

1-2017

Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Rich Classrooms : A Qualitative Study of Take-up in Relation to Linguistically Responsive Teaching

Melissa A. Collucci
Montclair State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/etd>



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Collucci, Melissa A., "Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Rich Classrooms : A Qualitative Study of Take-up in Relation to Linguistically Responsive Teaching" (2017). *Theses, Dissertations and Culminating Projects*. 52.
<https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/etd/52>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Montclair State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Culminating Projects by an authorized administrator of Montclair State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@montclair.edu.

TEACHER PREPARATION FOR LINGUISTICALLY RICH CLASSROOMS:
A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF TAKE-UP IN RELATION TO LINGUISTICALLY
RESPONSIVE TEACHING

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of
Montclair State University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

MELISSA A. COLLUCCI

Montclair State University

Upper Montclair, NJ

2016

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Michele Knobel

Copyright © 2016 by *Melissa A. Collucci*. All rights reserved.

MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
DISSERTATION APPROVAL

We hereby approve the Dissertation

TEACHER PREPARATION FOR LINGUISTICALLY RICH CLASSROOMS:
A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF TAKE-UP IN RELATION TO LINGUISTICALLY
RESPONSIVE TEACHING

of

Melissa A. Collucci

Candidate for the Degree:

Doctor of Philosophy

Program:
Teacher Education and Teacher Development

Certified by:


Dr. Joan C. Ficke
Dean of The Graduate School

Date

11/28/16

Dissertation Committee:


Dr. Michele Knobel
Dissertation Chair


Dr. Jeremy Price


Dr. Monica Taylor

ABSTRACT

TEACHER PREPARATION FOR LINGUISTICALLY RICH CLASSROOMS: A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF TAKE-UP IN RELATION TO LINGUISTICALLY RESPONSIVE TEACHING

by Melissa A. Collucci

This qualitative study followed four urban early childhood teachers through their participation in a teacher education program designed to enhance their linguistically responsive teaching and into the first four months of the new school year in an effort to identify what the teachers indeed “took up” from the opportunities presented to them regarding linguistically responsive teaching. The sociocultural concept of funds of knowledge was used to frame this study and to ensure that each teacher’s work was analyzed with the understanding that individuals bring to each learning moment unique knowledge and knowhow that impacts learning and practice. All was undertaken with the intent of providing research-based answers to the following question:

While following general education early childhood teachers through a formal learning program and into their classrooms, what “take-up” from the range of opportunities designed to help this small group of teachers become more linguistically responsive in their classrooms seems to be demonstrated?

By focusing on individual teacher “take-up” this research study gave proper recognition to teachers trying to teach English language learners (ELLs) more effectively.

Moreover, this study aimed to add insight into what a small group of general education early childhood teachers can reasonably “take-up” after participating in teacher education

opportunities that are research-based and specifically designed to help general education teachers become more effective teachers of ELLs. Findings were presented as four themes to better understand the nuances as well as the ebbs and flows of teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. The four themes that emerged were as follows: (1) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifested as a commitment to giving prominence to home languages; (2) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching involved personal introspection; (3) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifested as an understanding and incorporation of home language as a learning resource; (4) and the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching evolved over time into *community* sense-making.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work that went into this dissertation cannot be seen as an individual undertaking. Many fabulous people need to be thanked. Topping that list is Dr. Michele Knobel, my committee chairperson, whose expertise, deep knowledge, passion for research, and ability to ask the right questions pushed me to think deeper and write more intentionally than I ever thought possible. Her guidance was essential. I am equally grateful to Dr. Monica Taylor and Dr. Jeremy Price (my committee members) for challenging me to problematize the field I love in order to work toward its improvement. In a world that can certainly be intimidating, my committee accepted me and respected me for who I was throughout the entirety of this journey realizing of course, that “I am what I am not yet.” I was allowed to be a student, a teacher, a mother, a novice researcher, and a developing teacher educator at my own pace and in my own ways without question. That is true support and validation.

My doctoral journey and this dissertation could not have been possible without the loving support of my best friend and husband, Anthony Collucci, who not only sat side-by-side with me formatting the final details of this “masterpiece,” [his words] but listened to me as I planned, designed, documented, analyzed, and wrote. He made what could be a lonely journey a family adventure. That leads me to my children—the two most important people in my life—Anthony James and Cassie Grace who not only put up with “mom’s paper,” but also spoke so proudly of my goals to their friends and teachers. The adventure was ours, and now, we all get to celebrate this accomplishment.

Finally, proving that this list is not in order of importance, boundless thanks to my participants who willingly shared their classrooms and lives with me—they are wonderful women and tremendous educators. I am lucky to have had the chance to learn with them.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated with loving appreciation to my parents, George and Grace

Salvato, and my big sister, Jen Doktorski.

After all, they have been there since the beginning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	xvii
PREFACE.....	xviii
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.....	xxvi
CHAPTER ONE: CHANGING CLASSROOMS IN THE UNITED STATES.....	1
Demographic Trends in the United States	1
Political Impact on Classroom Linguistic Diversity	3
Anti-bilingual laws.....	4
No Child Left Behind	5
Problematizing the Primacy of English in the United States	8
Developing the Right Study	14
English Language Learners (ELLs).....	17
Conclusion.....	17
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK...	19
Linguistically Responsive Teaching and Teacher Education	19
Key Concepts and Terminology for this Study	23
Take-up.....	23
Opportunities	27
Research Question	28
Linguistically Responsive Teaching.....	30
The Linguistically Responsive Teaching (LRT) Framework	32
Orientations of the LRT Framework.....	34

Knowledge and Skills of the LRT Framework.....	34
Relevant Linguistic Research.....	36
Attending to the Cognitive Work of ELLs and the demands of Learning English.....	38
Acknowledging and Supporting the Role of Interactions.....	40
Teaching Vigilantly Aware of the Sociopolitical Context.....	43
Funds of Knowledge.....	47
Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Learning Theory.....	48
Defining Knowledge.....	52
Preference for Funds of Knowledge.....	56
Beyond the Funds of Knowledge Project.....	59
Conclusion.....	62
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY.....	64
Rationale for this Qualitative Study.....	65
Study Overview.....	68
Participant Selection.....	72
Adrianna.....	79
Epiphany.....	80
Lucia.....	83
Carley.....	84
Director-participants.....	86
Data Collection Methods.....	86

Adjusting the Study’s Timetable to Reality.....	87
Document Data.....	88
Semi-Structured Interviews.....	90
First Round of Interviews.....	95
Second Round of Interviews.....	98
The Third and Fourth Round of Interviews.....	99
Researcher Evaluation of Interviews.....	101
Conversations with a Purpose.....	103
Researcher Evaluation of Conversations with a Purpose.....	104
Observations.....	105
Rationale for Observations.....	106
Observation Guidelines.....	108
Three-day Institute Observations.....	111
Classroom Observations.....	112
Teleconference Calls.....	113
Researcher Evaluation of Observations.....	114
Researcher Journal.....	117
Researcher Evaluation of Researcher Journal.....	118
Data Analysis.....	119
Data Layout.....	119
Basic Coding.....	120
Ethical and Methodological Concerns.....	125

Accountability.....	126
Positionality.....	126
Trustworthiness.....	128
Limitations.....	133
Conclusion.....	133
CHAPTER FOUR: CATALYST SITE AND INTITIAL CONTEXT OF STUDY.....	135
Program History.....	137
Study Context: Program Proceedings for 2015-2016.....	139
The Program’s Linguistically Responsive Goals and Values.....	140
Understanding that Culture and Language are Deeply Connected.....	142
Deepening Cultural Consciousness.....	143
Introspection.....	145
Valuing Home Languages.....	147
Repositioning Home Languages as a Resources for Learning.....	148
Setting the Tone.....	151
Opportunities Specific to Linguistically Responsive Teaching.....	154
Modeling.....	156
“Literacy Moment”.....	158
Privilege Walk.....	162
Awaka Experience.....	164
Iceberg Theory.....	166
Cultural Mask Sharing.....	167

Artifact Sharing.....	168
“Trust Your Instincts”.....	168
Gesture Game.....	169
Video and Debriefing.....	170
Ongoing, Supportive Opportunities.....	171
Journaling.....	172
Facilitating Debriefings.....	172
Director’s Narrative.....	173
Curriculum Guide and Presentations.....	173
Opportunities Beyond the Institute.....	174
Mentoring and Coaching.....	174
Teleconferences.....	175
Stories of Success: What Take-up from this Program May Look Like.....	175
Conclusion.....	177
CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....	179
Developing an Initial Reference Point.....	182
Teacher-participant Commonalities.....	183
Early Hints of Linguistically Responsive Teaching.....	184
Relevant Aspects of Funds of Knowledge.....	186
<i>Lucia’s Relevant Funds of Knowledge</i>	188
<i>Adrianna’s Relevant Funds of Knowledge</i>	189
<i>Epiphany’s Relevant Funds of Knowledge</i>	191

<i>Carley's Relevant Funds of Knowledge</i>	192
Presentation of Themes.....	194
Theme One: The Take-up of Linguistically Responsive Teaching Includes Continual Introspection and Subsequent Action Regarding Views of Languages.....	197
Facilitating Introspection: The Churning of Funds of Knowledge.....	199
Take-up as Shifts in Reflective Stances.....	200
Take-up as Responses and Actions.....	210
Developing Funds of Knowledge.....	215
Ebbing and Flowing.....	218
Conclusion.....	222
Theme Two: Take-up of Linguistically Responsive Teaching Manifests as a Commitment to Giving Prominence to Home Languages within the Physical Environment.....	224
Take-up as New Ideas and Content.....	226
Take-up as Shifts in Linguistic Choices.....	232
Take-up as Shifts in Reflective Stances.....	234
Drawing Upon Their Funds of Knowledge.....	238
Ebbing and Flowing of Take-up.....	242
Conclusion to Theme Two.....	246
Theme Three: Take-up of Linguistically Responsive Teaching Manifests as an Understanding and Use of Home Languages as Learning Resources.....	248

Take-up as New Content.....	250
Take-up as New Practices.....	253
Take-up as New Ideas.....	257
Take-up as New Linguistic Choices.....	263
Carley’s Literacy Moment.....	264
Lucia’s Storytime.....	269
Epiphany’s Storytime.....	271
Adrianna’s Literacy Moment.....	274
Drawing Upon Funds of Knowledge.....	279
The Ebbing and Flowing of Take-up.....	281
Conclusion.....	282
Theme Four: The Take-up of Linguistically Responsive Teaching Seemed to Evolve into Community Sense-making Inside and Outside the Classroom.....	284
Take-up as Linguistic Choices.....	290
Take-up as New Content.....	292
Take-up as Actions.....	291
Take-up as Shifts in Reflective Stances.....	296
Drawing Upon Funds of Knowledge.....	300
Ebbs and Flows of Take-up.....	302
Conclusion.....	305
Conclusion to Chapter	306

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION.....	310
Contributions to the Field.....	311
Take-up: a Usefully Ever-evolving Concept.....	313
Funds of Knowledge: a Useful Framework.....	316
Recommendations for Research Regarding Linguistically Responsive Teaching.....	317
Emphasize Sociopolitical Issues.....	318
Replicate and Extend the Participant Pool.....	320
Extend the Time Table.....	322
Address the Ethnic and Gender Teaching Majority.....	322
Recommendations for Practice Regarding Linguistically Responsive Teaching.....	324
Cultivating a Mindfulness that Teachers are Individuals.....	324
Funds of Knowledge and Teacher Development.....	325
Consideration of All Languages.....	326
Realistic Goal Setting.....	327
Final Thoughts for Teacher Development.....	329
REFERENCES.....	331
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS.....	361
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW VIGNETTE.....	367

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Data Collection Timetable.....	71
Table 2	Pertinent Participant Demographics.....	78
Table 3	Teacher-Participant and Director-Participant Interviews.....	94
Table 4	Observation Schedule and Focus.....	111
Table 5	Data Record Examples.....	123
Table 6	Teacher Participants' Lived Experiences.....	188
Table 7	Carley's List of Helpful Translations.....	240

Preface

The purpose of this dissertation is to better understand how teachers become linguistically responsive educators. This dissertation represents a long journey on my part full of personal growth, introspection, research, and learning. Getting to this very succinct focus took years of living, learning, and reflection, much of which is shared in this preface. The preparation of all teachers for teaching all students is of great importance to me as a middle class, monolingual English speaking white female who went into teaching two decades ago to make a difference in the lives of children. I believe I have made a difference, too. At times throughout my teaching career I have worked with children similar to myself as a student—those who were timid, struggling readers, for example—but mostly I have worked with students quite different from myself—some who were amazingly confident, strong readers; others with autism; and several who were recently adopted from countries like Mexico and Russia. Although research (Sleeter, 2001, 2016) has made me call my whiteness into question at times, I believe with continued, concerted efforts to continually acknowledge my “whiteness” and the privileges that bestows upon me as well as the blinders it may impose, I have successfully been able to teach children quite different from myself and hope to help others do so as well (Galman, Pica-Smith, & Rosenberger, 2010).

Prior to my doctoral work and when asked about my success with particular students, I would speak of the need to forge connections with students by sharing who I was with them and finding out all I could about them. I believe this openness created an ability to find ways of teaching that worked for each child. My work was quite dependent

on the children in my care. Each year that I taught, even each day that I taught, was different than the next. Now, twenty years into my career and an emerging researcher in the field of education, I have found that my teaching “practice” aligns well with theories and concepts grounded in sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky (1978) and other sociocultural theorists and practitioners (e.g., Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1990) have emphasized how social interaction is imperative to learning. Acknowledging that each individual brings to any interaction their own knowledge, experiences, language, and knowhow is central to my teaching practice and, through my doctoral work, I have found a theoretical and pedagogical home with the socioculturally-informed concept of funds of knowledge (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll & Greenberg, 1990). All of which will be elaborated on in Chapter Two: Framing Theory and Relevant Concepts; however, a brief explanation of why I am passionate about these concepts and my work is warranted before continuing.

Funds of knowledge, defined as “historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being” (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992, p. 133) are the sum total of all the knowledge we as individuals have at a moment in time. This knowledge may have very little to do with school knowledge such as particular algorithms and rules of syntax. In fact, it is the knowledge that individuals gather outside of school—in their homes, among their families, while doing chores and living life—that is of particular interest to me as a teacher and researcher. The concept of funds of knowledge originally developed as a way to acknowledge this *other knowledge* as a student cognitive resource

when many educators felt their students were “lacking” skills and in need of remediation (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Moll & Greenberg, 1990). In this dissertation I am choosing to extend this concept to include adults’ funds of knowledge, particularly those of teachers. This desire to emphasize the funds of knowledge of teachers in their work stems from my own experiences and knowhow as a teacher.

As a traditionally certified elementary teacher I was introduced to much of the same content as my colleagues in my teacher preparation coursework, yet, very few of us could say our teaching practice was similar. We took up much of the teacher education content in our own way. For me, my early literacy language arts block was developed to enable ample time for me to meet with students in small groups and individually while students independently navigated the academic tasks throughout the room I establish for them in a manner best for themselves (e.g., with peers, alone, most challenging work first or last). Once the environment and learning tasks were established, the students were respectfully allowed to complete them in their own unique ways. Others with whom I graduated remained steadfast in their use of whole class literacy instruction for extended periods of time and relied heavily on worksheets and tasks best completed alone. I believe much of this has to do with our funds of knowledge—that knowledge we brought with us from our lives that helped us make sense of our current and new situations as well as new content.

I have no doubt that my knowledge gained from being a struggling reader informs my teaching. I also have no doubt that my knowhow regarding how to parent and support

a daughter with anxiety and panic disorder informs my teaching. I bring to every classroom I enter, from preschool to college, my funds of knowledge, and I believe others do as well. These unique funds of knowledge that teacher candidates and practicing teachers possess may be one of the reasons why teacher practice, development, and progress eludes some educational researchers and teacher educators. There is often no clear path to teacher success or to what is expected by teacher educators once teacher education students have graduated. I embrace this by asserting that as a newly emerging teacher educator and researcher, I want to help others become successful teachers by embracing their funds of knowledge and using these resources to help them develop their own unique teaching practice.

For me there is much to learn in order to do this well, and I humbly acknowledge the realization that I will continue to learn as I continue to emerge as a practicing teacher educator and researcher, but this dissertation is an important first step. I believe looking at teachers' funds of knowledge will shed light on teacher practice, especially in regard to becoming a teacher for *all* students. If I indeed want to help all teachers teach all students, forging connections with preservice and practicing teachers by embracing our funds of knowledge may offer a pathway to success, especially in light of my personal desire to help educators feel confident when teaching children whose first languages are not English. My personal desire to support the learning of students who enter school learning English led me to gravitate to research in the field of linguistically responsive teaching much of which emphasizes that teachers, even those who are monolingual English speakers, can learn skills and information and develop dispositions that can help

them better support the learning of students who are still learning English as they are learning school content. Key to my desire to focus on linguistically responsive teaching is not only the realization that the demographics of classroom populations in the United States are changing, but the fact that my own funds of knowledge have impacted my ability to teach students whose first languages are not English.

Even though I am a monolingual, English speaking white female, I know well how it feels to sit in a classroom within which the content does not make sense; just the mention of the words “first grade” bring a flush of embarrassment to my face and a pit in my stomach. However, more than just emotions, I know how frightening it can be when you cannot focus on what the teacher is saying and what the students are accomplishing. I also know how to survive, to “fake it,” and get through an arduous lesson without learning a thing. Aspects of my funds of knowledge gained as a student are as ever-present as my knowledge gained as an adult. For example, I can remember how important the labels around a classroom were to me; they helped me survive second grade. They became my lifeline until my teacher realized my situation. Now, as a parent of a child with debilitating anxiety and panic disorder at times, I know how to support my daughter through a fearful week, day, and even a minute. I know how to help her teachers make her feel safe. I know how to advocate for a child and at the same time support a teacher in teaching a child with particular contextual needs. Undoubtedly, this and many other aspects of my knowhow impact my work as a literacy educator and now, teacher educator. Yet, little to none of this knowhow has been acknowledged in my teacher education program.

My funds of knowledge are vast, ever-present, and ever-changing as are everyone's and each aspect of my unique knowledge framework for taking up the next bit of content and experience is readily available to help me learn to be more linguistically responsive, but I also want to help other teachers become more linguistically responsive, because my family and I know the loss of growing up at a time when being linguistically responsive was not part of the American lexicon. I am a third generation Italian-American with no knowledge of the Italian language. I grew up with parents who as children lived with their Italian-speaking grandparents, yet were "schooled" to only speak English. They grew up, and so did I, believing they did the right thing to prove they were indeed *American* and to enable their own American Dream success. I was wrong and so were they; access to the American Dream should not require disenfranchisement from one's home culture and language. I have very little connection to my Italian heritage and would never want that for any child. Heritage languages are direct links to heritage culture, and I believe the preservation of language enables an individual's connection to his/her heritage culture. I want to be part of the movement toward linguistic responsiveness inside *and outside* the classroom. This will take a lifetime, but this dissertation is a first step toward that goal. By taking this step I hoped to join the conversation about how to better support the preservice and practicing teachers I will work with in the future become linguistically responsive.

Ultimately, the purpose of this dissertation is to better understand how teachers become linguistically responsive educators. When I was a classroom teacher and literacy coach, I was disheartened to learn that there were very specific ways to support the

teaching of students whose first languages were not English in classrooms that I was never taught during my certification programs. Though I believe my personal connections with children and their families enabled me to figure out how best to support each student with whom I worked, I certainly would have benefitted from learning from a more knowledgeable other earlier in my career. I did not learn such important information until I was in my doctoral program, nearly twenty years into my professional career. I wanted to graduate with my doctorate as a confident literacy educator and to me that required understanding how to support the literacy development of those students who were learning English as they were learning content in my class or in the classrooms of teachers with whom I worked. With a desire to better educate myself so I could truly be a benefit to future teachers, current teachers, and their students, I became determined to be more linguistically responsive, that is, I wanted to be a teacher who supports those learning English by developing the knowledge, skill, and dispositions that would enable me to better teach ELLs and to better prepare others to do so as well.

In the field of linguistically responsive teaching there exists the Linguistically Responsive Framework (Lucas & Villegas, 2011), proposed by two professors for whom I have great admiration. Their framework acknowledges that to be linguistically responsive the practice of teachers needs to reflect particular orientations and pertinent knowledge regarding language use, language learning, and English language learners. Lucas and Villegas and the other faculty members with whom I have worked, helped me to humbly acknowledge that there was much for me to learn about teaching in United States' classrooms. Honestly, the detail and extent of the framework has also caused me

to feel uncertain and confused at times, a bit like a struggling reader again. I worried if I could be all that I needed to be in order to truly be linguistically responsive. However, with more research and personal investigation into the field, I started to formulate my own thoughts about how I can productively use the framework throughout my career. I accepted that just as no child is the same, no teacher could possibly be the same. Individuals bring unique histories and experiences to learning and day-to-day decision making. So, I began to think more about what becoming linguistically responsive may be for teachers in practice and how teacher educators can support such a process. Through research and reading I have aligned my work with theories and concepts that help to clarify my thinking (i.e., funds of knowledge, sociocultural learning theory, and the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching). They are presented in this dissertation and play an important part in how I framed my work and analyzed my data.

As a doctoral student I read the work of Maxine Greene whose optimistic critique of education led me to embrace what I did not know with the realization that I will soon know. Greene (1988) wrote, “There is, however, no orientation to bringing something into being if there is no awareness of something lacking in a situation” (p. 5). For me, I realized something was lacking in my own funds of knowledge (i.e., how to support the content learning of students who are learning English) and wanted to bring that something into being (i.e., a focus on linguistically responsive teaching). Furthermore, I want to be able to prepare and support teachers to take on the “work of teaching” all students successfully. This is one very specific aspect of teaching, but one that will only become more important as the student population of United States’ classrooms continues

to diversify linguistically and culturally. Therefore, my dissertation goal is to “bring something into being” that will enrich our ongoing discussion of teacher education and provide a means to enhance our preparation of new teachers. This study addresses the reality brought about by changing demographics; the need to realize that equitable quality teaching is more than just “good teaching;” and a need to “make visible” linguistically responsive teaching.

Statement of Purpose

Instead of looking at *linguistic diversity* as an issue *to deal with* in U.S. classrooms, this research study is grounded in the important reality that, across the nation, children of various ethnic, religious, cultural, linguistic, and racial backgrounds enter classrooms to learn and, in so doing, enrich classrooms within the United States with their unique resources, experiences, and even with their needs. A linguistically responsive approach, that is a teaching pedagogy that reflects specific orientations and knowledge regarding language learning, language use, and the learning of English language learners (the details of which will be explained in detail in Chapter Two), has been proven to hold a lot of merit (Bourdieu, 1977; Freire, 1970, 2000; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Motha, 2014; Norton, 2000; Valdés, 2001). I am locating my study very deliberately within this field to add to important conversations regarding how to best prepare teachers to teach the growing population of students whose home languages are not English while supporting their content learning in United States’ classrooms.

There is absolutely a need to continue educating educators about the very specific ways to successfully teach ELLs, but there is also a need to understand what becoming

linguistically responsive *could* look like (Bourdieu, 1977; Freire, 1970, 2000; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Motha, 2014; Norton, 2000; Valdés, 2001). Because such an understanding requires looking at teacher practice in relation to the goal of becoming linguistically responsive, a large-scale study for a solo researcher such as myself would be ineffective, but a small scale study with depth and focus could add valuable insight into what linguistically responsive teaching could be for different teachers in unique environments. Therefore, this study focuses on what four teachers took up regarding linguistically responsive teaching from opportunities presented to them during a formal learning situation to improve their teaching of ELLs. Individual teacher attempts may not match up exactly to what researchers have proposed as best practices (e.g., the Linguistically Responsive framework), but studying the work of teachers trying to better prepare learning opportunities for their ELL students is valuable, for this honest, grounded work provides insight into the nuances of such teaching, what can be expected, and how the work of teachers trying to be more responsive to their ELLs can be better supported.

As this dissertation begins, Chapter One provides an overview of how classrooms in the United States have changed due in part to policy and population changes and demonstrates why these changes have impacted teaching and learning in the United States. A discussion of the primacy of English in the United States and how this not only impacts my growing funds of knowledge, but those of others is also included as well as a brief overview of the entire dissertation and my research question. Chapter Two provides a comprehensive overview of the socioculturally-informed conceptual framing used for

this study, funds of knowledge, and ends with an overview of pertinent literature regarding linguistically responsive teaching. Chapter Three details the methodology, research tools, and data analysis employed in this qualitative study. Chapter Four is dedicated to an overview of the Northeastern Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms and the content from which take-up will be identified. Chapter Five is dedicated to the findings and discussion of same and Chapter Six discusses concluding thoughts.

With the completion of this dissertation, I hope to validate the teaching that I do and others do as we work to be more linguistically responsive by documenting within this dissertation how teachers become more linguistically responsive as they reconcile new content regarding home language and English-based learning in schools with who they are and what they have come to know regarding language use and learning in the United States. This study was developed out of a professional desire to better recognize and understand what the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching truly looks like when teachers intent on being more linguistically responsive work toward such a goal. In the end, I hope to identify manifestations of being linguistically responsive in order to substantiate the work of teachers with such a mindset to do so and in order to reflect upon ways to support teachers as they continue to take-up linguistically responsive teaching. Ultimately, this study is about taking an honest look at how well-intentioned teachers, brought together through a particular program designed to help them better support the learning of ELLs in their classrooms, uniquely take-up linguistically responsive teaching.

Teacher Preparation for Linguistically Rich Classrooms:

A Qualitative Study of Take-Up in Relation to Linguistically Responsive Teaching

Chapter One: Changing Classrooms in the United States

The purpose of this chapter is to establish that the changing demographics of United States' classrooms due in part to policy and population changes have impacted teaching in the United States. To do so effectively, a discussion of the primacy of English in the United States is included to emphasize how the values and views of English compared to other languages spoken in the United States impacts teaching as well as the very specific policy changes and demographic shifts in population. Finally, this chapter concludes with an explanation of how this study and the research question were thoughtfully developed along with a brief clarification of the use of the acronym ELL for English language learner.

Demographic Trends in the United States

Traditionally, the United States has been a linguistically diverse nation. Immigration trends, national policy, and birth rates have impacted this degree of diversity throughout the United States' history (Crawford, 2000; Gandara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez, & Hopkins, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2011), and, currently, linguistic diversity is on the rise (U.S. Census, 2013). Between 1980 and 2010, the number of people who spoke a primary language other than English at home climbed 158 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). More specifically, from 1990 to 2011 there was a 117 percent increase in the number of United States residents five years of age and older who spoke Spanish at home (U.S. Census, 2011). Today, over 37.6 million United States' residents speak Spanish at

home and over 1 million residents speak either Korean, Chinese, French, Tagalog, Vietnamese, or German at home (U.S. Census, 2013).

In the state in which this study took place, there are approximately 151 languages spoken and approximately 20 percent of school students speak a language other than English at home (State Department of Education, 2014). Reflecting the national trend, this diversity is not uniform throughout the state and, pertinent to this study, such diversity varies tremendously from school district to school district. While several districts report that less than one percent of the students speak a language other than English, others report that over 40 percent of students speak a home language other than English. These other languages often include Spanish, Korean, Portuguese, Arabic, Gujarati, Mandarin, Polish, Urdu, Creole (Haitian), Tagalog, and Vietnamese (State Department of Education, 2014).

Although immigration trends still impact the linguistic diversification happening in classrooms, many of these changes need to be accepted as simply the “new normal” for United States’ residents and classrooms. By citing statistics from Fix and Capp (2005) showing the majority of students considered to be limited in their English proficiency (76% in elementary aged and 56% secondary aged) were born in the United States, Villegas and Lucas (2011) directly address the misconception that all English language learners (ELLs), that is students whose first language is not English, are immigrants, and assert that “ELLs are not temporary visitors but are in fact ‘American’ students, part of the fabric of ‘mainstream’ schools and classrooms” (p. 37). The image of a “typical” United States’ student thus is changing in many states, and classroom practice needs to be

adjusted to better accommodate today's U.S. student; a goal that is complicated by the fact that current educational policy (discussed in the next sub-section) has led to the swifter inclusion of ELLs into general education classroom settings and the growing linguistic diversification of classrooms in the United States. Therefore, ELLs are finding themselves the students of general education teachers who are not specifically certified to teach students whose home languages are different from their own (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008; Villegas & Lucas, 2011). As will be discussed, such incongruity has implications for the ongoing development of all teachers today.

Political Impact on Classroom Linguistic Diversity

While the aforementioned statistics about language diversity nationwide, statewide, and districtwide are relevant to this study, the more pertinent issue is that general education classrooms are diversifying linguistically (DeJong & Harper, 2005; Villegas & Lucas, 2011), and ELLs often find themselves taught by teachers who lack knowledge of their learning needs and the practical skills essential to addressing those needs (DeJong & Harper, 2005; Pass & Mantero, 2009; Villegas & Lucas, 2011). Beyond demographics, much of the rapid change in terms of general classroom teaching responsibilities and uncertainty regarding linguistically diverse students can be attributed to policies that require placement of ELLs in mainstream classrooms more quickly than in the past and often with less English proficiency than used to be the case (NCLB, 2002; Proposition 227, 1998; Proposition, 203, 2000; Question 2, 2002). This is an unfortunate consequence of "highly politicized" and educationally unsound decision-making

(Menken & Solorza, 2014, p. 100). Take, for example, the passage of the “anti-bilingual” laws of California (Proposition 227, 1998), Arizona (Proposition 203, 2000), and Massachusetts (Question 2, 2002), the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2002), and national Race to the Top Initiatives (RttT, 2011)—which were policies that contributed collectively to misperceptions about the education of ELLs in the United States by deemphasizing bilingual education as a successful way to support ELLs in school and overemphasizing the need to test all students equally.

Anti-bilingual laws. In areas of the country with large numbers of immigrants, politicization impacted the voting results of anti-bilingual laws (i.e., referendums submitted to the voting citizens for direct decisions) enacted in the 1990s and early 2000s which asked registered voters to make the final decision as to how best to educate ELLs in public schools (Menken & Solorza, 2012; Mora, 2009; Proposition 227, 1998; Proposition 203, 2000; Question, 2002). To clarify, these referendum-type questions were not posed to a political body, but to voting citizens. Once the vote was final, state policy changed. With majority support from voters in California (Proposition 227, 1998), Arizona (Proposition 203, 2000), and Massachusetts (Question 2, 2002), their adoption led to the dismantling of existing bilingual education programs within each state. These initiatives and accompanying practices ran “counter to the spirit of past federal laws and court decisions that established the right of language-minority children to a meaningful and equitable education” (Mora, 2009, p. 14), and their adoption stirred nationwide controversy as individuals in other states began to challenge policies that had supported bilingual education for decades (Crawford, 2000). The passage of state anti-bilingual

initiatives began to change and confuse national views regarding how best to teach ELLs (Crawford, 2000; Cadeiro-Kaplan & Rodriguez, 2008). For example, teachers who once supported bilingual education moved towards English only classrooms, even when they had strong academic results when teaching bilingually (Menken & Solorza, 2014). Similarly, No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2002), an act of Congress that reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964 (previously reauthorized in 1994), negatively impacted the education of ELLs nationally due to the legislative language excluded by the act as well as details that were included, as explained below (Crawford, 2000; Mora, 2009; NCLB, 2002; Villegas & Lucas, 2011).

No Child Left Behind. No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2002) called for the swifter inclusion of ELLs into mainstream classes than previously allowed by law. That is, after three years of supportive schooling that could include various small-classroom settings that enabled ELLs to learn curriculum content using their native languages, ELLs were expected to be fully included in general education classes and tested in English just like everyone else regardless of their actual English proficiency (NCLB, 2002). Stringent timetables for ELLs were a departure from previous legislation that allowed for individualized programming and, therefore, individualized decisions concerning when to “mainstream” ELLs within general education classrooms (Equal Educational Opportunities Act [EEOA], 1974; Improving America’s School Act, 1994; NCLB, 2002). ELLs were also negatively impacted by NCLB’s omission of the term “bilingual” education; that is, “NCLB’s complete focus on English language development and complete silence on the use and development of other languages in schools” (Villegas &

Lucas, 2011, p. 39) was an unfortunate, yet deliberate departure from the 1994 reauthorization act (Crawford, 2000).

During the completion of this dissertation, No Child Left Behind was replaced by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) signed by President Obama on December 10, 2015 as the current reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESSA). Many claimed at its signing that the ESSA included measures to minimize the overemphasis on large-scale accountability efforts by scaling back the U.S. Department of Education's accountability (EdWeek, 2015, "Standards" para. 1). According to Ravitch (2016), a progressive educational advocate, the ESSA seemingly put an end to the stressors of No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top (yet another federal policy mandate that increased concern by advocates for ELLs over standardized testing and accountability for all students, especially ELLs). The ESSA seemed to decrease those stressors according to those who analyze educational policy carefully in regard to ELLs by returning power to the states and potentially smaller decision making bodies such as counties and districts to make major testing decisions (Ravitch, 2016).

