected the information contained in each demographic profile below during participants’ pre-interviews.

Table 1.

**Description of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Years Teaching</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Della</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* AA= African American; CA= Caucasian American; HA= Hispanic American.

Alicia. Alicia is fairly new to the early childhood field and explains that she “kinda fell into teaching kids” (Alicia Pre-Interview Transcript, p.3). She grew up in an urban area and was raised by her grandmother who raised her, her siblings and a few of her cousins. She explained that there were always children around her and since she was one of the oldest she ended up carrying a great deal of responsibility. “I guess I was always meant to
be around kids,” she said (Alicia Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3). Of her grandmother, she says, she was “real strict on us but sometimes we knew how to get what we wanted though” (Alicia Pre Interview Transcript, p. 3). As the study progressed, her playful demeanor is evident and it is clear that she has a comfortable grasp on her own use of the features of home language.

**Brenda.** While she is not the teacher with the most years of teaching experience, she is respected among the staff as the one with the most life experience. She grew up in a rural southeastern town and described her family’s economic status as poor. She explained that her family didn’t have much growing up and that they weren’t “pushed to go to school” (Brenda Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3). It appears that she too felt like she was placed into the early childhood field. She had been working at various jobs throughout her working career such as a cashier and office assistant. She explained that she loves children and couldn’t see herself doing anything different at this point in her life. However, if she was given the opportunity to go back to school she would have gone into business or earned a teaching license so she could teach in the public schools. Her perceived experience with the features of the home languages was limited at the outset, however she was observed using some home language dialect features during pre-observation sessions.

**Carmen.** She described her childhood as a “mixed bag of nuts” (Carmen Pre-Interview, Transcript p. 2). She says she grew up in a trailer park in a suburban southeastern city with, “…all kinds of people. There were black, white, Puerto Ricans, you name it, I was around so I picked up all kinds of different languages” (Carmen Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3). She always knew she wanted to teach young children and has been working with
children since she was old enough to do so. She loves her job and she loves the children and families she works with. She said that her friends always playfully describe her as the "white black girl" (Carmen Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3).

**Della.** Della is one of a set of twins who grew up in an urban southeastern city and decided at a young age that she wanted to be a teacher. She has been working with and teaching children for over a decade. She is fun loving and full of energy. She doesn’t mind rolling across the floor with the children or going outside to investigate the dirt on the playground. She describes her childhood as one that was always full of laughter and family. She recollected that she used to be the mastermind behind many practical jokes and pranks. This was definitely evident during one week when I was at the center of one of her plots. While preparing for one of our professional development sessions she greeted me with an ape costume that had everyone laughing. She explained that she loves making others feel comfortable around her. This was observed in how she communicated with parents and children using her command of her home language dialect frequently during the course of the study.

**Ella.** Ella is the twin sister of Della. She also has 11 years of experience and she is working on obtaining her bachelor’s degree in early childhood education. She is committed to the field and would like to one day own her own childcare facility. Like Della, she recalled a childhood full of laughter and surrounded by many loved ones frequently “...we always getting together for something” (Ella Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 4). She explained that she is the kind of teacher who enjoys having fun with her students but, “...when it’s time to work, it’s time to get down to business. They know I don’t play and that’s why they love me. I play with them but they know when it’s time to
be serious” (Ella Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3). Ella was often observed using home language features with children, parents, and staff. However, she would use her tone of voice and facial features to signal the children in regard to their behavior or to signal transitions throughout the day.

**Jocelyn.** Jocelyn is a native of the northeastern United States but spent the majority of her childhood and early schooling in Puerto Rico. She has lived in the southeastern region of the United States for the past 14 years. She explained that she was very familiar with the idea of code switching from the outset of the study as she felt like she had to learn how to code switch even in Puerto Rico. “There was the more formal Spanish that we learned in school but then there was also the informal way that we talked with our family and friends,” she described (Jocelyn Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 2). She remembered how she had to be able to move between the two forms and then having to do the same when she returned from Puerto Rico with the English language and the infusion of Spanish that resulted in what she referred to as, “Spanglish” (Jocelyn Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 1). She used Spanish words with the children on a daily basis and in some cases she spoke Spanish with some of the children who were Spanish-speaking at the center. In her over 20 years of experience in the early childhood field, she explained that she understands the power of language and the ability to make people feel comfortable through communication.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will present the major findings of the study. I use participants’ own words to underscore the understanding of the participants’ experiences within this setting. The participants’ quotes included in this writing were chosen because they provided a representative example of the particular theme or finding
they are associated with. In each phase of the study I embed participants’ quotes in order to convey the essence of the participants’ experiences.

**Pre-Intervention Phase**

**Pre-Observations--Frequency of Home Language Features and Code Switching**

In this phase of the study, it was important that I develop an understanding of the participants’ lived experiences with language dialect and gain an understanding of their background knowledge of the phenomenon. In the pre-observation portion of this phase, I began data collection by using unobtrusive observations in an observer role along with descriptive and reflective field notes. The purpose of these initial observations was to determine the frequency of specific home language features occurring within the classroom and how often teachers were using validating or deficit expressions in regard to home language. I conducted each observation in approximately 45-60 minute intervals depending on the time of day and classroom activity using descriptive and reflective field notes to capture details of the setting and personal reflections. The observation protocol (Appendix A) I developed for use during the classroom observations was based upon home language features that are most frequently used during discourse. The protocol allowed me to capture instances of code-switching and Academic Language between the teacher and the students through spoken and non-verbal interactions. Preliminary home language features were chosen based on their frequency use as defined in previous research. I documented validating and affirming home language as it occurred within classroom interactions. Examples of validating or affirming included sayings such as, “How else could you say that? Or say it another way” (Hollie, 2012). Deficit expressions could be expressed as, “Speak the right way, No, don’t say it like that, or Wrong” (Hollie,
2012). These initial observations provided a foundation for the research study as it offered insight regarding how often home language was being used with children during the course of the day. Data gathered from these initial observations were used specifically to inform questions 2 and 3 of the research questions listed above. The following table provides information collected during the pre-intervention phase of the study and is presented here to visually depict the frequencies of home language use by the teachers in the classrooms and the frequency and nature of their responses to children observed using home language features during teacher instruction.

Table 2

*Pre-Observation Frequencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>&quot;Be&quot; understood</th>
<th>Multiple Negation</th>
<th>Other Features</th>
<th>Validating</th>
<th>Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Della</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carmen, Della, and Ella had the highest frequency of home language features used in their classrooms during the observations as shown in Table 2. Some of the other features observed included the, reflexive /r/ sound—"Those not yo' glasses" (Alicia Pre-Observation Form, p. 1) the present tense copula verb—"She cute" (Ella Pre-Observation Form, p. 1) and the past tense singular verb—"We was right here" (Carmen Pre-Observation Form, p. 1). Overall, home language features were observed from teachers and children in every classroom during the observations, however none of the teachers
used validating or affirming expressions when home language features were spoken from the children. Della and Ella both used deficit expressions such as, "Is that how you say that?" (Ella Pre-Observation Form Transcript, p. 2; Della Pre-Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) during their instructional practice when they heard home language features. Both Della and Ella are African American women who described growing up in urban environments where they learned early that they would have to “speak proper” (Ella Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 2) in order to be taken seriously so it is noted that while both teachers had the highest frequencies of home language features observed in their classrooms, they were the only two teachers who were initially sensitive to listening for home language features, regardless of their non-affirmative responses.

Carmen also showed a notably higher frequency of home language features, which may be connected to her childhood and background in her command and understanding of home language. Alicia, a soft-spoken young early childhood teacher, spoke to her students significantly less than her counterparts during her observations. The majority of her spoken interactions with the children occurred during circle time and story time. Brenda, a Caucasian American woman, also used AAVE and HAE home language features during her observations. I also noted that she has been working at the center for five years with the majority of her counterparts being fluent in either AAVE or HAE.

Pre-Interviews—Beliefs/Practices of Language Dialect and Code Switching

As I moved into this next portion of the pre-intervention phase, I sought to examine teachers’ reported beliefs and practices in relation to my observations of the teachers during the pre-observations. The data I collected from the pre-interviews I
conducted with every teacher and the director would inform question 1 and 3 of the research questions. I designed the pre-interview protocol to gain insight regarding teachers’ beliefs and perceptions of African American English, Hispanic American English, Academic Language, and code switching. Through data collected from the pre-interview protocol, I was also informed about what teachers’ thoughts were regarding the use of children’s books containing home language prior to the professional development sessions. My analysis of interview data led to the structural development for the framework of codes and categories. The process of coding for the interviews was conducted using textural description similar to an open coding process followed by structural description similar to an axial coding process, referred to as horizontalization in phenomenological data analysis wherein I listed and completed a preliminary grouping of all expressions relevant to the participants’ experience of language dialect and culturally and linguistically responsive strategies (Hays & Singh, 2011; Patton, 2002). I began with a wide review of the data seeking large general categories using participants’ key words or phrases. Then I examined the relationships among these categories to gain an in-depth understanding or meaning within the larger context. I also coded the data collected during the observations using the same coding processing method. This process helped me to label and refine the data into core themes of the participants’ experience.

I used thematic analysis as a method to identify, analyze, and then report patterns or themes within the data I collected (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This required me to move back and forth between six phases: 1) Familiarizing myself with the data, 2) Generating initial codes, 3) Searching for themes, 4) Reviewing themes, 5) Defining and naming themes, and 6) Producing the report (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Data collected about
participants’ beliefs or understanding of home language, academic language, code switching or cultural influences were collapsed under one theme for Knowledge of Home Languages/ Academic Language/ Code Switching because the data informed research question number 1 regarding participants’ knowledge. Next, the codes of using home language in various ways and at various times emerged. These codes were collapsed into one theme for the Use of Features and Code Switching. Codes that were related to teachers’ feelings, perceptions, and receptivity to the culturally and linguistically responsive strategies and using the children’s books were collapsed under the theme, Teacher Perspectives of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) Instruction. Finally, two initial codes that weren’t as common or obvious were developed and eventually collapsed into the theme, Cultural and Linguistic Influence of Parents and Teachers. While they were initially unobvious, it was important that I included them in the report of the data as these may be considered influential factors in the use of home language and code switching. The codes listed below were eventually collapsed after the post-interviews were completed, transcribed and analyzed. Table 3 shows how the codes were subsequently collapsed and organized into themes. The initial codes are listed in Table 3 under the left hand column. The right hand column of Table 3, Collapsed Theme, provides a listing of themes that I eventually developed from the initial codes.
Table 3.

*Initial Codes and Collapsed Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Code</th>
<th>Collapsed Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic language understanding</td>
<td>Knowledge of Home Languages/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home language understanding</td>
<td>Academic Language/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code switching understanding</td>
<td>Code Switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing behavior using home language</td>
<td>Use of Features and Code Switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal code switching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time appropriateness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings/knowledge about using children’s books</td>
<td>Teacher Perspectives of CLR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher perceptions of children’s receptivity</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher receptivity to teaching code switching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental influence</td>
<td>Cultural and Linguistic Influence of Parents and Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theme: Knowledge of Home Language/ Academic Language/ Code Switching

The responses during the pre-interviews yielded insightful information. The interviewees' responses provided rich information regarding their knowledge, beliefs, and perceptions about home language, AL and code switching. All but one teacher, Alicia, could generally describe the term home language. Some of the responses included, “How people talk at home, how they’re talking at home” (Brenda Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 1) and “Home language [pause] I know it’s more of the way you talk in your own culture” (Director Jocelyn Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 1). Statements such as these underscore the importance of realizing participants' actual knowledge prior to their engagement in the professional development sessions. Such statements inform teachers' perceptions of home language as most of them mentioned that home language should be reserved for speaking at home or within one's own culture.
When the interviewees were asked specifically about the terms African American English and Hispanic American English, participants tended to respond using cultural differences to explain African American English and Hispanic American English. Della responded, “It’s like slang, you know we have our slang words and um Hispanics they mix in their Spanish with English all the time” (Della Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 2-3). Another teacher, Ella, attempted to explain the terms as such,

It’s like we use different slang than the other culture I guess. I guess they’re more proper than the African American and Hispanic American. I mean I guess (breathe), we have our own way of talking, our own language of speaking to, speaking to whoever (Ella Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 1).

These statements are only two examples of participants’ responses, however none of the interviewees were able to provide a technical definition for African American English or Hispanic American English; nevertheless there was an overt understanding that there were cultural influences that shaped the way members within each community speak amongst each other.