The ESSA may also reduce the potentially negative impact of the Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Disciplinary Literacy Standards (2014) on the ELL population and their teachers by allowing states to adopt challenging academic policy "that could be the Common Core State Standards, but doesn't have to be" (EdWeek, 2015, "Standards" para. 1). Previously, Bunch (2013) cautioned about the challenges (and opportunities) facing general education teachers specific to the education of ELLs, pointing out that "sooner or later, as schools move to implement the new

Common Core . . . almost every teacher in the United States will face the challenge of how to support students from homes where English is not the dominant language in meeting subject-matter academic expectations that require increasingly demanding uses of language and literacy in English” (p. 298). At the time of writing this dissertation, the potentially positive impact of ESSA was very much a possibility, but yet to be realized. However, even if the ESSA reduced the accountability pressures of standardized tests associated with Common Core Standards, No Child Left Behind, and Race to the Top their impact has already been felt.

Considering this political impact on educational practices along with the changing demographics of classrooms today, the reality is—as argued above—that classrooms across the United States (in some states more than others) are increasingly linguistically diverse and general education teachers at all grade levels need access to preparation that will help them teach ELLs efficaciously (Bunch, 2013; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Menken & Solorza, 2012; Mora, 2009). As will be discussed in Chapter Two, research-based information regarding how best to teach linguistically diverse students is certainly available (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008). However, reports of uncertainty and misconceptions about how to teach in linguistically diverse classrooms on the part of general education teachers still persist (Harper & De Jong, 2004; Pass & Montero, 2009). In short, there continues to be a pressing need to understand how teachers not specifically certified to teach ELLs truly can become more linguistically responsive in their practices within a social and political environment that has not necessarily recognized the importance of doing so. In the next section, I provide

an honest look at the primacy of English in the United States and how this runs counter to what needs to happen to support young learners in United States' schools. The contentious nature surrounding the use of home languages other than English in classrooms and also in society at large needs to be problematized.

Problematizing the Primacy of English in the United States

This study and the work of the four teachers documented herein needs to be contextualized by critiquing how English has earned such overt primacy within the United States while most other home languages, even those indigenous to the United State, tend to carry with them negative connotations (Crawford, 2000; Gandara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez, & Hopkins, 2010). This study is grounded in the belief that language, defined as a basic human means of communication that uses words and phrases to construct, convey and interpret meaning (Auer, 2013), is a key aspect of human identity. Gloria Anzaldua (2012), an American-born Chicana feminist, philosopher, and cultural activist, wrote, "Ethnic identity is twin skin to linguistic identify—I am my language. Until I can take pride in my language, I cannot take pride in myself" (p. 81). Her sentiments as a Chicana who experienced profound oppression growing up along the Rio Grande in southern Texas enables those of us who only speak English to understand the value of home languages; to her (and others) language and identity are intertwined.

At this point, it should be noted that human identity development, that is a particular aspect of an individual's self-concept that defines him/herself in relation to the social world, has been linked by theorists to a general sense of belonging in the social world (Erikson, 1968; Piaget, 1983; Stets & Burke, 2000; Vygotsky, 1973). Some

theorists have even stressed that identity is linked to an individual's feeling of legitimacy within their social worlds (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Although early research depicted the concept of identity as a stagnant, yet necessary end goal in human development (Erikson, 1968; Piaget, 1983), current modern thinking views identity formation as a lifelong process that is integral to human contentment (Greenhow & Robelia, 2009; Leander, 2000; Rowsell & Abrams, 2011). The nurturing and maintenance of such have been shown to be key aspects of human growth and fulfillment (Erikson, 1968; Piaget, 1983; Stets & Burke, 2000; Vygotsky, 1973). Therefore, when individuals speak of their language and identity, there is a sense that they are speaking about their self-preservation and lifelong fulfillment.

Take for example, the words of Amin Maalouf, a Lebanese-born French author. He wrote the following, emphasizing the value of his languages in relation to his sense of identity: "What makes me myself rather than anyone else is the very fact that I am poised between two countries, two or three languages, and several cultural traditions. It is precisely this that defines my identity. Would I exist more authentically if I cut off a part of myself?" (Maalouf, 2000, p. *i*). Individuals' home languages (first languages) are deeply personal aspects of their identity, yet no more purposefully selected than skin color or the sounds of their voices and no easier to lose, hide, or "cut off" than a limb, as Maalouf suggested. Nonetheless, if English is not their home language in the U.S., individuals often witness the contentious responses a language other than English elicits from others (Crawford, 2000; Lippi-Green, 2012; Motha, 2014). Fostering identity growth is essential to human development (Erikson, 1968; Piaget, 1983; Stets & Burke,

2000; Vygotsky, 1973) and by acknowledging language is integral to identity, facilitating language growth then becomes integral to human development as well. Thus, it can be argued that the general perception, or better yet the human *misperception* (and sometimes purposefully propagated misperception), of language use other than English in the United States is problematic, especially if one is a student whose home language is not English.

To effectively understand the context surrounding the teaching of students whose home languages are not English in the United States, pertinent realities need to be addressed. First and foremost, Americans mainly speak English because Americans were, like much of the world, colonized by Great Britain just over four centuries ago (Motha, 2014). With the physical drive of the British across oceans and lands, came the proliferation of English as the *lingua franca*. Quite simply, the British demanded such as a means to maintain control over their colonies; an imposition of control that defies the logistics of distance. Those in power remain in power when those being controlled lose who they are or become unrecognizable to themselves and “others” like them (Motha, 2014). In short, colonialism thrives on assimilation. As America became a young, sovereign English-speaking nation, new leaders continued to conquer and maintain control through the assimilation of others—Native Americans, Mexicans in what is now Arizona, part of California, Texas, and New Mexico—by forcing them to give up land, their previous livelihoods, and many times their heritage (home) languages (Gandara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez, & Hopkins, 2010). In fact, most of the indigenous languages that were truly “American” are lost (Crawford, 2000; Gandara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez, & Hopkins, 2010). Many linguists, Native Americans, and historians

trying to rekindle Native American languages out of concern that without those languages cultures can be lost, are having little success (Crawford, 2004; Gandara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez, & Hopkins, 2010). Unfortunately, experts estimate that over 100 indigenous languages have been lost due to English language and cultural assimilation and another 100 are on their way to extinction (Crawford, 2000; Manatowa-Bailey, 2007; McCarty, Romero, & Zepeda, 2006).

A second pertinent reality to consider is that whereas European nations boast multilingual citizens, Americans tend to take pride in their “primacy of English both in educational settings and public life” (Gandara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez, & Hopkins, 2010, p. 20). Although research supports the benefits of multilingualism (Bialystok, 2011; Cummins, 1980, 2000), United States’ immigrants more than any other nation’s immigrants tend to lose their home languages relatively rapidly—typically this occurs within two generations of the first immigrant’s arrival (Tienda & Mitchell, 2006; Motha, 2014). This is not so common in other countries where immigrants move and stay (Gandara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez, & Hopkins, 2010). Such a difference is often attributed to the fact that immigrant parents were “encouraged,” often by teachers who thought they were being helpful, to push their children and families to use only English. However, such behaviors by individuals who identify with the dominant culture can be seen as colonialism in contemporary times (Motha, 2014).

A third reality concerning American views of English in regard to the teaching of those whose first language is not English is that there is a strong, yet some would say “mythological,” belief in the United States that there is a single, well-defined Standard

English that stands as an educational goal for many individuals (Lippi-Green, 2012; Motha, 2014). As such, speaking a variant of English—“standard” or not—creates difference among people that once again creates (or adds) to one’s perceived status in the United States. Those who speak “Standard American English” are often assumed by American citizens to be at the top of the linguistic social status ladder while those who cannot speak any English are at the bottom. And, in between there is an array of grays including those who speak with “accents” (i.e., foreign or regional) and those speaking their own combinations of home languages and English (e.g., “Spanglish”). The impacts of such misperceptions about English in America have been studied and linked to different types of prejudice, racism, and linguicism (that is, discrimination based on the language spoken and how it is spoken) (cf. Crawford, 2000; Motha, 2014).

In her research pertaining to teaching English in American schools, Motha (2014) emphasized the role speaking English or not speaking English plays in the socialized gaps between rich and poor, Caucasians and non-whites, and the perpetuation of inequalities based on race and culture in the United States. Motha (2014) argued:

On the one hand, the English language carries enticing meanings and is connected to social advancement, opportunity, modernity, wealth, enlightenment, Whiteness, and cosmopolitanism. Those learning English do so with the assumption that language will allow them access to certain possibilities and identities . . . At the same time, I can think of numerous ways in which the spread of English has been conceived of as having adverse consequences or as shaping identities and futures in negative ways. (pp. 4-5)

Ultimately, language use has become another way to categorize and “class” people and to create negative stereotypes for certain demographic groups in the United States.

Finally, a fourth relevant reality to consider is that there is minimal desire on the part of those in power to change the misperceptions of language use and the primacy of English. Those in power—typically right now they tend to be native English speakers, Caucasians, (often) men—benefit from a stratified social system, especially one that is seemingly benign. Motha (2014) asserts, “If we believe on some level that we profit from inequality, we might be less inclined to move social justice to the top of our list of priorities” (p. 18). Essentially, those who are the recipients of social prosperity and power due to the fact that they are the benefactors of privileges bestowed upon them simply for speaking the language deemed “standard” have more to lose if such inequality was addressed. Therefore, language discrimination enables some to “profit” from its existence even if they were not perpetrators of it. For the purposes of her study of the teaching of English in the United States, Motha (2014) had to confront and explore prejudice, race, linguicism (e.g., discrimination based on language use), and colonization as these difficult to acknowledge concepts have direct impact on teaching English to those whose first language is not English. Her work highlights the challenges faced by teachers teaching in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. Inspired by these relevant realities and the desire to have a positive impact on the education of those whose first language is not English, this current study intends to contribute to the field of linguistically responsive teaching by acknowledging the difficult work of educators today and as work that is set within a context of stratified and contested language use.

To summarize, amid these issues concerning power and exclusion, white and non-white, American and non-American, teachers are still teaching every day, and their teaching of English is not neutral. There comes with such instruction a history bathed in issues of supremacy and discrimination, especially when it is located here in the United States (Crawford, 2000, 2004; Gandara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez, & Hopkins, 2010; Motha, 2014). Adding to the current challenges of teaching in the U.S. are policies that do not properly acknowledge the demands being placed on teachers and students when many of the students are learning English as they are trying to learn content. The happenings in the United States' culturally and linguistically diversifying classrooms are an irrefutable reflection of the tensions between what is sound educationally and what is expected policy-wise. All of which when openly acknowledged adds to the need to develop and conduct pertinent research within the field of linguistically responsive teaching in order to even better support teachers as they work to successfully teach all students. Therefore, I set out to develop a study that rightly gives focus to teachers teaching in urban United States' classrooms within the social and political context discussed above.

Developing the Right Study

This study was conceived to openly understand how teachers exposed to a profusion of research-based *opportunities* pertaining to teaching linguistically diverse students, take-up *linguistically responsive teaching* as educators of these and all their students within the United States. Based on research (discussed in Chapter Two), this *sense-making* process is expected to be uneven, non-linear, and unique for each

participant. The process may very well be “messy;” yet, understanding how these teachers grapple with content within opportunities designed to help them embrace their roles as linguistically responsive teachers is important in the overall goal of embracing and leveraging the richness of United States’ classrooms. The guiding intention of this study was to answer the following research question:

While following general education early childhood teachers through a formal learning program and into their classrooms, what “take-up” from the range of opportunities designed to help a small group of teachers become more linguistically responsive in their classrooms seems to be demonstrated?

To satisfactorily answer this question, the present study was purposely situated within a northeastern city of the United States to learn more about the *real* experiences of teachers teaching (and learning about teaching) in today’s classrooms. The northeastern United States is markedly enriched by individuals who speak various languages, hold unique beliefs, and have diversified histories deeply impacted by issues related to the primacy of English (Crawford, 2000; Gandara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez, & Hopkins, 2010; U.S. Census, 2013; Villegas & Lucas, 2011). My deep interest in accessing a teacher development program that would allow me to follow teachers through a well-defined and well-bounded professional development experience and into their classrooms as they attempted to be more linguistically responsive led me to The Northeastern Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute (pseudonym), a program that worked with already established teachers who intended to return to their same classrooms after their educational experience was complete.

Since 2007, the Northeastern Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute, a well-established institute for teacher preparation, focused on the cultural competence and linguistic responsiveness of early childhood teachers in the northeast (approximately 20 teachers per school year). The underlying philosophy and theoretical framing of the institute were very much dependent on the creative director's personal history and experience as an English language learner herself and as a linguistically responsive and culturally competent educator. The institute's foundational philosophy and that of this study were identified as compatible in terms of underlying philosophy, goals, and rationales. The summer institute included several opportunities that were relevant to the development of linguistically responsive teaching. Therefore, Chapter Four has been dedicated to describing the North Eastern Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute in detail to allow for a deeper understanding of the theoretical and conceptual ideas of the Northeastern Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms and this study.

The success of this study also depended upon exploring the development of linguistically responsive teachers within a conceptual framework that would take into account who the teachers were and allow for rich data collection without too rigid a definition of the end goal of linguistically responsive teaching. Clearly, I was not looking to document change as if these teachers needed to be changed. I wanted to understand how teachers who willingly sought to be better teachers for their students whose first language was not English went about the process. To do so I embraced the following key concepts—take-up of linguistically responsive teaching, funds of knowledge, and learning opportunities— which will be explicated in Chapter Two. However, before

moving into the theoretical content of my study, there is a need to clarify the logistical use of the acronym ELL.

English Language Learners (ELLs)

Although referring to children for whom English is not their first language in America's classrooms by means of an acronym seems somewhat inharmonious with the overall goal of the study, ELL is the term used by schools as well as the linguistically responsive professional development program that provides the catalyst content and context for this study. Here, using the ELL acronym is a logistical choice in that it affords consistency throughout the discussion of the context, pertinent research, and data included in this proposal in terms of referring to students whose home languages are not English and who are learning English in school as they learn content. Therefore, from this point on "English language learners" will respectfully be referred to as ELLs throughout the entirety of this paper which is summarized below.

Conclusion

Chapter One has provided a summary of the demographic shifts, pertinent policies, and current sociopolitical issues surrounding English and teaching in the United States. By doing so Chapter One highlighted the current challenges to teaching in U.S. schools if teachers do not feel prepared to teach in linguistically diverse classrooms and therefore, provided a rationale for focusing on linguistically responsive teaching at this time in the United States. Looking ahead, Chapter Two provides a comprehensive overview of pertinent literature regarding linguistically responsive teaching and ends with an overview the socioculturally-informed conceptual framing used for this study, funds of

knowledge. Also included are explanations for particular conceptual descriptors used in the research question and throughout this study such as *take-up of linguistically responsive teaching* and *opportunities*. Chapter Three details the methodology, research tools, and data analysis employed in this qualitative study. Chapter Four is a dedicated overview of the Northeastern Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms and the content from which take-up will be identified. Chapter Five is an integrated presentation of the findings and discussion of the same, and Chapter Six discusses concluding thoughts, many of which speak to the next steps in educational research and practice regarding linguistically responsive teaching. All of this is undertaken with the intent of providing research-based answers to the aforementioned research question.

Therefore, this study was designed to follow a small number of teachers into their classrooms for months after their participation in a teacher education program designed to facilitate their linguistically (and culturally) responsive teaching in order to better understand the process entailed in becoming more linguistically responsive. Thus, this study documents the “take-up” of linguistically responsive teaching practices, knowledge, and dispositions of four early childhood teachers after they engage in learning opportunities specifically geared towards preparing them to teach in linguistically responsive ways. A thorough discussion of these key concepts was warranted and therefore, the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter Two: Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

This chapter provides a detailed explication of the concepts (i.e., linguistically responsive teaching and funds of knowledge) and theory (i.e., sociocultural learning theory) that were integral to this study's development and completion. When the decision was made to follow teachers into their classrooms as they attempted to be more linguistically responsive, funds of knowledge was selected as the conceptual way to study, recognize, and validate how the specifics of their attempts may very well look different based on each individual's knowhow and past lived-experiences. The interrelatedness of the theory, concepts, and content presented in this chapter made it nearly impossible to address one without mentioning the others. However, to best establish the necessary framings and boundaries for understanding this study's overall rationale and intent, this chapter draws on the academic literature to clarify each major concept and theory in turn by providing an overview of linguistically responsive teaching, a discussion of sociocultural theory, and a review of funds of knowledge.

Linguistically Responsive Teaching and Teacher Education

The research impetus for this study came after the completion of an exhaustive analytic review which was designed to find evidence in the research literature regarding specific opportunities individual teacher educators within the United States reported providing to preservice teachers in order to address the reality that many of their future students will likely be ELLs. The systematic analysis of research studies began with a comprehensive search of the databases available via EBSCO Host (e.g., Academic Search Premier, ERIC, and Education Search Complete), using the search terms: "teacher

education,” “literacy education,” and “English Language Learners.” This initial search was limited to scholarly peer reviewed journals written in English. Realizing that literacy was too narrow a field for this topic, follow-up searches were conducted using broader search terms. These included: “preservice,” “limited English proficient,” “preservice teacher education,” “prospective teachers,” and simply “teacher education.” A corpus of 12 studies was generated by employing various combinations of this set of search terms and closely applying criteria to ensure the articles were reporting research; the focus was the preparation of mainstream teachers in the United States; the focus was on ELLs and not simply diversity; and there was an opportunity regarding teaching ELLs in the classroom presented to the preservice teachers about which the investigation was undertaken.

The corpus of articles included in this review comprised empirical research conducted over the past fourteen years. Nine of the studies were qualitative (Baecher, Schieble, Rosalia, & Rorimer, 2013; Bollin, 2007; Fitts & Gross, 2012; Marx, 2004; Menard-Warwick & Palmer, 2012; Olson & Jimenez-Silva, 2008; Sowa, 2009; Virtue, 2009; Zhang & Stephens, 2012); one study was quantitative (Jimenez-Silva, Olson, & Hernandez, 2012); and two employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative methodologies (Hsu, 2009; Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012). All of the studies were conducted within universities in the United States. In eleven of the studies the researcher was one of the teacher educators involved in the study as well (Baecher et al., 2013; Bollin, 2007; Hsu, 2009; Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012; Jimenez-Silva, Olson, & Hernandez, 2012; Marx, 2004; Menard-Warwick & Palmer, 2012; Olson & Jimenez-

Silva, 2008; Sowa, 2009; Virtue, 2009; Zhang & Stephens, 2012). Six studies took place in the south west (Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012; Jimenez-Silva, Olson, & Hernandez, 2012; Marx, 2004; Menard-Warwick & Palmer, 2012; Olson & Jimenez-Silva, 2008; Zhang & Stephens, 2012), one of which even took students to Mexico to conduct their study (Menard-Warwick & Palmer, 2012); two took place in the Midwest (Sowa, 2009; Virtue, 2009); three on the east coast (Baecher et al., 2013; Bollin, 2007; Hsu, 2009); and one in the south (Fitts & Gross, 2012). Each study was framed with relevant theories. Culturally responsive theories of education framed two of the studies (Baecher et al., 2013; Hsu, 2009); sociocultural theories framed seven of the studies (Fitts & Gross, 2012; Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012; Jimenez-Silva, Olson, & Hernandez, 2012; Menard-Warwick & Palmer, 2012; Olson & Jimenez-Silva, 2008; Sowa, 2009; Zhang & Stephens, 2012); two studies were driven by social justice (Bollin, 2007; Virtue, 2009); and one study was framed using critical white studies/race theory (Marx, 2004).

This systematic analytic review helped to illuminate specific opportunities (i.e., purposefully designed tasks developed with the time and support to enable learning) individual teacher educators did indeed provide to address this important reality such as the use of reflective journals and blogs throughout the semester; community service projects with ELL students and adults; and guided classroom observations of classes with ELLs. Each of the opportunities provided was developed with awareness that U.S. classrooms were diversifying, ELLs were a part of mainstream education, and teachers' accountability for all students was high. Specific to those studies included in the review, most indicated that more needed to be done to further understand the effects of the

opportunities provided. However, as discussed below, plenty was accomplished and learned nonetheless.

Evidence from the 12 studies reviewed strongly suggested that teacher educators were able to broaden preservice teachers' thinking with regard to language, culture, and home life (Bollin, 2007; Fitts & Gross, 2012; Hsu, 2009); address misconceptions by allowing preservice teachers the opportunities to work with ELLs (Baecher et al., 2013; Bollin, 2007; Fitts & Gross, 2012; Hsu, 2009; Marx, 2004); add to the preservice teachers' knowledge base in terms of specific knowledge about ELL language backgrounds, elements of Second Language Acquisition learning, and strategies for classroom use (Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012; Jimenez-Silva et al., 2012; Olson & Jimenez-Silva, 2008; Sowa, 2009; Virtue, 2009; Zhang & Stephens, 2012); and provide preservice teachers with the skills of collaboration to work collegially with other educators to advance their own learning and continued investigation into best practices for their students beyond their years as preservice students (Baecher et al., 2013; Bollin, 2007; Fitts & Gross, 2012; Hsu, 2009; Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012; Jimenez-Silva et al., 2012; Marx, 2004; Menard-Warwick & Palmer, 2012; Olson & Jimenez-Silva, 2008; Sowa, 2009; Virtue, 2009; Zhang & Stephens, 2012). By accomplishing many of the aforementioned goals, participating teacher educators believed they imparted to preservice teachers a level of comfort with and confidence in teaching linguistically diverse students that would eventually lead to more efficacious learning for linguistically diverse students (Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012; Jimenez-Silva et al., 2012; Olson & Jimenez-Silva, 2008). However, there was no evidence concerning long-lasting effects of

the many learning opportunities developed for the preservice teachers or how the opportunities impacted the preservice teachers' actual teaching of ELLs (Collucci, 2014). In fact, most of these studies indicated that more needed to be done by teacher educators to further understand the effects of the opportunities designed to better prepare teachers to teach linguistically diverse students and to better understand what was truly "taken up" by the participants. The impetus study also led to the adoption of "take-up" in lieu of change and *opportunities* as an all-encompassing concept for those activities, strategies, and experiences teacher educators provide their pre-service and in-service teachers to enable learning. In the next section, I further clarify how *opportunities* and the *take-up of linguistically responsive teaching* are defined, for they are two concepts that not only play an integral part of my question, but the entire study.

Key Concepts and Terminology for this Study

A clear understanding of "take-up" as well as "opportunities" needs to be presented to understand the goals of this study and the chosen theoretical framing. By addressing these two key concepts now, their link to and resonance with the orienting theory discussed in Chapter Two can be better understood. Both concepts are theoretically imbued and deliberately used because this study seeks to understand the individual and unique *take-up* of linguistically responsive teaching of all four teacher-participants from learning *opportunities* presented to them to foster such. Below I define each concept—take-up and opportunities—as they will be used in this dissertation.

Take-up. Within the context of this study, "take-up" is the individual act of adopting new content, ideas, practices, reflective stances, linguistic choices, responses, or

actions as one's own by incorporating one or more into his/her current reality (Buehler, Gere, Dallavis, & Haviland, 2009; Gere, Buehler, & Haviland, 2009). Similar to change, but more nuanced and less linear in its expectations, take-up allows for more individuality and choice in what will be done in response to the introduction of new content and expectations. This list is by no means exhaustive and the fact that many unknown manifestations of "take-up" could and should exist speaks to the openness of this study. For example, many adults "take-up" yoga and/or alternative fitness plans as means of self-improvement. Such self-improvement manifests uniquely for each individual as he/she makes particular choices throughout the process of learning to "do" yoga, is challenged by the level of newness of the chosen self-improvement plan, and maintains a particular (or changing) level of interest in becoming "good" at yoga. Just as one individual may fully embrace the ideas, behaviors, and introspective stances of yoga, thereby becoming quite the overt, meditative yoga practitioner; another person's take-up may manifest in the form of a new calmness in their everyday life that could easily be overlooked if they were not observed the few times they attended a yoga class.

When studying the preparation and development of teachers, researchers often identify "changes" (Guskey, 2002; Stein & Wang, 1988) or "transformations" (Ingersoll, Merrill, & Stuckey, 2014), or lack thereof, within and among individual teachers as central to their research. Yet, over the years, research has shown that looking for such things does not take into account the complicated process of teacher growth with regard to cultural and linguistic pedagogical goals (Buehler, Gere, Dallavis, & Haviland, 2009; Gere, Buehler, & Haviland, 2009). Gere, Buehler, and Haviland (2009), for example,

discovered that teacher growth is not “a smooth arc of development that could be translated into a stage-process model” (p. 826), but instead is a process better understood as “gradual and halting” (p. 843). After completing their study designed to better understand how raced consciousness impacted preservice teachers’ understandings of cultural responsiveness by including opportunities to interact with students in an under-resourced school, engage with literary texts, and discuss culturally responsive pedagogy, Buehler, Gere, Dallavis, and Haviland (2009) emphasized the need to “normalize the fraughtness involved in the struggle new teachers go through as they develop cultural competence” (p. 408). Buehler, Gere, Dallavis, and Haviland (2009) stand as a strong reminder that the time has well and truly come to look more realistically at what is being expected of teachers as they are engaged in understanding and “taking on board” complicated new ideas and concepts through what is considered research-based teacher development programs.

Furthermore, Buehler and colleagues (2009) confirmed that “[t]aking on a culturally responsive disposition is, therefore, not a simple cognitive task that can be modeled and transferred to beginning teachers—it is a personal struggle that challenges affective as well as cognitive capacities” (p. 409). This means responsive teaching (cultural and/or linguistic) requires more than just doing and implementing strategies. Teachers need to develop particular dispositions (Lucas & Villegas, 2011), address personal *blind spots* (Anonymized, 2013; see Chapter Four for more on this), and reformulate existing knowledge—none of which is a simple linear, pre-determined and predictable path with a ready-made finish line. In Buehler, Gere, Dallavis, and Haviland’s

study (2009), this negotiation led to some teachers resisting what they were being expected to learn about raced consciousness or unexpectedly reaffirming their own biased beliefs (Buehler, Gere, Dallavis, & Haviland, 2009). For example, Buehler, Gere, Dallavis, and Haviland (2009) explain:

Our research suggests that cultural competence cannot be thought of as a capacity that students develop in a gradual motion of forward progress. As Kelly's [one of their participant's] story reveals, the process of becoming culturally competent was an arduous journey filled with forward movement followed by missteps and backsliding, followed by forward movement again. (p. 416)

This was how *take-up* was conceptualized in relation to culturally responsive teaching for their study, and how it will be used in relation to linguistically responsive teaching for this current study. That is, regarding this study, “take-up” is the individual act of adopting new content, ideas, practices, reflective stances, linguistic choices, responses, or actions as one's own by incorporating one or more into his/her current reality. Adopting the concept of take-up for this study enabled a realistic look at what negotiations—good or bad, forward or backward progressions—teachers went through as they were engaged with new and often complicated realities regarding how to best teach linguistically diverse students by means of purposely developed learning opportunities that focused on the development of linguistically responsive teaching skills, dispositions, and knowledge. A discussion of what is meant by such learning opportunities in relation to teacher development is the focus of the next section.

Opportunities. Feiman-Nemser (2001) has long advocated for strong learning “opportunities” for teachers at the preservice level as exemplified in her conceptual paper detailing the professional learning continuum of teachers. Feiman-Nemser (2001) explains that for teachers to successfully mature as professionals they require appropriate support and *opportunities* to learn throughout their careers. An opportunity to learn or develop is generally defined as an amount of time allocated for the attainment of a particular goal often imbued with specific support toward a goal for which the opportunity was developed. Although several researchers and teacher educators refer to “opportunities” presented to preservice and practicing teachers and use this exact term to do so, others choose to label the “opportunities” provided as experiences, demonstrations, lessons, and activities. To simplify the focus of this paper all activities, methods, experiences, lessons, and strategies offered to the teachers will be referred to as opportunities with the assumption that they are opportunities to learn, to develop, and to take-up linguistically responsive teaching. Feiman-Nemser (2001) speaks of powerful learning opportunities in preservice education as those that “promote complex learning” (p. 1014); push preservice teachers “to think critically, solve problems, . . . learn things that matter to them” (p. 1015); and provide preservice students with the time and support to “examine critically their own taken-for-granted, often deeply entrenched beliefs so that these beliefs can be amended or developed” (p. 1017). To elaborate, preservice teachers need “opportunities” that will help them understand how to plan effective lessons and how to rethink the role of teacher they are about to undertake for their conception of teaching may be based on their previous role as student. These kinds of learning

opportunities vary in kind depending upon the teacher educator, the program, and the preservice students. Those specific to this study will be discussed in Chapter Four.

However, further clarification of Feiman-Nemser's (2001) conception of opportunities is included here.

Feiman-Nemser (2001) identifies preservice fieldwork as an appropriate opportunity to “test theory, use knowledge . . . and try out practices” in coursework (p. 1024). Other opportunities that support such knowledge and pedagogical growth could include teacher educator-facilitated viewings of exemplar lessons via video with thoughtful follow-up debriefings before viewers attempt to develop their own plans. Helping preservice teachers develop the skills, knowledge, and orientations necessary to teach in today's linguistically diverse classrooms requires, as with anything necessary for new teachers to learn, “powerful learning opportunities” specific to the goal at hand (Feiman-Nemser, 2001, p. 1014). In this present study, the concept of “opportunities” was central to examining what was being afforded teachers in terms of support for becoming more linguistically responsive. The opportunities presented to the participants in this study reflected very specific ideas about linguistically responsive teaching that could be taken up. By focusing on individual teacher “take-up” this research study gives proper recognition to teachers trying to teach ELLs more effectively.

Research question. By looking at the “take-up” of a small group of four general education early childhood teachers from opportunities presented to increase their linguistically responsive teaching, this study switches scholarly focus from a linear growth model of change to a more humanistic, realistic look at how individuals assimilate

new content and information with who they are and what they do currently and did in the past. This small qualitative study hopes to add insights to the field of linguistically responsive teaching by following teachers throughout the summer institute discussed above and into their classrooms in order to address the question:

While following general education early childhood teachers through a formal learning program and into their classrooms, what “take-up” from the range of opportunities designed to help a small group of teachers become more linguistically responsive in their classrooms seems to be demonstrated?

This study is especially relevant right now because more and more general education teachers—teachers without specialized certification or preparation—are responsible for teaching ELLs. To do so effectively, the socioculturally-informed concept of funds of knowledge is used to analyze the sense-making process undergone in this study.

Taking a different approach to understanding the impact of specific, research-based teacher education opportunities afforded by a linguistically responsive professional development institute (see Chapter four) and following the teachers beyond their initial learning opportunities, helps to clarify what the reviewed data could not— a gap in the research literature that this study aims to address, even if in small part. The focus of this study is on *linguistically responsive teaching* as a more explicit way to focus on teaching within classrooms with diverse language use and the larger society. Considering the education of ELLs expressly requires re-thinking the type of responsiveness necessary for their successful inclusion and learning in today’s classrooms (Bunch, 2013; Lucas &

Villegas, 2011). Therefore, the field of linguistically responsive teaching has emerged as a way to directly study how to prepare teachers to teach ELLs.

Linguistically Responsive Teaching

The work of researchers, theorists, and practitioners that impacts the field of linguistically responsive teaching thoughtfully give proper perspective to home languages used in relation to dominant languages of particular societies (Bourdieu, 1977; Freire, 1970, 2000; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Motha, 2014; Norton, 2000; Valdés, 2001). Current developments in the field reflect influences of Freire's (1970; 2000) emphasis on dialogue and respectful education as well as Bourdieu's (1977) theory of cultural capital that states that particular non-tangibles/commodities such as knowledge, culture, language, and abilities are more highly valued by members of certain societies than others. Freire's (1970, 2000) work emphasized the importance of dialogue for understanding within a just and equitable democratic learning environment and strongly critiqued didactic educational practices. He (1970) insisted that language should never be considered neutral, but always conveying meaning and history. For Freire (1970) education must enable individuals with the tools for learning, thinking, and participation; language and meaning-making are key to this success. Bourdieu's (1977) theory of language capital emphasized that those who speak the dominant language of a society whether it is a government-sanctioned national language or not, are enabled greater access to goods, services, and benefits compared to those who speak other, home languages.

Bourdieu's (1977) work raised awareness of the fact that certain "knowledge" (e.g., the ability to read and write in academic English in the United States) was and remains more highly valued by members of particular societies than others' knowledge (e.g., fluency in Spanish and/or other non-Academic English languages). Such knowledge translates into social and economic inequities (Bourdieu, 1977; Freire, 1970, 2000). Bourdieu (1977) further explained that this inequitable preoccupation with "linguistic capital" in the United States was perpetuated by the fact that those with power continue to maintain such status as long as there were *others* (i.e., those who do not speak English). Positioning language and the "power" of the dominant language in this way enables educators to see the injustice of not providing access to English and supporting the growth of home languages. Through practices that seem "neutral," those who speak the dominant language with little attention to the home languages of others and their need to access English, perpetuate injustice that further supports the viability of those in power (Motha, 2014).

Supporters of linguistically responsive teaching tackle the sociopolitical reality of language use in the United States and address the pedagogical needs of ELLs. This all-encompassing approach enables teachers to see the value of home languages in light of the inequitable primacy of English in the United States. Nonetheless, teachers must still embrace the reality that students need to learn English (at this time in U.S. history) to achieve school success (Bartolomé, 2008; Lucas, 2011; Norton, 2001; Valdés, 2000). Freire wrote (1970), "If the structure does not permit dialogue, the structure must be changed" and much of the work in the field of linguistically responsive education

recognizes the inequity of classroom *structure* when ELLs sit in classrooms with little access to their home languages or English. The English-only structure needs to be changed.

Hollie (2010), the executive director of the Center for Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching in Los Angeles, California, offers a metaphorical definition of cultural and linguistic “responsiveness” (referred to as CLR) that he uses with practicing teachers:

CLR is going to where the students are culturally and linguistically for the aim of bringing them where they need to be academically. Metaphorically, CLR is the opposite of the sink and swim approach to teaching and learning. It is jumping in the pool with the learner, guiding her with the appropriate instruction, scaffolding as necessary, and providing the independence when she is ready. (p. 2)

Research suggests that teachers who *go to where ELLs are* to bring them *where they need to be* embody specific knowledge, skills, and orientations (Lucas & Villegas, 2011).

Helping ELLs *swim* requires more than “just good teaching” (DeJong & Harper, 2005), and there is a growing body of research that informs the field of linguistically responsive teaching, especially in relation to valuable knowledge, skills and orientations (see, for example, the LRT framework in Lucas & Villegas, 2011) teachers can take-up to better address the educational goals of their students.

The Linguistically Responsive Teaching (LRT) framework. Within the growing field of linguistically responsive teaching exists a well-developed conceptual framework that takes many of the standpoints and key ideas regarding second language

learning, culturally responsive teaching, and the prominence of English in the United States into account—the Linguistically Responsive Teaching framework developed by Lucas and Villegas (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Villegas & Lucas 2008; see also Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008). As discussed in the preface to this dissertation, the framework’s impact on the field of linguistically responsive teaching and my own learning warranted that I provide a detailed overview of it before I review other relevant research.

The Linguistically Responsive Teaching (LRT) framework specifically addresses how to prepare linguistically responsive teachers by taking into consideration key theory related to the educational experiences of ELLs as well as the pedagogical knowledge pertaining to teaching ELLs. Conceptual frameworks such as this provide specific focus needed at a time when ELLs and their mainstream teachers are faced with increased demands from high-stakes assessments and national standards (Bunch, 2013). The LRT framework not only provides specific, well-researched, seemingly agreed-upon knowledge (i.e., what Lucas and Villegas (2011) delineate as “Knowledge and Skills” of linguistically responsive teaching) in regard to teaching ELLs, but brings the social and cultural issues surrounding ELL education to the forefront while maintaining a focus on language (i.e., delineated by Lucas and Villegas within their Orientations of linguistically responsive teaching). This framework was informed by a sociocultural orientation (i.e., an orientation that rests on the premise that social interactions are essential for individual learning) to teaching ELLs and fleshed out by the logical inclusion of teacher knowledge and skills directly related to the education of ELLs. Lucas and Villegas (2011) posit that

teacher educators can foster the development of linguistically responsive teachers through more focused preparation experiences and by addressing three elements concerning orientations and four elements concerning knowledge and skills.

Orientations of the LRT framework. Lucas and Villegas (2011) argue that linguistically responsive teachers must develop three orientations: sociolinguistic consciousness, value for linguistic diversity, and an inclination to advocate for ELLs. *Sociolinguistic consciousness* “entails (1) an understanding that language, culture, and identity are deeply interconnected, and (2) an awareness of the sociopolitical dimensions of language use and language education” (Lucas & Villegas, 2011, pp. 56-57). *Value for linguistic diversity* is embodied in practices, experiences, and attitudes that encourage respect for all languages and, therefore, students within the classroom. *Advocacy for ELLs* takes many forms and takes place in many forums (e.g., actively supporting improved educational opportunities and working to build community resources), but should always “ensure that language-related issues do not continue to be minimized” (Lucas & Villegas, 2011, p. 57). As teachers develop orientations that will enable them to more effectively prepare instruction for ELLs, they also need to “take-up” specific skills and knowledge, according to the framework.

Knowledge and skills of the LRT framework. According to the LRT framework, teachers need to develop knowledge and skills that support their ELLs’ learning. Lucas and Villegas (2011) define knowledge and skills as “the complex and interconnected disciplinary knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, knowledge of learners, and pedagogical skills needed by successful teachers” (p. 56). They identify four necessary

proficiencies for all teachers that should be addressed during the teacher preparation of teachers for today's linguistically diverse classrooms (a) learning about ELL students' language backgrounds, experiences, and proficiencies; (b) identifying the language demands of the classroom; (c) knowing and applying principles of second language acquisition Second Language Acquisition theory; and (d) scaffolding instruction for ELLs. *Learning about ELL students' language backgrounds, experiences, and proficiencies* requires that teachers spend time interacting with each ELL student, establishing connections between school content and student prior knowledge, and identifying the linguistic resources an ELL's language holds for future learning.

Linguistically responsive teachers also have the ability to *identify language demands of the classroom* that might challenge specific students and as explained by Lucas and Villegas (2011), "This involves identifying key vocabulary, understanding the semantic and syntactic complexity of language used in written materials, and knowing specific ways students are expected to use language to complete each learning task" (p. 62).

According to the LRT framework, teachers should also *understand the principles of second language learning and apply those principles* in the mainstream classroom.

Finally, according to the LRT framework, linguistically responsive teachers need to be able to *scaffold instruction appropriately* by applying strategies to make curriculum content accessible to ELLs such as using extra-linguistic supports, supplementing and modifying texts and oral language, and giving clear instructions (Lucas & Villegas, 2011).

Considering that this framework is not the only position available on linguistically responsive teaching and the fact that I wanted to better understand what *becoming linguistically responsive may look like*, I decided that other language-related research and information may well come into play. Indeed, my personal learning experiences led me to assume that my data would reflect aspects of the framework, but that there would be certain manifestations that would be unique for the participants, and that uniqueness was as important to me as those manifestations that prove to be an exact match to elements delineated in the framework and previously discussed literature. Therefore, in the following section, I discuss pertinent research by those in the fields of second language learning, bilingual education, and responsive teaching.

Relevant linguistic research. Researchers and practitioners in the fields of linguistics and second language learning offer many agreed upon insights into what informs linguistically responsive teaching among *all* teachers, but such research does not always make its way to the teachers who would benefit. The dissemination of pertinent information in education is often challenged by a disconnect between university-based research and district-based practice (Zeichner, 2010) and the lack of time (Collinson & Fedoruk Cook, 2001) on the part of practicing teachers to investigate an aspect of teaching they might not even be aware needs to be improved (see for example Pass & Mantero, 2009). Insights regarding how best to support the learning of ELLs often seem out of reach to general education teachers (DeJong & Harper, 2005; Pass & Mantero, 2009; Villegas & Lucas, 2011). These insights address the details of planning and actualizing lessons that support ELLs as they learn content and English, and they address

the broader social and political issues surrounding language and English language learning in the United States. Fundamental to a focus on linguistically responsive teaching is the understanding that “if a student is developmentally ready to learn the content of the curriculum, his or her not being fluent in English should not keep him or her from doing so” (Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008, p. 366). Of course such learning needs to be done with particular supports deemed necessary and ideally without the pressure of time constraints or testing mandates. Therefore, research strongly suggests the teacher needs to make content accessible for his or her ELLs, regardless of these students’ English proficiency. This requires an understanding of key aspects of second language learning processes as well as an awareness of the context surrounding the English-only preferences of society at large.

When helping students learn content as they simultaneously learn English there is much for teachers to consider, but three aspects of linguistically responsive teaching—the cognitive work of the student and the demands of learning English; successful interactions with speakers of the target language; and the social context within which English language learning is taking place—are emphasized within the language learning literature and provide a strong understanding of the complexity of linguistically responsive teaching. The following discussion is organized into these three major categories—in no particular order—to provide some insight into how teachers may be grappling with their role in their ELLs’ education. To sum up, the language learning scholarly literature strongly suggests that teachers need to support their ELLs cognitive work; they must provide a safe place for students to interact with English speakers as

well as those who speak other languages; and they must be aware of the social, political, and learning contexts in which they are trying to teach their ELLs and all students. Each of these points is discussed in turn below.

Attending to the cognitive work of ELLs and the demands of learning English.

Current academic literature amply argues that all teachers have to be able to support the content learning (i.e., science, math, etc.) of their ELLs as they support their English development (Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008). Considering the cognitive processes of language learning and use, researchers specify that teachers need to understand aspects of second language acquisition (SLA) theory in order to identify the learning demands general education instruction in English places on ELLs and use that knowledge to develop successful instruction for ELLs (Krashen, 1985, 2003; Cummins, 2000; Wright, 2010). Second language acquisition theory emphasizes the importance of communication with those who speak the target language (i.e., the language an individual is trying to learn) that is meaningful and which deemphasizes too much focus on language-use rules. This is a naturalistic approach that emphasizes supportive language interactions (Krashen 1985, 1997, 2003). In addition, Krashen's (1985, 1997, 2003) research emphasizes the importance of providing second language learners access to comprehensible input; that is, English use just beyond a student's current level of proficiency.

Cummins (1990, 1998, 2000), another influential SLA theorists and researcher, discusses the important difference between conversational uses of a second language (which takes approximately two to three years to develop), and academic use and

competence of that second or third language which takes at least five years to develop. Cummins (2000) also emphasizes that as an individual (e.g., ELL) learns a second or third language (e.g., English) he/she needs to nurture the development of his/her first language as well. This is an example of what Cummins terms “additive bilingualism.” As Cummins (2000) explains, “Additive bilingualism refers to the form of bilingualism that results when students add a second language to their intellectual tool-kit while continuing to develop conceptually and academically in their first language” (p. 37). A person should not cease developing their home language in order to focus on new languages.

Krashen’s (1985, 1997, 2003) research on supportive interactions and comprehensible input, along with Cummin’s (1998, 2000) research that focuses on how second and third languages can develop if the first language is well nurtured, provide insights into the cognitive demands placed on ELLs when they are learning English and suggest ways of easing those demands to nurture learning. Teachers can create situations in which ELLs are supported as they attempt to use English as well as time to use and continue developing their home languages. To do so much is written about supporting specific language skill development with scaffolding—a term that is often misunderstood as simply adult assistance. Gibbons (2002) clarified this common misperception by explaining, “*Scaffolding*, however, is not simply another word for *help*. It is a special kind of help that assists learners to move toward new skills, concepts, or levels of understanding . . . It is future oriented: as Vygotsky has said, what a child can do with support today, she or he can do alone tomorrow” (original emphases, p. 10). Much of the cognitive work needed to be done by ELLs can be supported with thoughtful scaffolds.

Scaffolding can include teacher facilitated cooperative learning, translations, visuals, and explicit, repetitive routines, to name a few options (Gibbons, 2002; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Understanding the importance of and how to implement supportive interactions in this way is central to linguistically responsive teaching.

Acknowledging and supporting the role of interactions. The research literature recommends that teachers need to consider the importance of fostering positive and supportive learning interactions within their classrooms and schools that allow second language learners to feel safe and therefore willing to take risks as they learn their target language. Wright (2010) explains how effective interactions, that is, those that provide the necessary linguistic scaffolding for ELLs, lead to more successful learning situations for ELLs. Interactions between ELLs and fluent and/or native English speakers during which those who speak English fluently support the attempts of the ELLs through “corrective feedback” and “modified interactions” provide necessary access through meaning making and enable ELLs to develop their use and understanding of English (Wright, 2010, p. 41). For example, when an ELL student refers to his textbook as a “libro” (e.g., “I found the answer in my libro.”), a teacher using “corrective feedback” simply responds using the English without making issue of the correction (e.g., “I am so happy you found the answer in your textbook. Well done!”). In the example, the teacher maintains focus on the greater learning goal, but the student’s English development is also being gently supported.

Similarly, Cummins (2000) writes about the need to create opportunities for students to engage in supportive interactions; that is, those in which peers acknowledge

all language use and attempts regardless of how skillfully the language is used. Supportive interactions naturally enable meaning making while avoiding coercive interactions that could suppress language learning such as looking disdainfully at a language learner who is trying to convey meaning in the target language (Cummins, 2000). In short, the literature argues strongly that teachers should know that enabling positive interactions for those trying to learn a particular language such as ELLs is essential to their English development.

As mentioned above, Krashen (2003, 2008) addressed the importance of interactions, too, and discussed the ways in which these interactions can be better understood and supported. For example, he developed the concept of the affective filter to explain how interactions within a classroom can support and/or inhibit language development. In his affective filter model, second language learning can be affected by motivation (a personal trait operating within an individual and in response to the environment) and anxiety (a personal trait that is often impacted by the surrounding environment and interactions). Although critics have debunked the idea of individual motivation as an indicator for language learning because such emphasis holds individuals accountable for *non-learning* that may indeed have more to do with a lack of access to those who speak the target language who are willing to “make meaning” with non-native speakers (Norton, 2000), the issue of anxiety still warrants consideration, especially in a classroom. Krashen (1985) argues that “When the filter is ‘down’ [there is no anxiety present] and appropriate comprehensible input is presented (and comprehended) acquisition is inevitable. It is in fact unavoidable and cannot be prevented” (p. 4). This

further explains the idea that language is “acquired” and can indeed happen fairly naturally in the right situations (at least in terms of conversational aspects of language) within supportive interactions. Most importantly these “right” situations require access to the new language. Understanding the importance of supportive access to the language being learned has implications for mainstream teachers as well as their ELLs (Valdés, 2001; Schleppegrell, 2004).

Schleppegrell (2004) specifies the need for an ELL to have time to learn and interact with an interlocutor or, in other words, an individual “who is willing to pursue the meaning-making moves of the learner” (p. 153). This means that they are open to working with others to make-meaning using whatever means possible—gestures, bits of each other’s language, and facial expressions. Teachers and peers can be interlocutors for ELLs. The type of relationships fostered within classrooms can impact ELL learning significantly. Therefore, considering interactions as pivotal to an ELL’s learning of English, proponents of sociocultural and sociolinguistic orientations towards language learning emphasize the need to consider positive, supportive language interactions and use for ELLs with others, because “meeting” ELLs “where they are at” means that teachers need to be positive about what an ELL offers to the class no matter their level of English mastery (Hollie, 2011; Valdés, 2001; Schleppegrell, 2004). In short, being responsive requires that teachers know that ELLs need opportunities to use English and to feel good about doing so, as well as to use their home languages (Norton, 2000; Wright, 2010).

Indeed, Valdés (2001) suggests that teachers need to be aware of, and help foster, positive interactions and responses that involve ELLs and their fellow students. Even if they themselves are monolingual, teachers should realize how social contexts affect language use. Therefore, when students enter school, teachers can provide learning environments that value each student's unique language and support each student's development of academic language, learning, and thinking through successful interactions with ELL peers and with English speaking peers (Valdés, et al., 2005). As they do so, teachers need to consider the larger social context as well (Cummins, 2000; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Motha, 2014; Norton, 2000; Ogbu, 1978; Valdés, 2001).

Teaching vigilantly aware of the sociopolitical context. Finally, the academic literature in second language acquisition fields suggests that teachers need to be vigilantly aware of the contexts in which they teach—the social, academic, and the political context within the classroom and outside the classroom—for these contexts impact the learning and the type of support needed for ELLs in their classrooms. Researchers diligently draw attention to sociopolitical issues concerning language use in the United States, such as language discrimination (Crawford, 2000; Motha, 2014) and the lack of access to important opportunities that require English, such as particular (often better) employment or health care (Crawford, 2000; Cummins, 2000; Gandara, 2000; Norton, 2000). Of particular interest is research by Ogbu (1978) that discussed the reality of the Burakumin, a once low achieving ethnic group in Japanese schools where they were marginalized and their language was not the language of power. Ogbu (1978) found that by changing the sociopolitical context of learning for themselves and emigrating to the United States, the

Burakumin found more academic, social, and economic success. That is, the Burakumin, after leaving Japan, a society within which they achieved little success and emigrating to the United States where their social status was unknown, were able access more opportunities for growth and learning than in Japan (Ogbu, 1978). Ogbu (1978) asserted that when looked upon as subordinate, just as the Burakumin were in Japan, certain ethnic and cultural groups achieve less in schools than do their dominant culture counterparts. However, as demonstrated by the Burakumin example, previously unsuccessful groups can find access to the language of power and success by changing their sociopolitical context. Right now, decades after this study was reported, those most challenged by the sociopolitical context of the United States are ELLs, many of whom have Hispanic and South or Central American heritages. With their sociopolitical context unchanging, the challenges of better supporting their learning and success need to occur in other ways; better supporting their education through linguistically responsive teaching is just one of those ways.

Cummins (2000) pointed out that “[s]ubordinate groups that fail academically have generally been discriminated against over many generations” (p. 40) which further supports the claim that teachers need to possess sociolinguistic consciousness; that is, an understanding that language, culture, and identity are deeply interconnected and impacted by interactions (or lack thereof) with dominant-language speakers, and that the dominant language can very much act as a gatekeeper to power, social status, and other benefits often deemed part of the “American Dream.” Equally important if mainstream teachers are going to be able to keep *ELLs afloat* in U.S. classrooms is an understanding of the

sociopolitical dimensions of language. When those in power hold negative views of a cultural group or linguistic group, the marginalized group typically struggles for success within the classroom just as they do in the wider society. To be linguistically responsive, current research strongly argues that teachers need to know the discriminatory views many ELLs are up against in the United States (see Chapter One for more on this).

Cultivating such dispositions needed in order to be linguistically responsive requires the acknowledgment of personal misconceptions about language usage, ethnicity, culture, and race, even by those who are well-intentioned (Bartolomé, 2008). Such work is complicated, but necessary in education. Bartolomé (2008) emphasizes that without deep self-awareness a teacher can continue to “other” their students; that is, even though they may believe they are helping “others,” they actually are perpetuating the hegemonic practices of American schools. Bartolomé explains (2008):

[I]f a teacher has been socialized to believe that English is the only language of success in the United States and that English is the language that all Americans should speak, she might justify a decision to ban other language or dialects in her classroom for her students’ “own good.” However, if she recognizes that this notion of success and English dominance is rooted in white supremacist thinking that serves to distance some students from their communities and families, she might be willing to adopt a “both/and” stance rather than an “either/or” stance.
(p. 200)

Thus, for example, by adopting a “both/and” stance a teacher can recognize the power of English in the United States, and yet continue to support her students’ access to English

and the power it holds—higher education, access to benefits, employment—while still supporting her students’ home languages and, by doing so, their culture and linguistic identity (Bartolomé, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). As demonstrated in this summary, researchers offer many insights into how best to support the learning of ELLs.

Although the specifics of each individual researcher’s work cannot fully be developed within the confines of this paper, ideas and concepts drawn from each can help to establish a working understanding of linguistically responsive teaching, as will be seen below. From the lesson-specific use of SLA theory to the vigilant maintenance of a nuanced understanding of the sociolinguistic and sociopolitical issues impacting ELLs, there is much for general education teachers to take-up if they are going to become linguistically responsive; and, theoretically, many ways a teacher can embody linguistic responsiveness.

As a still-growing field, there is still much to be learned about how teachers become linguistically responsive. The Linguistically Responsive Teacher framework is a sound ideal to use to guide the development of opportunities for teacher educators and to enable reflection about what has been and needs to be accomplished by teacher educators and teachers. However, as teachers become linguistically responsive there may be additional aspects of their work and experience, not accounted for within this framework, that need to be considered as well. My underlying assumption is that the ideals delineated in the framework may not properly recognize all teachers for their attempts, because how teachers become linguistically responsive has a lot to do with who they are and what they bring in terms of lived-experiences to their practice. This study seeks to add knowledge

to the framework and the research discussed regarding linguistically responsive teaching. Therefore, this study is going to take a step back from anticipating findings that align—or not—with the Linguistically Responsive Teaching framework, and instead truly see what the participating teachers take-up in regard to what they were offered during their professional development program. To help identify how and why teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching may be more nuanced than a framework or current research can capture, this study's framing and analysis is guided by the concept of funds of knowledge, for it provides a research rationale for individuality that is believed necessary to look at when studying the practice of teaching. Funds of knowledge is the focus of the next section.

Funds of Knowledge

Funds of knowledge are defined by Moll, Amanti, Neff, and Gonzalez (1992) as the “historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being” (p. 133). This includes the skills, knowledge, and knowhow individuals, their families, their friends, and their community members use to manage their lives. For some, these funds of knowledge may be related to childcare, cooking, and work outside the home such as carpentry or masonry. For others, their funds of knowledge may be grounded in language or technical knowhow that support the prosperity of their home (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Moll & Greenberg, 1990). Funds of knowledge can be drawn from several lived and shared experiences that often are quite unique in comparison to classroom and school knowledge. For example, there is specific knowhow

involved in planning a week's worth of family meals on a budget such as the financial knowledge (e.g., knowing what can be purchased for everyone) and the nutritional knowledge (e.g., knowing what is the best options for everyone).

In this study, therefore, instead of simply acknowledging that individuals have unique background knowledge and experiences that impact learning, this approach emphasizes that home experiences, cultural practices, and engagement in “the activities that constitute household life” are essential means (i.e., “tools for thinking”) for negotiating new life experiences and exposure to new content and ideas and practices, such as that associated with linguistically responsive teaching in the case of the present study (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005, p. 18). Framing this study in this way recognizes that funds of knowledge are “always implicated in how one thinks and develops” wherever an individual may be with regard to place and time (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005, p.18). This position is deeply concordant with this study's intentions and, thus, makes for an ideal framing through which to view the study's design and data. Fundamentally, funds of knowledge is a sociocultural way of looking at knowledge and this is examined in the following section.

Vygotsky's sociocultural learning theory. The development of funds of knowledge was strongly influenced by Vygotsky's sociocultural learning theory which posits that individuals learn in social contexts (Scott & Palincsar, 2009; Vygotsky, 1978). “Sociocultural theory” is not a single, monolithic theory, but is characterized by the important recognition that individuals learn socially through various interactions with others within a particular context. The original ideas about the “socialness” of learning

put forth by Vygotsky (1978) have been expanded upon by several theorists, all of whom have maintained the central tenets of his theory: individuals learn through social interactions; language and other semiotic tools (e.g., mathematics and art) facilitate learning; and the context within which learning takes place impacts the learning that occurs. These central tenets influenced the way this study was designed and the data that were collected.

Fundamental to Vygotsky's original theory was the belief that social learning, that which is learned through interactions with others, leads to individual learning (Scott & Palincsar, 2013; Vygotsky, 1978). For example, a young baby learning language first does so through interactions with an adult before independently employing the language learned. Often, the social interactions that lead to learning (e.g., babbling with mommy) by the individual (e.g., baby) occur with the help of "more knowledgeable others" (e.g., mommy) (Vygotsky, 1978). A more knowledgeable other supports the learner within what Vygotsky (1978) termed the "the zone of proximal development."

Vygotsky's concept of "zone of proximal development" (ZPD) describes the "space" between what students know and can do independently and that which they are only able to achieve with the help of "more knowledgeable others" by means of supportive social interactions. The gap between what the individual can and cannot yet do is just large enough to allow for learning growth. For example, a child learning a new reading strategy, such as using picture clues, may meet with the teacher to practice reading a story with pictures purposefully placed to support text reading. Such meetings

occur until the student is able to pick up a similar book and employ the strategy of using picture cues to help comprehend text without direct support from the teacher.

Socioculturally speaking, Vygotsky (1978) explained, individuals use their own unique semiotic tools—language, mathematical concepts, etc.—to interpret new experiences in social practice and make sense of new content as they also reflect upon what was once known. Through this sense-making process people think and develop cognitively; that is, they come to know more about particular content and themselves in relation to others, content, and experiences. Each newly understood concept, bit of knowhow, experience, and knowledge is then brought to the next moment and through the same process of adaptation and assimilation individuals continue to learn and grow cognitively. Knowledge continually readjusts with each new moment.

In the previous example, it is likely that the teacher brings knowledge of teaching reading, an interest in helping the child learn successfully, and the teaching skills to do so; while the student brings developing knowledge of how to read, an interest in learning to read, and emergent literacy skills. The personal histories (e.g., experiences with text), cultures (e.g., family literacy practices), and values (e.g., the belief that a teacher should be a facilitator of learning) each participant brings to the learning situation also influence social learning outcomes. These “social” and “cultural” dimensions of learning are well-established, interrelated aspects of all sociocultural theories and have been expanded upon in academic work subsequent to Vygotsky’s original work, especially as theorists from fields other than psychology built upon and reworked them.

Key to particular ideas explored in this study (i.e., take-up of linguistically responsive teaching) was Vygotsky's sociocultural learning theory and specifically the notion of *development*. As described by Vygotsky (1978), development is "a complex dialectical process characterized by periodicity, unevenness in the development of different functions, metamorphosis or qualitative transformation of one form into another, intertwining of external and internal factors, and adaptive process" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 166). Particular to the present study, teachers participating in the Northeastern Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute program were brought together to learn (socially) with other teachers, a set of mentors, and the director of Northeastern Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute. They were engaged in the same learning opportunities within the same context, but their "development" was respectfully expected to be unique due to the complex nature of development as discussed by Vygotsky (1978).

Development thus was depicted as a uniquely complex process and this study respects that and further explores such. It was anticipated that the individual teachers and their teaching would be impacted differently due to a specific kind of "tools for thinking" they brought to the learning opportunities that can be described readily in terms of their "funds of knowledge" (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005, p. 18; see also: Moll & Greenberg, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978). Thus, I argue that one useful way of unpacking the complexity of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching is to consider the "funds of knowledge," of each teacher as they take-up linguistically responsive teaching. Before discussing how and why funds of knowledge frames this study well, there is a need to articulate a clear definition of *knowledge* as it will be used in this study.

Defining knowledge. When developed initially by Moll and his colleagues in the 1980s, the concept of funds of knowledge purposely used the word “knowledge” to emphasize the value of experiential knowhow and lived experiences believed to be important in an individual’s ability “to know” or “to learn” at any moment in time, especially in classrooms where human connections and interactions play a significant role in knowing, developing, and learning (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). However, preference for a funds of knowledge conception of knowledge is best understood in comparison to other more recognizable notions of knowledge.

Epistemologists, those who study knowledge, have primarily concerned themselves with propositional knowledge that is best understood as knowledge of facts, or an understanding that a particular belief is true, and justified to be so, based on evidence from experience, from knowhow, and from thoughtful dialogue with others. Epistemologically speaking, knowledge comprises “well-justified true beliefs” for nothing is certain, but much can be justified through discussion, observation, and analysis (Gettier, 1963; Pritchard, 2007). Post-structuralists deliberately challenge the absolute certainty often associated with knowledge. By definition, post-structuralism developed as a response to “structuralism,” which was an intellectual movement that claimed the relationship between the abstract and reality could be mediated by structure (e.g., the structure sometimes unconsciously produced by the author of particular genres of literature make the text more comprehensible to those who read that particular genre often). Such structures allow for more to be readily known (e.g., a *Star Wars* fan might readily understand *Star Trek*) or at least enables new content to be painlessly organized

and therefore, be understood (Angermuller, 2015). Supporters of poststructuralism pushed individuals to think beyond “structure” and resist the idea that human culture and knowledge could be easily and neatly bounded.

A poststructural mindset critiques what others have deemed known as “truth” about knowledge. This mindset argues that what others often try to see as unassailable knowledge is influenced by personal and social interpretation and, therefore, never pure or justifiable *knowledge per se* (Angermuller, 2015). Quite possibly an epistemological or poststructuralist debate about what is truly known by teachers may be of interest in another study, but such intellectual debates would only slow the forward progress of this particular inquiry. Theoretically, these views of knowledge offer much to think about, but for the purposes of this study, knowledge needed to be discussed in a more tangible manner, especially if “take-up” of content associated with linguistically responsive teaching on the part of teachers was to be the focus. The concept of take-up relies on the assumption that humans, teachers in this case, are always in possession of knowledge that shifts and wanes in certain aspects, but develops overall.

Interestingly, many researchers acknowledge that there is specific teacher knowledge that educators possess. Shulman (1985), for example, examined various types of what he called “teacher knowledge” and developed a widely regarded concept concerning pedagogical content knowledge. This concept describes a combination of various types of teacher knowledge (e.g., knowledge of content, knowledge of student learning, and knowledge of teacher practice and pedagogy) that educators employ in their work. Pedagogical content knowledge, for example, includes everything that teachers

“know” as they teach—content, curriculum, and the knowhow to represent such for students so they can learn (1986). In short, Shulman argued that teachers, in order to be effective professionals, must know a lot about their subject matter and how to make it accessible in order for students to learn. Again, this view of knowledge offers unique opportunities to discuss the teaching profession and what teachers do in general, but this is not the focus of the present study. This study focuses on the nuances of teacher practice regarding linguistically responsive teaching and embraces the individual ways each teacher is expected to come to know how to be linguistically responsive.

Clearly, looking at this small sampling of the ways in which knowledge can be conceived demonstrates that knowledge is a rather complicated concept to define. However, for the purposes of this study, knowledge is deemed to be the sum total of all experiences, practices, and knowhow individuals have with them at a particular time and bring with them to each new moment. Knowledge in this way is fluid, malleable (aspects of it may possibly be lost), but generally speaking individuals always have knowledge. Therefore, with the addition of an explicit conception of just what knowledge “is” in a tangible sense, “funds of knowledge” became an ideal concept with which to work. A funds of knowledge orientation assumes people already and always “have” knowledge and actively employ such to help them learn *more*. Rather than be embroiled in an epistemological debate about knowledge and truth, the funds of knowledge concept remains a more workable, usable way to study the “take-up” of ideas, content, and actions from a learning opportunity, and resonates with the sociocultural framing behind this study. There is value to such an investigation in the world of teacher education.

As teacher educators continue to facilitate their knowledge as well as the skills and orientations necessary to be responsive and successful teachers for all students, many questions still remain. Fairbanks, Duffy, Faircloth, He, Levin, Rohr, and Stein (2010) wrote a conceptual piece in which they explored possible reasons for the many differences documented in the teaching of their preservice students once they become teachers. Their experiences as researchers and teacher educators led them to postulate that the content of teacher education programs alone is not necessarily sufficient to predict the development of effective and responsive classroom teachers. Ultimately guided by the realization that “[e]ven though we [Fairbanks and colleagues] introduce students to similar professional knowledge of effective practice, learning theory, instructional strategies, and the like, we see them putting their knowledge to work in sharply different ways when we observe their teaching” (Fairbanks et al, 2010, p. 61), each of the authors hypothesized about the importance of teacher beliefs, vision, belonging, and identity in shaping teacher practice—all worthwhile elements to study further. However, I am choosing to hypothesize that many of these differences in actualization of professional knowledge are based upon each teacher’s funds of knowledge.

As a white, middle class female teacher who went into teaching to make a difference, I am easily type-cast as the stereotypical do-gooder who is too different ethnically and culturally than the students who need good teachers to be effective. Yet, I believe after two decades of practice that I, and those who join me as members of that statistical category, can be successful teachers for *all* students regardless of their

language, culture, and heritage. Finally, I believe that what makes a good teacher is very individualized in terms of what each teacher is bringing to her profession. After reading and researching funds of knowledge as it was originally conceived in regard to students, I began to formulate the idea that I and all teachers also have unique funds of knowledge that impact our teaching and our take-up of what is required to be successful teachers.

Preference for funds of knowledge. The concept of funds of knowledge as employed in this study was cultivated within the work of Moll and his colleagues over the course of several key studies (i.e., Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Moll & Greenberg, 1990) culminating, so far, in the Funds of Knowledge project (2005). The formulation of this 2005 study, and therefore, its framing theory, was a collaboration among researchers from different fields and viewpoints. Gonzalez, an anthropologist, drew from prior ethnographic work done for the Tuscon Project which, in turn, had been designed to study nonmarket systems of exchange within a Mexican-origin community in Tuscon, Arizona. This anthropological study led to a deeper understanding of “the transformative effect of knowing the community in all of its breadth and depth” and laid the foundation for the “methodological and theoretical bases of the Funds of Knowledge project” (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005, p. 3).

During a prior educational research study into the literacy education of bilingual students, Moll and Greenberg (1990) sought to develop more successful literacy experiences for bilingual students in schools by tapping into student, family, and community “resources,” especially their home language use and abilities, and to shift teacher thinking from what students *do not have and/or do* (deficit thinking) to what

students *can do and/or have* (positive-resource oriented thinking). Out of this combined body of work, funds of knowledge came to be seen as more than “prior experiences,” “home resources,” and culture. Pertinent to my own study, home languages other than English became recognized as valuable aspects of each individual’s funds of knowledge.