There was also the idea of speaking proper and how it differed from the two home languages. This idea emerged again when the interviewees were asked about their knowledge and perceptions of academic language as Ella expressed, “Academic is like speaking [pause] I guess proper, proper I guess” (Ella Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 1) and Brenda responded, “It’s like if they’re able to talk like in a sentence or something [pause] something like that, that makes sense you know” (Brenda Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 2).

The director, Jocelyn also offered her perspective on academic language, saying, “My understanding is that when a child utilizes academic language or advanced language you
could tell the parents are prepared or they’re kinda highly educated” (Director Jocelyn Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 1). The idea of speaking proper, making sense, and advanced language appear to coincide with Jocelyn’s view that academic language should be viewed as something that is necessary for preparing preschool children for grade school as she went on to say, “I mean we’re not doing grammar here but still, I mean we want children to speak appropriately because it’s a part of them when they get ready for school” (Director Jocelyn Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 5). Ella, Brenda, and Jocelyn offered perspectives that were useful in understanding teachers’ perceptions and beliefs within this preschool setting.

The interviewees’ knowledge of code switching once again highlighted cultural differences. Most of them were able to provide a general idea of the practice of code switching. It was noted that some of the explanations of what respondents believed code switching to be were from a non-affirming perspective as Brenda and Della shared,

I just listen to what they’re saying and if it [pause] if they’re not saying it correctly or whatever try to go over it. Repeat it the way it should be and have them repeat it. Yeah repeat what they’re saying but correctly and then have them repeat what I say (Brenda Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3).

Code switching? I don’t know I guess like for example, you see a child playing during nap time and you’re getting observed I guess you have to switch, you know, you gotta watch how you talk to that child, like um, we don’t play during nap time but in African American slang um, it’s a little different, it’s like um, you don’t have no business playing during nap time, so I guess that’s you know code switching (Della Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 2).
The first statement by Brenda indicates a non-affirming perspective in that home language is viewed as incorrect and thereby needs correcting from the teacher. In the second statement Della also indicates the teacher’s perceptions that home language is incorrect to use if she were being observed by an authority. However she explains code switching from the perspective of using it to direct children’s behavior.

Overall, five of the six interviewees had a very basic idea of home language, academic language and code switching. However, all participants were unable to provide any technical or specific features of home language. When asked about providing examples of home language and academic language, all participants were vague and often focused on cultural and educational differences between those who speak home languages and those who speak academic language. As I analyzed the larger categories of data from the interviewees’ responses on how home language and code switching could be used in the classroom, I reduced these initial categories into the following codes, directing behavior using home language, non-verbal code switching, and time appropriateness. These codes were then collapsed under the theme, *Use of Features and Code Switching*.

Theme: Use of Features and Code Switching

One significant category that emerged from the data collected within three of the six interviews regarding the Use of Features and Code Switching, was being able to direct children’s behavior using home language. As Ella expressed in her pre-interview, her sentiments regarding her position on home language use,

Exactly, I have two different ways of saying things. So they’ll know which
one. Oh!, the home language one is more serious than the, the nicer one. I mean
sometimes you have to do that. I mean, I don’t know cause sometimes these kids can
rue over you. I’m sorry and that ain’t gonna happen (Ella Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3).

Ella’s sentiment is one that resonated strongly amongst the African American teachers.
As noted earlier, Della explained that she would use home language features to direct a
child’s behavior during naptime if she wasn’t being observed. Alicia also expressed ideas
that lent itself to this same theme:

You have to talk calm to them but sometimes you have to switch it up so they know
that you are not playing with them. If they hear you talking all proper sometimes they
don’t get it and you need to say it different so they get it (Alicia Pre-Interview
Transcript, p. 2).

In addition to using home language features to direct behavior, the participants also
explained the idea of being able to code switch without actually using words as noted by
Ella, “Sometimes all I have to do is look at them a certain way and they know I’m not
playing with them. They be like I’m sorry [Ms. Ella] and they know they better get it
together” (Ella Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3). While some participants, expressed how
they use non-verbal code switching, Brenda was the only participant to talk about her
experience from a different viewpoint as she explained,

When I can’t get some of the children to listen sometimes all I have to do is call
[Della or Ella] in here and they might just give them a look and then that’s all they
need to straighten up. It’s so funny how they just know (Brenda Pre-Interview
Transcript, p. 3).
Non-verbal code switching was also later observed in the classroom as teachers implemented culturally and linguistically responsive instructional practices. As I interviewed participants, they expressed the idea of non-verbal code switching and I noted that all participants referenced it in some way—whether they engaged in non-verbal code switching or observed it.

Another category that emerged under the theme, Use of Features, was Time Appropriateness. Participants mentioned the idea of there being a time and a place for using home language and how it was important to use academic language while they are being observed versus when they are “just relaxed” (Della Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 2) in their classrooms. She shared, “Like you know, you might say it one way if you’re being observed versus a way that [pause] another way where you just, you just relaxed” (Della Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 2). In terms of Time Appropriateness, teachers responded during their pre-interviews that they believed that they would not use home language when they were being observed for their teaching practices or by officials such as those from licensing, accrediting agencies or social services. However, when asked when they would use code switching in their classrooms, most responded differently as noted in Carmen’s response, “In the classroom? [pause] Every time you’re in the classroom, not just one time, every time” (Carmen Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3). While teachers reported that they believed home language should not be used while they were being observed for their teaching practices or by officials such as those responsible for determining the school’s accreditation or licensing status, I was able to consistently observe teachers using home language features—verbal and non-verbal while being observed during the study.
Theme: Teacher Perspectives of CLR Instruction

During the pre-interviews, participants were asked how they felt about learning and teaching code switching skills using children’s books that contain home language features. Overall, participants reported feeling positive about learning and teaching code switching skills. Some were surprised that there were children’s books containing home language features that they could use in their instructional practices. Some responses included, “Mm, I uh, I think it would be good. I mean you know depending on the book. I didn’t even know there were books like that (laughs)” (Carmen Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3), “They have those type of books? Well, I guess that would be good for them because it will teach children about multiculturalism and about culture and how people are different and to accept diversity” (Della Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3), and “I think it should be used. It’s teaching diversity and acceptance and I would utilize code switching books in my facility because it would actually define and give understanding to other children to understand what certain words mean” (Director Jocelyn Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 6). Each participant expressed their thoughts about code switching and using the children’s books prior to the professional development intervention and overall, the feelings before implementation were positive.

Theme: Cultural and Linguistic Influence of Parents and Teachers

There were two categories that were smaller than the others but were still of importance to include—parental influence and teacher influence. These ideas were briefly mentioned in a few interviews and also helped to provide a deeper essence of the environment. In this section, some participants reflected on their experience with
observing parents and children using home language or engaging in code switching. The
director, Jocelyn shared observations she’s made,

I’ve heard it when the parent picks up children, when they drop off the
child [pause] uh [pause] if they’re having a conversation between themselves
before they go into the classroom. Like for example I have a, a child’s uncle who
drops her off sometimes and they do this nod thing and always laugh and you
know it’s so cute but they know that’s their way of saying bye to each other
(Director Jocelyn Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3).

Jocelyn and the other participants acknowledged that parents are an influential
component in their child’s use of home language and ability to code switch. As Jocelyn,
the center director referenced, “So like the child I was talking about you know she knows
that that is just the way she does with her uncle but she wouldn’t do the same thing with
the teacher. She just knows” (Director Jocelyn Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 5).

When I prompted Jocelyn further by asking how she thought the child came to know that
she shouldn’t do the same gesture in school Jocelyn explained,

Well the children understand that there is a difference between when you’re at
home and when you’re at school and the children just realize that and that’s why
we have to teach them that there is a difference you know and how to switch
(Director Jocelyn Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 5-6).

As we continued the interview, Jocelyn went on to acknowledge that educators have to
participate in teaching children code-switching skills. Teachers also discussed their own
influence on code switching in the classroom as Ella referenced, “Um well, first I have to
teach myself too so I can be able to teach them to talk academic. I mean I have to, I have
to change the way I talk too so I can help them talk proper” (Ella Pre-Interview Transcript, p. 3). With this recognition, there was a realization of their own participation in the phenomenon and how they can be influential in their instructional practices. In the next section, a deeper understanding of the participants’ feelings, beliefs and perceptions about home language and code switching was analyzed through the weekly reflections that occurred at the beginning and end of each professional development session. The subsequent weekly observations that occurred after each PD session provided further insight regarding participants’ beliefs aligning with their instructional practices. This next section informs questions 2 and 3 of the study’s research questions.

**Intervention Phase: Professional Development Reflections and Observations**

As the study progressed into the intervention phase, I entered this phase with gained visual and verbal information from the participants’ during pre-observations and pre-interviews regarding their lived experiences of using home language dialect within the preschool setting. With this foundation, I could then help build teacher knowledge during the intervention phase through professional development sessions regarding language dialect and implementing culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in their classrooms. The professional development sessions were designed to provide the participants with knowledge on home language, Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) Literacy and Language Instruction, and Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) using culturally and linguistically responsive children’s literature. There was a total of four one-hour long professional development sessions and the goal of each PD session was to provide teachers with culturally and linguistically responsive children’s literature that they could use in their everyday practice, increase
teacher's cultural and linguistic awareness and to have that awareness translate into
teacher implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in their
classroom practices the following week. Using the DCAP model of teacher reflectivity,
each session aside from session one started with teacher reflections from the previous
week and ended with teacher reflections regarding how they believed children would
respond to the book set the following week. In this section the data is organized
according to each professional development session. The data collected from each
reflection that occurred within the professional development session will be presented
along with an observation section to include the frequency use of home language
features, instructional practices, and language/code switching activities that occurred
after each professional development session.

PD Session #1 Reflections: Introduction to Home Language and Code Switching
Book Set:
   Say Hello! (Rachel Isadora)
   Yo, Jo! (Rachel Isadora)

The first professional development session and all subsequent PD sessions were
conducted at the preschool in the usual central area where Director Jocelyn held staff
meetings and trainings. Each PD session lasted approximately one hour and allowed
participants to gain a better understanding of home language features through collective
readings of the books in the set. The participants engaged in using code switching
strategies during and after the readings and were able to demonstrate an understanding of
CLR pedagogy. When teachers were asked how they believed the children would respond
to the PD Session #1 books, they were excited about sharing the books with the children.
Della expressed, “I love them! I can’t wait to use them and I want summa these for
myself!” (Della, PD #1 Reflection Transcript, p. 1) and Brenda shared, “I think the kids will like the books” (Brenda, PD #1 Reflection Transcript, p. 1). Participants also commented on the connections and relationships that children may see between the books and their everyday lives outside of the classroom. Jocelyn and Della commented,

Oh definitely! they will get to see children using some of the same languages that they use and that there are other ways to say things. So you know getting them to see that. So I really am excited to see their reactions and stuff. (Director Jocelyn, PD #1 Reflection Transcript, p. 1)

But yeah they will see the kids using the languages but they will also learn from us how to switch it off an on and when is the time and place cause there’s a time and a place for everything you know. You can’t be sayin’ whatever you want when you go up in those classrooms when you get older. You know what I mean? (hmmph) (Della, PD #1 Reflection Transcript, p. 1)

In addition, to being excited about sharing the books with the children it also appeared that the teachers had grasped an understanding of their role in implementing culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in their practice. When the participants were asked if it was possible to incorporate the aspects of home language found in this book set without the children feeling like they already know the information, there was consensus that their job was to be sure that the children truly understood how to engage in code switching and for those children who may feel like they already know the information, they could be used to help teach others as Ella expressed,

I mean some of them might but really I don’t know if they just copying off of
how I talk or if they really know how to switch it up when it’s time to. So you
know. Know what I mean [pause] I mean for real all of them really need to know
how to do this so even if some of them know I would just ask or have them help
me teach others. (Ella, PD#1 Reflection Transcript, p. 1-2)

Ella’s statement expressed her understanding of children’s capital. However she
understands that regardless of children’s background knowledge, that she has the
responsibility to investigate what children may or may not know.

Table 4 provides information collected during the first teacher observations of the
intervention phase and is presented here to visually depict the frequencies of home
language use by the teachers in the classrooms and the frequency and nature of their
responses to children observed using home language features during teacher instruction.

Observations after PD #1

Table 4.

*Observation Frequencies After PD #1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-K Teacher Participants</th>
<th>Alicia</th>
<th>Brenda</th>
<th>Carmen</th>
<th>Della</th>
<th>Ella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAVE/ HAE Features/Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Be Understood”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Negation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language/ Code Switching Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Lifting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retellings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Playing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachable Moments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 presents the frequency of home language features being used by the teacher in the classroom, the frequency of affirming and non-affirmative implementation in instructional practices, and the frequency of culturally and linguistically responsive language/code switching activities. This first round of observations after the first professional development revealed that aside from Della and Ella, there was a decrease in one of the identified home language features, while the other feature actually increased in overall use across participants. There was also an increase in validating and affirming instructional practices after preschool teachers received targeted culturally and linguistically responsive professional development. While there was an increase in that practice, there was also an increase in the deficit and non-affirmative instructional practices among three of the five teachers. All teachers implemented at least two of the strategies taught during the professional development session.

The features observed by Alicia included both identified features as well as other features such as, differences in subject-verb agreement and the present tense copula verb rule. Examples of some of the features I observed Alicia saying were, “She ‘bout to take him for a walk,” “Where the ladybug?,” and “I don’t see no ladybug” (Alicia PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2). Alicia lifted a sentence in the book and repeated it for the children and made sure they knew that the sentence represented a different way to say hello. She did implement the role-playing strategy when she mimicked leaving the room and saying, “gotta bounce” and a child responded by saying “catch you later” (Alicia PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 3)

Brenda incorporated a number of teachable moments during this set of observations. She started by asking the children, “what does yo mean?” (Brenda PD #1
One Caucasian American child responded, “Cool. It means you’re cool” (Child, Brenda PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2). Then she asked the children, “Yo bro! what does that mean?” (Brenda PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) A Hispanic American child responded, “Hello!” (Child, Brenda PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) In terms of her style of instructional practices, she embraced more of a deficit/ non-affirmative model asking children, “Is that how you talk to your Grandpa?” and “How you ‘sposed to talk to your Grandpa?” (Brenda PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) An African American child responded, “No, I just say Hi Grandpa!, not wassup” (Child, Brenda PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) Another child said, “You ‘sposed to say Hi” (Child 2, Brenda PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) She also role-played with the children using questions such as, “If I ask you how are you doing what would you say?” (Brenda PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 3)

Carmen was observed using the multiple negation feature during the observation—“It’s not nothing bad” and “I don’t wanna see no belly” (Carmen PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 1). She took advantage of moments to extend the children’s thinking, “What do you think the dog is trying to say?” (Carmen PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2), and allowed them opportunities to make everyday connections to the book. She also used the sentence lifting technique and had the children engage in a code switching activity by having them attempt to translate between home language and AL forms. She also asked them, “Do you answer your Grandpa, yo chillin?” (Carmen PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) Another child responded by
saying, “No, he’s not a little boy” (Child, Carmen PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2). The children appeared to begin showing understanding of situational appropriateness.

The students in Della’s class were very inquisitive and she appeared insensitive to that as there were many missed opportunities for teachable moments. For example, when a child asked, “What’s Kenya?” (Child, Della PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) The teacher replied, “It’s in Africa,” (Della PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2), without any further discussion. The child replied, “Strange [pause]” (Child, Della PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2), and again Della didn’t provide any further extension such as pointing to the globe that was in the classroom to give the child a better understanding and help to make a better connection. Della had a mix of both validating and strong deficit approaches as she shared the books with the children asking, “Do any of you guys talk like that?, you hear anybody talk like that?, and what else were they saying?” (Della PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2-3)

Ella was amongst the participants who used the identified home language features more frequently and validated the different languages encountered within the books. She focused more on code switching strategies using promptings such as, “So you can talk to your friends one way and to grown ups a different way” (Ella PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2). The children appeared responsive to this as they engaged each other with terms such as, “yo and wassup” being careful not to address the teacher with these salutations (Ella PD #1 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2).
PD Session #2 Reflections: Exploring the “Be” Understood Home Language Feature Within Sentences
Book Set:
Honey Baby Sugar Child (Alice Faye Duncan)
Snug in Mama’s Arms (Angela Shelf Medearis)

As participants moved into the second professional development session, the use of code switching was extended to include the specific home language features. Here the participants were asked to specifically focus on the “Be” understood feature within sentences. The participants continued to engage in using code switching strategies to help children switch between using the home language feature and the academic language version of the sentence. During the professional development session they collectively read the books in the set while adding to their understanding of CLR pedagogy. When teachers were asked how they believed the children would respond to the PD Session #2 books, they specifically discussed what they thought some of the children in their class would say as they read the books to them. Prior to engaging in the book reading, the participants were asked how they believed the children responded to PD 1 books. Ella and Della shared their experiences below.

My kids loved it though, they enjoyed the reading, they enjoyed guessing where [the words] came from. On one of um I was stuck and I ain’t wanna say it wrong so the kids ain’t try to say the word either. (Ella, PD #2 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 1)

I got stuck on a word too myself. Well my kids was somewhat into it but uh maybe cause how I was feeling. I wasn’t in it myself and I wasn’t feeling well but um maybe if I read the books more with enthusiasm they probably be interested more in it. But some of them knew the words. They knew what the book was
about before I even read it so overall, I think they liked the books. (Della, PD #2 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 1)

Della realized that her mood was reflected in how she presented the books to the children. While her enthusiasm was lacking, she still helped children make everyday connections as evident below in her statement, “They were talking about the dreads and we started talking about her brother who wears his hair like that” (Della, PD #2 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 3). Brenda also shared her thoughts, “I don’t really know if my kids really [pause] I mean they responded a lot and tried to repeat stuff. I was too busy fussin’ with Robert” (Brenda, PD #2 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 2). Brenda expressed that she didn’t believe her students responded as positively as she would’ve liked to the books. However after receiving researcher feedback and becoming aware of how connections were made, Brenda realized how she had extended the feedback her students provided during class and how often she took advantage of teachable moments in the previous observation session.

After being asked to reflect on the experience of the first book set, the participants engaged in the second professional development through the collective reading of the two books that were used to explore the “Be” Understood feature within sentences. Once the readings were complete and the participants practiced using the Language/Code Switching Activities with the books, they were asked to reflect on how they believed the students would respond to the PD #2 book set. The overall sentiment was that they believed students would make everyday connections to the books in the set and the culturally and linguistically responsive strategies would help them make those connections. Alicia shared, “My little ones will probably really like this book with all the
nicknames and they gonna want to say the nicknames” (Alicia, PD #2 Reflection #2 Transcript, p. 1). The responses given by participants exhibited their enthusiastic predictions of how students would potentially respond to the books in the set. Table 5 provides information collected during the second observation session of the intervention phase and is presented here to visually depict the frequencies of home language use by the teachers in the classrooms and the frequency and nature of their responses to children observed using home language features during teacher instruction.

Observations after PD #2

Table 5.

*Observation Frequencies After PD #2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-K Teacher Participants</th>
<th>Alicia</th>
<th>Brenda</th>
<th>Carmen</th>
<th>Della</th>
<th>Ella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AAVE/ HAE</strong> Features/Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Be Understood&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Negation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language/ Code Switching Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Lifting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retellings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Playing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachable Moments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Home language use increased in the classroom across all teachers as shown in Table 5. Two teachers showed an increase in their use of deficit/non-affirmative instructional practices, while one teacher increased in her validating/affirming practices and completely decreased her deficit/non-affirming practices. Three of the five preschool
teachers implemented three or more culturally and linguistically responsive language/code switching activities after participating in the second professional development session.

A few of the verbal examples of the home language frequencies observed and spoken by Alicia were, “You sleepin?” and “Yeah, they sleepin” (Alicia PD #2 Observation Form Transcript, p. 3). She took advantage of multiple teachable moments throughout the observation using pictures from the book to help children make everyday connections. She asked her students, “Do mama hold you and rock you?” and “Do mommy dance and sing with you?” (Alicia PD #2 Observation Form Transcript, p. 3) She used the sentence lifting and role-playing strategies as well. At one point she lifted a sentence from the story (“That means your smile makes your mommy happy”) and she used her code switching ability to transform the sentence from home language dialect to AL.

Brenda had one of the higher frequency uses of the “Be” understood feature during this session. She engaged the children in the book set with a number of connection questions. In addition, she used affirming instructional practices asking the children, “So another way we can say this is what?” and “So let me read this to you a different way” (Brenda PD #2 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) She also employed code-switching strategies—one of which was sentence lifting. One of the sentences she lifted from the book was, “You my favorite patty cake” and she asked the children how they could say the sentence a different way.
A number of deficit instructional practices were observed during Carmen’s observation. As she asked children questions such as, “Are you supposed to say you the angel or you are the angel,” “What you supposed to say? What’s missing there?,” and “Is that right?” (Carmen PD #2 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) Carmen had the most instances of the multiple negation feature during this observation period and an example of one of the identified features observed, “You don’t have no dog, no cat, no goldfish” (Carmen PD #2 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2). She used the sentence lifting and retelling code-switching strategies to help children see and hear differences between home language features and AL features. Two specific sentences she used from the book were, “You my favorite patty cake” and “You the star in my crown.” She also made connections to the book for the children when she asked about farms and had them recall when they went to the pumpkin patch.

Validation of home language was a strong component of Della’s session with her students. She conducted the highest number of affirming instructional practices amongst her colleagues during this observation session. She also most frequently used the “Be” understood feature and the sentence lifting code switching strategy. An example of some of the sentence lifting she used was, “Alright, when they say squeeze ya and kiss ya, what do you think they mean there?” (Della PD #2 Observation Form Transcript, p. 3) and she followed by asking the students, “So what’s another way you can say these sentences?” (Della PD #2 Observation Form Transcript, p. 3)

Ella started the story time by asking the children to predict, “What do ya’ll think it’s gonna be about?” (Ella PD #2 Observation Form Transcript, p. 1) She conducted both affirming and non-affirming instructional practices. One of the deficit instructional
practices she used, “What’s missing there?” (Ella PD #2 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2), gave the impression that something was wrong with the language used versus having students look for alternate opportunities to re-word the sentence as she did when she asked students, “So how else could we say it” (Ella PD #2 Observation Form Transcript, p. 1). In addition, she implemented culturally and linguistically responsive code switching strategies—sentence lifting, role-playing, and teachable moments. In the role-playing activity, children imitated how they snuggle and prepare for bed.

PD Session #3 Reflections: Exploring the “Be” Understood Feature at the Beginning of Sentences.
Book Set: 
*Bippity Bop Barbershop* (Natasha Anastasia Tarpley)
*I Love My Hair* (Natasha Anastasia Tarpley)

The focus of this session was to provide participants with the opportunity to explore the “Be” Understood feature from a different angle. Participants provided reflections of how they believed the children responded to PD #2 books. The participants were eager to begin sharing their thoughts as all of them started responding at the same time. Carmen started out by pointing out something that she felt was a flaw.

Uh at one point everybody was involved and then they kinda [pause] kinda you saw how they kinda went to the um [pause] went doing they own thing and I ain’t want to [pause] want to make them [pause] make them listen to the story you know but um I think they did pretty well because even though the boys were over there they still listened. They were still listening and they were actually answering questions too so I thought that was pretty good. But I should have gathered them you know kind of let’s all sit in a circle you know. (Carmen, PD #3 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 1)
Another participant expressed her experience of the observation session and shared how excited her students were about the new books and the discussion of the books from the previous week. “They did awesome!, they loved the books. You know they tend to have a good time” (Ella, PD #3 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 2-3). The connections that children made to the book were also mentioned during the reflection. “And then they made connections to their own family because Maya started talking about her grandpa with their Chinese food when he came to visit her” (Carmen, PD #3 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 3). When the participants were asked how the children responded to learning the specific home language feature, many of them believed that their children grasped the concept. “Well my children got it. They understood that there shoulda been or that there was a missing word there” (Ella, PD #3 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 3). “Yeah my kids seem to get it too and then they also loved talking about the nicknames and what their nicknames are and everything” (Carmen, PD #3 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 4). The participants were then asked to reflect on whether they found it difficult to teach the home language feature to the children. “Well no not really I mean I just pointed it out to them and told them both ways” (Carmen, PD #3 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 4). “Once I said, ‘should you say it like that, they were like no and they changed the sentence themselves” (Ella, PD #3 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 4). Ella’s comment was an opportunity to further discuss the difference between validating/affirming expressions versus deficit expressions when referring to language. “When you say, ‘should you say it like that?’ that sends the idea that somehow what is being said in the book is wrong but that is not the message I want to send the kids. I want them to know that there are just different ways that people can say the same thing and just because the mommy in the
story said it one way it doesn’t mean that she is saying it the ‘wrong way’ but that she is more so saying it ‘another way’ (Researcher’s Voice, PD #3 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 4). “Yeah, yeah exactly you don’t want them to think that cause some of their parents might say it the way it says in the book, you know, that their parents are wrong, it’s just different” (Director Jocelyn, PD #3 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 4).