To clarify, funds of knowledge is not a neutral concept. It developed out of a need to push back against the rhetoric, dominant especially in the United States in the 1980s when Moll and colleagues noticed that certain populations of school children in the Southwest (i.e., Latino/Latina, Mexican immigrants) were labeled as students who “did not have” or “lacked” knowledge (Fitts & Gross, 2012; Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll & Greenberg, 1990). Instead, funds of knowledge embraced the human reality that everyone has knowledge because everyone lives and thrives. That knowledge may not be a perfect match, however, for the institutionally valued and institutionalized knowledge of school (e.g., what is testable via standardized tests; particular versions of historical events), but that was why acknowledging students’ funds of knowledge became important in the world of education, for much was missed regarding what students know when school knowledge remained the chief criterion for judging what counted as knowledge. Funds of knowledge became and still are seen as the means individuals use to survive that are unique to all individuals, because no two people experience life in the same way.

Funds of knowledge are not stagnant bits of prior knowledge and memories, but instead are an ever-present, ever-changing accumulation of knowhow that individuals draw upon to navigate their current situations (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll,

Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 200; Moll & Greenberg, 1990). For example, a student who is in charge of planning and preparing the family meals each night relies on resources specific to cost management, healthy eating, time-management, and all the skills and knowledge involved in the act of cooking—recipe development, portion planning, and a multitude of other resources that are likely not necessary in a classroom, but are very necessary and important to the family’s daily survival. A socioculturally informed concept identified by Moll and Greenberg (1990) and further developed by Gonzales, Moll, and Amanti (2005), funds of knowledge developed out of this theory to emphasize the type of knowledge that was overlooked in schools (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll & Greenberg, 1990).

The goals of the Funds of Knowledge project (2005) were to involve teacher-participants in a process of researching their students’ funds of knowledge, provide facilitated time for the participant-teachers to makes sense of their unique home findings together, and support these teacher-participants as they adjusted instruction to create space in their learning environments for students to employ and leverage their funds of knowledge within classroom learning opportunities (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). By prioritizing the importance of students’ funds of knowledge as valuable *resources* for learning, participating educators were able to tap into these outside-school resources and better formulate learning opportunities for their students. For example, one teacher-participant who taught a second grade class that included Hispanic and Native American students created and implemented a learning module based on the knowhow and skill involved in work of carpentry. Not only did her students “flourish” because “what they

brought from home [funds of knowledge] surrounded and supported their learning,” (Sandoval-Taylor, 2005, p. 162-163), but she also explained how the “planning became the heart of the experience,” which speaks directly to the importance of the actual act of discovering what each student’s funds of knowledge are and how these can positively inform and shape classroom practice (Sandoval-Taylor, 2005, p.163).

Beyond the Funds of Knowledge Project (2005). Funds of knowledge usefully recognizes the “in the moment knowledge” the teachers in my study gained through lived-experiences and everyday knowhow as well as what each of them brought to this learning experience, too. Much of the research that employs a funds of knowledge framing focuses on the funds of knowledge of students (Mantei & Kervin, 2014) and how teachers can better prepare instruction by accessing (Aguirre, Turner, Bartell, Kalinec-Craig, Foote, Roth McDuffie, & Drake, 2013) and/or acknowledging (McLaughlin & Barton, 2013) their students funds of knowledge. Research in this area identifies how teachers can learn about their students’ funds of knowledge (e.g., Mercado, 2005), how teachers can use their students’ funds of knowledge to plan relevant instruction (e.g., Amanti, 2005; Sandoval-Taylor, 2005), and the benefits that the students receive when their funds of knowledge are recognized (e.g., Sugarman, 2010). Often such studies focus on ELLs and their home language as knowledge resources and funds of knowledge (e.g., Haneda, & Wells, 2012; Rowe & Fain, 2013).

There exists a small, but growing pool of studies that address the teachers’ funds of knowledge (Siefert, Salas, & D'amico, 2015). Some recognize teacher or preservice language learning as part of teachers’ funds of knowledge (e.g., Coleman, 2015; Safford,

& Kelly, 2010), while others simply recognize that *all* individuals have funds of knowledge that enable their learning and, in the case of teachers, their teaching unique to who they are. In fact, research by Hedges (2012), which is further discussed below, considered the role of *teacher* funds of knowledge. What most appeals to me is that the results of each study reminds teacher educators and society that teachers are indeed individuals, often times doing the best they can with what they have come to know. Much of this knowledge and its impact on practice can be understood by better understanding the individuals.

Hedges (2012), for example, explicitly extended the concept of funds of knowledge to that of *teachers'* funds of knowledge. This expansion allowed for a focused look at how teachers with very specific and powerful funds of knowledge chose to teach in relation to their specific contexts. Hedges (2012) argued that all new content was “filtered” through a teacher’s funds of knowledge; that is, “formal, research-based knowledge was filtered through funds of knowledge as a well-established form of personal knowledge in teacher decision-making” (p. 20). This argument raises awareness of the impact of teacher’s own funds of knowledge on their practice and pedagogy. Thus, I am purposely taking a conceptual stance that acknowledges that *all* individuals possess important knowledge-resources that they bring to each new learning opportunity. As a white, middle class woman I am confident that I have specific funds of knowledge that have enabled me to be the educator I am today.

Important to each use of this theory is the fact that teachers have individualized life-learned knowledge to bring to their teaching profession and understanding such can

help teacher educators better support the development of teachers; in this case, of those who want to be more linguistically responsive. It is important to emphasize, however, the present study maintains the view that funds of knowledge remain actively present as usable tools for learning, not merely filters to make sense of incoming content. Moreover, in regard to this current study, the entirety of funds of knowledge, especially those related to language and language learning for each participant are of interest, not just those that directly relate to their work as teachers. In order to avoid narrowing the concept of funds of knowledge to something that seems only relevant to the educational world, this study remains true to the way in which funds of knowledge was originally conceived (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) and seeks to understand how the past experiences and lived knowhow of teachers impacts their take-up of linguistically responsive teaching.

Pertinent to this study, funds of knowledge are neither always positive nor always negative, but they absolutely change and shift as individuals go about the act of living day to day and interacting. New experiences, content, and interactions lead to input that becomes accommodated into one's funds of knowledge. In this study, understanding each of the teacher-participant's funds of knowledge added insight into the unique take-up of linguistically responsive teaching by each teacher in light of shared learning and experiential opportunities designed to better prepare teachers to be linguistically responsive. Proponents of funds of knowledge also accept that "[s]ense-making processes may be contradictory or ambiguous" (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005, p. 9) and that sentiment resonates with this study's conceptual use of *take-up* as presented in Chapter One. In lieu of studying the psychologically complex concept of *development* to its full

capacity, for that would take the focus away from the goal at hand, this study is more concerned with the actual take-up of linguistically responsive teacher that can be identified within or by each of the teachers once they have been involved in opportunities designed to enhance their teaching and understanding of ELLs.

Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of the important concepts and theory that guided this study, its analysis, and its presentation. Take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was presented as a more nuanced way of looking at how the teachers may embody linguistically responsive teaching in a way that respects the fact that doing so is a complicated goal. The use of learning opportunities to explain what the teachers engage within as they learn about linguistically responsive teaching was also discussed as were the guiding theory of sociocultural learning theory and two significant framing concepts; they are linguistically responsive teaching and funds of knowledge. All work well for this study because this research was designed to seek a more nuanced understanding of what it means to be linguistically responsive and in doing so substantiate attempts at being linguistically responsive that do not necessarily align with frameworks and research.

Although each of these theories and concepts were explained separately, their complementary nature will become more apparent as the study is presented and will afford a better understanding of what teachers can accomplish when they seek to become more linguistically responsive teachers. The next chapter, Chapter Three: Methodology provides a detailed overview and discussion of this qualitative study's design. A thorough discussion of this methodology's rationale, tools, participants, and contexts is included as

well as clear understanding of data analysis and time-table. All methodological concerns and the ways in which they were addressed are clarified with the intent of assuring the reader that this study and its findings are indeed worth reading.

Chapter Three: Methodology

This chapter provides a detailed discussion of the qualitative methodology used for this study. The chapter begins by explaining why a small qualitative study was developed and employed to provide research-based answers to the following question:

While following general education early childhood teachers through a formal learning program and into their classrooms, what “take-up” from the range of opportunities designed to help this small group of teachers become more linguistically responsive in their classrooms seems to be demonstrated?

The chapter then continues with a systematic reporting of the design that begins with a general overview of the study, followed by a brief explanation of participant selection, and then a short description of each of the four participants and their respective teaching contexts (the majority of data regarding take-up was collected at each participant’s school). Next, a detailed overview of the data sources and tools used in this study is provided—i.e., non-participant observations (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Spradley, 1980), semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2014), conversations with a purpose (Burgess, 1984; Cole, 2005), and document data (Merriam, 2009)—and how they enabled this study to remain true to its sociocultural framework and funds of knowledge orientation. An overview of the data analysis process follows and, finally, this chapter concludes with a necessary acknowledgement and discussion of ethical concerns and how I addressed them.

Rationale for this Qualitative Study

As explained in Chapter One, the intent of this dissertation was to document and examine, as far as possible, the take-up of early childhood teachers after engaging in opportunities specifically geared towards preparing them to teach in linguistically responsive ways. Take-up has been defined as an individual's manifestations of new ideas, practices, reflective stances, linguistic choices, responses, or actions drawn from particular opportunities emphasizing linguistically responsive teaching as one's own by shifting previous practice to reflect new revelations. Considering that the research regarding take-up (as discussed in Chapter Two) suggested that take-up would not be a linear process of change, but a process best described as "gradual and halting" with some forward movement, some resistance, some moments of clarity, and some confusion (see Gere, Buehler, & Haviland, 2009, p. 843), a study that allowed for individual variations in kind and depth of take-up, and acknowledged the uncertainty of such manifestations, was meticulously designed. Each aspect of this study's design was thoughtfully based on research regarding high-quality qualitative data collection methodology and analysis, the rationale for which is the subject of the next paragraph.

Qualitative studies can take the form of a number of well-recognized designs or approaches (e.g., case study, ethnography). However, this study remains best understood as a qualitative study influenced by specific designs and methodologies developed specifically to address my question. For example, this study could not work as a case study because case studies focus on individuals or well-bounded programs or institutions, and each individual teacher was not the focus of my inquiry, and neither was the

professional development institute they attended. Instead, this study sought to document more about an emerging process—not the specifics of individual attempts at—take-up of linguistically responsive teaching (see criteria for case study design in Creswell, 2005; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Merriam, 2009). However, semi-structured interviews often used in case study work were an integral source of data collection in this qualitative study. Conducting ethnography also was not a logical choice because my focus was not the culture of the group or the social and cultural interrelations within a group (see criteria for conducting an ethnography in Creswell, 2005; Merriam, 2009). Understanding the possible manifestations of take-up as a larger conceptual occurrence trumped studying the culture and social interrelationships of the group. However, data collection methods derived from ethnographic work, particularly field-based observations, were influential in the design of this study because the rich data collected using such observations allowed me to carefully watch how the teachers made sense of their work after their engagement with content specific to the practices, skills, knowledge, and dispositions of linguistically responsive teaching encountered in their professional development institute (for more on this institute, see Chapter Four). Therefore, although this study does not “fit” a prescribed “type” of qualitative research, this study was uniquely designed with knowledge of various qualitative methodological choices in mind in order to address my study’s goals.

Fittingly, Merriam (2009) explains, “Qualitative researchers [such as myself] are interested in understanding how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experience” (p. 5) and this helps to

explain the rationale behind why researchers choose to conduct more generalized, yet purposely formulated qualitative research. To clarify, a qualitative design often incorporates the use of qualitative tools of interviews and observations to enable researchers to construct meaning as they seek to better understand a particular phenomenon or concept of interest that does not have a readily defined meaning, but requires thoughtful interpretation. This study fits well with this definition because its primary goal was to understand how teacher take-up manifests as different teachers make sense of their experiences as participants in the Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute in relation to their own funds of knowledge and current teaching context and experiences. Hence, a research design was specially tailored for this study and thoughtfully planned that does not easily fit pre-established designs and approaches.

To conduct a qualitative study, I, the researcher, necessarily thought inductively about the data to be gathered, asked what I believed to be good questions of the participants related to the overall research question, carefully observed the participants in context, maintained a questioning eye in relation to the concept of take-up, and ensured that the study's design remained true to the essence of robust qualitative research (Merriam, 2009; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). As affirmed by Lankshear and Knobel (2009), "qualitative research [such as this] [is] centrally concerned with how people experience, understand, interpret and participate in their social and cultural worlds" (p. 61), and this study design reflected these primary interests. When conceived, this study was centrally concerned with how public preschool teachers would "experience, understand, interpret, and participate" in learning opportunities to increase their

linguistically responsive teaching made available throughout the institute and how they subsequently participated in their various “social and cultural” worlds (i.e., the classrooms and schools in which they work) throughout the process of “take-up.” A brief overview below introduces the specifics of this study’s methodology.

Study Overview

In this qualitative study the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching of four urban preschool teachers—Adrianna, Epiphany, Carley, and Lucia—was documented and thoughtfully analyzed using a funds of knowledge framework. The five month duration of data collection for this study was determined by balancing the goals of completing, submitting, and defending a dissertation in a timely manner with the desire to allow time for sense-making on the part of the participants to occur. During and after data collection completion, analysis and writing were conducted. While a period of observation longer than five months would have been ideal, the strictures of needing to complete my dissertation in a timely manner precluded such a timeline.

Data collection—the details of which will be discussed in the next section—began in August 2015 and took place in two phases. The first phase was circumscribed by the summer institute. During these three days, data were gathered about opportunities that supported the linguistically responsiveness of the early childhood teachers, for it was from these opportunities and the ideas suggested by them that the participants would begin to take-up linguistically responsive teaching. To do so effectively, full-day observations were conducted with special focus on the study participants; conversations with a purpose took place; and document data were collected that pertained to the

directors, Dalia and Maria, and their work, as well as to the four teachers who volunteered for the study. At this time, Dalia and Maria were referred to as director-participants, because their take-up was not the focus of this study; however, their program development and actualizations were key to providing the context for this study (see Chapter Four). Adrianna, Carley, Epiphany, and Lucia were best labeled as teacher-participants.

The second phase of data collection began in late August after the institute was complete. These data mainly focused on the teacher-participants at this time, but Dalia and Maria continued to provide data throughout this second phase as well. The teacher-participants were observed during teleconferences (if they participated) and in their classrooms; they were interviewed approximately once a month until the end of December; they participated in conversations with a purpose usually on the days they were observed; and they also volunteered pertinent document data (e.g., lesson plans, parent correspondences). Due to changing schedules beyond each teacher-participant's control the monthly goal for interviews and observations needed to be flexible. For example, the third round of observations took place in December instead of November due to the increased demand placed upon the teachers by administrators to make time for whole school activities. During this second phase of data collection, the director-participants, Dalia and Maria, were observed during the teleconference calls; were interviewed twice each; and continued to share relevant data during conversations with a purpose and by sharing document data related to the teacher-participants and/or the program's undertakings (e.g., handouts to supplement teleconference calls and pre and

posttests of the teachers-participants). Below is a chart that summarizes the data collection timetable followed in this study (see Table 1). The study specifics follow, beginning with participant selection, and a description of each participant is.

Table 1
Data Collection Timetable

		Institute Observations (3 days—eight hours each day) Phase 1	One-on-one Interviews (Approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour each at each teacher’s school and directors’ office) Phase 2	Classroom Observations (Teachers’ classrooms) Phase 2	Teleconference Observations	Conversations with Purpose (Institute site, directors’ office, and teacher’s school) Phase 1 and 2	Document Data (completed application, lesson plans, observations by Dalia, letters/emails sent to student’s home) Phase 1 and 2
Teacher Participant	Adrianna	August	August October November December	September October December	October December	August September October November December	August September October November December
	Carley	August	August October November December	September October December		August September October November December	August September October November December
	Epiphany	August	August October November December	September October December	October December	August September October November December	August September October November December
	Lucia	August	August October November December	September October December		August September October November December	August September October November December
Director Participants	Maria	August	August September		October December		
	Dalia	August	August September		October December		

Participant Selection

In direct support of this study, Maria, the director of the summer institute, graciously included my data collection needs and the intent of my study as part of her initial pitch to her program participants in a letter and email prior to the institute. She believed my study fit naturally into what the participants were already expected to do. By enrolling in the program the participants already agreed to provide Maria with information pertaining to their current and developing understanding of cultural competency and the teaching of ELLs; they also agreed to monthly observations and assessments as part of the program; and they agreed to provide continual feedback to Maria throughout the year through discussions with mentors and the completion of surveys. These agreements were always a part of participating in this program. Participating in my study required them to provide data about their own teacher take-up in similar ways since observations and interviews were the chief means of data collection. Unlike the program-conducted observations they had already agreed to, my extra observations were not evaluative and were to be done during times selected by the teacher-participants. This aspect of my data design did not ask much more of the teachers beyond their agreement with Maria. However, my research interviews did ask more of their time, so my own data collection agreement with them allowed them to pick the time and place for each interview and to end their study participation at any time for any reason.

According to my original study design (outlined in my proposal), the participants were to be selected prior to the summer institute itself in order to interview and observe

them prior to their participation in the summer institute. However, due to unforeseen events, this was not possible. The issues which held up participant selection were two-fold. Maria, the director of the program, had an urgent family matter to attend to most of the summer and the program's funding took longer than expected to formalize; these events delayed the program's selection process and timetable. Consequently, the selection of teachers was made at the start of the summer institute instead of prior to the end of the preceding school year. This required some minor adjustments on my part in terms of when to start data collection and selection deliberation, but nonetheless four teacher-participants were identified and data collection began.

A funds of knowledge approach to this investigation warranted that each teacher-participant be viewed as an individual with unique past and present lived-experiences that provided potential resources for growth (i.e., part of her unique tools for thinking) as she grappled with new information, practices and knowledge. This study's focus on take-up and generating a sense of what that may look like, guided me to look for participants with unique characteristics and experiences. To effectively study take-up, "maximum variation" of willing participants was sought to ensure that participants were "chosen that possess[ed] or exhibit[ed] a very wide range of characteristics or behaviors respectively, in connection with a particular issue [teacher take-up]" (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011, p. 157). The rationale for such was based on the fact that this study was trying to generate information about a relatively new and variable concept: take-up. As a reminder (see Chapter Two for more detail), within the context of this study, "take-up" is the individual act of adopting new content, ideas, practices, reflective stances, linguistic

choices, responses, behaviors or actions as one's own by incorporating one or more into his/her current reality that is linked in some way to a specific experience or learning event. As was found to be true in previous studies of take-up regarding cultural consciousness, this process was expected to be unique to each individual even though the content from which take-up was to be drawn from was the same (Buehler, Gere, Dallavis, & Haviland, 2009; Gere, Buehler, & Haviland, 2009).

Although previous research regarding take-up speaks of “forward momentum” and “backward slides” this study prefers to use the metaphorical reference of ebbs and flows to capture the inconsistent, yet persistent nature of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. Just as the ocean water ebbs and flows in response to other natural occurrences—tides, gravitational pull of the moon, wind—but does not just disappear and reappear, teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching changes in strength and direction, but always remains in motion and do not simply disappear and reappear. The momentum of take-up may change direction, strength, and appearance, but take-up for these women, once put in motion was constantly ebbing and flowing. By including teachers from different schools who embodied as much diversity as the original pool afforded, this qualitative study strove to carefully document multiple demonstrations of take-up as they ebbed and flowed. Therefore, gathering information from the most diverse sources was an ideal for this study.

Out of twenty-eight institute participants (14 partners from 14 early childhood classrooms and nine schools) all of whom were female, four women volunteered for this study. The volunteer pool was not ideal in terms of providing potential options from

which to choose, but the four who volunteered did offer enough uniqueness to keep this study's goals attainable and were thus selected. The inclusion of all of those who volunteered to be participants enabled a chance to discover and identify as many aspects of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching as possible. The original proposal suggested six participants, but clearly stated that the project would be successful with four. Seeking six was a number based on research that suggests planning for possible attrition (Creswell, 2005; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Merriam, 2009). Fortunately, all four who volunteered and were subsequently selected, remained committed to the data collection process until its end in December 2015.

According to Creswell (2011) most qualitative studies rely on purposeful sampling; that is, "intentionally" selecting individuals from a particular site, in order to learn about a particular phenomenon or concept. The success of the study, however, relies on choosing participants who are "information rich" (p. 204). In this situation where the participant selection options were limited, my intention for ensuring my participant pool was indeed "information rich" was to substantiate that the study would indeed be worthwhile with the participants who volunteered. That is, I wanted to make sure that their participation in the study was a good use of each participant's time and that the four participants offered me plenty of diverse perspectives to warrant continuing with this study (Creswell, 2011). Fortuitously, the participants did indeed offer diversity in terms of their ethnicity, linguistic backgrounds, teaching experience, schools of employment, willingness to participate in the professional development, years already spent teaching in

a classroom, and age (discussed in more detail below). This certainly made for a rich pool of difference across as many of these dimensions as possible.

As stated above, all of the participants in this year's program were female. Interestingly, over the years few men have taken part in the Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute—a fact that most likely speaks to the reality that most early childhood educators in this area of the United States are female (Bourn, 2015). Remarkably, none of the teacher-participants and even more curiously few (less than five) of the program attendees identified themselves as white. This is actually contrary to research which shows that the majority of early childhood teachers are white women (Goldenberg, 2013; Marx, 2004; Segall & Garrett, 2013). Two explanations may shed light on these interesting demographics: (1) Attendees for the institute were solicited from urban school districts in the northeastern part of the United States, and (2) the program's focus on global diversity may have been of interest to those who self-identified as non-white such as Latina, African American, Asian, and Indian.

All of the participants taught four year old children in preschools in the same northeast urban school district. Two of the teacher-participants, Epiphany and Adrianna, were lead teachers who worked with one aide in their classrooms (the aides participated in the program, but not this study). Epiphany and Adrianna were fully responsible for lesson planning, student assessments, teaching, and directing the aide as to how to help meet those goals. They had their own classrooms in different schools. Two teacher-participants, Lucia and Carley, formed a teaching team. Although Lucia was more experienced and took the lead, Carley helped with planning, daily assessments, and

typical teaching responsibilities. They worked in the same classroom, but in a different school from either of the other two participants. Once these four teachers consented to be part of my study, agreement from the administrators of the three schools was sought and received. This collectively enabled a smooth transition from phase one to phase two of data collection. These three unique classroom sites for data collection will be discussed below after the participant overviews.

All names, school names, and district names are pseudonyms. In fact, all school statistics were taken from each school's website, but these websites were not cited in the text so they could not be identified. However, although pseudonyms were used, each individual and site could easily be identified through a dedicated Google search and/or other simple investigations. Therefore, I discussed these concerns with Maria, her colleagues, the participants, their administrators, and my critical colleagues. All agreed that due to the non-evaluative nature of this study, possible identification did not pose a threat to anyone involved. Furthermore, they also concurred that including specific information about the program in light of the overall study's goal trumped any need to keep the true identity of the program and/or the attendees un-identifiable.

Table 2 below summarizes the teacher-participant's characteristics as well as the characteristics of their teaching contexts.

Table 2.
Pertinent Participant Demographics

	Gender/Age	Heritage/Language(s) spoken	Teaching Experience	School Context	Personal History of Interest
Adrianna	Female/Mid 40s	Ecuadorian American English/Spanish	20+ Years Masters in Educational Leadership	Urban preschool Public More than 90% of student qualify for free lunch African American, Hispanic student population	Immigrated as a young teen. Enrolled in English as Second Language classes
Carley	Female/Early 20s	African American English	New (less than 5 years)	Urban preschool Public More than 90% of student qualify for free lunch African American, Hispanic student population	Teaches and lives in the same school district in which she grew up in.
Epiphany	Female/Mid 30s	African American English	10-15 Years Masters in Inclusive Education	Urban preschool Public More than 90% of student qualify for free lunch African American, Hispanic, Asian student population	Teaches and lives in the same school district in which she grew up in.
Lucia	Female/Mid 30s	Guatemalan American English	10-15 Years	Urban preschool Public More than 90% of student qualify for free lunch African American, Hispanic student population	Began elementary school speaking Spanish. Enrolled in English as Second Language classes. Lost ability to speak Spanish

Adrianna. At the time of this study, Adrianna, a self-described “American-Ecuadorian” was in her early forties and had been a preschool teacher for 18 years. Adrianna had three children. Her oldest was 21 years old. Her youngest was 10 years old. Adrianna is bilingual in English and Spanish. She was born in Ecuador and immigrated to the United States when she was a young teenager. When she enrolled in high school, she was classified as an English as a Second Language (ESL) student. Subsequently, Adrianna earned a Master’s Degree in Educational Leadership, a dual degree in Spanish and Early Childhood Education, a P-3 Teacher’s Certification, and a standard supervisor certificate. Currently she is teaching four year olds at Urban City public preschool.

Adrianna described herself as a “lifelong learner” who wanted to “continue teaching and making a difference in the lives of children” (Adrianna, Letter of Application to the Program, May 2015). Adrianna was described by colleagues as a leader who collaborates well with children, community members, colleagues and parents. One colleague specifically noted that “her [Adrianna’s] ability to connect with her students and her talent at teaching is truly superior” (Adrianna, Resume, 2015). Adrianna spoke fondly of her teenage years when one principal “took [Adrianna] under her wing” and helped her enroll in high school (against the wishes of her mother who wanted her to work instead). She said that as a teacher “I want to return back what she was able to do for me” (Adrianna, Interview 1, August 30, 2016). Her “pay-it-forward” rationale for good teaching and her determination to do what is right for students played a major role in her decision to attend the summer institute and her existing interest in becoming linguistically responsive.

Adrianna teaches at a community-based, National Association for the Education of Young Children certified, urban preschool; one of three schools serving approximately 255 public education students. The school adopted Creative Curriculum (i.e., a published preschool curriculum designed to help teachers employ best practices for early childhood education as they address important early childhood goals) and boasts a culturally relevant education. The school is overseen by a larger community-based organization that was established in 1972 to address the “social unrest in the late 1960’s . . . as an activist, community-based, grassroots organization committed to empowering the marginalized Puerto Rican and Latino community” (School website, 2015).

Adrianna had 15 four-year-old students and was supported by one aide with whom she has a “great working relationship” (Adrianna, Interview 1, August 30, 2016). Most of the children Adrianna had in her class qualified for free lunches, spoke English and/or Spanish, and self-identified as either African-American or Hispanic. Four were classified as Special Needs and had IEPs; two spoke Spanish only; three spoke Spanish and English; and one spoke mostly English in school, but knows his mother’s African language. When Adrianna volunteered for the summer institute she had only been teaching at her current school for 6 months. She spent most of her 18 year long career at her previous school of employment. Adrianna applied to the program so that she could “continue doing my best for the students” (Adrianna, Application to The Northeastern Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute, May 2015).

Epiphany. At the time of this study, Epiphany identified as an African-American, monolingual English speaking woman in her thirties and had been a preschool teacher for

13 years. She had a ten year old daughter who attended a charter school in the same neighborhood. Epiphany spoke with concern about her Hispanic-African American niece who was nearly (and mistakenly) classified as “Learning Disabled” due to her inability to speak English fluently. Epiphany grew up in the same city and school district in which she was teaching and living and was glad to be a teacher there (Epiphany, Interview 1, August 29, 2015). Epiphany received a Master’s Degree in Inclusive Early Childhood Education, Teacher of Students with Disabilities Certification, and a P-3 Teacher’s Certification.

Epiphany reported that she believe “all children can learn” and that it was her responsibility as a professional to continue learning how best to include all students and create successful learning experiences for all students (Epiphany, Interview 1, August 29, 2015). She has been described by colleagues as a teacher who has made “a tremendous difference in the lives of young students” due to her devotion to her students and willingness to do all she could for them (Epiphany, Letter of Recommendation, 2015). A goal for Epiphany has always been to build “a more inclusive classroom” (Epiphany, Interview 1, August 29, 2015).

When she went to high school students who spoke Creole and Haitian dialects were “segregated” from the rest of the students. She explained: “I guess they were probably in ESL classes, but you never saw them” (Epiphany, Interview 1, August 29, 2015). Epiphany acknowledged that such separation did not allow for diverse populations to get to know each other: “They [students that were segregated by language] were the different ones. Now, we welcome all students and should” (Epiphany, Interview 1,

August 29, 2015). Therefore, joining the institute was in large part a way for Epiphany to better include diverse cultures and languages appropriately “especially at this age [preschool age 4] . . . and . . . especially because now everything is geared toward Common Core, tests, and you are responsible as a teacher for all kids” (Epiphany, *Conversation with a Purpose*, August 29, 2015). Interestingly, Epiphany was the only participant who cited this recent responsibility as a reason to learn how best to teach linguistically diverse students.

Epiphany taught at a community-based, pre-K-6 urban public school for children with Special Needs that was National Association for the Education of Young Children certified. The school adopted Creative Curriculum and boasted over thirty years of experience teaching and providing care (pre-care, after care, breakfast, lunch and snack) for a diverse population of approximately 210 preschool-age and elementary-age children. She had been teaching there for 13 years.

Epiphany’s class included 15 four-year olds. Many of their families self-identified themselves as African American or Hispanic. Two families identified culturally with India and one family with Bangladesh. One boy spoke mostly Spanish and three others spoke Spanish and English. The boys from Ethiopia and India spoke English fluently, but shared their home languages with Epiphany when prompted. Most of the children qualified for free lunch. Interestingly, the students in this class were grouped together as three year olds too. So, at the beginning of the year, Epiphany claimed she felt like “the outsider.” In her words she reported, “They had their own way of talking to each other. They felt real comfortable. I was the new kid” (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 7,

2015). Unique to Epiphany was the fact that the students and parents had their own culture already and she was stepping in as the newbie. Epiphany worked closely with an aide who was bilingual in English and Spanish. Although their partnership was new, Epiphany reported that they worked well together (Epiphany, Interview 1, August 29, 2015).

Lucia. At the time of this study, Lucia was a monolingual English speaking woman in her mid-thirties with a Guatemalan heritage. Lucia was married and had two sons—ages five and seven—and three step sons ages—three, fourteen, and twenty. She had been teaching preschool for 14 years. Lucia was born and raised in the United States for most of her life, but spent a couple of her preschool years in Guatemala with her extended family where she learned to speak Spanish. In fact, after two years there, Lucia returned to the United States speaking only Spanish. Although her dad was bilingual in English and Spanish, her mother only spoke English. When she began school in the United States, she was classified as an ELL and was pulled from regular class in order to receive services. Lucia learned English quickly and lost her ability to speak Spanish nearly as quickly; and this loss weighed on her. “I want to punch myself . . . I wish I could do it all over again” (Lucia, Interview 1, August 26, 2015). When asked how she thinks this happened, she said “I wanted to fit in . . . stay in class” (Lucia, Interview 1, August 26, 2015).

Lucia was a traditionally certified P-3 teacher. She majored in Human Ecology with a concentration in Early Childhood Education. According to her director’s letter of recommendation (2015), Lucia was a dedicated teacher with a desire to be respectful and

supportive of all students' home languages and cultures. Lucia was described by her director as a teacher who "pays careful attention to get to know the individual child personally and academically" (Lucia, Letter of Recommendation, May 2015). Lucia taught in a public inner-city school with a population of mostly Hispanic and African American students with her co-teacher Carley (pseudonym), the final participant.

Carley. Carley was Lucia's assistant teacher, but was welcomed by Lucia as a co-teacher. At the time of this study, Carley was in her early twenties and was a monolingual, English speaking African American woman. She had a three year old daughter who attended a preschool in the same district. Carley went to school in the same urban district in which she was teaching and was happy to see that English and Spanish speakers as well as other speakers were in class together. When she went to school, "they [ELLs] were separated, so I never saw them" (Carley, Interview 1, August 31, 2015). She was currently enrolled in a traditional teacher certification program and had been working approximately three years in the same school as Lucia, servicing a diverse student population. Although she ended the previous year with Lucia, the 2015-2016 school year was their first full year together.

Passionate about all children deserving an equal education, Carley was excited to work with Lucia (Carley, Interview 1, August 21, 2015). Carley was described by her director as "diligent about establishing relationships with parents and wishes to effectively communicate with them and have them included in the classroom as much as possible" (Carley, Letter of Recommendation, May 2015). Carley's daughter attended a pre-school in the same district and often came home speaking Spanish phrases. Carley

was quite supportive of her daughter's language learning and wanted to be able to support her growth as well.

Together, Lucia and Carley formed a teaching team at an urban preschool that serviced approximately 100 three and four year olds. The school also adopted Creative Curriculum and boasted a "rich foundation and exciting 'journey into early childhood education'" for all of the students. Creative Curriculum was geared toward children's interests and put emphasis on helping children progress through developmentally appropriate practices. Due to the culturally and linguistically diverse population and their own desires to "do what is best for the students" Lucia and Carley applied together for the program. Lucia remembered that "the application came to us at the very last minute, but we somehow got it done. She [Carley] kept following me around with it saying, 'we can do it'" (Lucia, Interview 1, August 26, 2015). When asked about what Lucia said, Carley laughed and responded "I knew that we needed to learn how to do this better [teach in linguistically diverse classroom]. It was such a lucky opportunity" (Carley, Interview 1, August 31, 2015). Both seemingly agreed that the program was necessary and their inclusion was fortuitous.