After reading the new book set, the second reflection of PD #3 asked participants how they believed children would respond to the books. Each participant responded favorably in that they believed the children would enjoy the book set. “Oh yes, they are gonna love these books. The little girls are gonna be talking about the beads and her braids” (Della, PD #3 Reflection #2 Transcript, p. 1). “My kids will probably point out all of the B’s in the title of the book” (Ella, PD #3 Reflection #2 Transcript, p. 1). They also started to point out other things that would be of interest as they shared the books with the children. “You can also talk about some of the things in the books aside from the features, like you can talk to them about what a ‘pick’ is too or ‘looking sharp’ you know cause you can say that another way too” (Ella, PD #3 Reflection #2 Transcript, p. 1). “Oh yeah and ‘two cool cats’” (Brenda, PD #3 Reflection #2 Transcript, p. 2). “They gonna love the role-play too cause they love playing dress-up and stuff like that” (Ella, PD #3 Reflection #2 Transcript, p. 2). “Oh this is gonna be fun!” (Della, PD #3 Reflection #2 Transcript, p. 2) Table 6 provides information collected during the third observation session of the intervention phase and is presented here to visually depict the frequencies of home language use by the teachers in the classrooms and the frequency and nature of their responses to children observed using home language features during teacher instruction.
Observations after PD #3

Table 6.

*Observation Frequencies After PD #3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-K Teacher Participants</th>
<th>Alicia</th>
<th>Brenda</th>
<th>Carmen</th>
<th>Della</th>
<th>Ella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AAVE/ HAE</strong> Features/Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Be Understood”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Negation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language/ Code Switching Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Lifting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retellings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Playing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachable Moments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a slight decrease in home language features observed in the classroom after PD session three as shown in Table 6. Teachers who exhibited deficit/non-affirmative instructional practices during the previous observation session showed a dramatic decrease in these practices and significant increases in validating/affirming instructional practices. There was also an increase in the number of teachers who implemented three or more strategies. This increase rose from three teachers previously to four teachers during this observation period.

Alicia steadily increased her conversations with her students during the observation thereby allowing for more opportunities to observe language features between her and the children. There were no multiple negation features observed during this session. Alicia did not engage in any validating or deficit instructional practices or
sentence lifting. She used a role-playing activity with her students allowing children to make the buzzing sounds of the clippers to act like they were in the barbershop.

Brenda used validating instructional practices as she worked with children, “And you know another way you can say it is…” (Brenda PD #3 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) She implemented all code switching strategies except role-playing during this observation period. The children were engaged throughout the reading. They offered a number of comments regarding their own experiences in the barbershop and getting their hair combed. Brenda used these comments to engage children in discussion and help children make everyday connections.

The multiple negation feature was observed once during Carmen’s session. The “be” understood feature was observed as well as other features. Both deficit and affirming instructional practices were observed. She implemented the use of sentence lifting, teachable moments, and role playing, having children pretend that they were in a barbershop. Carmen also talked about the use of picks and how at one time in history picks were more frequently used for afro styles when people wore their hair as such.

In Della’s classroom there was no observation of the multiple negation feature during this session. The “Be” understood feature and other features were observed. She used affirmative instructional practices asking, “What’s another way you can say that?” and “Now he said… “you up?” you can also say, “Are you up?” (Della PD #3 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) The culturally and linguistically responsive code switching strategies were implemented positively.

The “Be” understood feature was the more frequently used feature of the two studied features in Ella’s classroom. An example from her observation session was, “We
talking bout hair or what?” (Ella PD #3 Observation Form Transcript, p. 3) There weren’t any instances of deficit practices during this session. She implemented the language that was aligned with validation practices, asking children to think of other ways to say phrases or sentences. Sentence lifting occurred three times throughout her observation session. Examples of her implementation of this practice were, “you can also say this another way” and “let’s think of another way we can say this” (Ella PD #3 Observation Form Transcript, p. 4). Retelling activities given during PD were implemented and included having the children to tell a story about their own trip to the barbershop as though they were talking to their friends about it and then having them change the way they told the same story to a teacher or an adult. The children in her class role-played the barbershop scenes from the book and Ella implemented teachable moments with her students as she talked about hair textures and how some hairstyles required different forms of maintenance.

PD Session #4 Reflections: Exploring the Multiple Negation Feature
Book Set:
If The Shoe Fits (Gary Soto)
Red Dancing Shoes (Denise Lewis Patrick)

The session began with reflections from PD Session #3 and how participants believed children responded to the books. Some of the responses were, “They really enjoyed the books and the children really got engaged with the role-play” (Carmen, PD #4 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 1). “They loved it (pause) I think they loved the books and we did talk about the light switch thing so that was good too” (Ella, PD #4 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 1). They were also asked how they believed the children responded to the difference with the “Be” Understood feature. “My kids they picked up on it once I asked
them about it and then this time I tried to just make it like it was just a different way instead of you know just asking them you know like, ‘should you say it like that?’ (Della, PD #4 Reflection #1 Transcript, p. 1)

After reading through the final book set, the participants then engaged in another reflection exercise about how they believed children would respond to the books. “My kids will probably like the pictures and stuff” (Brenda, PD #4 Reflection #2, p. 1). “You know because we teach them Spanish they will probably make connections to the book with Rigo too” (Director Jocelyn, PD #4 Reflection #2, p. 1). “They prolly talk about how their shoes get small for them too and maybe passing things down to their younger brothers and sisters” (Ella, PD #4 Reflection #2, p. 1). “We can you know talk to them about taking care of things that you get” (Director Jocelyn, PD #4 Reflection #2, p. 1). “I think they’ve really enjoyed all the books and with these being new books that we never read to them before they will just be excited for that too so I think these will be good for them too” (Della, PD #4 Reflection #2, p. 1).

The participants were also asked how they thought the children would respond to being taught the multiple negative feature. “They will probably think it’s funny but some of them might not even catch it because I know for me sometimes I say it that way too. I can hear myself saying it right now so they might not even think anything of it” (Ella, PD #4 Reflection #2, p.1). “Right! And nothing is wrong with it! Remember it’s just another way of saying something” (Director Jocelyn, PD #4 Reflection #2, p.1). Table 7 provides information collected during the fourth observation session of the intervention phase and is presented here to visually depict the frequencies of home language use by the teachers.
in the classrooms and the frequency and nature of their responses to children observed using home language features during teacher instruction.

Observations after PD #4

Table 7.

Observation Frequencies After PD #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-K Teacher Participants</th>
<th>Alicia</th>
<th>Brenda</th>
<th>Carmen</th>
<th>Della</th>
<th>Ella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAVE/ HAE Features/Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Be Understood”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Negation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language/ Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switching Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Lifting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retellings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Playing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachable Moments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overall decline in home language features was observed in the classroom. There was a decrease in validating/affirming instructional practices and an increase in deficit/non-affirmative instructional practices when compared to the previous observation period. Implementation of three or more culturally and linguistically responsive strategies occurred among three of the five preschool teachers.

Alicia mispronounced and stumbled on many words throughout the book reducing the “flow” of the book. The children engaged in role-playing as they got up and danced in their shoes. She did not implement either validation or deficit instructional practices, but instead made emphasis on specific words/ phrases that children said using home
language. She reinforced the academic language by stressing the correct words in her response to the children. For example a child said, “Hey he’s got tie” (Child, Alicia PD #4 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) and she responded saying, “He’s got a tie” (Alicia PD #4 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2). The table above shows that Alicia only used one of the strategies given during the professional development session having the children dance in their shoes during the role-play.

There were a number of instances of the multiple negation feature in Brenda’s classroom. For example, “I haven’t said nothing yet” and “you don’t clean shoes with no mud” (Brenda PD #4 Observation Form Transcript, p. 1) Brenda implemented deficit instructional practices as she guided student learning of culturally and linguistically responsive code switching strategies asking students, “How can we say it better?” (Brenda PD #4 Observation Form Transcript, p. 2) She used all of the possible code switching activities offered during the professional development.

Carmen had a balance of both validating and non-affirming instructional practices during her observation period using both equally. She also took advantage of each strategy that was provided during the professional development session. In Della’s classroom, the multiple negation feature was used during the session and she used validating instructional practices during this session. The sentence lifting code switching strategy was implemented during the session as well. Ella used validating instructional practices while she worked on culturally and linguistically responsive code switching ability with her students. Instead of telling them that they were wrong she re-shaped the question and said, “Okay so give me another way to say it” (Ella PD #4 Observation
Form Transcript, p. 2). She used every code switching strategy taught during the professional development except the teachable moment activity.

**Post Intervention Phase**

**Post Reflection**

After the participants had engaged in the professional development sessions and received knowledge of home language features and culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in the intervention phase, I re-examined participants’ beliefs and practices through their post-reflections, post-observations and post-interviews during the post-intervention phase. The post professional development session began with participants providing feedback as to how children responded to the PD 4 book set. Alicia commented that she had a few children in her class to get up and start pointing to the pictures. Once again, Brenda interpreted her students’ interest as misbehavior. She explained that her students kept trying to get closer to the book by attempting to get in front of each other, and pointing at pictures. Her colleagues were able to help her to re-evaluate what occurred by offering feedback such as, “Sounds like they really liked the books” (Carmen, Post-PD Reflection Transcript, p. 1) and “At least they stayed around the book and didn’t walk away” (Ella, Post-PD Reflection Transcript, p. 1). After her colleagues provided feedback, I was also able to remind her of some of the occurrences during the observation in her classroom and she remembered specific moments that were evidence that children had been paying attention. For example, one student said, “I can say it like that when I’m at home.” (AA Child, Brenda PD #4 Observation Form Transcript, p. 3) in response to one of the sentences in the book. Overall, the teachers said that the children enjoyed the book set and one teacher reported that she joined in on the
fun as well by participating in showing the children some of the dance styles mentioned in one of the books. After reviewing each book set and all of the features included in the study, I conducted one final debriefing to receive overall feedback of the study. Each participant reported that she enjoyed the learning experience and looked forward to continuing to use the book sets even after the study completion. Table 8 contains the frequencies observed during the post observation sessions for each participant.

Table 8

Post-Observation Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-K Teacher Participants</th>
<th>Alicia</th>
<th>Brenda</th>
<th>Carmen</th>
<th>Della</th>
<th>Ella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AAVE/ HAE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features/Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Be Understood&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Negation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language/ Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switching Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Lifting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retellings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Playing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachable Moments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows an increase in home language features from the previous observation period. Validating/affirming instructional practices were observed among all teachers, however two teachers remained constant in their deficit/non-affirmative instructional practices. All teachers implemented at least two culturally and linguistically responsive strategies—the sentence lifting and role-playing activities.
At the outset of the study, Carmen, Della, and Ella had the highest frequency of home language features used in their classrooms during the observations and that was generally consistent throughout the study with a few exceptions. However, during the post-observations, there was an overall lower instance of deficit instructional practices than during the pre-intervention phase of the study. Use of the code switching activities provided during the targeted Culturally and Linguistically Responsive professional development continued after the final professional development observation session as evidenced by the frequency use of strategies in Table 8 above.

Post-Interviews

Post-Interviews—Beliefs/Practices of Language Dialect and Code Switching

The final stage of the post-intervention phase included conducting post-interviews with every teacher and the director to collect resulting data that would continue to inform question 1 and 3 of the research questions. I developed the post-interview protocol to gather further insight regarding differences in teachers’ knowledge, beliefs, and perceptions of African American Vernacular English, Hispanic American English, Academic Language, and code switching from the pre-intervention to post-intervention phase. The data collected from the post-interview helped to inform me of what teachers’ beliefs and thoughts were regarding the use of children’s books containing home language after engaging in the professional development sessions. The data collected from pre- and post- interviews led to the structural development for the framework of codes and eventually, themes. I developed codes after I analyzed interview transcriptions. A list of the codes and collapsed themes was mentioned earlier in the pre-intervention phase section of this chapter. The following sections are identified according to each
theme and I provide examples of participants’ responses to capture the essence of the
participants’ experiences with the phenomenon after being engaged in the intervention
phase of the study.

Theme: Knowledge of Home Language/ Academic Language/ Code Switching

The post-interview transcriptions provided useful information regarding participants’
gained knowledge. The interviewees’ responses allowed for the ability to identify
differences from the pre- and post phases of the study regarding their knowledge and
perceptions about AAVE, HAE, AL and code switching. The data I collected from the
post-interviews revealed that all participants could describe an understanding of the term
home language to some degree. Some of the responses included, “At home you use
different words than in school” (Alicia Post-Interview Transcript, p. 1) and “Basically
you just talk however you wanna talk without worrying about how you’re saying it or
how it’s coming out” (Brenda Post-Interview Transcript, p. 2).