Together Lucia, the lead teacher, and Carley taught 15 four-year olds. The majority of students self-identified as African-American or Hispanic; two spoke mainly Spanish; four spoke English and Spanish; and one boy from Ethiopia spoke English fluently, but was able to share in his home language when asked. Most of the students qualified for free lunch. Lucia taught at this school since she graduated college. Carley had been there three years as a floating assistant. This was her first full-time classroom

position. They reported working collaboratively throughout much of their day (Carley, interview 1, August 31, 2015; Lucia, interview 1, August 26, 2015).

Director-participants

As discussed earlier, Maria and Dalia provided essential data regarding what the teacher-participants could possibly take-up. As developers and providers of the teacher education program over the summer, they offered unique insights into the content from which the teacher's take-up would come. Moreover, data obtained from Maria and Dalia was used to provide useful "insider" data via interviews and/or conversations with a purpose and to add insight into the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching demonstrated by the four participants. Due to the fact that the program's timetable was somewhat off-kilter at the time my own study started, Dalia also provided data about the teacher-participants' teaching prior to their acceptance into the program, for she was able to talk with them and observe them before the institute was officially set to take place. The willingness and support of Maria and Dalia also enabled me to conduct observations of all opportunities presented during the summer institute and to secure four strong teacher-participants. Data collection was enabled with their assistance. A detailed discussion of data collection methods and tools is the focus of the next section.

Data Collection Methods

Systematic exploration of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was enabled by gathering data about each teacher-participant's take-up of new content, ideas, practices, reflective stances, linguistic choices, responses, or actions into her current reality in natural, already occurring settings (i.e., institute and classroom observations) as

well as through the teachers' own words (i.e., personal interviews; conversations with a purpose; institute application documents). Moreover, using a funds of knowledge orientation as the theoretical framing for this study required collecting information about the teacher-participants' personal and professional lived-experiences through the use of interviews, observations, and conversations with a purpose. Details regarding specific data collection methods employed in this study are discussed below, but first an explanation of early adjustments needs to be addressed.

Adjusting to the study's timetable to reality. Ideally this study was going to begin in May 2015 with participant solicitation and data collection (i.e. pre-institute teacher interviews and observations). The rationale for starting data collection at this time was to get a first-hand, preliminary idea of each teacher's existing practice regarding linguistic responsive teaching. However, due to the issues previously mentioned the schedule needed to be readjusted within the realm of the approved research plan. Since permission was granted by the directors and teacher-participants to use document data compiled by Maria and Dalia regarding each participant, this data was used to supplement data regarding the teachers' pre-institute sense of linguistically responsive teaching. Per their program participation agreement, each teacher agreed to the completion of evaluative observations; the first of which happened prior to the summer institute and was completed by Dalia for each teacher-participant. They also completed several "tests" regarding their understanding of language and culture in the classroom and submitted other relevant information regarding demographic information and pertinent teaching information. These data were used to address the otherwise disappointing gaps

in initial knowledge of each teacher-participant's teaching. Data were also supplemented with information from Dalia gathered during an interview to better understand each teacher's initial sense of linguistically responsive teaching prior to the institute. Though not ideal, the strength of the initial study's design—that is seeking access to pertinent program information—and the compatibility of the program's design with the study's intent enabled a way for the research to continue successfully.

Data were collected using pertinent extant document data; 20 semi-structured interviews (as defined by Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2014) that lasted approximately 40-60 minutes each with the teacher-participants and the directors of the institute; three full days of observations the details of which were guided by research (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Morrison, 1993, Spradley, 1980) during the summer institute; three classroom observations per focus teacher also guided by research (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Morrison, 1993, Spradley, 1980) ; observations of two teleconferencing communications post the institute the details of that were also guided by research (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Morrison, 1993, Spradley, 1980); several key documents the inclusion of which finds support in research (Merriam, 2009) and conversations with a purpose (Burgess, 1984; Cole, 2005). Each of these is discussed in turn below.

Document data. Several important extant documents specific to the four teacher participants were collected and analyzed for this study. Document data were important to a deeply contextualized study of this kind because they provided valuable information regarding unique aspects of the teacher-participants and their possible take-up (e.g., their lesson plans and correspondences to parents.) Such documents were already written in

the teacher-participants' words and were not subjected to transcription. Such documents as recommended by research offer valuable information without over taxing the researcher's analysis work, making them a less demanding way to contextualize the data gathered (cf. recommendations in Creswell, 2011; Merriam, 2009). Documents gathered over the course of this study included: institute teacher observation records written by Maria and/or Dalia, institute applications submitted by the teacher-participants, summer institute handouts, pre-tests and post-tests given as part of institute proceedings, surveys conducted by Maria and Dalia, lesson plans written by the four teachers participating in this study, teacher-parent correspondences, supplemental lesson materials (e.g., worksheets), and Maria's summer institute presentation outlines. Specifically, the initial applications that teachers submitted to the institute for selection purposes provided necessary demographic information as well as information about why they wanted to be in the program. Below are two examples of prompts they answered:

- The professional letter should speak to your teaching experience and desire to learn more about effectively teaching diverse populations, and
- The personal essay will speak to the following questions:
 - 1) Why do you want to be selected for this summer institute/mentoring program?
 - 2) What do you hope to learn that will change your classroom practices and beliefs about culturally and linguistically diverse children and families?
 - 3) What are the challenges you are experiencing in terms of cultural competency and working with children who are acquiring English as a second language?

(Institute Application, 2015)

Participants' answers to these questions provided at least some pertinent data per participant such as their experience teaching ELLs and their level of comfort doing so. All document data enriched the data pool and helped to contextualize the take-up of the teachers by giving a sense of what each teacher's practice was like prior to beginning the summer institute as well as what each was doing after the summer institute that may not have been observable.

Semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews, that is, interviews with a small number of guiding, open-ended questions, were conducted one-on-one and face-to-face with the four teachers as well as with the two director-participants. Interviews were necessary in this study because they enabled access to data that were "impossible to replicate" for research purposes (Merriam, 2009, p. 88), such as attempts at linguistically responsive teaching that were not observable during specific observations and each teacher's prior lived-experiences. Interviews ideally "access a person's definitions and understandings of concepts" (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004, p. 198), and over time the use of interviews in this study enabled documentation of how each teacher defined (and re-defined) her teaching role and concepts relevant to becoming more linguistically responsive in her teaching (while not necessarily using this exact term in the interview itself). Informed by research (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2014), each of the four interviews per teacher-participant comprised specific pre-prepared questions and prompts that guided the discussions. Each teacher was asked the same guiding questions. For example, Interview One included the following questions and discussion prompts within the prepared list of questions and prompts:

1. Tell me about the students in your class this year.
 - Prompt: For those who are considered “English Language Learners” what are their home languages?
2. Tell me a little bit about teaching the ELLs you have.
 - Prompt for benefits and challenges
 - Prompt: Can you give me an example of a recent lesson that you feel was successful for your ELLs?

These interviews enabled flexibility in terms of the order in which the questions were asked as well as the wording used each time they were asked (cf. Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2014). Often times the prompts proved necessary, but sometimes they were not needed. For example, after being requested to “tell me about the students in your class” one teacher actually started with describing her ELL students and their home languages before going on to talk about the rest of her students. Therefore, this prompt was unnecessary in one particular situation, but fruitful in others.

This type of variation in the way each interview was uniquely enacted, yet still accessed the information being sought, spoke to the importance of developing effective questions. According to Merriam (2009), questions need to start an important conversation, so they should be understandable and use words the interviewees would expect. Also, Patton (2002) suggested using a variety of questions such as those that ask individuals to speak about their own backgrounds, what they did, how they feel, and what they know. Finally, researchers recommended that the questions be piloted with others to ensure they elicit the type of information anticipated (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2014).

Through piloting with colleagues and actual use, most of the questions developed for this study proved “effective” in that they yielded descriptive answers about each teachers’ funds of knowledge and their take-up of linguistically responsive teaching (Merriam, 2009). Question development proved effective and so too did the data collection timetable.

A data collection timetable (see Table 3 below) that went beyond the summer institute was guided by the research question’s focus on “take-up” in relation to the opportunities afforded by the institute. According to Patton (2001), interviews help researchers learn from participants “those things [they] cannot directly observe,” such as—and especially important to this study—“how people have organized the world and the meanings they attach to what goes on in the world” (pp. 340-341); and gaining a sense for how teachers were grappling with the concept of linguistically responsive teaching over time. Since understanding take-up required finding out how the teacher-participants interpreted and experienced their world over time, each teacher-participant was interviewed four times over the course of the five month study. Each semi-structured interview had a particular focus. This was an important design feature because research suggests that take-up will take time, and the intent of this study was to document the subtle and overt ebbing and flowing of each participant’s take-up of linguistically responsive teaching as they participated in the summer institute and began teaching again. Talking with the teachers one-on-one also provided ample time for teachers to share with me their attempts at and thoughts regarding linguistically responsive teaching.

Table 3 below summarizes the focus of each interview as well as the type of data gathered by each. Also, delineated in Table 3 are the interviews conducted with Maria, the creative director, and Dalia, her co-director. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed using general transcription approaches suggested by popular education research methodologists (e.g., Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Creswell, 2005; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2014) and a notebook was used to jot down any questions, realizations, and reactions during the interviews that were added to the margins of the transcribed interview data (Creswell, 2011; Merriam, 2009). Clarifications were often made via email exchanges to ensure that each teacher's sentiments were accurately recorded, especially when part of the conversation was inaudible or when I was relying on my handwritten notes.

Table 3*Teacher-Participant and Director-Participant Interviews*

	Focus (i.e., Relation to Research Question)
Initial Teacher Interviews <i>August 2015</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Experiences with teaching a linguistically diverse population - Overall experiences as a teacher - Current classroom community - Personal history & values - Reasons for participating in the program
Second Teacher Interview <i>September 2015</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Initial response to seminar - Current teaching decisions regarding their own class, specific to linguistically diverse students in light of having participated in the institute - Initial Take-up that they themselves have noticed or claim
Third and Fourth Teacher Interviews <i>October 2015— December 2015</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current classroom teaching in light of having participated in the institute - Recent teaching decisions regarding linguistically diverse students - Evolving Teacher Take-up as they see it/report it - Relating Take-Up to institute and life-experiences
Initial Director Interviews <i>August 2015</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rationale for the creation of the summer institute and its goals - Rationale for design, core components and opportunities - Impact over the years, specific to opportunities - Teacher Take-up - Changes in seminar design and offerings over the years - Teacher “blind spots” and misconceptions regarding linguistically responsive teaching - Future intentions
Follow up Director Interview <i>September 2015</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Initial reflection to summer seminar work - Reflection on opportunities provided for enrolled teachers - Teacher Take-up, specific to participants - Potential “blind spots” brewing

First round of interviews. The first round of interviews with each teacher was completed prior to the start of the new school year, August 2015. Each took place in the teachers' respective classrooms. The intention of the first interview was to find out more about each teacher as an individual and to tap into their individual funds of knowledge as teachers and as life-long learners. The questions elicited specific details about their thoughts, feelings, and musings regarding their past experiences with students in their classroom who spoke a language other than English; their experiences teaching those students; their personal histories and values; and their reasons for participating in the summer institute. Examples of questions developed to access the above included the following:

1. If he/she spoke another language growing up . . . Tell me about your experience as a student who spoke another language at home.
 - a. Prompt about what teachers did to help him/her
 - b. Prompt about peer relationships
2. Or, as a student, were you in class with students who would be considered English Language Learners? Tell me about your experiences as a student in class with ELLs.
 - a. Prompt how him/her teacher worked with ELL students.
 - b. Prompt about his/her relationship with ELL students

Ideally, asking good questions requires asking a few effective questions; more than five can be overwhelming in this kind of interview (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2014). The first round of teacher interviews took place after their participation in the summer institute.

Therefore, this first interview had two goals—to elicit each teacher’s first impressions of and immediate responses to the summer institute and to learn about each teacher’s current and past personal and professional experiences.

As it turned out, this particular round of interviews only slightly touched upon each teacher’s funds of knowledge and instead focused heavily on the various opportunities in which they participated during the institute as well as what they were intending “to try” in the upcoming school year regarding language. Therefore, more time was spent during the second and third rounds of interviews and especially during conversations with a purpose (see below) delving into each teacher’s funds of knowledge. Such adjustments worked well since getting a sense of take-up early on was a priority; after all, the literature regarding take-up suggested take-up would not be a linear, easily identifiable process (Gere, Buehler, Dallavis, & Haviland, 2009), and the best way to track its manifestations was to meet with the teachers soon after their summer institute participation to begin data collection specific to this end. If anything was going to have to wait, the logical choice was the funds of knowledge.

During this first round of interviews, Maria, the director of the summer institute, was also interviewed. This first interview with her took place soon after the completion of the summer institute, August 2015, because her immediate reaction to the institute was of interest and her memory of the teacher-participants and their engagement in the opportunities she planned was still fresh. Other goals for the director’s first interview were to discuss her rationale for creating the program and the particular opportunities included in the Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute as well as

eliciting her thoughts about what each teacher's take-up may currently be and might eventually manifest itself as. Questions guided her to reflect upon the four teacher-participants specifically; elicited her insights into "blind spots" and misconceptions regarding linguistically responsive teaching she may have seen; and required her to reflect on the institute happenings. Here are some questions used:

1. Tell me a little bit about yourself.
 - a. Prompt to find out if she speaks other languages
 - b. Prompt to find out where she grew up, and
 - c. What her schooling was like?
2. Why did you create this program?
 - a. Prompt to discuss the rationale behind her focus on ELLs.
 - b. Prompt to find out how she is defining and addressing cultural competence.
3. I read your reports and was interested in learning more about your concept of blind spots. Please, explain what a blind spot is.
 - a. Tell me about the blind spots you have documented in the past.
 - b. Any thoughts about why they persist?

During this first interview Maria was able to clarify the opportunities she intended to provide for the participating teachers, discuss whether she met her expectations, and provide her rationale for each. As she was the creator and director of the same program for eight years, Maria also answered questions about past experiences pertaining to "blind spots" she has identified in the past, the opportunities presented this year in relation to

past years, and teacher take-up over the years. Her insight and reflections helped to contextualize the data gathered during this year's iteration of the institute.

Second round of interviews. The second interview with each teacher-participant was conducted in early October 2015, shortly after the school year began in September, 2015. More semi-structured questions were asked to gain a sense of what each teacher was thinking and doing regarding linguistically responsive teaching such as:

1. What have you taken up in terms of being a linguistically responsive teacher?
2. What are you saying? What are you doing? How has your teaching changed?

Also, this second interview included an eliciting device to help generate more data about their current sense-making with respect to ELLs in the general education classroom (see Appendix A). An eliciting device is an interview tool used to generate detailed, descriptive data from the respondents (Creswell, 2011; Flick, 2009; Lankshear & Knobel, 2004). "Devices" can be maps, objects, artwork, computer images, and other similar tools likely to draw fine-grained details pertinent to the study from the interviewees (Creswell, 2011; Flick, 2009; Lankshear & Knobel, 2004). In this instance the eliciting device was a vignette written especially for this study that described a young preschool-age ELL seemingly not participating during story time as her teacher read and attempted to involve the students in discussion (see Appendix B). The goal for the inclusion of the vignette was to encourage the interviewees to share information that may lead to further insight about their own, current understanding of linguistically responsive teaching by distancing the interviewees from their own immediate teaching situations and encouraging them to

share their perceptions of the event described without feeling as though they are being judged (cf. recommendations in Haviland, Prins, Walrath, & McBride, 2010, p. 355).

Prompts regarding the vignette teacher's pedagogy (i.e., her seeming disregard for the student's inattention and lack of participation) and the student's interactions (and lack thereof) were used to generate talk about how to teach, engage, and support a young ELL during a typical early literacy lesson. As the interviewees "made sense" of the vignette student's experience, they shared insights into their past and current teaching experiences and knowledge. However, presenting the teachers with the vignette during the interview was not as successful as giving them time to reread the vignette again and then send their comments to me via email. I found that with the second approach, each teacher took time to email more developed thoughts about the young girl and her teacher. These comments proved more fruitful than those shared during the interviews in terms of the goal of leaning more about each teacher's take-up of linguistically responsive teaching.

The third and fourth rounds of interviews. The third and fourth interviews with each of the four teachers took place in November 2015 and December 2015 respectively. To obtain an understanding of teacher take-up three and four months past the seminar and after two and three rounds of mentor support and teleconference discussions, interview questions were open-ended, but directly focused on take-up and linguistically responsive teaching. Questions were deliberately focused in nature, such as this: Give me an example of a decision you made since the start of the school year about one of your ELLs that you feel is an example of something you have taken up from the summer institute?

During these interviews, the teacher participants also were asked to reflect upon ideas raised during their first interview with emphasis on finding out how their take-up was beginning to manifest. For example, during the third interview each teacher was asked to comment on their September plans and intentions (e.g., In September you were going to create a literacy moment. How did that go? Tell me about the process and lesson.) Also, during the last interview, the vignette was presented to the teachers again as another avenue for the teachers to talk about their current take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. This helped to generate interview data that was compared to their initial interview transcripts in order to identify the extent to which there were shifts—in any direction—concerning thoughts, language, and reactions in relation to linguistically responsive teaching. This re-use of this vignette helped to begin a conversation about what they each think they have taken-up from their participation in the summer institute.

Unsurprisingly, considering advice found in the methodological literature on interviews and qualitative studies, the final interview was the most fruitful in terms of the amount of data it collected (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2014). The teacher-participants each selected a time for their last interview that enabled at least an hour of conversation. Their demeanors were easy; their talk was loosely dependent on the questions; they each seemed to come to their own last interview ready to share all they could before the study ended. Every interview ended with the same question: Is there anything else you would like to share at this time? At the end of the first, second, and third interviews very little was shared by anyone; but at the end of this last interview the teachers seemed to use this question to truly make sure I knew what they were thinking about and doing for their

ELLs before my study concluded. The tone of each set of responses was friendlier; there were many more laughs. Much of this had to do with our growing relationship, too.

Researcher evaluation of interviews. In retrospect, my presence at the summer institute stood juxtaposed to their work. Whereas they were up and about participating in each opportunity; sometimes singing, sometimes debating during the institute sessions, I sat quietly typing at my laptop, taking notes. For the most part the only times they got to know me as a person was in the interviews. By the fourth round, they finally seemed comfortable with me. This comfort level proved beneficial. They seemed less afraid to share their struggles and lingering concerns about their effectiveness as teachers of ELLs.

I also learned by the last interview to let them tell me why they planned a particular opportunity. There were times when I misspoke during the first and second round of interviews and made assumptions about their choices: “Oh, because you saw it during the summer institute” or “because your mentor said to,” and I could see too late that the teachers were somewhat taken aback by what I said. By the third and certainly by the fourth interviews, I began to restate what they each were trying to do—“you are planning a literacy moment”—and simply ask “Why?” My own skills as a research interviewer were improving as their comfort level was increasing; leading to higher quality data collection by December. Also, much of our growing rapport had to do with the inclusion of conversations with a purpose (see the next section) in this study, for they forced me to be intentional about “touching base” with each of them.

Semi-structured interviews proved ideal for this study from the first to the last interview because there were no expectations about what each teacher-participant would

share in terms of their past lived-experiences and funds of knowledge and in regard to how they were currently shifting their practices, actions, or thinking based on what was presented during the summer institute. Because each teacher had already experienced and lived much of what could impact their take-up, the interviews as expected based on suggestions from research (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2014), helped to access data pertaining to their unique funds of knowledge by remaining personal, thoughtful, and flexible. Using semi-structured interviews enabled me as the researcher “to respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging worldview of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic” (Merriam, 2009, p. 90). For example, asking Adrianna about her early education led to the realization that she was an immigrant with a significant story to tell.

Adjustments in the flow of questions asked of her were quickly made on the spot. Instead of immediately moving to the next question regarding her current students, I prompted her to speak more about being a student whose home language was different from the majority of her school peers and teachers. Just as Adrianna was able to do in the previous example, the questions provided participants with a way for them to share descriptions of their own experiences (past and present), their unique funds of knowledge, and their own insights into their current teaching contexts over time. Indeed, as several interviews unfolded, the language I used and the order of the questions were changed to accommodate what the interviewee was sharing at the time. The semi-structured nature of the interview enabled this rich conversation and helped to collect data that later proved fruitful in answering my research question. Conversations with a purpose, discussed below, enriched these discussions and my data.

Conversations with a purpose. Throughout the study, conversations with a purpose also occurred that were not necessarily audio recorded or formally structured, but were documented afterwards by means of field notes. Conversations with a purpose are unstructured interviews that take place in contexts where formal interviews are not appropriate or they occur unexpectedly, yet have a theme related to the study's intent, because the researcher intentionally guides the conversation to topics or points of interest (Burgess, 1984; Cole, 2005). Formally documenting these conversations proved useful as anticipated after researching their use (cf. characteristics of discussed by Burgess, 1984; Cole, 2005), because they enabled pertinent discussion about the immediate situation without being overly intrusive or time consuming. These types of conversations took place during the three-day institute, as well as prior to and after each classroom-based observation of the teachers.

The aim of these conversations was to gather timely data pertaining to take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. For example, as I was directed from a classroom to the school's main office during one particular school visit, the teacher-participant, Adrianna, suddenly remembered that she had created a bulletin board in the hallway with the children about famous people from each child's country of origin. Of interest was the fact that Adrianna shared how one little girl who normally does not participate in whole class sharing situations volunteered to talk about her famous person, Shakira, in Spanish. As this young girl talked to the class in Spanish the teacher and aide stopped her from time to time to translate for the rest of the class. Such rich information was neither discussed during my most recent interview with Adrianna, nor observed during the observation that

just occurred; demonstrating how important such conversations with a purpose were to this study.

As rapport developed between the participants and me, these conversations with a purpose increased most likely due to participants feeling more comfortable about speaking openly with me, their feelings of familiarity with me, and their desire to speak about current happenings and wonders. As with other interviews employed in this study, researcher input remained minimal, but purposeful—constantly focusing on gathering pertinent information. As suggested by research, the data were documented by means of researcher notes made as soon as possible after the conversation and analyzed along with all other data gathered (Burgess, 1984; Cole, 2005).

Researcher evaluation of conversations with a purpose. Due to the fact that the first and second interviews became compressed due to time constraints, the conversations with a purpose allowed a time for me to “follow up” each interview with casual, yet intentional, conversation at a later time. As teachers were cleaning up centers or setting up lunch, I was able to chat with them about their families, their own school memories, and their experiences outside the classroom that were relevant to their teaching practices and dispositions, such as Carley’s story about her three year old daughter coming home from day care and speaking Spanish to her. They also had a chance to ask me about my experiences beyond my research. Over time these conversations became an important avenue for relationship building and, I hypothesize based on research and experience, led to the very real fruitfulness of the final interviews with each teacher. They also helped me better understand what I was seeing during observations.

Observations. Observations (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Creswell, 2005; Merriam, 2009), that is focused, predetermined time dedicated to watching the teacher-participants in their naturally, already established settings (e.g., classrooms, the summer institute) and engaging with students and colleagues, enabled a firsthand look at teacher take-up. Observation as a systematic data collection process entailed “looking (often systematically) and noting systematically (always) people, events, behaviours, artefacts, routines, and so on” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011, p. 467). In this study, observation data gathered during the summer institute as well as in the teacher-participants’ classrooms and during their teleconference discussions were used to complement and qualitatively triangulate data from documents, interviews, and conversations with a purpose in order to truly identify any changes in take-up particular to actual teaching. Specifically, ethnographic observation techniques based on what Spradley (1980) termed *descriptive observations* and *focused observations* were employed to ensure that enough data regarding linguistically responsive take-up for each teacher-participant was gathered. Although dated, Spradley’s (1980) work influenced the type of observations sought. Below, each type of observation is described followed by a rationale for my use of his ideas.

Three full day observations of the summer institute were conducted in August 2015 in a manner comparable to what Spradley (1980) termed *descriptive observations*. For these descriptive observations I gathered information on all aspects of what the teacher-participants and the director-participants were doing to ensure that I captured as much as possible everything that could lead to take-up. The four teacher-participants

were observed as they participated in the opportunities designed to increase their understanding of linguistically responsive teaching as well as all other opportunities afforded them during the three-day summer institute such as those specific to developmentally appropriate practices and developing cultural consciousness. These descriptive observations also included observing them interacting with others in-between planned opportunities because within these interactions ideas regarding the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching may have been further discussed and could have impacted take-up of linguistically responsive teaching.

Classroom observations began in September 2015 and continued at a pace of approximately once a month until December 2015. The September observation remained descriptive because it was the first time I was seeing the teachers in action in their natural setting, and I wanted to gather as much contextual information as possible. The remaining observations were what Spradley (1980) called *focused observations* because I went in specifically looking for evidence of linguistically responsive teaching. Similarly, the teacher-participants were “observed” during the teleconferences that took place in October and November using protocol for focused observations. All guidelines are discussed below.

Rationale for observations. In this study all observations provided “live data from naturally occurring situations” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011, p. 456) that were an integral part of the teacher-participants’ social worlds of interest to this study—their classrooms, the three-day institute, and their telecommunication chats. Observations took place in each of these three settings in order to gather data about what the participants did

(or did not do) and say (or did not say) as they interacted (or not) with others in contexts particular to the focus of this study (see Table 4 below). The observations enabled collection of data about the physical contexts (i.e., classroom and seminar setting) and human (teacher, student, and director) interactions—formal and non-formal—as well as the ideas, language, and overall tone of the classroom teaching and institute opportunities (cf. Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Spradley, 1980). Everything was planned to support of this study’s conceptual assumption that the actual manifestations of each teacher could not be predicted or judged against a predetermined framework or timetable for appearance. Therefore, keeping the data collection wide ensured that enough data was captured in an effort to better understand the concept of take-up.

During each observation I attempted to assume the role of passive participant observer; one who is ever-present and known to the group as a researcher but not actively partaking in the occurrences being observed (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Spradley, 1980). However, in an effort to balance the role of passive observer with the desire to not make others uncomfortable due to my presence, I did engage with others at times. For example, during the summer institute Maria often needed a hand readjusting the room for the next learning opportunity and out of pure appreciation for her support, I helped and chatted. Also, when the observations moved to the classrooms, the children were quite curious about me and usually spent the first few minutes of my visits welcoming me as children do with a high five and a big “Hi, Miss Melissa!” Also, at times the children needed help, and I was not able to remain passive when a little boy’s nose began bleeding or when another little girl got soap in her eyes.

Remaining passive during my teleconference observations was uncomplicated. Part of the protocol for all participants was to keep the phone on mute unless you had a question or were answering a question. I stayed muted throughout each session; everybody participating in the teleconference knew I was gathering data only from my study participants. This is discussed in more detail later.

Participant observation of varying degrees (from passive to fully participating) is useful in any study in that it affords researchers the chance to be a part of the situations being observed over a long period of time; this thereby enables researchers to get a better *sense* of what is going on. Ethnographers often rely on various degrees of participant observation as they study cultures often unknown to themselves, for example (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Spradley, 1980). Although this study was not an ethnography because I was not concerned with culture *per se*, key, classic researchers in the field of ethnography provided valuable guidelines for my passive-participant observations. Therefore, particular guidelines—as discussed next and developed by LeCompte and Preissle (1993) and Spradley (1980) were used to guide how I conducted each observation. Again, these methodologists' work is old, but their guidelines remain invaluable.

Observation guidelines. Each observation listed above followed the same basic guidelines. First, each observation documented the physical setting, the interactions of the people involved, the characteristics of the individuals, and the general happenings (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2010). Second, I assumed the role of a “modestly” passive participant observer; that is, someone who attempted to be “present on the scene of action, but does not participate or interact with other people to any great extent”

(Spradley, 1980, p. 59), but did interact briefly to exchange niceties and maintain a comfort level with those in the immediate environment. Third, I employed guidelines developed by Le Compte and Preissle (1993) to help me stay focused on the purpose of my study. Examples of some of their guiding questions, and how I modified them for particular observations that were relevant to my study of take-up are:

- What is taking place [in general and relevant to linguistically responsive teaching]?
- How do different participants behave toward each other [with a focus on ELLs in the classroom]?
- What meanings are participants [teachers] attributing to what is happening [opportunities to foster linguistically responsiveness]?” (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993, pp. 199-200)

Fourth, all observations were audio recorded as I took notes (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Creswell, 2005; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002, 2014).

As I worked to document all I could as a modestly passive participant observer, I took field notes via laptop while jotting handwritten “notes to self”—sketches of the environment, questions, musings, reflections, and possibly speculation—in a small notebook which I referred to as my “notes to self,” but others might better understand them as my reflective notes (Creswell, 2005; Merriam, 2009). Actual verbatim spoken language copied down in field notes was identified with quotation marks and reviewed via my backup audio recordings to allow for further elaboration or verification of what was said and done. Moreover, any language other than English used was later clarified

with the help of the teacher or Google Translate. This was important because all language uses provided data specific to my interest in linguistically responsive take-up.

Finally, all observation data records for each classroom observation were merged and expanded upon immediately after each observation as each was transposed into digital files. This judicious reworking of observation records was conducted in order to fill in any gaps in my initial notes before important details were forgotten and to support the documentation of questions and seeds of analysis (jotted down in handwritten notes) before ideas developing in context were forgotten over time (cf. recommendations in Creswell, 2005; LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Spradley, 1980). By following these guidelines all observations were rich with description and details. However, based on where and when they took place there also were subtle differences in the type of details. As seen in Table 4 below, each observation cycle had a specific focus based on the overall purpose of this study and the institute's progression. To further understand the specific focus of each observation listed in Table 4, an overview of each follows.

Table 4.
Observation Schedule and Focus

Observation	Focus
Institute Observations <i>August 2015</i>	- Descriptive observation (Spradley, 1980) - Focus on linguistically responsive opportunities - Focus on participants
Follow-up Classroom Observations <i>September 2015</i> <i>October 2015</i> <i>November 2015 or December 2015</i>	- Descriptive-September (Spradley, 1980) - Focused observation (Spradley, 1980) - Linguistically responsive teacher take-up
Teleconferences Observations <i>October 2015</i> <i>November 2015</i>	- Focused observation (Spradley, 1980) - Linguistically responsive take-up

Three-day institute observations. These observations remained deeply descriptive per Spradley (1980) to ensure that all necessary data was gathered. The sociocultural theoretical orientation of this study supports the position that how and why individuals make sense of the opportunities afforded them was and is always unique for each participant, but dependent upon the social context and interactions. In truly embracing a funds of knowledge orientation, I could not pretend to know what aspect of the institute's opportunities each teacher was relating to or attending to until the data analysis began. In an attempt to maximize useful data available at the time of analysis and interpretation, however, I documented as much as possible, keeping my focus on the four teacher-participants. My observation tools—the audio recordings, the typed notes via laptop, and my reflective notebook—were selected with the challenges of these three days in mind and helped to keep the data on the four focus teachers organized and prominent in my observation records made during the three-day seminar (cf. recommendations in Cohen,

Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Creswell, 2005; LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Merriam, 2009).

Classroom observations (September, October, November or December). Each of the four teacher-participants was observed once in September, October, and either November or December during a language arts lesson. This lesson choice was to provide some consistency across participant data and was selected due to my experience and confidence as an early literacy teacher. I was able to identify the overt intent of the teachers and the type of opportunities they were preparing for their students (e.g., a shared reading experience to introduce new content; a guided reading lesson to focus on site words in text, a choral reading to develop reading fluency and work on expression, etc.). Therefore, I was better able to focus on my observation without seeking too much additional information about the actual lessons. These first observations were deeply descriptive (Spradley, 1980) and were informed by the guidelines mentioned earlier (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993) in an effort to gain a rich sense of each teacher *as a teacher*. For example, I recorded notes during the lessons, snack times, bathroom times, and even recess to get a sense of the overall classroom happenings and atmosphere and teacher-participant's facilitation of such. Whereas one teacher-participant sang songs with the group during circle time and simply pointed to children as it became their turn to use the bathroom and wash their hands, another lined everyone up and maintained order as they went into the bathroom per their position in line; two very different ways to achieve the same goal. In the latter situation little data were pertinent to this study; but in the former situation the songs sang were often in Spanish, and therefore were of interest

to this study. I went into these first observations with a willingness to observe and document all I could because I wanted to feel confident that I gathered enough data pertaining to their individual teaching regarding ELLs, so that during my analysis I could recognize take-up as it began to unfold.

Once the teachers began to get to know their students and settle into the new school year, classroom observations took on a more specific focus. Through the use of focused observations (Spradley, 1980), I gathered evidence of linguistically responsive teaching and, therefore, evidence of individual take-up, that is manifestations of what appeared to be new ideas, practices, reflective stances, linguistic choices, responses, and behaviors informed by the content of the summer institute. In total, the four teachers were observed approximately three hours (one hour per each observation) in total in their respective classrooms.