When I asked the interviewees specifically about the terms African American
Vernacular English and Hispanic American English during the post-interview, they were
able to describe specific features relative to each home language and make connections.
However, Alicia continued to have difficulty explaining the terms. Rather she provided
narrative information about the books. Her response to the question about African
American Vernacular English And Hispanic American English terms was, “In If The
Shoe Fits, his shoe didn’t fit, he had a birthday party, and he had a lot of friends over his
house for the first time” (Alicia Post-Interview Transcript, p. 2). All of the other
participants were able to describe the specific features and characteristics as Ella and
Jocelyn described, “With both of them, it’s like each culture has their own way of talking
with each other but like there are certain things that make each one unique” (Ella Post-Interview Transcript, p. 4) and “Well the way both languages use the double negatives is something that I know about both of them” (Director Jocelyn Post-Interview Transcript, p. 1). Discussion about cultural influences was not as pronounced during the post-interviews. The conversations were focused more on children feeling comfortable to use their home language and “being able to socialize and make friends” (Ella Post-Interview Transcript, p. 3).

In addition, participants addressed the cultural features and the importance of teaching the culturally and linguistically responsive code switching strategies so that children will learn how to move in between home language and academic language. The idea of speaking proper and being polite emerged again when the participants were asked about their knowledge and perceptions of academic language as referenced during Della and Jocelyn’s post-interviews, “Academic language is when a child is using proper words and stuff” (Della Post-Interview Transcript, p. 1) and “It’s the language that we find in books, not all books but maybe academic readings.” (Director Jocelyn Post-Interview Transcript, p. 1). Within the post-interview discussions, every participant was able to provide an understanding of culturally and linguistically responsive code switching from an affirming and validating perspective. Brenda shared, “It’s like turning the switch off and on you know changing the way you’re saying things. You read it one way and not really correct it, but just say it a different way” (Brenda Post-Interview Transcript, p. 2). Della also expressed a similar idea as she explained code switching as, “Going back and forth between the two, showing the different ways and breaking it down to their level too.” (Della Post-Interview Transcript, p. 1)
Overall, the participants exhibited an understanding of home language, academic language and code switching. However Alicia appeared to again have difficulty explaining her understanding of African American Vernacular English and Hispanic American English. Even after I prompted her and reworded questions, she was still unable to provide a clear understanding or an example. There were often long pauses during her interview as I allowed her time and opportunity to think of her responses. In the next section, *Use of Features and Code Switching*, there was a shift in how participants thought about home language features and how to use them in the classroom environment.

**Theme: Use of Features and Code Switching**

The idea of being able to direct children's behavior using home language never emerged in the post-interviews. The participants were no longer focused on the connection between behavior and language. Participants started to express that features should be used to put children at ease, encourage playing around with words or phrases, and to build social skills. Carmen expressed how she used the features, “You know you can play around with the features but then you also want to teach them the academic way too” (Carmen Post-Interview Transcript, p. 2).

Time Appropriateness emerged once again during the post-interviews as participants mentioned the idea of there being a time and a place to use home language and when being polite or proper is necessary. The difference that occurred in the conversation however was that the participants were no longer focused on their own appropriateness, i.e., not using home language while they are being observed. The participants expressed that code switching and the use of home language should occur on a daily basis between
student and teacher. Jocelyn shared that code switching and the use of home language should occur, “During their conversations, while they’re having their free play, during center times we can actually go ahead and have conversations with them so they can practice” (Director Jocelyn Post-Interview Transcript, p. 3). Ella also expressed that, “We should take any opportunity with using home language to have teachable moments with the children” (Ella Post-Interview Transcript, p. 3). While the theme of Time Appropriateness remained a constant from the pre-intervention phase to the post-intervention phase, there was ultimately a difference in how the participants viewed this concept after having been engaged in the professional development sessions reporting that they would use home language and culturally and linguistically responsive strategies with children throughout the day. While participants initially expressed the belief that they should not use home language while being observed for their teaching practices or by officials from accrediting or licensing agencies, they used home language features—verbal and non-verbal while being observed during the study and during the post-interviews they shared that they would use home language and code switching whether they were being observed or not.

Theme: Teacher Perspectives of CLR Instruction

At the beginning of the professional development sessions, with the exception of the first session, I asked participants how the children responded to each book set and to share one thing that they felt went well and one thing they felt needed to be improved. At the end of the professional development sessions, I asked participants to reflect on how they believed the children would respond to the newly introduced set of books. I transcribed these reflections and feelings during PD implementation and included them in
the previous PD sections for each book set. During the post-interviews, I asked participants about their feelings toward using children’s books to teach code switching skills. Overall, participants responded positively about using the book sets to teach code switching skills as Carmen and Della expressed, “Using the books helped because the pictures were good for the children to see the actions of what was being done and then talking about two different ways to express yourself” (Carmen Post-Interview Transcript, p. 3) and “I liked using the books and role playing with the children” (Della Post-Interview Transcript, p. 2). Each participant expressed their thoughts about culturally and linguistically responsive code switching and using the children’s books after engaging in the professional development intervention. Their perceptions about CLR instructional practices remained generally positive throughout the study.

Theme: Cultural and Linguistic Influence of Parents and Teachers

Parental influence and teacher influence were smaller codes that emerged during the pre-intervention phase. During the post-interviews, these themes were once again mentioned in two separate participant interviews. One spoke about a specific instance where a parent was speaking to their child and used a phrase, “Watch ya mouth” and another child who was unfamiliar with the term looked puzzled and asked her how could his friend “watch his mouth?” (Ella Post-Interview Transcript, p. 2) She took the opportunity to create a teachable moment. While the center director, Jocelyn, shared her experience with observing teachers and parents interacting using home language,

Sometimes I’ve heard the teachers and parents using it because they’re very comfortable with parents and they will actually utilize that home type of language. But during conferences [teachers] are more academic. They’ll utilize
the academic language cause they’re talking about the child’s development but if they’re just having a regular like verbal conversation between themselves they’ll use home language. (Director Jocelyn Post-Interview Transcript, p. 2)

While this was a smaller theme, it was important to include as it added to the context of the setting and provide further insight regarding teacher-parent relationships and parent-child relationships that influence home language and code switching practices in the classroom.

**Summary**

In my observations and examination of the early childhood professionals’ beliefs, perceptions, and frequency of home language features before and after receiving targeted culturally and linguistically responsive professional development, I found that frequencies and perceptions varied across participants. The data reveal that as knowledge of the phenomenon increased, all participants remained consistent in their belief that there can be multiple ways to verbally express the same thing and that the use of culturally and linguistically responsive children’s books can be an effective strategy in helping to teach children language code switching skills. In terms of their understanding of home language, most participants could describe to some degree, the difference between home language and academic language. A few were able to further define and provide examples of African American Vernacular English (AAVE), Hispanic American English (HAE), and code switching. At the outset of the study, a few participants could not provide specific reasons why home language and code switching skills in the early childhood classroom might be considered effective or ineffective, however most reported that they thought it would be beneficial to incorporate this into their practice in order to
help children to better understand and adapt to Academic Language. Data indicate that once teachers were given home language and code switching strategies, they did teach and implement these strategies in their classrooms. Hollie (2012) noted that engaging teachers in Culturally and Linguistically Responsive pedagogy (CLR) enables them to validate and affirm the home culture and home language of their students for the purposes of building and bridging the student to success in the culture of academia and mainstream society. While the teachers did use the strategies and taught the skills, there were a few that continued to use language that was non-validating or non-affirming when there were instances of children using home language features.

This chapter presented the data I collected and analyzed in this research study. The study’s research questions were addressed using the data—transcriptions from interviews, professional development reflections, and observation protocols—to inform each question. Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching and Learning (CLR) and Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) were the frameworks that served as the foundation of this research. Ultimately, the findings of this study revealed that teacher beliefs and perceptions at the outset of the study favored more of a deficit model of CLR when their understanding of home language, academic language, and code switching was limited. After receiving targeted professional development to include historical and practical information, overall teacher beliefs and perceptions aligned with more validating and affirming instructional practices. However, instances of deficit instructional practices amongst the Caucasian American teachers continued to persist, while to a lesser degree than at the outset of the intervention phase. The most commonly used culturally and linguistically responsive code switching strategies across
all participants were the sentence lifting and role-playing exercises. Studying the phenomenon of home language and code switching within this preschool allowed for an understanding of the connection between teachers' beliefs and perceptions of home language, academic language and code switching and their specific cultural and linguistic instructional practices. Chapter V will follow with implications of the study, conclusions and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Introduction

Understanding teacher language dialect beliefs and related classroom practices prompted the development of a research study that incorporated the engagement of preschool teachers in effective implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in the classroom. This research aimed to expand knowledge about culturally and linguistically responsive strategies that can be implemented within the preschool setting that recognize children’s home languages—AAVE, HAE, or otherwise, and help build and bridge all children to understanding and success in the culture of academia. Building upon research in the area of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) teaching and learning, I implemented a qualitative phenomenological case study design that allowed me to examine teachers’ language dialect beliefs and practices and to then document the nature and frequency of the implementation of the culturally and linguistically responsive strategies provided to the participants through the use of children’s literature. Through this process I captured and observed the phenomenon of home language dialect within the urban multicultural preschool along with the nature and frequency of teacher implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies within the classroom.

Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching and Learning (Hollie, 2012) and Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (Hyun & Marshall, 2003) were the theoretical frameworks I utilized to guide the study. Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) Teaching and Learning is the practice of validating and affirming
students’ home culture and home language for the purpose of building and bridging students to success in the culture of academia and mainstream society (Hollie, 2012). Additionally, Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) is a guide in the field of early childhood education for practitioners to incorporate multicultural sensitivity within a set of pedagogical guidelines in early childhood education, emphasizing age appropriateness and individual appropriateness (Hyun & Marshall, 2003). Utilizing elements of both frameworks, I developed targeted professional development that was both affirming of children’s home culture and language while also guiding teachers toward incorporating culturally and linguistically appropriate instructional practices in the preschool setting. The study’s framework was central to the conceptualization of teachers’ language dialect beliefs and practices as the focal stimuli that affect the nature and frequency of implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in the classroom.

Researchers engaged in work exploring literacy and language achievement from a cultural perspective acknowledge that accounting for children’s home language must be a factor in the development of instructional practices that will play a contributing role to literacy skill achievement (Magnuson & Waldfogel, 2005; Fryer & Levitt, 2004; Ramey & Ramey, 2004). In elementary school, students who have the ability to code-switch have measurably better reading scores than those who don’t (Craig & Washington, 2004; Wheeler & Swords, 2006). Furthermore, while fourth-grade reading score gaps of African American and Hispanic American elementary school children show narrowing from the early 1990s to 2013, students without code-switching skills and proficiency in other literacy skills continue to perform in the low normal range on most standardized
tests (NAEP 2013; Donahue et. al., 2003). As early childhood educators are tasked with building children’s emergent literacy skills, they should consider these disparities in elementary school reading achievement as they prepare all children to enter elementary school. Moll et al.’s (1992) ideas of embracing children’s cultural funds of knowledge are important when considering reasons for possible differences in achievement across cultures. Understanding students’ cultural funds of knowledge allow teachers opportunities to connect with their students and with their families. When teachers take the time to do so, children feel validated and affirmed while learning new concepts and strategies. Therefore, in order to effectively address the language development needs of all children in their classrooms, it is essential that preschool teachers understand home language, code switching and related skills in order to build effective teaching practices that are both culturally and linguistically sensitive to the children they teach.

**Overview of Previous Chapters**

In Chapter One, I provided an introduction to the phenomenon of home languages discussed and the basis for why this study was necessary. The impetus for this study grew out of previous observations I conducted at this preschool center and I was inspired by the conversational relationships and the diversity in dialect that occurred between the teachers and the children. The purpose of this study was to: 1) examine participants’ frequency, beliefs, and perceptions of home language dialect—specifically AAVE and HAE, AL, and code switching in an urban multicultural preschool and, 2) observe whether there are changes or adjustments in teacher instructional practice regarding early literacy and language as it relates to home language dialect and code switching, after having been provided with targeted culturally and linguistically responsive professional
development. Therefore, this phenomenological case study was designed to gain insight into teachers' perspectives and frequencies of home languages, academic language and code-switching and to then observe how their instructional practices were influenced after receiving culturally and linguistically responsive professional development using children’s books through the following research questions:

1. What do the pre-kindergarten teachers and the director know about the features of the home language dialects—AAVE and HAE, Academic Language, and the practice of code switching?

2. In what ways, if any, are the features of AAVE and HAE, AL, and the practice of code switching used between participants and students within the context of daily classroom life?

3. Does targeted CLR PD influence participants’ beliefs, perceptions, and practices regarding home language dialects and code switching in the classroom?

The literature in Chapter Two covered the history of the identified home languages—African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Hispanic American English (HAE), providing the foundation for the purpose and rationale for this qualitative research. Understanding and addressing the challenges of culturally and linguistically diverse students in the early years can potentially aid in the elimination of the disparities in language arts and reading achievement (Condron, 2009; Craig & Washington, 2006). The review of literature presented a broad spectrum of information related to cultural and linguistic responsiveness, teacher beliefs and cultural awareness, and the academic success of all urban multicultural preschool students. The literature revealed a gap in
preschool language development research as it relates to home language dialect and teacher responsiveness, in that there has been limited research that has been conducted among scholars to build a dialogue regarding culturally and linguistically responsive strategies to be implemented in the preschool environment. While there are several issues that must be explored and studied further such as parental and community influence, the literature reviewed can serve as a foundation for subsequent dialogue. The pattern of relationships discovered in the review of literature offered information that revealed the need to acknowledge differences among cultures when implementing strategies for culturally and linguistically diverse students.

In Chapter Three, I provided detailed information regarding the context and setting for the study. The participants included all of the teachers and the director within a center-based urban multicultural preschool in the southeastern region of the United States. The participants consisted of five female preschool teachers and one female center director. Three of the preschool teachers identified themselves as African American and two teachers identified themselves as Caucasian American. The center director identified herself as Hispanic American.

In Chapter Three I also outlined the method and procedures used in this research study. The data collection occurred through observations, professional development sessions, and individual semi-structured interviews with the preschool teachers and the center director. The professional development model I created contained elements of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching and Learning (CLR) and Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) and was designed to teach preschool teachers about the historical relevance of home languages, provide realistic,
culturally and linguistically responsive hands-on tools (children’s books/activities) that the preschool teachers can implement during the school day, and ultimately encourage language code switching skill mastery for the urban multicultural population of children they teach, thereby increasing opportunities for increased academic engagement and future overall academic success. I used descriptive and reflective field notes to capture the details within the setting along with my personal reflections. I analyzed the data using coding and reporting strategies suitable for a phenomenological data analysis to include the transcription of interviews, margin notes, textural and structural descriptions similar to that of open and axial coding processes, and theme/pattern formations (Moustakas, 1994; Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Throughout the data collection and data analysis, I utilized bracketing, accounting for researcher bias and assumptions, through methods of writing personal memos and reflexive journaling as a means of examining and reflecting upon my engagement with the data (Tufford & Newman, 2010). This process also allowed me to reflect on my reasons for undertaking this study, to include my assumptions regarding the phenomenon of language dialect and code switching, and my personal beliefs and value system as it related to the study.

Chapter Four included the presentation of the data collected, coded and analyzed in this research study. The study’s research questions were addressed using the data—transcriptions from interviews, professional development reflections, and observation protocols—to inform each question. I coded the data collected during the observations and transcribed the pre-interviews using an open and then axial coding processing method to begin developing codes and abstracting patterns and then I used thematic analysis as a method to identify, analyze, and then report patterns or themes within the
data I collected. Themes that emerged included participants’ knowledge of home language, academic language, and code switching; use of features and code switching; teacher perspectives of CLR instruction; and the cultural and linguistic influence of parents and teachers.

In this chapter I present an overview of the study and the major findings from the themes generated from the data analysis presented in Chapter Four. A discussion of the implications of the study and recommendations for future research follows the presentation of major findings. This chapter is divided into three sections in order to facilitate the presentation of the analyzed data. The first section provides an overview of the study including a discussion about the implementation of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive children’s literature and the reflective DCAP process using a phenomenological case study design. The second section discusses the major findings of the study in relationship to the literature and each research question. The final section includes the implications for future research, recommendations and conclusions.

Overview of the Study

This research study was designed using a phenomenological case study design in order to capture preschool teachers’ language dialect beliefs and their use of the home languages, African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Hispanic American English (HAE), and code switching within its real-life context of the preschool classroom (Yin, 2009). The study included five preschool teachers and one preschool center director within an urban multicultural preschool. The center was purposely selected as a result of prior researcher involvement with the preschool during a smaller scale qualitative project where African American Vernacular English was observed between children and staff. I
collected data using semi-structured pre-and post-interviews, classroom observations using descriptive and reflective field notes, and professional development reflective sessions. The analysis led to descriptive information from the preschool teachers to inform culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and learning practices in the preschool classroom.

Hollie's (2012) Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) Teaching and Learning and Hyun and Marshall's (2003) Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) served as the frameworks of this case study design to provide a detailed description of teacher instructional practices in the classroom before and after receiving targeted professional development using culturally and linguistically responsive children's books. Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching and Learning is a model that infuses the practice of culturally responsive teaching with the importance of validating and affirming students' home language. The framework offered five general pedagogical categories to infuse CLR strategies in the classroom. For the purposes of this study, two established general pedagogical categories were employed, Responsive Academic Literacy and Responsive Academic Language Instruction. I infused these pedagogical categories with culturally and linguistically responsive strategies using children's literature to guide preschool teachers with implementing culturally and linguistically responsive practice within the preschool setting.

Hyun and Marshall's (2003) Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) framework allows for connections between classroom teaching and consideration of students' home culture to include their language and discourse styles. It incorporates reflectivity as a key element, such that teachers are reflective regarding their
teaching practices and strategies as they relate to their students. The use of reflectivity exercises was a key component in the professional development sessions as this provided the participants with opportunities to make connections in what they are teaching to how the activity/lesson may relate to students’ lives outside of the classroom by accounting for students’ lived culture (Hyun, 1998; Hyun & Marshall, 2003). This study aimed to examine preschool teachers’ beliefs and perceptions of home language dialect while providing the participants with a cultural understanding of the history of home languages and code switching. In doing so, I was then able to make connections between preschool teacher language dialect beliefs and preschool teacher dialect practices within the classroom.

**Summary of Study Themes**

I analyzed participants’ interviews, observations, and professional development reflections using coding and reporting strategies suitable for a phenomenological data analysis. Upon analyzing textural and structural descriptions, I collapsed relevant codes within specific themes. Using thematic analysis, I eventually defined and named each theme. The final themes from this study are, Knowledge of Home Languages, Academic Language, and Code Switching; Use of Features and Code Switching; Teacher Perspectives of CLR Instruction; and Cultural and Linguistic Influence of Parents and Children. I will briefly discuss each theme in the following paragraphs.

Knowledge of Home Languages/ Academic Language/ Code Switching developed as a theme as a result of the initial codes developed from the data regarding participants’ beliefs and understanding of home language, academic language, code switching, and cultural influences. The data collapsed under this theme informed
Research Question 1 regarding participants' knowledge. Specifically, the extent of participants' knowledge of the home languages along with their knowledge of academic language and code switching before and after being engaged in the study in relation to the nature and frequency of their implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies. This theme carried throughout the phases of the study, as it emerged as a progression of participants' knowledge upon being engaged in the study.

Next, in my analysis of the theme, Use of Home Language Features and Code Switching, verbal and non-verbal use of home language features along with the idea of time appropriateness were significant factors in the discussion and helped me in addressing Research Question 2 regarding the ways in which home language features, academic language and code switching were used between participants and students within the context of daily classroom life. Teachers expressed the idea of using home language to direct behavior of the children in the preschool setting during the pre-intervention phase. This sentiment is one that resonated strongly amongst the African American teachers in this preschool. In addition to using home language features to direct behavior, the idea of being able to code switch without actually using words is also essential in how teachers connect with their students in the multicultural preschool setting and this was evident during observations in the classroom as teachers implemented culturally and linguistically responsive instructional practices. As participants were interviewed the idea of being able to non-verbally code switch, or signify was discussed and it was noted that all participants either engaged in non-verbal code switching with the children or observed it through facial expressions or tone of voice. Participants also mentioned the idea of there being a time and a place for the use of home language and the
importance of using proper or academic language while they are being observed versus when they are under relaxed conditions in their classrooms. This idea of situational appropriateness connects back to CLR (Hollie, 2012), in that one of the key elements of effective code switching is being able to teach children the concept of determining what cultural or linguistic behavior is most appropriate for the situation.

Codes that were related to teachers’ feelings, perceptions, and receptivity to the culturally and linguistically responsive strategies and using the children’s books were collapsed under the theme, Teacher Perspectives of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) Instruction. During each professional development session, participants had the opportunity to reflect on their engagement in the study, their feelings about the books, how they felt the children would respond to the books, and their feelings about their implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in their classrooms. The participants engaged in two reflections during each professional development session—one at the beginning and one at the end. At the beginning, participants discussed how they believed children responded to the CLR instruction and their perceptions of their implementation of CLR instruction during the previous observation period. At the end of the professional development session, the teachers discussed and predicted how they felt their students would respond to the new set of books introduced during the professional development session. Teachers’ beliefs and perceptions of CLR instruction and strategies were also noted during participants’ pre and post- interviews. In my analysis of participants’ responses, their perspectives of the culturally and linguistically responsive professional development and instruction helped to inform Research Question 3 regarding whether targeted professional development
influences participants’ beliefs, perceptions, and practices regarding home language dialects and code switching in the classroom.

Finally, two initial codes that weren’t as common or obvious were developed and eventually collapsed into the theme, Cultural and Linguistic Influence of Parents and Teachers. While they were initially unobvious, it was important that I included them in the report of the data as these may be considered influential factors in the use of home language and code switching. As I explored teachers’ language dialect beliefs and perceptions, the cultural and linguistic influences of parents and teachers were discussed from the teachers’ perspective but primarily from the center director’s perspective. These ideas offered a deeper essence of the environment and the connection between parents and teachers in this preschool setting. Teachers believe that parents are influential in their child’s ability to code switch and they discussed their own influence on code switching in the classroom. With this recognition, there was a realization of their own participation in the phenomenon and how they can be influential in their instructional practices. An admonishing for early childhood educators to participate in teaching children code switching skills came from the center director during our discussions in that there was a belief that teachers can influence whether children will gain the ability to code switch prior to kindergarten entry. The cultural and linguistic influence of parents and teachers was also discussed from the context of seizing opportunities to create teachable moments. While this was a smaller discussion, it was important to include as it added to the context of the setting and provided further insight regarding teacher-parent relationships and parent-child relationships that influence home language and code switching practices in the classroom.
Major Findings

The theoretical frameworks, Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) Teaching and Learning and Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP), that serve as the foundation for this study address the importance of teachers incorporating children's culture and language into the classroom setting. As teachers gain knowledge and awareness of children's culture and language in addition to conducting their own self-assessments of their beliefs and practices, they can increasingly understand children's funds of knowledge and cultural capital (Moll et al., 1992). With this understanding, teachers can then use students' funds of knowledge to make their teaching practices more culturally responsive and inclusive. An underlying factor, discussed in detail within the literature that influenced the need for this study is the disparity in elementary reading scores on standardized testing across cultural groups (Lopez & McEneaney, 2012; NAEP, 2013). Addressing language and literacy issues such as home language and code switching during early education may help to reduce the large numbers of African American and Hispanic American children who will enter kindergarten experiencing significant difficulty learning to read as they progress through the elementary grades (Craig & Washington, 2006). Embracing children's home language dialects and utilizing their cultural capital to implement culturally and linguistically responsive strategies must be accomplished through an affirming and validating instructional perspective.

This research underscores the notion that effective early childhood teacher implementation of these strategies can result in children who learn how to effectively code switch between their home language and academic language and gain an
understanding of situational appropriateness. Understanding preschool teachers’ language dialect knowledge and beliefs are essential in the connection between the frequency and nature of teacher implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in the preschool setting along with teachers’ affirming and validating instructional practices.

In the discussion that follows, I present the major findings from this research which include, teachers’ language dialect beliefs and lack of understanding of home language, academic language, and code switching; the need for targeted culturally and linguistically responsive instruction; and recognition of the cultural and linguistic influence of parents and teachers.