Teleconference calls (October, November). Supportive, voluntary teleconference calls were hosted twice during the course of this study by the director and mentors. The first teleconference was held in mid-October 2015 and focused on quality transitions between activities in a preschool classroom. The second was in mid-November and focused on the Common Core Standards. Both teleconferences included discussion pertaining to linguistically responsive teaching. Participation in the calls was voluntary, but the teachers who participated received small, monetary incentives. Each of my participants did not sign on for each chat. Epiphany and Adrianna took part in both; while Carley and Lucia joined only the second call (they missed the first due to Back-to-School Night.). Several other teachers and aides participated from the summer institute, but I

only analyzed what was said by the teacher-participants in my study. Because the goal of the teleconference calls was to provide support for the teachers once they returned to their classrooms, these observations specifically focused on discussions pertaining to linguistically responsive teaching and how the teachers were making sense of such in their practice. Unique to these observations was the fact that I was provided with professional transcripts of the calls. However, I still used my written notebook to jot notes and reflections and complete a detailed observational after each chat (Creswell, 2005; Merriam, 2009). These observational records were analyzed in the same manner, as the data collected by way of interviews, conversations with a purpose, and observations (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Creswell, 2005; LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Merriam, 2009). This is detailed in the following section.

Researcher evaluation of observations. As discussed above, the role of passive participant was achieved during the institute observations, except for the few times I left my role to help with logistical matters and to take part in general conversations concerning well-being. In the classrooms my early childhood educator-self did not want the children to feel uncomfortable by my lack of interaction, so I welcomed a few high-fives and got the chance to hear about the latest and greatest yummy treats they sampled that day. In general, though, the teachers worked with me to find a place in the classroom from which I could observe without being intrusive in my own data collection.

Overall, the observations proved to be a significant source of data regarding each teacher's demonstrated take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. Understandably, the interviews could not capture as the observations did the use of gestures, wait time, the

hugs of assurance, and the gentle head taps that guided ELLs through their day. The observations also provided a sense for how much linguistically responsive teaching was happening at different times during the day. As previously mentioned, one teacher used transition times between activities to infuse home languages into the class's everyday routines by having the children sing and do hand motions while waiting to use the bathroom or transition to recess. Another teacher actually brought an ELL to another aide in the building to have his work translated so that she could fully understand what he wrote. Seeing this important work in action made this study successful in terms of insights into take-up that were generated. Even when observations seemed to be challenged by visits from the child study team or demands by an administrator that a teacher attend an impromptu meeting, these moments proved important regarding the challenges to teaching (in general) and certainly to maintaining a linguistic responsive disposition in particular.

Although having the chance to see evidence of linguistically responsive teacher far outweighed the challenges I encountered during my classroom observations, these challenges nonetheless need to be discussed along with the measures put in place to ensure that their impact on evidence and any claims was minimized. The most significant challenge to the use of observations was what Merriam (2008) referred to as observer "contamination" meaning that the very nature of observing others changes the happening or event as those observed "perform" differently than they otherwise might (p. 127). This concern was addressed in three ways. First, I was not reliant only on observational data. The interviews, conversations with a purpose, and my researcher notebook helped me to

qualitatively “triangulate” data to ensure I was interpreting what I was seeing in a robust and defensible way. Second, I benefitted from working closely with my advisor and a dedicated group of doctoral peers. By sharing with them some of the happenings that were observed or that I was involved in, I was able to gauge how significant an impact on my data the event could be seen as. Third, I tried to become as normal to the teacher-participants as possible within the confines of my study, and this was best achieved over time (cf. Merriam, 2009). Ethnographers benefit from spending long days with their participants (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Spradley, 1980). I extended my time as much as possible, so that I became a fairly typical presence to them.

Per their study consent forms, the teacher-participants knew when I was coming; in fact, they often invited me to come for particular lessons, no doubt so I could “see” them trying to be linguistically responsive. This was not a problem for my data because I was very much interested in their overt attempts at being linguistically responsive and how those attempts actually happened (i.e., Did they go as planned or hoped? Were the intentions a reflection of what they learned in the summer institute?) It was all important to me, but to gather information regarding less overt attempts at being linguistically responsive, I would always ask if I could arrive early to get a sense of how their day was going prior to the lesson, and I would linger after each observation to engage in conversations with a purpose and/or continue my observations. This extra time proved beneficial for two reasons.

First, I was able to observe the classroom during less “prepared” times. Students often were having a snack or were in centers during this time which meant there were not

particular lesson plans being followed. Second, the teachers became increasingly comfortable with me each visit and across the course of the study as research methodologists suggested may happen (cf. LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Merriam, 2009). As mentioned earlier, several of the conversations with a purpose happened during these less structured times. Moreover, the more time I spent with them, just as with the interviews, the more the teacher-participants “allowed” me to see. For example, when I went to conduct my last interview with Lucia and Carley, they had a new student in their classroom who was very distracting to the other children—crying, trying to run outside the door, and Lucia said, “I knew you were coming and this is what it’s like sometimes” (Lucia, Conversation with a Purpose, December 3, 2015). Slowly, the more they saw me, the more the teachers allowed me to see. As for the children, true to form, I was quickly forgotten about after I entered the room. A fairly common occurrence was that a student would come up to me after about 45 minutes and say, “You still here?” All in all, my observations remained true to my goal of documenting teacher take-up and the soundness of the data was secured by these measures as well as the use of other data gathering tools, the last of which, my researcher journal, is discussed below.

Researcher journal. Throughout the collection and analysis of data, I maintained a handwritten journal to jot down what I referred to as “notes to self.” Others refer to this as a researcher journal (e.g., Ortlipp, 2008) because such a tool helps a researcher to maintain focus, keep track of important revelations without disturbing the data collection, and reflect upon their work as an observer, interviewer, and data analyst (Creswell, 2005; Ortlipp, 2008). My journal was important to me for all of the aforementioned reasons and

it also enabled me to maintain personal focus and integrity by providing a place for me to keep my in-the-moment questions, realizations, and concerns across all aspects of my work from collecting data to formulating potential findings. These notes included questions to ask either the teacher-participants or director-participants at a later time, concerns, and early analytic and theoretical connections. Sometimes I would rewrite my question and conceptual definitions to remind myself of the focus and intent of my study.

Researcher evaluation of research journal. At times I found myself easily distracted by other classroom happenings that were not central to the question at hand, but that deeply resonated with me as a classroom teacher. For example, one little boy spent about twenty minutes pining for his mom while the teacher, Adrianna, kept her classroom on task and gently eased him back to his work with little disruption to others. This was certainly a mark of good responsive teaching, but the boy was not an ELL. In fact, at the same time, an ELL student was independently using bilingual story telling materials from a literacy lesson previously observed. My journal and “notes to self” about my experiences in the field as a novice researcher helped me maintain focus. My journal also helped me to jot down concerns: Was I too involved in the classroom today? Did I find out enough about who she is? I would then share my concerns with my advisor and make the proper adjustments necessary to the work ahead or make a mental reminder to change a plan of action. For example, I came to realize with the help of these explicit musings that maintaining a truly passive-observer role was not going to be successful in a preschool environment. The children were much more themselves when I was friendly and slightly engaging.

To sum up, the data collection methods designed for this study proved to be effective in that they were informative and provided insights into what the teachers were doing, thinking, and saying in response to their participation in Maria's program, specifically, the summer institute aspect of the program, and their own attempts at being linguistically responsive. The various data types enabled a richer analysis as will be further discussed in the next section.

Data Analysis

Data layout. Data from interviews, observations, conversations with a purpose, and documents was analyzed using Saldaña's (2009) method for basic coding. Before this coding process is explained in detail, I want to clarify specifics about the various data sources, how they were managed throughout the process, and how the actual documents that were analyzed were set up. As mentioned earlier, each interview was audio recorded and transcribed for data analysis purposes. Along with the audio recording, handwritten "notes to self" were transferred to the margins of the transcribed interviews. Recognizing that *how* people speak was as important as what they actually said, transcription followed ethnographic conventions in that I was careful to note pauses, sighs, rises in tone, exclamation, stumbles, and other features that could be significant (cf. Blommaert & Jie, 2010). A uniform set of transcription conventions were developed and documented similar to those suggested by Blommaert and Jie (2010). These transcript conventions included: using all-caps for emphasized words, using a question mark to indicate a questioning rise in intonation, and surrounding a period with parenthesis to indicate a pause. As mentioned earlier, observations were documented as expanded observational

records that included transcription of audio recorded segments of activity or speech or excerpts from professionally-produced transcripts (in the case of teleconferences observations); typed field notes; and handwritten “notes to self.” Data collected via conversations with a purpose were typed into separate documents with any “notes to self” tracked in the margins. Finally, document data were kept and analyzed in its original form. Two inventories—electronic and hardcopy—of all data sets were maintained that separated all raw and expanded versions of each data source (i.e., interviews, observations, conversations with a purpose, and document data) along with their respective “notes to self” into tiered filing systems based on data type (raw or expanded), the date(s) gathered, the teacher-participant the data pertained to (interviews and classroom observation), and the level of coding completed as will be discussed below.

Basic coding. Data analysis was my own sense-making process; however, as suggested by research I did seek input from colleagues in order to build confidence about my emerging codes and themes (Creswell, 2005; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Merriam, 2009). Data analysis “involve[d] consolidating, reducing, and interpreting what people . . . said and . . . [I had] seen and read” (Merriam, 2009, p. 176) during observations and by combing through available documents. The basic coding approach recommended and described by Saldaña (2009) for a new researcher such as myself guided me to read through my transcripts, observation records, and documents to “look for leads” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 81). To do so effectively I coded all raw data gathered that is, I “assign[ed] some sort of shorthand designation to various aspects of . . . data so that [I could] easily retrieve specific pieces of data” (Merriam, 1998, p. 164) by using coding

repertoires suggested by Saldaña (2009) for basic coding. For example, I assigned, “Parents as language resources for teacher” to the following raw data:

I ask parents if I am saying it right; some Spanish is different (Adrianna, Interview 1, August 30, 2015); and We stand in the hall and parents help me translate to other parents what’s happening. It’s so helpful. (Lucia, Interview 2, October 23, 2015)

Of the many practical guides to working with data (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003; Fetterman, 1988), Saldaña’s technique and suggestions worked well with the goals of my study because the aim of this study was to document teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching—a fairly unexplored concept. Saldaña’s method for basic coding allowed for the openness necessary to study such a newly identified and barely discussed concept. This method enabled me to draw insights, make connections, and eventually notice findings as they “bubbled up” from the smallest bits of data. For example, the teachers’ data sources showed evidence of the use of phrases provided by someone else to use with students who spoke a language other than English. What seemed to be a teacher checking over her notepad in one class before addressing the students and another pulling out a post-it to speak to a student, turned into evidence regarding take-up. These teachers were in their own way “employing survival phrases”— a term introduced during the summer institute—for themselves and their ELLs. Assigning codes in this way across teacher data allowed for authentic insights.

Furthermore, I used the same coding method for all forms of data. This worked well for my needs because it became possible to make connections across the data

sources. At all stages of analysis I remained mindful of my funds of knowledge orientation by constantly relating bits of sense-making back to what each teacher-participant shared as relevant to her current practices, musings, and actions. However, to reiterate, the focus was not the individual teacher-participants' growth or change, but the possible manifestations of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. All data were best analyzed in relation to this single concept. I also remained mindful of the hallmarks of linguistically responsive teaching so that I could begin formulating tentative answers to the overall research question:

While following general education early childhood teachers through a formal learning program and into their classrooms, what “take-up” from the range of opportunities designed to help a small group of teachers become more linguistically responsive in their classrooms seems to be demonstrated?

The cyclical process of basic coding began with initial coding, which Saldaña described as coding for “first impressions” using key words and phrases throughout a complete data source (Saldaña, 2009, p. 4). These initial key words and phrases were recorded in the column to the right of the data being analyzed. All initial codes were catalogued into an on-going, editable code register. Samples of my early codes include: “bilingual student input,” “asking parents,” “stories with Spanish,” and “environmental labels in Spanish/other languages.” Initial coding took place shortly after each piece of data was gathered and expanded into a data record as previously discussed (see Table 5 below).

Table 5.*Data Record Examples*

Initial Code	Parents as language resources for teacher	Use music to include other languages
Definition	Parents use home language to help teachers better communicate with students.	Songs sung or listened to by students and teachers include languages other than English
Raw Data	Adrianna—How do you say, “I need a hug?” Lucia—Parents of bilingual children help with monolingual Spanish Speaking family Carley— Parents of bilingual children help provide management phrases Epiphany—Give some key words, management phrases	Adrianna-sings “Family song” in English and switches to Spanish. Children repeat after her. Carley/Lucia—Play music in several languages Epiphany—She and aide lead class in Head, shoulders, knees and toes. She sings English, Aide sings Spanish

Undoubtedly, coding data from one source before another is even gathered impacts this initial coding process for succeeding data (Saldaña, 2009). For example, after coding one teacher-participant’s interview and identifying the code “parents as language resources,” such evidence was more readily identifiable within the next teacher-participant’s raw interview data. However, returning to the raw more than once and in a random order ensured that other evidence was not overlooked and coding remained authentic. Furthermore, as the initial coding process was completed, certain codes seemed similar to others while some appeared often and others infrequently, signaling a need to collapse and condense the initial codes when possible. Understandably, a second cycle of coding was undertaken as recommended by Saldaña (2009) to “develop a sense of categorical, thematic, conceptual, and/or theoretical organization from [the] array of First Cycle codes” (p. 149). Samples of codes derived from secondary coding are “peers as

translators,” “parents as language resources,” “multilingual story book reading,” and “intentional use of home language.”

To help with the consolidation of codes after the second round of coding, second and third readers (members of my doctoral study group) were asked for their input. I wanted to ensure that their understanding of the data and connections across sources resonated with my own (cf. recommendations in Creswell, 2005; Merriam, 2009). During this third cycle of coding, initial codes were consolidated, expanded, and better organized. This iterative process “further manage[d], filter[ed], highlight[ed], and focuse[d] the salient features of the qualitative data record for generating categories, themes, and concepts grasping meaning, and/or building theory” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 8). Once a third cycle of analysis was completed, more established categories were used to make connections and develop themes across all participant data in relation to the research question and theory presented.

The emerging themes were developed across the complete data corpus with the help of colleagues. Again, members of my doctoral study group read through my codes, their definitions, and evidence to help me construct early themes that were naturally emerging. After deliberating upon their suggestions and my own analysis, four clear themes emerged. They were (1) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching involves personal introspection/reevaluation; (2) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifests as a commitment to giving prominence to home languages in the classroom; (3) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifests as an understanding and incorporation of home language as a learning resource; (4) and the take-up of

linguistically responsive teaching evolves over time into *community* sense-making. These will be delineated and discussed in Chapter Five. The themes helped me to identify and describe teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. By reflecting upon these themes, I felt confident that a more nuanced understanding of the process of teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching emerged. After all, my intention was to make a worthwhile research contribution to the field by putting forward information and insights that would contribute to valuable discussion regarding how teachers can be more linguistically responsive. Understanding take-up in this way may generate discussion that helps teacher educators better plan and support teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. To add merit to my contribution, I needed to openly address issues regarding bias, methodology, and ethics. This is the focus of the next section.

Ethical and Methodological Concerns

To ensure that this study was deemed a credible contribution to the field, I enacted several research-based, time-proven protocols to build trust in my study's overall happenings and findings. Every decision and action was made with careful consideration of my own positionality, accountability, and trustworthiness. I enacted particular proven protocols—following IRB regulations, allowing volunteers to quit at any time, changing names—to ensure that this study had worthwhile findings to share with the educational research world; however, more needed to be explicitly disclosed in terms of trustworthiness, accountability, and positionality to ensure that my readers were confident with my findings. In this section I explain how I maintained the integrity of the study's focus while also remaining deeply respectful of the concerns of my readers and

colleagues. Below I detail how I maintained accountability, trustworthiness, and integrity regarding my own positionality throughout this study.

Accountability. First and foremost I, as the head researcher, was responsible for this study's worthiness in the field of educational research. My teacher-participants and director-participants trusted my work, and I felt deeply responsible to maintain their trust by taking pains to be accountable for my decisions and actions throughout this study. All formal accountability measures were upheld—IRB approval was sought and obtained; consent of the participants was voluntary and participants were allowed to drop out at any time; pseudonyms were used; data collection was rigorous; all recordings and transcripts were kept confidential; and names of the teachers, directors, mentors, schools, and sites for the institute were changed. In fact, I went so far as to omit the director's name from citations of materials she wrote and which I cited. Nevertheless, I still needed to balance my personal influence with the integrity of this study. Therefore, openly acknowledging my positionality and personal investment in this study was imperative.

Positionality. An awareness of my positionality was key to conducting well-received qualitative research. *Positionality* describes how an individual is located socially, professionally, politically, and personally within their personal and professional worlds. An acknowledgement of such personal locales and social forces and how they impact relationships with participants and data interpretation was essential (Merriam, 2009). Foster (1994) discussed in her ethnographic and life-history work the idea that researchers can never truly be insiders or outsiders to the group they are studying. However, they must remain diligently aware of their own perspectives, life-histories, and

biases and make these “transparent” to their readers so that their readers can use such information to better understand and critically read the research at hand. I felt that my own position offered challenges and benefits to my research, but it was truly up to me to be honest about my position, my biases, and perspectives so that my participants and readers could make their own judgments regarding my work.

This study was important to me as a teacher and teacher educator. Over the course of my doctoral studies I became deeply passionate about the fact that many literacy and early childhood teachers with whom I identify do not know how to successfully support children whose first language is not English in their classrooms. As an early childhood teacher I certainly felt as though I was of like mind with some of the teacher-participants in my own study, as if they were teachers with whom I would enjoy working. However, to them I was certainly the “white woman from the university” conducting research. (Adrianna jokingly shared this sentiment with me when she was talking about how she definitely had a preconceived idea about who I was and what I wanted to accomplish; Adrianna, Interview 4, December 21, 2015). Clearly, whereas I thought of myself as “one of them” (i.e., I am an early childhood educator who seeks to be responsive to all students), they did not see me that way and perhaps that was for the best. Foster wrote, “Research conducted by insiders cannot capture the total experience of an entire community. But neither can research conducted by outsiders. We must be mindful of this fact for . . . *no one commands the power to know all things*” (1994, p. 144; original emphasis). This humble, honest approach to research, complemented my own teacher

sensibilities and enabled me to see what I was not expecting and to appreciate what was truly there.

Accepting my positionality and making it apparent to my participants and readers was an important aspect of the “work” of this research. From the start I located myself as a monolingual English speaking, white female certified elementary teacher and reading specialist who was certified with no knowledge of the specific research that guides linguistically responsive teaching. I openly talked about being somehow a part of the “problem.” Acknowledging that I was indeed blindly part of the problem required that I not only keep thinking of my positionality in terms of my “whiteness,” (Galman, Pica-Smith, & Rosenberger, 2010), but also in terms of my language use. As a monolingual English speaker whose family was guided by educators years ago to only speak English, I too perpetuated a primacy of English that was no longer logical to me, and I had to keep my own feelings of guilt and inadequacy in check (Motha, 2014). This positionality was embraced by me and made apparent through conversations with a purpose and discussions with my advisor and “critical friends.” Actually, I felt as though my education failed me and my actual and potential students. This was a significant driving force for the present study and because of its deeply personal nature, I had to keep asking myself if what I was finding in the data was truly there. As discussed in the next section, developing trustworthiness within my audience was the ultimate goal.

Trustworthiness. Ultimately, I wanted my study to have impact and in order to have such I needed to ensure that it was indeed trustworthy. My goal in conveying trustworthiness was to demonstrate that this study was worth reading (Lincoln & Guba,

1985). Therefore, I openly disclosed to my participants, my critical “friends,” and my advisor, my struggles of data collection, changing timetables, and my own positionality that could impact my interpretation of data. To counter balance the impact of my positionality, that is who I was personally, professionally, and socially in order to maintain a high level of trustworthiness with my readers, I used my researcher’s notebook; I relied on the assistance and guidance of my critical friends; and I spent as much time in the field conducting data collection as logistically possible.

The inclusion of a researcher’s notebook helped to make sure every concern was valued and revisited with my advisor and “critical friends” (doctoral study group and colleagues). I met with my advisor approximately twice a month in person and attended monthly doctoral study group sessions with three colleagues and my advisor. These meetings with “critical friends” provided valuable critique and thoughtful suggestions as to how to proceed with data analysis and my final assertions (cf. recommendations in Costa & Kallick, 1993; McNiff, Lomax, & Whitehead, 1996). Discussions with my advisor and critical friends continually reminded me that research is never a neutral act (Creswell, 2005; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002, 2014; Spradley, 1980). That is, teaching and learning do not take place in a laboratory and to pretend otherwise would not be beneficial to the field of educational research. Data gathered via observation and interviews needed to be honestly accepted and coded and my researcher notebook along with my critical friends helped me to maintain this focus. Spending as much time in the field as possible also helped to add trustworthiness to my study.

As suggested by research (Merriam, 2009), my researcher-presence impacted what I was observing, and studying individuals in their own context had its own challenges to be sensitive to (Creswell, 2005). My presence as a passive-participant easily could have changed the outcomes I was observing, especially when considering the presence of others who did not agree to or know about my research study (i.e., other teachers in the institute, or children in the observed classrooms). Some would say I made participants more self-aware of their actions (Merriam, 2009); others would say participants tried to “show me” what I was looking for (Creswell, 2005); and still others would claim that I would directly impact a moment or several moments with and without realizing it (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Spradley, 1980). In fact, the community fostered by Maria was a key aspect of the work she and the teachers accomplished together in three days. However, that same strong sense of community and collaboration challenged my planned neutral observations. For example, the directors and program participants often tried to include me in the opportunities in which they were engaged, (e.g., the Privilege Walk and the Awaka experience; see Chapter Four for more on these). Clearly my presence was not overlooked.

None of the above claims can be disputed easily, nor should they be. I was not running a test on a new vaccine which would require the utmost, lab-proven specificity. I was trying to understand the human concept of take-up and to do so, embracing the entire humanity of the situation was necessary. As discussed previously, however, dedicating as much time as was feasible to observations helped to develop confidence in this method for collecting data because the more present I was, the more the teacher-participants and

the others around seemed to forget about me. Time in the field allowed for relationship building and the growing consistency to certain data (e.g., the use of similar strategies among the teachers from lesson to lesson but at different times in the semester) increased my own confidence in my data and subsequent analysis and interpretations.

Similarly, information gathered via interviews and vignette discussions could not be accepted as absolute truths as given by participants either (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002, 2014). According to (Merriam, 2009), the very act of being interviewed shaped and informed each individual's answers to the questions I asked. As mentioned earlier, the more times we engaged in either semi-structured interviews or conversations with a purpose, the more "genuine" the conversations felt and seemed to flow. However, I remained mindful based on the research that throughout the study that participants may not have wanted to divulge their views on the topic of take-up or may not have been able to articulate their thoughts or feelings (Lankshear & Knobel, 2004). For example, when using the vignette during the second interview did not elicit that type of conversation I had hoped for, I offered up the chance for the teacher-participants to take more time to think about what they wanted to say. Each of them sent me a more substantial list of thoughts regarding the vignette than they gave during my face-to-face interview with them, and I hypothesized that this was due to the fact that they gained time to gather their thoughts by using email, rather than having to provide on-the-spot responses. For my study's purpose, I did not require unreflective gut reactions to situations. I wanted honest thoughts about what they were thinking, feeling, and articulating concerning linguistically responsive teaching. Planning for three interviews and allowing for as many

conversations with a purpose as time and circumstance allowed, helped to develop confidence in this data. Moreover, drawing on document data and observational data helped to increase confidence by corroborating evidence among the data.

I planned thoughtfully with my advisor to ensure this study was deemed trustworthy and indeed, “credible” (i.e., the findings make sense based on the data presented) by its readers. Therefore, to build confidence in my own sense making, I used multiple data sources—observations, interviews, conversations with a purpose, and document data. By comparing data across sources referred by some as qualitative “triangulation” (Merriam, 2009, p. 215), I was able to build trustworthiness in my study outcomes, as well. By readily identifying similar codes and then grouping these into themes across data sources, I built confidence in my findings. I also employed a strategy referred to as “member checking” in that I “solicited feedback on [my] emerging themes” from my teacher-participants and director-participants to ensure that I was not misrepresenting them (Merriam, 2009, p. 215). As the study neared completion, I sent them a draft of the findings and discussions (Little feedback was received other than supportive, positive remarks). Finally, I enlisted the help of my “critical friends” who were asked to read a number of iterations of my analysis and interpretations to ensure that they were indeed noting similar trends (Merriam, 2009).

Finally, as mentioned in my discussion of observations above, I inadvertently collected data about the students in the teacher-participants’ classrooms and the non-participant teachers during the summer institute. I only analyzed that which was pertinent to my focus teachers, however. Although this kind of collateral participation was an

unavoidable issue for this study, as it is in most qualitative research (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993), this was not an ethical concern for the present study due to the non-sensitive nature of the classroom, summer institute, and teleconference discussion topics. These were sites and events that openly and explicitly welcomed visitors. At the summer institute, funders stopped by and left randomly; in the classrooms, child study team members, extra aides, nurses, and supervisors were observed visiting classrooms at different times; and the teleconference discussions were open to all involved in the summer institute who wanted to join, but were not mandatory. These were very public sites within which to observe. Fortuitously, I was one of many “others” in each realm. Although I was quite passionate about my work, I tried to keep those feelings in check.

Limitations. As with all qualitative research the findings and discussion of the data gathered for this study remain most pertinent to the particular teacher-participants with whom this study was conducted. However, the results will add to the discussion of linguistically responsive teaching. In and of itself that is a worthy goal because so little is understood in the field of education regarding the teachers of ELLs who were not directly prepared to teach students whose first languages are not English. The methodology was deliberately designed to remain true to the expectations of sound qualitative research, to gain insight into what becoming linguistically responsive entails for individuals, and to be worth reading by educators to at least add to the discussion of possibilities.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I have provided a careful overview of my participant selection, data collection methodology, data analysis, and recognition of concerns going forward. By

doing so I hope that I have increased the trustworthiness of the results and findings that are the focus of Chapter Five: Findings and Discussion. Before presenting the findings, Chapter Four explicitly describes the catalyst site and initial context of study. This descriptive chapter is included in order to further increase the trustworthiness of the study by providing a detailed overview of the wonderfully rich teacher education program within which the four teacher-participants were presented important content and took part in pertinent opportunities to increase their linguistically responsive teaching. Chapter Four also establishes very explicitly the linguistically responsive teaching learning opportunities that were made available to all of the early childhood educators selected to participate in the institute.

Thus, this report continues with a thorough, descriptive overview of the Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute in which I try to convey a true understanding of the concordant nature of the program's mission and actualization, and discuss these in relation to this study's goals. I provide a detailed description of the director's goals and rationale as well as provide examples of some of the actual happenings of the three day initial institute I felt best reflected the linguistically responsive goals of the institute within which this study's data collection began.

Chapter Four: Catalyst Site and Initial Context of Study

Chapter Four is dedicated to a rich discussion of the Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute (pseudonym), the catalyst context for this study, because of its culturally and linguistically responsive orientations to teaching. Finding such a site for teacher education was not easy. I spent many months calling universities and consultants in the geographic region of interest trying to identify a program that would enable me to observe teachers as they took part in learning opportunities designed to foster linguistic responsiveness and then, follow the teachers back to their classrooms. Most universities did not necessarily work with practicing teachers nor did they follow their graduates into the field, and few consultants worked with enough teachers in a manner that was concordant with my work. With tenacity and a willingness to reintroduce my study goals several times over, I finally connected with Maria, the founder and director of the Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute. The culturally and linguistically responsive focus of her program was of interest to me and Maria was open to my study's question:

While following general education early childhood teachers through a formal learning program and into their classrooms, what “take-up” from the range of opportunities designed to help this small group of teachers become more linguistically responsive in their classrooms seems to be demonstrated?

The program's philosophy, the opportunities presented to participants, and the organizational rationale for the program all merit more than a quick snapshot because

they indeed formed the foundation from which the concept of teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was studied in the present investigation.

To assist the reader in understanding the nature of take-up studied in this particular investigation and analyzed in subsequent chapters, this chapter includes a detailed overview of the August 2015 to July 2016 rendition of the program to demonstrate that this program's sociocultural design and its linguistically responsive focus were consonant with the goals of this study. The chapter begins with a discussion of the program's history; continues with an overview of the linguistically responsive goals developed by Maria; provides an overview of the learning opportunities that were offered during the three day summer institute that concentrated on fostering such; and finally, incorporates a brief discussion of previous "success stories" from this program to provide examples as to what type of take-up may be supported by the 2015-2016 program happenings.

All of the information used for this contextualizing chapter was obtained from documents—reports, press releases, curriculum guides—written by Maria over the past eight years (and anonymized by me for this report); interviews with Maria and her co-director, Dalia (see Chapter Three: Methodology); and my own observations of the summer institute (see Chapter Three: Methodology). This information was sought purposely to better understand the rationale behind the program's design and to set the context for this study. The documents used for this section were not subjected to close data analysis. At times throughout this chapter, connections between extant academic

research and the work of Maria were drawn to effectively demonstrate the program's compatibility with this study's framing and focus.

As will become apparent in the Program History, much of the program rationale was based on academic research. However, influences from Maria's own life—experiences gained while teaching in linguistically and culturally diverse settings as well as being an ELL herself became perceptible during interviews and observations. Therefore, Maria's voice—quotes from her interviews, her observable discussion, and her own writing—were included here to emphasize that her life-experiences and her funds of knowledge (that is past experiences and current knowhow and values, especially those regarding language learning and use) played a prominent role in the program's overall design.

Program History

Maria, a former pre-school director, teacher educator, and certified professional development coach, established the Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute to inspire early childhood educators to provide more successful learning opportunities for ELLs than she was afforded as a monolingual Spanish speaking kindergarten student in the United States and to address the confusion she witnessed as a preschool director that was exhibited by young children when their home cultures and languages were not prominent in their early educational experiences (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Maria's original funding proposal included a week-long professional retreat during which the attendees would spend their days participating in opportunities designed to foster their cultural and linguistic

responsiveness in their classroom practices and their evenings participating in group reflections and cultural experiences. Originally, Maria not only wanted to provide the seeds for teacher awareness and growth regarding language and culture, but to provide time to nurture such growth collaboratively. A week-long retreat did not find support due mainly to the financial demands of housing the teachers. Therefore, within the logistical confines of money and time, Maria tried to stay true to those original intentions and drafted a proposal for the Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms that found support in private businesses interested in supporting the well-being and healthy development of young children as well as those with funds set aside to support literacy learning in schools (Maria, Interview 1, August 19, 2015).

Since 2007 The Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute has offered yearlong comprehensive teacher education to early childhood teachers (preschool through third grade) who work with culturally and linguistically diverse student populations. This has included a pre-institute evaluation of each teacher and aide accepted to the institute and conducted by Maria and/or her co-director Dalia; a three day intensive summer institute; nine months of mentoring; periodic supportive teleconference calls; and visits from the program directors. The program has also offered a leadership institute and a mentor's retreat that were not a part of this study, but the inclusion of which speak to the thoughtfulness and intentionality of this multidimensional program. Over the eight years since its inception, the program has impacted the teaching of over 200 early childhood educators and their students.

Study Context: Program Proceedings for 2015-2016

The August 2015 to July 2016 rendition of the program provided the catalyst site and context for this study and included the support of several knowledgeable teacher educators including Maria, her co-director Dalia, and eight mentors who each had three to five teachers in their charge. As contracted consultants, these mentors attended the summer institute, a mentor institute, and visited each of their assigned early childhood educators once a month to provide support and feedback to the classroom educators and directors. To become a program participant, interested early childhood educators with linguistically diverse students submitted an application in teams of two (co-teachers and/or teachers with aides) that included surveys regarding personal education and work history, essays, resumes, and two letters of recommendations for each member of the team. During the application process, each team was formally observed in their classrooms by Dalia in order to obtain a sense of their current teaching practices and to make final decisions about program acceptance.

Twenty-eight educators (14 teaching teams) were accepted to the August 2015 to July 2016 iteration of the program. Everyone who was accepted attended the three-day, content-specific summer institute along with their mentors. This institute offered opportunities designed to better prepare the teachers and aides for the diverse classrooms in which they teach. After the summer institute, teleconferences were offered by the program every second month and addressed topics deemed pertinent to the participating educators' work. Each time an educator joined a teleconference call, she received a small gift card as incentive for continued participation. Financial support from private funders

financed the institute happenings (i.e., the materials, the mentors' salaries and an \$800 stipend for each team to be spent on classroom materials). Near the end of the school year (i.e., April 2016), the participating teachers and aides were invited back to showcase their learning and their students' learning with regard to the program's goals—ideally showing an increase in cultural and linguistic responsiveness in participating educators' teaching practices. The overall goal of the institute was to foster cultural and linguistic consciousness, because Maria believed that “becoming culturally and linguistically conscious [was] the beginning of becoming culturally and linguistically responsive” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Helping to develop more responsive teachers in local classrooms was, in short, the focus of her work. To Maria, a responsive teacher is “in tune with her class, understands what they can do and need” (Maria, Interview 1, August 19, 2015). The programs' linguistically responsive goals and values as well as the opportunities to support the development of such are discussed below.

The Program's Linguistically Responsive Goals and Values

Although separating language and culture from each other was not the typical way Maria went about her work with teachers, a distinctive vision of a linguistically responsive teacher was presented to the teachers over the course of three days. Maria wrote in a previously published report that prior to 2007 when she developed the program, “there [was] no generally accepted approach for preparing teachers to educate ELL students” (Anonymized, 2008, p. 2). Instead, she developed opportunities that she believed would lead to linguistically and culturally responsive teaching based on her experiences as an educator and ELL. To do so, she drew on her own experience and her

academic reading in the fields of bilingual education and second language learning. A summary of that initial and enduring vision is included below, followed by a delineation of the opportunities Maria designed to support each aspect of this vision. Although aspects of Maria's work will resonate with the research reviewed in Chapter Two, Maria's goals were not formulaic nor did she convey an ideal to which teachers should be compared. Realistically, she presented her work; that is, the development of culturally and linguistically responsive teachers, as the "beginning of a life-long process" for educators (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015).

In this section, the linguistically responsive goals for the program were outlined to give prominence to key content in relation to this study's intent. Although many more goals were addressed during the institute in regard to culturally and developmentally appropriate preschool learning, this section highlights key elements of the three day instituted that collectively formed the "baseline" or "starter kit" of potential linguistically responsive practices, notions, and knowledge/skills to be "taken up" by participants, and which, in turn, formed a key element of my own study. Throughout the three day institute culture, language, pedagogy, and practice and how each related to Maria's vision of linguistically responsive teaching were important threads of discussions and opportunities.

Over three days Maria presented a strong vision of linguistically responsive teaching that emphasized values and open-mindedness. In order to be linguistically responsive teachers and aides, Maria outlined the following goals: (1) educators (teachers and aides) should understand that culture and language are interconnected; (2) educators

need to develop cultural consciousness; (3) educators should dedicated time to be more introspective about their own judgmental views of language and diverse students; (4) educators should value all students' home languages in order to better value their students; and (5) educators should see home languages as an integral part of academic learning. Emphasis was always on the belief that each participant can make positive and productive shifts in their values, thinking, and practices over the year ahead (and beyond) and this would be a deeply personal process. To me these goals resonated with my assertion that teachers bring to their professional work their own funds of knowledge, especially those regarding language use and learning that should be acknowledged for they impact the ways in which individuals teach. The following section summarizes the linguistically responsive teaching goals that begin with, and go well beyond, the belief that language and culture are interconnected.

Understanding that culture and language are deeply connected. For Maria language and culture were deeply intertwined. Therefore, when speaking about language, Maria wanted the attendees to know that she was always considering culture. Maria explained, "For me, language is culture and culture is language" (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Maria described to the participants that as a Puerto Rican-American girl and now woman, there were feelings and values important to her that only Spanish had the language to describe: "There are words that cannot be translated literally. There are cultural meanings so embedded in the Spanish language" that she cannot properly express in English. For example, Maria explained that *Te quiero* was a Spanish phrase she used to describe her feelings for her husband when they were still dating. The

phrase meant roughly, “I really care for you but don’t quite love you” and she assured the group, “It sounds much sweeter in Spanish!” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015).

Maria explained that without her home language, aspects of her culture would have been lost to her and emphasized such by referencing a definition of language found in the Curriculum Guide stating, “Language is intertwined with culture in multiple and complex ways . . . Language is a system of signs that is seen as having cultural values” (cited in Anonymized, 2015, p. 45; Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015; see also Kramsch, 1998). Maria related this directly to ELLs in classrooms. This personal view of language and culture clearly resonated with the wider academic field as they discussed the important role language plays in the development of one’s identity and self-worth (see also Chapter One and Two; Anzaldua, 1987; Erikson, 1968; Greenhow & Robelia, 2009; Leander, 2000; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Maalouf, 2000; Piaget, 1983; Rowsell & Abrams, 2011; Stets & Burke, 2000; Vygotsky, 1973) and impacted her program’s goals and design. The opportunities designed to support this understanding (i.e., cultural artifact sharing, the creation of cultural masks, and a facilitated discussion of the Iceberg theory) will be fully discussed after each aspect of linguistically responsive teaching addressed by Maria is further explained (see the section on opportunities later in this chapter). Maria’s view of cultural consciousness is the subject of the next section.

Deepening cultural consciousness. Not only did Maria want the attendees to know that language and culture are truly intertwined, but she wanted the teachers to strive for cultural consciousness, defined by Maria as “an awareness that we may think and

judge diverse children and their families based on our own experiences, biases, and blind spots . . .” (Anonymized, 2015, p. 40; Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015).

Maria urged attending teachers to challenge their own current understanding of culture and diversity because by doing so the teachers would challenge what they have come to know about language use and learning. The acknowledgment of this knowhow and knowledge was key to my study because I argue that an individual’s knowledge tool-kit (i.e., funds of knowledge) regarding language is ever-present and impacts teachers as they use their tools-for-learning to learn and develop as teachers. Maria and the mentors, her fellow teacher educators, wanted participating teachers to leave the three day institute more culturally conscious about their understanding of culture and language than when they arrived because as Maria stated:

Culturally conscious teachers strive to identify their blind spots and correct mistruths about culturally and linguistically diverse children and families so they can see their student for who they really are and can use their culture and language as anchors for their development. This requires continuous investigation and modification to one’s thinking and practices. (Anonymized, 2015, p. 40)

Cultural consciousness should therefore be seen as a process without a definitive endpoint.

To further explain this goal, Maria included an excerpt from *The Heart of the Teacher—We Teach Who We Are* by Parker J. Palmer (2007), an author and an activist for social change:

Teaching, like any truly human activity, emerges from one's inwardness, for better or worse . . . teaching holds a mirror to the soul. If I am willing to look into the mirror and not run from what I see, I have a chance to gain self-knowledge—and knowing myself is as crucial to good teaching as knowing my students and my subject. . . . In fact, knowing my students and my subjects depends heavily on self-knowledge. (p. 160, see also Anonymized, 2015, p. 76; Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015).

Cultural consciousness, the development of which is complex, has been written about by supporters of culturally responsive teaching (e.g., Delpit, 1995; Gay, 2000, Ladson-Billings, 2014; Villegas & Lucas, 2002) and linguistically responsive teaching (e.g., Lucas & Villegas, 2011). In order to further deepen self-knowledge and cultural consciousness and to thoughtfully build upon pertinent funds of knowledge to extend learning, Maria suggested that teachers need time to be more introspective about their work and what matters to them. This intentional introspection is the subject of the next section.

Introspection. Maria and Dalia worked diligently to engage and support teachers in what they called “introspective work.” Introspection in this sense refers to reflective contemplation of one's thoughts, opinions, values, and practices. Maria further explained that “teaching linguistically and culturally diverse students requires that teachers continually seek to know themselves, their students, their communities, and ‘why culture and language matter’” (Anonymized, 2011, p. 1). The process of becoming more culturally competent and linguistically responsive “requires opening oneself up to critical

reflection, the harsh criticisms and condemning opinions of others, and it entails having to listen to the unflattering assessment of one's own actions" (Anonymized, 2011, p. 2). Maria conveyed to the participants that linguistically responsive teachers better understand themselves, the knowledge they bring (i.e., funds of knowledge regarding language), and their blind spots.

During the three days of the summer institute, Maria often referred to the need to address "blind spots . . . mistruths . . . anything you are not aware of" (Maria, Interview 1, August 19, 2015). In her opinion one of the biggest blind spots she saw regularly in program participants was the fact that "teachers don't 'see' the importance of home language, because they have never been told to look" (Maria, Interview 1, August 19, 2015). Regarding language-related blind spots Maria often spoke directly about "myths" such as the belief that "Total English immersion . . . is the best way for English language learners to learn English" and "ELL children's family members should stop speaking the home language to the child because it will further confuse them and interfere with learning" (Anonymized, 2015, p. 101; see also Espinosa, 2008).

Maria also debunked the stereotype or oft-held blind spot that all ELLs are immigrants. She herself, for example, was born in the United States to parents who spoke only Spanish. Thus, Maria emphasizes to participants that ELLs are not a single, homogenous group and should not be talked or thought about as such. In many ways, Maria used her personal history to create a more realistic understanding of being an American born ELL. Maria's focus on helping teachers to understand their own blind spots in relation to language (and culture) unique from their own, led her to develop

opportunities within the three day institute to helping teachers better understand themselves and their funds of knowledge regarding language and culture such as the Privilege Walk that truly forced the teachers and aides to look at themselves in relation to others (see the section on opportunities later in this chapter). Along with understanding the interconnectedness of culture and language, deepening cultural consciousness, and introspection, Maria emphasized that educators should understand the value of an individual's home language. Her rationale is explained in the next section.

Valuing home languages. Maria emphasized that linguistically responsive teachers should value students' home languages by making them visible and present in the classroom. She explained, "children bring culture and language to the classroom . . . that is who they really are . . . the sounds of their language, the games they play, what makes them who they are, it's all tied up in language" (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). By making home languages visible and present in the classroom, teachers show that "the children matter here" (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2016). Such a position finds support in the work of researchers in the field of linguistically responsive teaching (Bartolomé, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Valdés, 2001). Maria spoke about the research-supported connection between language and a child's developing self-concept/identity as well as the strong affirmation that "children and [their] families have a right to use and develop their home language" (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015; Anonymized, 2015).

To emphasize the importance of valuing all language, Maria spoke about the ills of *linguicism*; that is "discrimination based on the language one speaks" (Anonymized,

2008, p. 1). To further clarify, she explained that positioning English as “*the* language” of the classroom sends negative connotations regarding other languages to students and their families who speak home languages other than English (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2016). Maria went on to discuss how some children can easily become “invisible and undervalued” while they sit in a classroom full of language they do not understand (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015) especially when the classroom language (English) is more highly valued than the language they already speak. Maria used modeling (see the section on learning opportunities later in this chapter) as her primary means to convey how and why teachers should value their student’s languages and cultures. By doing so Maria urged the teachers and aides to use home languages as resources for learning. This notion is the focus of the next section.

Repositioning home languages as resources for learning. According to Maria, becoming linguistically responsive also included accessing home languages as learning resources, an idea which resonated with many in the fields of second language learning (Cummins, 1980, 1998, 2000; Valdés, 2001) and funds of knowledge (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll & Greenberg, 1990). Maria emphasized that linguistically responsive teachers see home language as an important foundation for academic learning and purposely include home language daily, especially in lesson planning. Maria further explained that linguistically responsive teachers also need to facilitate progress in each student’s home language. In other words, “ELL students who receive systematic learning opportunities in their home language between the ages of three and eight, consistently outperform those who attend English-only programs on measures of academic

achievement in English during the middle school and high school years” (Anonymized, 2011, p. 3; see also Espinosa 2008). Maria reminded institute participants that as teachers in schools with National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accreditation, they should be aware of the fact that NAEYC prioritizes the need for early childhood teachers to be respectful and inclusive of diversity, community, and home languages as means to nurture cultural identities (NAEYC, 2009). Losing one’s first language can be devastating to emotional growth and self-esteem (see Castro, Ayankoya, & Kasprzak, 2011).

Specific to academic growth, Maria shared research that spoke of the need for children to use their home languages as resources for learning content and eventually English (Cummins, 1998, 2000; Espinosa, 2008). Researchers often speak of home languages as an active and present aspect of an individual’s funds of knowledge that needs to be made accessible to students (Haneda & Wells, 2012; Rowe & Fain, 2013) and Maria echoed this important realization by emphasizing that if students are not allowed to use their home languages they often do not develop proficiency in either their home languages or English (see Anderson, 2004). To be linguistically responsive all languages must be seen as an asset by teachers even when others do not see their importance easily and this repositioning of home language will certainly extend and possibly transform a teacher’s funds of knowledge (Anonymized, 2015). Maria dedicated several hours of institute time across the three days to understanding and practicing literacy moments, a primary opportunity put forth as an ideal way to thoughtfully include home languages in learning (see the section on learning opportunities later in this chapter). Although each

aspect of being linguistically responsive emphasized by Maria has been discussed separately for clarity in this section, they were presented over the three days in integrated and meaningful ways.

Speaking with clarity about the importance of linguistically responsive teaching was personal for Maria as proven by her own words, “this work [all that is being accomplished at the institute] is both professional and personal. I have deeply felt the cultural divide [her years spent in an English only classroom as a Spanish speaking young girl] when teachers do not make an attempt to know and infuse . . . language into the classroom” (Maria, Interview 1, August 19, 2015). Maria explained that she imagined children felt much like she did. English-only in a classroom for her was “just a cloud of noise that created even greater fear” (Maria, Interview 1, August 19, 2015).

To summarize, Maria’s personal experience and funds of knowledge gave life to the research she was quoting and the beliefs she was conveying, those being that linguistically responsive teachers educators (1) should understand that culture and language are interconnected; (2) should develop cultural consciousness; (3) should dedicate time to be more introspective about their own judgmental views of language and diverse students; (4) should value all students’ home languages in order to better value their students; and (5) should see home languages as an integral part of academic learning.

To support the teachers and aides as they began the process of becoming more linguistically responsive, several opportunities were developed for the teachers. How these opportunities were presented and the context within which they were presented are

important to understand and are the subjects of the next two sections—Setting the Tone and Learning Opportunities. As will be explained, Maria, through her warm sharing of her own life-experiences and personal values, established a learning context that was safe and supportive. As she explained, if you are going to expose difficult “blind spots” and share experiences of confusion, you need to feel supported (Maria, Interview 1, August 19, 2015). Maria told the teachers that they (Dalia, the mentors, and she) were asking them (the participants) to change and change takes time and hard work. [While my present study was focused on using the concept of take-up, Maria believed that in essence they were asking the teachers to change—change their practice, change their classrooms, and change their ways of thinking about language (Institute Observation Day 3, August 14, 2015).] In support of the work she was asking the teachers and aides to do, Maria established a particular contextual tone within which the opportunities were presented.

Setting the Tone

From August 12, 2015, to August 14, 2015, the twenty-eight educators (teachers and aides), eight mentors, and two directors gathered in a beautifully renovated historic urban mill situated adjacent to one of the host city’s recently established children’s gardens overlooking a park used by city personnel for school-related functions. To emphasize this year’s program theme, “The Global Child: Preparing Teachers to Engage Diverse Learners” the large industrial, city-chic room was decorated by the directors with art, photographs, poems, books, maps, flags, and dolls representing various ethnic groups and countries to create several displays highlighting children, language, culture, art, and music from around the globe. Upon arrival, the new cohort members were greeted by the

directors not only in English, but also in several other heritage languages that the participants spoke, such as Spanish, Portuguese, Haitian Patois, and Arabic, and guided to join their pre-assigned groups at large round tables tastefully decorated with individual name tags and flags reflective of each table member's heritage (information about participants' heritage had been gathered by means of their application materials). At their tables, their working materials awaited them—a drawstring backpack for each participant filled with a curriculum guide, pens, paper, and a journal for reflections and note-taking. As the teachers settled in, music representing several countries from around the world played while mentors walked around individually greeting this new cohort. Meanwhile, Maria and Dalia were observed diligently checking to see that the participants were signed in and seated with their correct table mates (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015).

After several introductions and niceties, Maria addressed the group to overview the goals and expectations she had established for them. As part of this overview, Maria included a poem by Mayra Fernandez (1992) entitled, *They Don't Prepare Me for This*, which tells the all-too-common-tale of a teacher meeting her new class—"a sea of faces so different from my own mirrored image"—then, realizing the inadequacies of her "Queen's English" and finally, wistfully hoping "Perhaps I could learn Vietnamese, Cantonese, Farsi, Korean, and Spanish by Christmas." With many nods of agreement, Maria went on to explain that although learning all the languages teachers will encounter in classrooms today was neither possible, for in the city in which they were gathered alone there are over 37 languages spoken in the main school district, nor necessary; they

could better understand how to teach children “so different from [them]selves” (Fernandez, 1992) in a way that “embraces who they are and what they bring to the classroom culturally and linguistically” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Maria emphasized how “everyone has the capacity to develop skills to work effectively with children and families who have diverse cultures, language, and abilities” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015; see also Anonymized, 2015). She emphasized that not only is it possible to teach all children knowledgeably, but necessary. These remarks resonated with my professional desire to support all teachers as they learn to teach all children.

Maria modeled through her staging of the environment, her use of other languages, and through her warm, thought-provoking demeanor, a commitment to building a sense of “community” she hoped each of the teachers would soon create in their classrooms (Maria, Interview 1, August 19, 2015). As written in the institute’s curriculum guide and shared through a choral reading of this text by the teachers and aides, Maria asserted, “development and learning are embedded in the sociocultural context in which they occur” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). This orientation spoke directly to the theoretical framing supporting the three day schedule of opportunities and learning, too. Maria believed that learning together, with and from others, has a deeper impact on human thinking than learning in isolation. Maria conveyed her theoretical beliefs through her own actions, the design of the physical room, the planned interactions that supported each opportunity, and the overall ambiance of the

institute. This entirety of the summer institute was clearly a time of supportive, active, social engagement, and every minute was valuable.

For example, Maria spoke about taking advantage of their time together to truly “learn with and from one another all they could about culture, language, and why teachers should be more conscious of each” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2014). Therefore, even lunch reflected this sentiment with daily samples of food from various cultures and ethnic groups such as Puerto Rican potato salad (asopao), Ecuadorian chicken with rice (arroz con pollo), and Algerian couscous. As Maria and Dalia welcomed everyone to share in these daily feasts, they explained the food options, their countries of origin, their names, and unique qualities about each dish (e.g., whether it was a traditional holiday dish or customarily an everyday staple). Together, the directors and mentors facilitated discussion among the teachers about their own family recipes and food choices (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Maria’s sociocultural framing of her own learning and work with teachers harmonized well with the framing of this study and so too did her emphasis on individual knowledge, learning, knowhow, and experiences.

Maria continually intertwined research, literature, poetry, and song with her personal experiences to engage the teachers in thinking about their current classrooms, their students, and the opportunities presented to them during the institute. This type of rich, dimensional information-sharing continued across the three days. Thus, not only did Maria’s well-designed set of learning opportunities for developing teachers’ linguistically

responsive teaching harmonize well with my own study's intent, but so too did the learning opportunities through which she tried to facilitate responsiveness in participants.

Opportunities Specific to Linguistically Responsive Teaching

The learning opportunities presented in this chapter actually took place in an environment that was contextually enriching and deeply interconnected as described above. However, in keeping with the goals of the present study, the focus of this chapter is on the linguistic aspects of the program and how teachers take-up linguistically responsive teaching. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, the linguistically responsive goals and the specific learning opportunities to support them are presented in isolation in this section, a process that is indeed decontextualizing, but deemed necessary for reasons of clarity. Each opportunity specific to linguistically responsive teaching presented below was further supported by mentor facilitated discussions and debriefings during the institute (and into the school year), readings, personal journaling, open discussions, and/or Maria's initial welcoming address as will be more thoroughly explained in this section. In fact, to best identify (yet further decontextualize) the opportunities included in the institute that supported the teachers' facilitation of linguistically responsive teaching, they will be presented in three sections—opportunities specific to linguistically responsive teaching that took place during the summer institute; ongoing, supportive opportunities (that enabled deeper exploration and integration during the summer institute); and finally, opportunities beyond the institute (that impacted take-up). The opportunities included in the three day summer institute that were specifically relevant to fostering linguistic responsiveness included modeling, literacy moment

demonstrations and practicums, a privilege walk, Awaka Experience, Iceberg Theory presentation, Gesture Game, cultural masks and artifact sharing, “Trust Your Instincts,” and videos with debriefings. Each of these is described below.

Modeling. Maria and Dalia modeled much of what they were asking the teachers to return to their classrooms to do. Although many of the modeled techniques were inspired by Maria’s professional readings (e.g., Hogg & Yates, 2013) and personal research, Maria thought it fitting to share this proverbial quote aloud with the participants during the three day institute: “Tell me and I forget. Show me and I remember. Involve me and I understand (proverb)” to explain the rationale for the institute’s decorated environment, the interactive opportunities, and the overall actions of Dalia, the mentors, and herself (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). From the moment the program attendees arrived, they were enveloped into a learning environment that affirmed all languages and cultures. For example, Maria, Dalia, and the mentors incorporated other languages into the morning song sung to start each institute day; greeted participants in their home languages; displayed flags for everyone from their heritage nation on their table; and created several displays around the room emphasizing that the language (and culture) of the participants mattered to them and to their learning. Maria and Dalia seamlessly enabled those aides who did not speak English a chance to use their home languages during all opportunities and welcomed those who spoke languages other than English to include those languages as a means to enhance the learning for all. For example, one of the aides who was bilingual in Arabic and English often added Arabic to the songs, stories, and modeling when possible.

Everything took place in a room that was transformed into an early childhood environment with displays of multi-lingual texts and print (e.g., poems and songs from other countries), authentic materials (e.g., displays created by previous participants for their classrooms), art (created by the current participants prior to arrival), and books the teachers could use in their classrooms. For example, the morning song was written in several pertinent languages displayed on a wall (a copy was also included in their curriculum packet); bilingual books along with props were readily available (e.g., *Pablo Neruda, Poet of the People*, 2011); and artifacts brought in by the institute attendees were displayed in English and other home languages (e.g., an Ecuadorian vase). They also ended each day with a whole-group discussion circle at which time Maria provided specific prompts to try and engage everyone in reflection. Maria explained, “I listen to everyone’s thoughts and reflections. They give me energy and focus” (Maria, *Conversation with a Purpose*, August 13, 2015). These circle-time reflections (the adult version of a preschooler’s circle time) were deemed invaluable to Maria as she believed they provide educators time to listen to what their “students” are currently thinking in regard to the content being presented.

Modeling how to include and value others’ home languages were the major intentions behind the actions of Maria, Dalia, and the mentors. These were presented as ways each educator could let “children know they belong in their classrooms” (Maria, *Interview 1*, August 19, 2015). In fact through modeling, all aspects of linguistically responsive teaching identified above were addressed. Maria and Dalia demonstrated the interconnectedness of culture and language; embodied cultural consciousness; “talked out

loud” about being introspective about their own judgmental views of language and diverse students; valued all students’ home languages; and used home languages as integral parts of academic learning. Modeling was used heavily during each of the literacy moments as well, but that particular kind of opportunity warrants a separate overview.

“Literacy moment” demonstrations and practicum. As mentioned above, Maria and Dalia modeled and emphasized the need to intentionally incorporate the home language of the participants’ students daily in the classroom. One type of learning opportunity that was enacted several times in various ways across the three days of the institute was the literacy moment. A literacy moment, as defined by the program, is a learning opportunity created by a teacher that actively includes the children, possibly the use of props and dramatic actions, and definitely involves the purposeful use of pertinent culture and home languages (Anonymized, 2015; see also Giroir, Grimaldo, Vaughn, & Roberts, 2015). Maria’s version of literacy moments finds support in research that reports on the various ways stories can be used to thoughtfully engage emerging readers with the story and text (Rao, Newlin-Haus, & Ehrhardt, 2016) as well as in research that reports about the ways in which interactive stories provided support to ELLs (Giroir, Grimaldo, Vaughn, & Roberts, 2015).

Maria explained to participants during the three day institute that when developing a literacy moment a teacher often does the following:

uses children’s literature to teach concepts and link those concepts to interactive activities that provide meaning and cultural connections and acceptance. By

adding gestures, visuals, props, and body language we [teachers/educators] double the message and increase comprehension. In this way, teachers facilitate the learning of English while reinforcing the importance of home language.

(Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015)

Per the demonstrations, to create a literacy moment a teacher selects a book that allows for the inclusion of (or already has) language(s) and culture(s) that are appropriate for the age group and then, intentionally plans to either read or tell the story using props and/or drama to help students follow along. Follow-up opportunities and lessons are also created by the teacher to extend the learning for the children throughout the day and/or week. An exemplar of a literacy moment was modeled by one of the mentors, Sofia (pseudonym), based on the *Little Red Hen*, a traditional folk tale.

Sofia told the story of the *Little Red Hen* by adapting the characters so that they were animals from countries of origin represented by many of the participants in the institute—Peru, Venezuela, and Argentina. She also infused dance reflective of each nation and language particular to each country for the characters. For example, the Cat from Peru was too busy dancing the salsa and said, “No, estoy bailando” (“No, I am dancing”) every time the hen asked for her help; the dog from Argentina danced the carnavalito and the squirrel from Venezuela danced the merengue. All remained unwilling to stop dancing and help the Little Red Hen (who was called in this particular retelling: La Pequeña Gallina Roja).

After Sofia told the story with the help of volunteers and props a preschooler could easily use—stick puppets, a rolling pin, a sack representing flour, and a bowl—she

taught the participants the dances from the various countries; she reviewed the language she used in the story at times (e.g., “No, estoy bailando”); and went over the various breads and grains each country traditionally uses (e.g., aniseed bread of Peru). In this way, Sofia took a traditional folk story commonly found in English and infused it with language-use and cultures that were specific to the audience. She also discussed ways to integrate the story and Spanish language into other content areas. Two other literacy moments were modeled by the mentors, each with unique inclusions of languages other than English and culture as well as props and drama. One was based on the book *Nappy Hair* (1998) and the other was adapted from the book *One Love* (2011), a picture book based on Bob Marley’s song.

As she reviewed the modeled literacy moments, Maria also spoke of the importance of spending time using the same content and vocabulary with young children and especially ELLs. She explained to the teachers and aides, “Your brain is a pattern maker, so for young children the more time you spend on topics with literacy moments and related content, the more schema develop” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015; see also Piaget, 1983). Contextualizing learning with several means to make connections—visuals, language, funds of knowledge—in this way is strongly influenced by sociocultural theory as it allows children to engage their own tools for learning to grapple with the content and make meaning (see Vygotsky, 1978).

Following all three demonstrations, the teachers and aides were given time to develop their own literacy moments with colleagues at their tables to be shared on the last day of the summer institute. They were guided by a set of questions posed by Maria:

“Who is in the room? How do I reach everyone? How can I make every child feel like this story was designed for them?” (Institute Observation Day 2, August 13, 2015).

Maria’s questions emphasized that being attentive to the students and intentional about languages are important when planning a literacy moment. Maria referred to this as a practicum opportunity—a chance to practice what was learned and, as research suggests, a time to critique a pedagogical suggestion (see also Martins, Costa, & Onofre, 2015).

Maria highlighted the aspects of each literacy moment presented on the third day that were successful. Those that spoke to the linguistically responsiveness included: the use of songs in students’ home languages into their retellings; labelling props with English and home languages; teachers and aides finding translations for repetitive phrases in their books in home languages; and teachers extending the stories with lessons that allowed students time to share and use their home languages (Institute Observation Day 3, August 14, 2015). The hope was that the participants would take the exact lessons enacted and/or the skills necessary to do so—that is, the ability to infuse multiple languages and culture (and support the learning of each) into an age appropriate story and related learning activities—back to their respective classrooms and design and enact at least one literacy moment for their classes.

Throughout these modeled literacy moments and the practicum, the emphasis was on the belief that linguistically responsive teachers intentionally include the home languages of their students in their literacy and content area lesson planning. The literacy moments and practicum opportunity provided a basis for understanding that linguistically responsive teachers see language and culture as interconnected; value home language;

and reposition home language as an academic resource by intentionally including home languages, create opportunities for children to hear and use home language, provide visuals and other learning aides to support ELL learning of English, and modify their current vision of lesson planning and literacy planning to account for all attempts at language usage. Other opportunities focused on different aspects of being linguistically responsive, such as the privilege walk opportunity that focused on asking educators to look inward at their own life-experiences and current lenses for interpreting such.

Privilege walk. Several versions of the Privilege Walk can be easily searched (Sassi, & Thomas, 2008; Williams, 2016) and those who employ them believe they do help individuals who participant better understand their own privileges or lack thereof in relation to other participants and possibly society at large that might not be easily seen otherwise (Sassi, & Thomas, 2008; Williams, 2016). During this particular privilege walk, the participants began by standing in a straight line holding hands, emphasizing the words of the facilitator, Dalia, “We all begin in the same place . . . seemingly equal with one another” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Then, the participants were directed to take steps forward and backward based on each question asked. For example, participants were asked to take one step backward if they were female; two steps forward if they went to college; one step back if they were black; and two steps backwards if they did not speak English well. The participants moved and emotions were stirred. When done with the list of questions, the teachers who were once holding hands in a line (demonstrating equality) were scattered above and below the imaginary line of origin and seeming equality. The further afore the line they finished, the less privileges they were

led to believe they had. The further beyond the starting line they were, the more privileges they seemingly had. These assumptions of privilege, and lack thereof, were now exposed to the entire group of educators. A quick scan could easily provide information about each person's "privileges." Emotions were palpable. Some teachers and aides were visibly upset, agitated, and frustrated by the experience; some were embarrassed. While some were waving their arms in disgust and expressing distaste for the results, others were slowly inching backward and forward trying to "blend" with those in the middle, seeming to indicate physically they understood that anyone who was an outlier either forward or backward obviously "had" more or "less" privileges. The participant's reactions were plentiful and welcomed during a debriefing discussion. This space provided the opportunity to debrief with others about feelings as well as the purpose of such an opportunity.

Maria emphasized to the group that stirring emotions is necessary on her part because she wanted to raise awareness of stereotypes and personal positions individuals hold with regard to language, culture, race, and education. "We [Maria, Dalia, and the mentors] are asking you to feel what you haven't felt . . . we want you to feel how your children feel. Awareness is the first stepping stone in this process of becoming [culturally and linguistically conscious and responsive]" (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Embracing how emotionally "raw" the educators stated they felt at that time, Maria emphasized the need to talk about what impacts them as teachers and aides by asserting, "Education does not take place in a vacuum. . . . Individual life-experiences impact our learning at this moment. We have to embrace who we are, what we think we

know, and what we feel denied” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Many aspects of Maria’s notions resonated with my working definition of funds of knowledge and how individuals need to be mindful of what we know about language learning and use in the United States. Maria, Dalia, and the mentors continued through small group debriefings and large group discussion to connect the privilege walk experience directly to how our society views linguistic and cultural differences in an effort to begin raising awareness of individually held *blind spots*.

Maria summarized the privilege walk opportunity by explaining how she wanted the participating educators to recognize their own misconceptions and *blind spots* through introspection; emphasizing that by better understanding their own privileges in relation to others, especially the students and families with whom they work, they can truly start to change their personal perceptions of the work they do as linguistically (and culturally) responsive teachers. Understanding one’s own perceptions and misperceptions is important in regard to being responsive teachers. Addressing the particular blind spots regarding language through introspection was the focus of other opportunities as well such as the Awaka experience and the Iceberg theory demonstration.

Awaka experience. The Awaka Experience was adapted from a workshop Maria had previously attended and has been used in the business world to foster positive relationship building (Anonymized, 2015). Maria incorporated the Awaka Experience to raise awareness of the power of individual preconceptions and how they can cause misinterpretations and blind spots. About an hour was set aside for this first day opportunity during which the participants were divided randomly into two groups—The

Awaka and the Richlanders (It should be noted that although the two Spanish speaking teachers were originally grouped separately, Maria effortlessly readjusted the random selection process to make sure they were together and with their bilingual mentor). The groups were given time to work together and learn about who they were “to be” based on artifacts and a written description of their group’s characteristics provided by Maria. On one hand, the Awaka was a traditional, island community somewhat isolated from modern conveniences that thrived on its rich natural resources of agricultural and seafood. To the Awaka music and art were a source of great pride. On the other hand, the Richlanders were a financially wealthy society that thrived on modern communication and industrial changes and had a history of providing financial aid to countries “in need.” The Richlanders recently identified the Awaka as a society “in need” of their financial support. The Awaka had no idea they were of interest to the Richlanders prior to their first meeting—the reenactment of which was the focus of this opportunity.

The two cultural groups met and the Richlanders pitched their plan to help the Awaka by giving a tremendous amount of money to the Awaka for they were “in need.” However, the Awakans resisted their help. Their civilization was successful, but just different from the Richlanders. Whereas the Richlanders valued material success and were a more developed economy, the Awaka were happy as a traditional village. Much time was spent involving all of the participants in negotiations between the two cultural groups, and further time was spent debriefing why the negotiations failed. Maria emphasized the lack of understanding of each other’s cultures and values. Emphasis was also placed on how viewing the Awaka from a deficit viewpoint as a society “in need”

instead of one with resources to offer, the Richlanders failed to help the Awaka at all and even negatively impacted any chance they had to work together.

The introspective debriefing sessions, first with mentors and then as a whole group, enabled a connection between this opportunity and what the classroom experiences of students who are different from their teachers linguistically (and culturally) are often like. Maria emphasized how children who speak a language other than English *have* a language that should be seen as resource instead of an obstacle and those same children need to be acknowledged for the resources that they bring to the classroom, and not be viewed as “in need” (Institute Observation Day 2, August 13, 2015). This opportunity emphasized that by being repositioned, teachers can see how outward demonstrations of valuing languages are important when trying to be linguistically responsive. Similarly, the next opportunity, the Iceberg Theory, was employed to convey the idea that language is often “not seen” as important to students, but should be valued as it is an integral part of a student’s identity.