Teachers’ Language Dialect Beliefs and Lack of Understanding the Phenomenon

In this multicultural preschool setting, study participants’ had limited ideas regarding what they believed home language to be, however they lacked a clear understanding of code switching as a process that serves to bridge home language and academic language. The teachers were initially using home language features without a clear understanding or awareness of language dialect and all teachers’ supported the use of home language features through a deficit perspective of children’s cultural and linguistic capital. Through engagement in this study, teacher knowledge increased and the nature of most teachers’ instructional practices shifted from a deficit/non-affirming perspective to a validating/affirming perspective, supporting Moll et al.’s (1992) funds of knowledge theory. After completing all four professional development sessions, all participants could describe an understanding of the term home language to some degree with the belief that home language should be reserved for speaking at home or within one’s own culture.
While participants were initially unable to provide a technical definition for African American English or Hispanic American English, there was an overt understanding that there were cultural influences that shaped the way members within each community speak amongst each other. Participants also emphasized the notion of speaking properly and how it differed from the two identified home languages. For the participants, speaking proper, making sense, and advanced language appeared to coincide with academic language being viewed as something that is necessary for preparing preschool children for grade school. The understanding of teacher language dialect beliefs within this study is important to the field of early childhood education as it uncovered the need for foundational knowledge of the concepts of the home languages identified in this study, academic language, and code switching in early childhood education. This research fills an existing gap in the present literature and underscores the significant roles teachers' language dialect knowledge and beliefs play in whether effective culturally and linguistically responsive implementation of instructional strategies occurs in the classroom.

**Need for Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Professional Development**

The targeted professional development sessions strongly influenced teachers' understanding of home language, academic language, and code switching. Following the professional development sessions, teachers' beliefs and perceptions consistently aligned with their practice and implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies using the children’s book sets. Participants positively embraced the idea of learning culturally and linguistically responsive strategies to address the language and literacy needs of their students in the preschool setting. Throughout the course of the
intervention phase, participants shared how the children responded to each book set and teachers were given opportunities to collaborate and share concepts that they felt went well and areas of implementation that needed to be improved. At the end of each professional development session, reflections on how they believed the children would respond to the newly introduced set of books were conducted. Participants’ perspectives of how CLR strategies were being received by the students were both optimistic and reluctant at times. Two teachers expressed that they did not believe that the children in their classes had been or would be as responsive to the instructional implementation after they listened to the report of fellow teacher participants’ positive experiences with implementation. The support from other teachers during the reflective exercises of the professional development sessions helped these teachers realize that there in fact was evidence of learning in their classrooms as children used language from the books and role-played with the language and the stories of the books.

As teachers gained knowledge, their beliefs and perceptions shifted from primarily a deficit or non-affirmative perspective prior to receiving the professional development to a more validating and affirming perspective. Teachers practiced and implemented the strategies from a validating perspective and used the strategies with a higher frequency after the intervention phase. After the intervention phase, participants overwhelmingly shared during the post-intervention phase that the need for more interventions that account for culture and language are necessary as they prepare preschoolers for elementary school. Overall, participants responded positively about using the book sets to teach code switching skills to preschoolers and their feelings after
the implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies remained positive similarly to their feelings during the pre-intervention phase.

Targeted culturally and linguistically responsive professional development is necessary to the field of early childhood education as teachers focus on meeting the academic needs of all children regardless of cultural background. Continued knowledge and support for preschool teachers in the form of targeted professional development that is specific to the population of children and families they serve is important in teachers' effort to support children culturally and linguistically in the preschool learning environment. In addition, it is important to understand that even when teachers are enthusiastic about new instructional strategies, continued opportunities to self reflect and support colleagues are still necessary to aid in effective implementation. Although teachers may report enthusiasm or excitement about new information presented during professional development, they need supportive opportunities for continued positive growth in their teaching. Culturally and Linguistically Responsive (CLR) Teaching and Learning and Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) provide foundations for developing culturally and linguistically responsive professional development practices that are inclusive of students' culture and home language. However, the field of early childhood education currently lacks research discussing the connection between preschool teachers' language beliefs and instructional practices regarding home language dialect, academic language and code switching in the literature on home language and code switching in the classroom.
Recognition of Cultural and Linguistic Influence in the Preschool Setting

The study participants believed in the connection of home and school in that while teachers recognized that they are influential in the cultural and linguistic environment of their classrooms, they believed parents play a key role as well in determining whether their child will have the ability to code switch as they enter kindergarten and are influential in what occurs in the preschool setting. Following the professional development sessions, the participants realized that teacher participation in the phenomenon or use of home language and code switching can be influential in their instructional practice and how children engage in language discourse in the classroom. Participants discussed the cultural and linguistic influence of parents and teachers intermittently throughout all phases of the study.

Specifically, teachers described their verbal and non-verbal (signifying) use of home language features and code switching to include directing behavior in the classroom and the idea of time appropriateness in their pre-intervention discussions of how they use home language and their influence in the classroom. Teachers believed that through using non-verbal home language features, depending on their tone of voice or facial expression, they could redirect children's behavior. In addition, the idea of time appropriateness was another way in which teachers influenced the linguistic environment in the classroom. As teachers used verbal home language features in the classroom, children also responded using home language features. Likewise, when teachers used non-verbal features, the children responded accordingly.

Teachers expanded their ideas during the post-intervention phase of how they influenced the preschool setting from a cultural and linguistic perspective, as they
expressed using home language to put children at ease, encourage playing around with words or phrases, and to build social skills. The difference that occurred in the conversation regarding time appropriateness from the pre-intervention phase to the post-intervention phase is important to the field of early childhood education in that there must be an acknowledgement of teachers' cultural and linguistic capital in relation to the cultural and linguistic capital of the children within their classrooms. Acknowledging teachers’ cultural and linguistic capital, early childhood researchers and practitioners need to realize that teachers should engage in self-assessment and self-awareness of their language dialect experience. From self-awareness, teachers can then be strategic in how and when they use home language features in the preschool setting while affirming children’s home language culture and bridging them into the academic language culture.

**Implications for Research and Practice**

Major findings of this study contribute to the field of early childhood education and address areas in the literature that are lacking in regard to culturally and linguistically responsive teacher practice and implementation of practical strategies for use in preschool settings. The findings illuminate the need for increased teacher knowledge and awareness of children's cultural and linguistic capital in order to effectively meet the language and literacy needs of all children attending urban multicultural preschools. While there has been an increased focus in the research community on the interchange of the role of language, academia, and its influence on literacy achievement across various ethnicities, the focus has primarily been devoted to upper elementary, middle and high school students (Brown, 2009; Rickford & Rickford, 2002; Wheeler & Swords, 2006). There are large gaps in research conducted regarding the interchange of the role of home
language dialect—specifically AAVE/HAE, AL, and culturally and linguistically responsive teaching strategies. Where the literature does exist, it does not include providing practical, age-appropriate strategies for early childhood educators to implement with the children they teach. The major findings from this study have implications for practice and future research in early childhood education.

Based upon the study findings, it is crucial that those in the early childhood field work to develop research and practical educational programming that will guide teachers in foundational knowledge and best practices of the concepts of code switching and home languages, specifically the home languages identified in this study as these represent a large percentage of children living in urban multicultural settings. The cultural and linguistic connection between academic language and code switching in early childhood education is also a missing link in the existing research of preschool language development in preparation for grade school. Positive alignment of teachers’ language dialect beliefs with their understanding of the phenomenon of code switching and home language is essential in order to implement effective culturally and linguistically responsive instructional strategies in the classroom. It is necessary for early childhood researchers to understand this connection as it can influence whether instructional practices related to language development are effectively implemented.

Following the importance of foundational knowledge of home language, academic language, and code switching, is the need for targeted culturally and linguistically responsive professional development for practicing early childhood teachers working with children in urban multicultural settings. It is essential that research in the early childhood field critically analyze professional development models being
implemented with teachers who present with varying cultural and linguistic capital. More importantly, the professional development model must account for the cultural and linguistic capital of the children who will ultimately benefit from teachers’ implementation of the information received during professional development sessions. Additionally, the practice of incorporating opportunities for self-reflections or creating embedded self-assessments for teachers during the pre-intervention and intervention phase of new instructional practices allows for a supportive space for teachers to become aware of their own personal impartiality or bias. This process may benefit early childhood researchers seeking to keeping teachers engaged in the intervention.

Finally, the study findings also point to the need to recognize the cultural and linguistic influence that teachers and parents have on children’s home language use and code switching ability. Based upon this finding, it is imperative that as early childhood research and practice is developed, teachers’ and parents’ influence is accounted for as preschool children need to learn the necessary language and literacy skills to academically succeed in grade school. Early childhood professionals should consider including parents in the implementation of culturally and linguistically instructional practices that will bridge the home and school connection. Implementation should also be conducted from an affirming and validating perspective wherein teachers embrace children and families’ cultural and linguistic capital.

**Conclusion**

Exploring the phenomenon of home language and code switching in the preschool setting allows for opportunities to engage early childhood teachers in understanding children’s cultural and linguistic capital. This study was conducted in order to examine
preschool teachers' implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies in an urban multicultural preschool through gaining an understanding of teachers’ knowledge, beliefs, and instructional practices regarding identified home languages—African American Vernacular English and Hispanic American English, Academic Language, and code switching. The study also offered preschool teachers age-appropriate culturally and linguistically responsive strategies using children’s literature that they could readily implement in their classrooms. Major findings indicate the need for alignment between teachers’ language dialect beliefs and understanding of code switching, the need for targeted culturally and linguistically responsive professional development, and the need to recognize the cultural and linguistic influences of teachers and parents. When teachers were provided with targeted culturally and linguistically responsive professional development, their knowledge and beliefs aligned with a positive understanding of code switching. At the outset of the study when teachers’ knowledge was minimal, instructional practices were conducted from a deficit/non-affirmative perspective and as knowledge increased the nature of instructional practices shifted to an affirmative and validating perspective supporting the idea of teachers embracing children’s cultural and linguistic funds of knowledge. When addressing the cultural needs of children in the preschool setting, teachers’ language dialect knowledge, beliefs, and instructional practices have to remain positively interconnected for effective instructional implementation that accounts for children’s culture and linguistic diversity while bridging connections between the home, school, and community.
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# APPENDIX A

## OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

### Preschool Center Observation Form: Spring 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's Pseudonym:</th>
<th>Age Group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer's Name:</td>
<td>Date of Observation:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Books read (Title and Author), if applicable:

**RESPONSIVE ACADEMIC LITERACY AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION:**
**USING CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY RESPONSIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON HOME LANGUAGE RULES</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Be&quot; understood (ex. You up yet?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple negation (ex. He don't have none, Ain't got no more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other rules observed...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other rules observed...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other rules observed...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other rules observed...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
### Validating/Affirming Instructional Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficit Expressions/Terminology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. fix it, correct it, speak correctly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Affirmative Expressions/Terminology (Validate)** |     |    |
| Ex. translate, put it another way, switch, say it in academic or school language |     |    |

**Comments:**

### Impromptu Questions/Comments from Children during Book Readings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's Questions/Comments</th>
<th>Children's Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Overall how does teacher respond to comments/questions from children?*

*Overall does teacher allow children to ask questions? How does she respond?*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language/ Code Switching Activities</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Lifting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Playing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachable Moments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Activities Teacher Presented:**

**Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) Framework: Reflectivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement/Reflectivity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The majority of students appear to be engaged in the activity; Making cultural connections to books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher notes children that are not attentive and attempts to encourage engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
APPENDIX B

PRE-INTERVIEW PROTOCOL (TEACHERS)

Home Languages and Code Switching Perceptions in Early Childhood
Pre-Interview Protocol Consent Form (Preschool Teachers)

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

My name is Nicole Austin. I am a graduate student in the Early Childhood Doctoral Program at the Old Dominion University. I am doing a research study on the frequency and perceptions of home language and code switching in early childhood education.

I would like your permission to interview you and use your comments in my study. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Your name will not be used in the study. All information collected will remain confidential, any identifying details, original tapes and transcripts will also be restricted to the research team. You do not need to answer any questions that you do not want to. Any time during the interview you may stop your participation with no questions from me.

If you have questions regarding the study or your participation, you can contact me at 757-683-6042. Should you need further information you can contact Dr. Theodore Remley, Chair of the Darden College of Education Human Subjects Review Committee at 757-683-6695. You can also contact my advisor, Dr. Angela Eckhoff, at 757-683-3283.

When the results of my research become available I would be pleased to send you a copy if requested.

Consent Statement:
I have read this form. I understand that nothing negative will happen if I choose not to participate. I know that I can stop my participation at any time. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Signature ________________________________
Printed name ________________________________
Date ________________________________

Nicole Austin, MA
Early Childhood Education Doctoral Program
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, VA
(757)-683-6042
naustin@odu.edu
Nicole Austin

Interview Protocol (Preschool Teachers)

Topic:

1. What does the director and teachers know about features of the home language—AAVE, HAE, Academic Language, and the practice of language code switching?

2. How are features of AAVE, HAE, AL, and the practice of language code switching used between preschool teachers and students within the context of daily classroom life?

Opening Script:

Hi my name is Nicole Austin. Thank you so much for taking time to talk with me about your thoughts on home languages/ code switching and the relationship it may or may not have to early childhood development. Everything that we talk about is in confidence. In fact, is there a pseudonym or alternate name that you would like me to refer to you as? This should take about thirty minutes and I have about ten questions for you. Is it okay if we record our session so that I can get the most from this interview? I don’t want to miss anything while we talk.

***Once the audio has started: “Thank you for agreeing to let me use the audio tape. Are there any questions that you have for me before we begin?

Questions:

1. What do you think of when you hear the term home language?

2. What do you think of when you hear the term academic language?
3. What do you know about home languages such as African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Hispanic American English (HAE)?

4. What do you know about language code switching?

5. What are some examples of home language and language code switching that you’ve observed and/or have used yourself?

6. How can code switching skills be used in an early childhood classroom? When?

7. What are some reasons why home language and code switching skills in the early childhood classroom might be considered beneficial to language development/reading achievement? Negative?

8. In what ways can teachers work with children who speak home languages in learning to understand Academic Language?

9. What are your thoughts regarding the teaching of code switching skills using children’s books containing home language features?

10. Is there any more that you would like to share in regards to code switching?

Well those are all the questions I have for you. Again, thank you so much for your time.

As soon as I complete my collection and analysis, I will be happy to share it with you. Do you have any other questions for me? Thank you.

***Shake hands***

***End audio recording***
APPENDIX C

PRE-INTERVIEW PROTOCOL (DIRECTOR)

Home Languages and Code Switching Perceptions in Early Childhood
Pre-Interview Protocol Consent Form (Director)

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

My name is Nicole Austin. I am a graduate student in the Early Childhood Doctoral Program at the Old Dominion University. I am doing a research study on the frequency and perceptions of home languages and code switching in early childhood education.

I would like your permission to interview you and use your comments in my study. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Your name will not be used in the study. All information collected will remain confidential, any identifying details, original tapes and transcripts will also be restricted to the research team. You do not need to answer any questions that you do not want to. Any time during the interview you may stop your participation with no questions from me.

If you have questions regarding the study or your participation, you can contact me at 757-683-6042. Should you need further information you can contact Dr. Theodore Remley, Chair of the Darden College of Education Human Subjects Review Committee at 757-683-6695. You can also contact my advisor, Dr. Angela Eckhoff, at 757-683-3283.

When the results of my research become available I would be pleased to send you a copy if requested.

Consent Statement:
I have read this form. I understand that nothing negative will happen if I choose not to participate. I know that I can stop my participation at any time. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Signature _____________________________
Printed name _____________________________
Date ____________________________________

Nicole Austin, MA
Early Childhood Education Doctoral Program
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, VA
(757)-683-6042
naustin@odu.edu
Nicole Austin

Interview Protocol (Director)

Topic:

1. What does the director and teachers know about features of the home language—AAVE, HAE, Academic Language, and the practice of language code switching?

2. How are features of AAVE, HAE, AL, and the practice of language code switching used between preschool teachers and students within the context of daily classroom life?

Opening Script:

Thank you so much for taking time to talk with me about your thoughts on home languages/ code switching and the relationship it may or may not have to early childhood development. Everything that we talk about is in confidence. In fact, is there a pseudonym or alternate name that you would like me to refer to you and the preschool as? This should take about thirty minutes and I have about ten questions for you. Is it okay if we record our session so that I can get the most from this interview? I don’t want to miss anything while we talk.

***Once the audio has started: “Thank you for agreeing to let me use the audio tape. Are there any questions that you have for me before we begin?

Questions:

1. What do you think of when you encounter the term *home language and academic language*?

2. What do you know about home languages such as African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Hispanic American English (HAE)?
3. What do you know about language code switching?

4. What are some examples of home language features and code switching that you’ve observed between teachers? Between teachers and students? Between teachers and parents?

5. What (could/ would?) you tell your students’ parents about code switching?

6. How can code switching skills be used in an early childhood classroom? When?

7. What are some reasons why home language use and code switching skills in the early childhood classroom might be considered beneficial to language development/ reading achievement? Negative?

8. In what ways can teachers work with children who speak home languages in learning to understand Academic Language?

9. What are your thoughts regarding the teaching of code switching skills using children’s books containing home language features?

10. Is there any more that you would like to share in regards to code switching?

Well those are all the questions I have for you. Again, thank you so much for your time. As soon as I complete my collection and analysis, I will be happy to share it with you. Do you have any other questions for me? Thank you.

***Shake hands***

***End audio recording***
APPENDIX D

POST-INTERVIEW PROTOCOL (TEACHERS)

Home Languages and Code Switching Perceptions in Early Childhood
Post-Interview Protocol Consent Form (Preschool Teachers)

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

My name is Nicole Austin. I am a graduate student in the Early Childhood Doctoral Program at the Old Dominion University. I am doing a research study on the frequency and perceptions of home languages and code switching in early childhood education.

I would like your permission to interview you and use your comments in my study. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Your name will not be used in the study. All information collected will remain confidential, any identifying details, original tapes and transcripts will also be restricted to the research team. You do not need to answer any questions that you do not want to. Any time during the interview you may stop your participation with no questions from me.

If you have questions regarding the study or your participation, you can contact me at 757-683-6042. Should you need further information you can contact Dr. Theodore Remley, Chair of the Darden College of Education Human Subjects Review Committee at 757-683-6695. You can also contact my advisor, Dr. Angela Eckhoff, at 757-683-3283.

When the results of my research become available I would be pleased to send you a copy if requested.

Consent Statement:
I have read this form. I understand that nothing negative will happen if I choose not to participate. I know that I can stop my participation at any time. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Signature ______________________________

Printed name ______________________________

Date ____________________________________

Nicole Austin, MA
Early Childhood Education Doctoral Program
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, VA
(757)-683-6042
naustin@odu.edu
Nicole Austin

Interview Protocol (Preschool Teachers)

Topic:

1. What does the director and teachers know about features of the home language—AAVE, HAE, Academic Language, and the practice of language code switching?

2. How are features of AAVE, HAE, AL, and the practice of language code switching used between preschool teachers and students within the context of daily classroom life?

Opening Script:

Thank you so much for taking time to talk with me about your thoughts on home languages/ code switching and the relationship it may or may not have to early childhood development. Everything that we talk about is in confidence. In fact, is there a pseudonym or alternate name that you would like me to refer to you as? This should take about twenty minutes and I have about seven questions for you. Is it okay if we record our session so that I can get the most from this interview? I don’t want to miss anything while we talk.

***Once the audio has started: “Thank you for agreeing to let me use the audio tape. Are there any questions that you have for me before we begin?

Questions:

1. What do you think of when you encounter the terms academic language and home language?

2. As of today, what do you know about home languages—African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Hispanic American English (HAE)?
3. What do you know about language code switching?

4. What are some examples of home language features and code switching? Which ones have you used?

5. How can code switching skills be used in an early childhood classroom? When can they be used?

6. What are some reasons why home languages and code switching skills in the early childhood classroom might be considered beneficial to language development/reading achievement? Negative?

7. In what ways can teachers work with children who speak home languages in learning to understand Academic Language?

8. What are your thoughts regarding the teaching of code switching skills using children’s books containing home language features?

9. Is there any more that you would like to share in regards to home languages and code switching?

Well those are all the questions I have for you today. Again, thank you so much for your time and if you would like a copy of the information I have collected I will be happy to share that with you as soon as I complete my collection and analysis. Do you have any other questions for me? Thank you.

***Shake hands***

***End audio recording***
APPENDIX E

POST-INTERVIEW PROTOCOL (DIRECTOR)

Home Languages and Code Switching Perceptions in Early Childhood
Post-Interview Protocol Consent Form (Director)

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

My name is Nicole Austin. I am a graduate student in the Early Childhood Doctoral Program at the Old Dominion University. I am doing a research study on the frequency and perceptions of home languages and code switching in early childhood education.

I would like your permission to interview you and use your comments in my study. The interview will last approximately 30 minutes. Your name will not be used in the study. All information collected will remain confidential, any identifying details, original tapes and transcripts will also be restricted to the research team. You do not need to answer any questions that you do not want to. Any time during the interview you may stop your participation with no questions from me.

If you have questions regarding the study or your participation, you can contact me at 757-683-6042. Should you need further information you can contact Dr. Theodore Remley, Chair of the Darden College of Education Human Subjects Review Committee at 757-683-6695. You can also contact my advisor, Dr. Angela Eckhoff, at 757-683-3283.

When the results of my research become available I would be pleased to send you a copy if requested.

Consent Statement:
I have read this form. I understand that nothing negative will happen if I choose not to participate. I know that I can stop my participation at any time. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Signature ______________________________________

Printed name ___________________________________

Date _________________________________________

Nicole Austin, MA
Early Childhood Education Doctoral Program
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, VA
(757)-683-6042
naustin@odu.edu
Nicole Austin
Interview Protocol (Director)
Topic:

1. What does the director and teachers know about features of the home language—AAVE, HAE, Academic Language, and the practice of language code switching?

2. How are features of AAVE, HAE, AL, and the practice of language code switching used between preschool teachers and students within the context of daily classroom life?

Opening Script:

Thank you so much for taking time to talk with me about your thoughts on home languages/ code switching and the relationship it may or may not have to early childhood development. Everything that we talk about is in confidence. In fact, is there a pseudonym or alternate name that you would like me to refer to you as? This should take about thirty minutes and I have about ten questions for you. Is it okay if we record our session so that I can get the most from this interview? I don’t want to miss anything while we talk.

***Once the audio has started: “Thank you for agreeing to let me use the audio tape. Are there any questions that you have for me before we begin?

Questions:

1. What do you think of when you encounter the terms academic language and home language?

2. As of today, what do you know about home languages such as, African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Hispanic American English (HAE)?

3. What do you know about language code switching?
4. What are some examples of home language and code switching? Which ones have you observed being used between teachers? Between teachers and students? Between teachers and parents?

5. What (could/would?) you tell parents about language code switching?

6. How can code switching skills be used in an early childhood classroom? When can they be used?

7. What are some reasons why home language and code switching skills in the early childhood classroom might be considered beneficial to language development/reading achievement? Negative?

8. In what ways can teachers work with children who speak a home language in learning to understand Academic Language?

9. What are your thoughts regarding the teaching of code switching skills using children’s books containing home language features?

10. Is there any more that you would like to share in regards to home languages and code switching?

Well those are all the questions I have for you today. Again, thank you so much for your time and if you would like a copy of the information I have collected I will be happy to share that with you as soon as I complete my collection and analysis. Do you have any other questions for me? Thank you.

***Shake hands***

***End audio recording***
APPENDIX F

TRANSCRIPTION LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Participant Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Della</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX G

## INITIAL CODING STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Code</th>
<th>Collapsed Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic language understanding</td>
<td>Knowledge of Home Languages/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home language understanding</td>
<td>Academic Language/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code switching understanding</td>
<td>Code Switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural differences</td>
<td>Use of Features and Code Switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing behavior using home language</td>
<td>Perspectives Before/After PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal code switching</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time appropriateness</td>
<td>Cultural and Linguistic Influence of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings/knowledge about using children's books</td>
<td>Parents and Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher perceptions of children's receptivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher receptivity to teaching code switching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX H**  
**CODEBOOK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example of Coded Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Home Languages/Academic Languages/Code Switching</td>
<td>The information and definitions participants offered in regard to language</td>
<td>“Home language [pause] I know it’s more of the way you talk in your own culture”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Home Language Features and Code Switching</td>
<td>Ways in which features are used in the classroom</td>
<td>“Like you know, you might say it one way if you’re being observed versus a way that [pause] another way where you just, you just relaxed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives Before/ After PD Implementation</td>
<td>Ideas and feelings of participants before, during and after PD</td>
<td>“Using the books helped because the pictures were good for the children to see the actions of what was being done and then talking about two different ways to express yourself”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Linguistic Influence of Parents and Teachers</td>
<td>Parent and teacher linguistic influence; influence of authority figures</td>
<td>“I’ve heard it when the parent picks up children, when they drop off the child [pause] uh [pause] if they’re having a conversation between themselves before they go into the classroom. Like for example I have a, a child’s uncle who drops her off sometimes and they do this nod thing and always laugh and you know it’s so cute but they know that’s their way of saying bye to each other.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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