Iceberg Theory. Maria’s presentation of the Iceberg Theory led the participants through a self-discovery opportunity regarding a distinction between surface culture and deep culture that culminated with a visual comparison of both concepts to an iceberg; the tip of which was the surface culture (e.g., attire, physical appearance, music) and the vast bottom of which represented deep culture (e.g., language, religious beliefs, values). The visual display with facilitated discussion emphasized how deep, important aspects of human culture and identity are not easily seen, and therefore not often acknowledged unless individuals are asked about their culture, their values, and their language. Maria

emphasized that educators need to look beyond what is easily known by looking at children and being with them in a classroom to search for information about their culture through thoughtful interactions, family sharing, and other creative ways. Suggestions were generated about how to find out more about the deep, meaningful culture of young students.

In this regard parents were seen as key to understanding deep culture which necessarily includes home language(s), too. Some suggestions such as asking parents for key phrases, sharing books in home languages, and asking parents to come into the classroom were discussed as being linguistically responsive practices that may enable the thoughtful inclusion of deep culture and, consequently, home languages into the early childhood classroom. Opportunities that could also address this understanding and be used with young children almost exactly as they were in the institute are the cultural mask and artifact sharing.

Cultural mask sharing. Prior to the first day of the summer institute, the participants were asked to design a double sided mask of themselves—one side depicting what others see of them; the other depicting what is important to each of them that others may not see. Many similar sharing exercises have been documented in the academic literature with teachers and students over the years to provide individuals with another outlet to share who they are and what is important to them (e.g., Singh & Richards, 2006). Through a structured sharing experience in which teachers and aides were at first randomly paired with partners and then, allowed to flow from one person to the next

discussing their masks, each participant had a chance to learn about their colleagues as well as share deeply about themselves.

Artifact sharing. The participants were asked to bring in a cultural artifact that would be displayed for the duration of the institute. A cultural artifact in this sense meant something special in their collection of memorabilia or artwork that was significant to their family and/or heritage in some way. These thoughtfully shared artifacts added to the welcoming environment (modeling what Maria and Dalia wanted the teachers to do in their classrooms) and also provided a source of personal values and/or history for whole-group discussion and sharing on the last day of the institute. Dalia began the discussion by sharing her artifact—a plaque of her name. She shared that her name (not her pseudonym) was carefully chosen by her parents for what it meant in an African dialect her parents’ families spoke. This type of sharing provided a means by which Dalia, Maria, the teachers, aides, and mentors could access elements of each other’s deep culture. Similarly, a teacher and/or aide could adopt the same opportunity to gain insight into their students’ deep culture and affirm the connection between culture and language. In attempting to do so, an educator enables students to share their language naturally; and better understand and welcome their home languages—which are key goals of linguistically responsive teachers.

“Trust Your Instincts.” During this, one of the last opportunities presented to teachers during the three day institute, the teachers worked in teams to better understand how communication can be enabled under difficult circumstances. The teachers and aides worked in teams of six to create a structure out of straws. However, two team members

could not talk; two had their hands tied behind their back, and two were blindfolded. The rationale according to Maria was “to help [teachers and aides] understand what it feels like when [they] are not able to communicate and fully participate” (Institute Observation Day 3, August 14, 2015). Maria went on to ask the teachers to think about why children, especially in the pre-school years, might exhibit aggressive or challenging behaviors. Maria hoped to convey the need for empathy and patience on the part of the teachers and aides if they are going to develop greater responsiveness to students.

Gesture game. Similarly, the gesture game was introduced to convey the idea that communication is possible even without language. Much like the game of charades, the teachers had to pick a word or phrase and “explain it” to their group without using words. Some phrases were particular to classrooms such as “line-up” and “get ready for recess.” This exaggerated situation emphasized the need for the participants to overcome language barriers using objects, gestures, body language, visual cues, and facial expressions. If a teacher is to be truly linguistically responsive, they must make communication the goal and relent on their instinct to use English only. Exhausted and confused at times as evidenced by their comments, the teachers and aides seemed to realize as demonstrated through their debriefing comments that though difficult, this was one way they could become more linguistically responsive and help their ELLs feel welcome and included (Institute Observation Day 3, August 14). The Gesture Game focused on developing positive responses during moments in which communication is challenged and often frustrated. According to Maria, a linguistically responsive teacher

conveys that the challenges can be overcome with creativity, patience, and time (Institute Observation Day 3, August 14).

Video and debriefing. A video series entitled, *Teaching Strategies Starting Points: Video Series Teaching English Language Learners* (Latham, Connors, Walter, & Eubank, 2009) was shown across the three days of the institute in small clips that were debriefed subsequently in small and whole groups as well as reflected upon individually in journals. The content of these video clips focused on understanding second language acquisition as well as on emphasizing that teachers of all ethnicities and languages can successfully support the learning of ELLs if they welcome children; value their home language; provide support; create consistent and predictable daily schedules; assign buddies to ELLs; create environments that reflect children's lives; and include family (Latham, Connors, Walter, & Eubank, 2009). The videos also gave specific strategies regarding communicating with students who speak languages that are different from the teacher such as the use of gestures, visuals, objects, body expressions, and facial expressions. The video creators also suggested modeling often, slowing down directives, repeating and reviewing, checking for understanding, and providing respite (time for ELLs to take a break from trying to understand or use English). Every suggestion and strategy suggested was visually demonstrated by classroom teachers who the video narrator described as "successfully teaching ELLs" (Latham, Connors, Walter, & Eubank, 2009).

By using the videos, Maria and Dalia were able to share a great deal of content specific to strategies that support ELLs in mainstream classrooms. The videos also

provided demonstrations of real world teaching that could not be replicated any other way during the institute. Researchers have reported on the value of watching lessons via video with debriefings (Grossman, 2011; Grossman, Compton, Igra, Ronfeldt, Shahan, & Williamson, 2009). Similar to reading a textbook, the large amount of information presented in small video clips required support and further discussion which was provided by the directors and mentors. The videos emphasized that linguistically responsive teachers (the video did not use this language) need to know that ELLs need their language to learn, and teachers can support their continued content learning in English dominated classrooms with the many strategies presented.

Ongoing, Supportive Opportunities

As discussed above, specific outcomes for the institute were pointedly supported by specific opportunities, but certain opportunities such as daily journaling, a curriculum guide, facilitated group debriefing, and Maria's narrative that she built up over the three days of the institute were used to support all work of the participants. Through the cyclical process of participation in a new opportunity, reflection, and discussion, Maria wanted to provide opportunities, time, and content that would enable teachers the best chance to better understand why and how to be more linguistically responsive teachers. The opportunities below—journaling, facilitated debriefings, curriculum guides, and Maria's personal narrative—find vast support in teacher education and development literature, so their inclusion is not questioned, but consistent with the presentation of this institute as noteworthy and as being firmly grounded in researched-based pedagogy.

Journaling. Journal notebooks were given out to the participants and used purposefully five times over the course of the three days to enable the teachers to “[take] a moment to think and question” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Written reflections are often a part of a teacher education program as they support reflection and future practice (Lindroth, 2015). Some of the questions posed for reflection were as follows:

- Are you aware of what lenses you use to work with people who are culturally and linguistically diverse? (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015)
- What are your blind spots? (Institute Observation Day 2, August 13, 2015)
- What is the best way to educate our culturally and linguistically diverse children? (Institute Observation Day 3, August 14, 2015).

The prompts continually pushed the educators to consider their own perceptions of language and culture in regard to teaching young children. At times during the three days the teachers and aides were asked to share some of their reflections and were reminded to journal often after they left the institute.

Facilitated debriefings. Group debriefings facilitated by the mentors were held after each opportunity and at the start of the second and third day. Debriefings, similar to those discussed in research (Addleman, Brazo, Dixon, Cevallos, & Wortman, 2014), conducted by the mentors focused on the previous opportunities and included discussion among the group participants. The mentor often began with a question or purpose and gently urged each teacher and aide to share immediate reactions and developing insights. Significant to this particular opportunity was the fact that the participants were assigned a

table for the three days at which they sat with their mentors, co-teachers or aides, and other teaching teams mentored by the same individual. This was the start of a nine-month relationship based on coaching, reflection, and support. During each debriefing, ideas from the group were recorded on large sheets of chart paper and later shared during whole group discussions. Maria and Dalia would use these discussions to get a sense of how their work was going and if necessary make adjustments.

Director's narrative. As mentioned earlier Maria used her personal narrative as a way to emphasize the importance of an individual's home languages as demonstrated continuously via the opportunities, but she was also able to fill in important gaps in understanding. Maria spoke of individuals losing their home language as well. Her stories and experiences combined with her firm intent to allow others to use their language and to try and use language not familiar to her throughout the three days, emphasizing the fact that she was trying to convey how important it was to value and use home languages.

Curriculum guide and presentations. Finally, the on-going use of visual presentations, handouts, and references to the curriculum guide provided the content, visuals, examples, resources, and opportunity guidelines as well as models of lesson plans and classroom environments discussed. Though not considered an "opportunity" in and of itself, the presentations along with the guide provided a foundation for many of the opportunities. The greatest asset offered by the curriculum guide was the opportunity for reflection and supportive planning after the institute. In fact, Maria included many additional supportive readings such as copies of the mentors' literacy moment lesson plans, research articles and references, and copies of all of the presentations by Maria and

Dalia. “I want this program to inspire teachers to become a scholar of culture and language” (Maria, Interview 1, August, 19, 2015). Maria hoped participants’ reflection and introspection would continue beyond the summer institute and designed the program to have as many ongoing supports as was feasible logistically.

Opportunities Beyond the Institute

Maria emphasized that participating teachers and aides are not going to go back to their classrooms and try to copy what was accomplished in the institute. Instead, she said, “You are the originators. You don’t have to fit these ideas into your teaching. You create the ideas that work for you and your children [students]” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Maria eloquently added that individuals are “always in the process of arriving at cultural competency” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). The goals of the institute were not to provide immediate answers, but to provide a chance to start reflecting on new and old notions of responsive teaching: “That’s why we are not leaving you [referring to the mentoring and teleconferences].” Maria, Dalia, and the mentors would be with them throughout the year to support all types and aspects of take-up. Below is a brief overview of the opportunities provided to the teachers in support of their continued attempts to take up what was presented during the three day institute.

Mentoring and coaching. Each teaching team met their mentor at the workshop and that mentor provided monthly supportive classroom visits throughout the school year until May 2016 as well as three evaluative visits spaced over the course of the school year. Mentoring is a valuable part of teacher education (Bower-Phipps, Klecka, & Sature, 2016; Fragoulis, 2014). The mentoring and debriefing sessions with a mentor were

included in this program because of their research-based value as well as Maria's background as a coach. Coaching is, "when someone asks questions and listens deeply for answers to move someone from where they currently are to where they want to be" (Institute Observation Day 3, August 14, 2016). According to Maria, positive change was the overall goal of this program and because of the individual nature of such Maria included mentoring and teleconference calls.

Teleconferences. Every other month the directors and mentors hosted a two-hour teleconference call related to what they were observing in the classrooms of their mentees. Significant to the teleconference calls was that they were voluntary so participation was always uncertain for each call. However, the two that were "observed" for this study had approximately 85% attendance. The first focused on meaningful transitions in a preschool class and the second on Common Core related issues.

Stories of Success: What Take-up from this Program May Look Like

Each year Maria and her colleagues publish the results of the program in terms of "teacher change" regarding the use of institute-advised strategies, overall "teaching rhythm" and temperament, and classroom design. Each of these measures is broken down into developmental appropriateness, ELL strategies, and culturally competent strategies. Last year data collected by the mentors and directors through observations and surveys that assigned numbers to levels of achievement documented an increase in the use of culturally competent strategies as well as strategies for ELLs in all areas. However, observational data collected by the mentors captured and described greater variation among the teachers when compared (Anonymized, 2014).

Based on mentor observation data, some teachers demonstrated remarkable “growth” as linguistically and culturally responsive teachers, while others showed little or no change (Anonymized, 2014). Evidence of growth that has been documented over the years includes, but is not limited to the use of multilingual labels and print in the environment (word walls); language in centers; literacy moments—props to support multilingual stories, extensions to other content areas; circle time co-teaching/supporting home languages; and attempts to use “survival phrases.” Other evidence includes the observations of home language for content; home language for directions; the use of extended wait time; time for students to hear home language in the classroom via music, CDs, other people; and the adoption of a buddy system.

Each year “success stories” are published that highlight the yearlong work of past attendees. Many of the stories included teachers using literacy moments, including home language, and even learning new languages. One recent “success story” tells how two English speaking teachers were able to successfully teach Mandarin and Spanish speaking students content while supporting their English development. By using tools such as Google Translate, tracking down linguistically appropriate materials, and accessing help from home, the teachers were able to provide time for the students to learn using their home languages as they continued to develop English. Data gathered by Maria and her team demonstrated enormous growth in this teaching team’s ability to support vocabulary development in English and home languages of their children by implementing small group instruction, one-one-one instruction, literacy moments, and cooperative learning (Anonymized, 2015). Though my search for what is linguistically

responsive teaching may not be found or shared as similar “success stories,” the fact that they are shared with participating teachers suggests that they are given “benchmarks” against which to judge their own take-up of institute content.

Conclusion

Whereas Maria and colleagues define and identify teacher change as modifying practice to fit the content and techniques presented, this study maintains that the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching may not be synonymous with change. Certainly, they are similar, but take-up remains defined as an individual’s manifestations of new ideas, practices, reflective stances, linguistic choices, responses, or actions drawn from particular opportunities emphasizing such as one’s own by incorporating one or more into his/her current reality after engaging in opportunities specifically geared towards preparing her to teach in linguistically responsive ways.

The previous results of Maria’s work along with my three days of observation of the summer institute combined to instill great confidence in my decision to select the Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute as my catalyst site and context for this study. The overview above demonstrates that Maria offered plenty of rich content within research-based opportunities from which all of the educators could take-up linguistically responsive teaching. This was ideal for my purposes because I sought a robust program that would enable me to follow the teachers into their classrooms to see evidence of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching, the various ways in which this occurred for the four teachers participating in my study is the focus of the next chapter, Chapter Five: Findings and Discussion.

As will be seen, the present study followed the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching based on the foundation established by the Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute—and especially via the three day institute—by means of examining the classroom practices and the interviews of four teachers from the 2015-2016 program cohort. Due to time constraints pertinent to completing a dissertation in a timely manner, the present study did not follow the teachers throughout the entire year. (The possibilities/implications of which will be discussed further in the final chapter and in terms of suggestions for future research.) Nevertheless, five months of data collection provided me enough time to document the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching of the four teacher-participants. The findings and discussion of which are the subjects of the next chapter.

Chapter Five: Findings and Discussion

This chapter presents and discusses the outcomes of systematically coding the data as discussed in Chapter Three in order to generate salient themes that help to address the question:

While following a small group of general education early childhood teachers through a formal learning program and into their classrooms, what “take-up” from the range of opportunities designed to help a group of teachers become more linguistically responsive in their classrooms seems to be demonstrated?

To do so effectively this chapter provides an orienting section that reminds the reader why take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was the focus of this study, who the teacher-participants were, and what they brought to the this process in terms of funds of knowledge and linguistically responsiveness.

The four teachers who comprise the main participants in this study were introduced in Chapter Three and are revisited briefly below in order to help readers keep in mind important information regarding each teacher-participant’s funds of knowledge and previous understanding of linguistically responsive teaching prior to their summer institute participation. That being said, in lieu of looking at individual teacher data and identifying their individual take-up on a micro case-by-case basis, the purpose of this investigation was to formulate a better understanding of the concept of teacher *take-up* of linguistically responsive. This approach works well at this time because much more needs to be understood in terms of what actually happens when teachers try to be

linguistically responsive in order for teacher educators to better support new and practicing teachers in today's classrooms.

In recognizing the nuances of trying to be linguistically responsive and that it is not a simple causal relationship between being taught to *do this* and then *doing this* seamlessly, I argue that an individual hears and understands *this* through many personal aspects and processes including those regarding funds of knowledge, especially those funds of knowledge related to language and linguistic use in the United States. This study identified a range of ways to be “linguistically responsive” in people’s teaching, which covers initial forays through to fine-tuned established practices (see Chapters Two and Four for more on this) and discusses the emerging evidence of such in relation to each teacher’s particular funds of knowledge, especially those aspects related to language use and learning.

To clarify, this conception of *linguistically responsive teaching* as multi-dimensional and nuanced can be likened to what is understood when an individual is said to possess athleticism—a familiar concept to most and commonly defined as able to engage in sports and/or physical fitness activity in some way. Athleticism, however, remains a nuanced term that is best understood as a broader concept comprising a range of possibilities that can amply be identified by looking across the skill set and attributes of several athletes and sports instead of looking only at one particular athlete. For example, looking only at Michael Phelps, 23 time gold medal Olympic swimmer and World champion, might logically lead to the understanding that athleticism has much to do with swimming fast and skillfully, but understanding that athleticism can also be about

agility, power, and foot speed as demonstrated when looking at Serena Williams, 36 time world tennis champion, would be missed if evidence from different athletes was not gathered. Therefore, just like an understanding of all the nuances of athleticism requires looking at how the concept manifests in more than one athletic individual, understanding what constitutes linguistically responsive teaching requires examining what teachers who are actively trying to be linguistically responsive are doing, thinking, and saying. This view also supports my contention that, based on the findings included in this chapter, each individual's funds of knowledge regarding language impacts how each teacher becomes linguistically responsive.

Conceptually, looking at shifts in linguistically responsive teaching in this way requires understanding what was actually "taken-up" as a (likely) result of participation in and exposure to the opportunities presented in Chapter Four. With an understanding that a direct confirmation of a causal relationship between content covered in the institute and post-teacher practice is complicated to say the least, I carefully considered the language and observable actions of the teacher-participants in relation to what was covered in the institute while I remained open to finding evidence of linguistically responsive teaching that was not directly relatable to the institute content. Therefore, the pre-institute teaching of the teacher-participants prior to their participation in the summer institute is briefly discussed here. Understanding what was and was not formally identified prior to the summer institute will serve as reference by which the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching is identified. Only that which was influenced identifiably (i.e., can be traced back to content or pedagogy presented during the summer

institute) in terms of linguistically responsive teaching is included in this particular development of teacher take-up. Included within this descriptive discussion are key aspects of each teacher-participant's funds of knowledge since each individual's funds of knowledge undoubtedly played an integral role in the sense-making and take-up captured in this study. After the following brief, preliminary summary of important aspects concerning each teacher, each of the four main themes that emerged from the data and the necessary evidence that enabled the construction of each of these themes is presented. Certainly, impact of funds of knowledge will be considered in more detail and explored throughout the findings and discussion as well.

Developing an Initial Reference Point

In order to better understand the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching by these teacher-participants, this section provides a descriptive overview of Lucia, Adrianna, Carley, and Epiphany, drawing on data gathered from the institute observations, document data, early interviews, and conversations with a purpose. Pertinent aspects of their current teaching contexts and funds of knowledge are presented as well as information regarding their teaching practices prior to their acceptance into the program and participation in the summer institute. As I was studying Adrianna, Epiphany, Carley, and Lucia while they worked toward becoming more linguistically responsive in their teaching, I was also learning more about who they were and what they brought to their classrooms in terms of experience, knowhow and funds of knowledge; much of which will be shared throughout the discussion of the four themes in which my findings. However, I first feel compelled to share what I came to learn about each

teacher-participant soon after the study began because it impacted my coding of the data and, therefore, my findings and discussion. Below, I briefly orient the reader to who these woman were and some of the aspects of their backgrounds that they were drawing upon as they worked to be better teachers for their ELLs—most importantly their commonalities, their teaching practice prior to the institute in regard to linguistically responsive teaching, and their unique funds of knowledge.

Teacher-participant commonalities. Adrianna, Epiphany, Carley, and Lucia were teaching pre-kindergarten students who were four years of age in the same urban school district, but not at the same school, except in the case of Carley and Lucia who were co-teachers in the same classroom. Therefore, all four followed the same mandated curriculum as will be apparent in their classroom theme choices (e.g., All About Me, Family and Community) and selections of songs and books cited in the next section. Their common curriculum was mandated by the city in which they taught and prominently included hands-on, developmentally appropriate practice. The district adopted Creative Curriculum which was a published curriculum that emphasized discovery and project-based learning and maintained accreditation by National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC, 2012).

Each teacher-participant had the opportunity to learn collaboratively during the summer institute and to participate in mandatory, structured mentoring opportunities as well as voluntary teleconferences. Each teacher also knew the goals of the program (e.g., to become better teachers of ELLs) and was aware that she was going to be evaluated in relation to those goals. Each teacher willingly agreed to take part in this study and

remained committed to the end. However, each teacher demonstrated her own unique ways of responsive teaching. Therefore, purposefully considering who each teacher was and what she was already bringing to the institute in terms her funds of knowledge made sense. Although all aspects of their funds of knowledge were of interest, those that were particularly relevant were those aspects of their funds of knowledge that were related to language learning, language use, and the instruction of ELLs.

Early hints of linguistically responsive teaching. In June 2015, the teacher-participants were evaluated by Maria and her co-director Dalia in order to establish an understanding of their then-present degree of cultural competency and linguistically responsive teaching. Dalia visited each applicant during the school day to conduct an observation and complete the institute's *Pre-Assessment* form that rates each teacher on their use of developmentally appropriate practice, how they teach ELLs, and their demonstrated cultural competency. Cultural competency was defined for purposes of the program as the understanding on the part of an individual that culture and language are deeply connected and important to all individuals as they grow, learn, and thrive (Anonymized, 2015). These initial evaluations are summarized in the next paragraph. As mentioned in Chapter Four, Maria, Dalia, and the teacher-participants enabled me access to all program documents as a means to deeply contextualize my study.

Adrianna demonstrated minimal evidence of her cultural competency and use of strategies to support ELLs. Very little Spanish was used in her classroom at the time of the observation-based evaluation aside from when her aide used it for classroom management purposes. However, all information sent home to parents by Adrianna was

written in both English and Spanish. Adrianna and her aide shared the responsibility of translating letters. Since Adrianna was bilingual in English and Spanish, suggestions for her from Dalia included using Spanish during lessons and using strategies such as slowing down, repeating content, and allowing children time to process information before production of answers (Adrianna, Institute Evaluation, June 2015).

Epiphany was observed using developmentally appropriate practices such as modeling and checking often for students' understanding of the content. Nonetheless, she showed no attention to languages other than English and little explicit attention to multiple cultures. Suggestions for Epiphany included using specific learning strategies such as bilingual books, eliciting students' use of their home languages, and creating a list of key phrases in pertinent languages to support home language and including the cultures of her students in the classroom (Epiphany, Institute Evaluation, June 2016).

Lucia and Carley were evaluated as a team because they co-taught in the same classroom and self-identified as a teaching team. According to their observation record, they incorporated several developmentally appropriate practices such as the use of repetition of important content during group learning and facilitated center work, but neither of them was observed enabling or supporting the use of a language other than English, and there was little evidence that home cultures were represented in their classroom. Nevertheless, few posters highlighting various world cultures were on display throughout the room and some information that went home was written in Spanish (e.g., notes regarding logistical details about the upcoming "move-up" ceremony). Maria's suggestions for them included learning about how to support the English learning and

content learning of ELLs in the classroom and how to include cultures relevant to the students more overtly (Lucia & Carley, Institute Evaluation, June 2016).

Overall, their initial evaluations seemed to suggest that there was much to be addressed by each teacher in terms of becoming more linguistically responsive in their classrooms. Many possible ways for them to take-up linguistically responsive teaching were presented to them during the summer institute (see Chapter Four); however, Epiphany, Lucia, Carley, and Adrianna also brought their own lived-experiences and knowhow to the summer institute and back to the classroom. These funds of knowledge need to remain present in this study and are described below (keeping in mind that this description is incomplete due to the complex and fluid nature of funds of knowledge as discussed below).

Relevant aspects of funds of knowledge. This study included a particular focus on funds of knowledge (cf. Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992; Moll & Greenberg, 1990). To reiterate, an individual's funds of knowledge are the "historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being" (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992, p. 133). The concept of funds of knowledge was developed out of the conviction that all individuals have valuable cognitive, personal, experiential, and cultural skills, knowhow, and resources through which, with which, and because of which they are able to develop (and learn) as individuals. All new content and experiences are impacted by each individual's funds of knowledge because they are ever present semiotic tools for learning. Looking at an individual's funds of knowledge

regarding language use was not novel to this study; others have done the same (Coleman, 2015; Safford & Kelly, 2010). However, I did so to generate a conversation about what the process of *becoming* linguistically responsive entails and includes on an individual basis.

Each teacher brought a wealth of funds of knowledge to their summer learning and continued attempts at linguistically responsive teaching. Certain aspects of each teacher's identified funds of knowledge are highlighted and further explained in the next four paragraphs because they knowingly relate to language and linguistically responsive teaching. Therefore, the table below highlights particular lived-experiences shared by each teacher-participant from which particular knowhow developed that continued to impact how they made sense of their teaching. Information presented in the table is further expanded upon in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 6*Teacher Participant's Lived Experiences from which Specific Knowledge Comes*

Teacher-Participant	Relevant Aspects of their lived experiences that yield particular knowhow (a partial look at funds of knowledge)
Adrianna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ecuadorian Immigrant -Identifies as “American-Ecuadorian” -Bilingual in Spanish and English -Tries to speak “good English” according to her own words -Early childhood teacher for 20 years -Mother, divorced -Speaks often about talking “American”
Carley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Identifies as African-American -New teacher -Mono-lingual English speaker -Single mother -Lives and works in same city -Grew up in city of current employment -Wants to speak the language of her students
Epiphany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Identifies as African-American -Over 10 years of teaching experience -Mono-lingual English speaker -Single mother/lives with sister and niece -Lives and works in same city -Grew up in city of current employment -Passionate about inclusion
Lucia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Identifies as Guatemalan American -Mono-lingual English speaker -Lost ability to speak Spanish -Mother of five -Married -Speaks of husband's health issues -Hopes to relearn Spanish

Lucia's relevant funds of knowledge. Lucia spoke often about her own experience as an ELL student in kindergarten and first grade. She described how she resented being pulled from class and unable to understand what was being said in class. Lucia said, “I was so tired of missing class. Then, when I was plopped back in, I didn't

feel like I belonged” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). She spoke about how her feelings of disenfranchisement pushed her to learn English as fast as possible and to decide as a young child to never use her Spanish again. Even when her father tried to speak to her in Spanish, she would answer him only in English. Lucia “wanted to be with the other kids” and, to do so, she forsook her paternal home language.

Regarding language, Lucia came “to know” (albeit misguided) that English was what she needed to speak to be included in her class socially and academically. Although she began to rethink what was once known to her, the experiences culturally and historically had deep impact on what she had been drawing upon for years in terms of helping others acclimate to United States’ classrooms. This aspect of her funds of knowledge would be challenged during the summer institute as she began to be more linguistically responsive. During the summer institute, Lucia expressed regret about losing her ability to speak Spanish and underestimating the value of being multilingual: “The privilege walk helped me see the value of being bilingual” (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). During the privilege walk (see Chapter Four), the participants were told to take two steps forward if they spoke more than one language. Lucia’s loss of Spanish and her experiences as an ELL who “earned her way” back to her English-speaking classroom were of particular interest to me as I studied her take-up of linguistically responsive teaching.

Adrianna’s relevant funds of knowledge. Adrianna spoke about her own children and how she always wanted to represent them well by using “good” English herself, that is, “English with an American accent” as she explained (Adrianna, Interview 1, August

30, 2015), because she believed that by doing so she was showing others that she and her family were *American*. Adrianna's children spoke some Spanish, but mainly "proper English" (her words), which, according to Adrianna, was English without an Ecuadorian accent. Adrianna also spoke of being a Spanish-speaking ELL in high school and the bullying she encountered as a result. She recounted, "One girl [who was Puerto Rican and spoke Spanish] would purposely translate wrong for me . . . make me more scared" (Adrianna, Interview 1, August 30, 2015). Adrianna tried to learn English as quickly as possible so she did not have to rely on others who were not trustworthy. She took full advantage of her English as a Second Language classes: "When everyone thought it was time to goof off, I asked questions about what I heard, how I say stuff, what do I do when . . . I wanted to feel like I belonged [with the English speaking kids]" (Adrianna, Interview 1, August 30, 2015).

Adrianna's experiential knowhow acquired as an ELL student in a United States' high school and as a bilingual mother were of interest as her take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was studied, so too were other language-related aspects of her funds of knowledge. Adrianna's funds of knowledge regarding language also included knowledge of English dominance and importance as well as the lived-experiences guided by the desire to access the "power" that English holds in America. Albeit questionable in terms of a just way to have to live, Adrianna knew how to get by with the English she knew as she learned more English and to hide her Spanish-inflected accent when necessary. Adrianna felt her ability to know the language terrain of the United States (cultural capital) was key to her success as a teacher and mother, and this particular

knowledge was of interest to me as she worked to become more linguistically responsive as a teacher.

Epiphany's relevant funds of knowledge. Epiphany spoke of being a single African American mother who decided to get her master's degree in inclusive education out of a need to embrace her responsibility as a teacher of all children: "That's my job. To teach everyone" (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Returning to university was not easy for her financially or logistically as a single mother, but necessary to her. When speaking about children with special needs whose behaviors and reactions confused her, Epiphany told the other educators at the summer institute, "If they are going to be in my class, then I need to know how to teach them" (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Epiphany said that taking classes in special education and inclusive education made her more tolerant of children with special needs and other differences. During my interviews with her, Epiphany voiced her opinion that all students should learn together—"anything else was segregation" (Epiphany, Interview 1, August 29, 2015). She used the word "segregation" several times during the study and the weight of that word should not be overlooked.

Epiphany came to know what it was like to be segregated based on an aspect of who she was, an African American woman growing up in the city and raised by only her mother. According to Epiphany, "It's not easy when you see or think you see what others [those who are not African American] get. My mom worked hard, and I did too to make sure we get as much as we can, especially for our kids" (Epiphany, Interview 1, August 29, 2015). Epiphany spoke of a life filled with lived-experiences and knowhow of an

individual not easily granted the privileges she believed others got just by being more like the dominant culture. Other researchers have documented similar sentiments on the part of African American teachers whose own lived-experiences shaped their responsiveness to their Latino/a students (Siefert, Salas, & D'amico, 2015). Epiphany undoubtedly brought that knowhow with her every day when she taught students who go to school in the same urban district in which she grew up. Her knowhow may not be directly related to language, but it certainly could impact her take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. She *knew* children were not equally respected if they were not included in the regular classroom. Epiphany's desire to include everyone in her classroom in all of the learning opportunities she afforded them, and her knowhow gained trying to do just that, impacted her take-up of linguistically responsive teaching in interesting ways, as is shown later in this chapter.

Carley's relevant funds of knowledge. Carley, the youngest member of this study and the newest teacher of the four, spoke of being in classes as a student herself with only English speaking students even though she grew up in a linguistically diverse city. She reflected: "I think they [ELLs] were just somewhere else" (Carley, Interview 1, August 27, 2015). Carley spoke about how much better schools were today for being inclusive and letting children learn together. However, she felt at a loss most of the school year when considering how to make that type of learning situation successful because she only spoke English. She said, "I thought English was enough to be a teacher . . . there is a lot I need to learn about teaching kids who don't speak English" (Carley, Interview 1, August 27, 2016). As a single African American mother in a community that was mainly African

American and Hispanic, Carley spoke of wanting to support her own daughter's learning as much as her students' learning. "My three year old comes home saying 'Hola' and singing songs in Spanish," she explained, because many of her daughter's classmates were Spanish-speaking and her teacher was bilingual (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). Carley's lack of experience in learning with ELLs when she was a child and her desire to embrace the linguistic culture of her daughter's school, as well as the culture of the school in which she worked, impacted her take-up of linguistically responsive teaching.

At the time of this study, Carley's earlier funds of knowledge that included the idea that classrooms were for English speakers only had already been challenged by her responsive nature. Through her work as a classroom aide and her lived-experience as a single mother of a little girl who attends school where languages used by teachers and students is fluid, she has come to know that making meaning is more important than just speaking correct English. She said, "Honestly, I just need to know how they [my ELL students] are feeling sometimes, especially when they are sad" (Carley, Interview 2 October 29, 2015). In those moments it is not about supporting English development or any particular language, it is about understanding each other and making quick meaning to help a child in need. Carley began the study eager to know more about how to be inclusive when one is an English-only speaker.

All of the teacher-participants brought their unique funds of knowledge with them to the work that was documented in this study. These women had unique and particular funds of knowledge regarding language and linguistic use, teaching, and thriving in

families as children and as parents. I do not claim to know all there is to know about each woman's funds of knowledge, but I will deliberately share what I believe are important connections between what each teacher-participant attempts in terms of becoming linguistically responsive and their own unique knowhow/lived experiences specific to language. Just as I believe I have more to offer the field of linguistically responsive teaching because of my unique funds of knowledge as a white, middle class female early childhood teacher, mother of a child with panic disorder, and a once struggling reader, I believe each of these teacher-participants has much to offer; most of which will be uncovered throughout the larger discussion of findings.

These women were not calling the knowledge and views they brought with them to the institute their funds of knowledge, but I did. As they were trying to make sense of the content presented to them, I was carefully documenting how they seemed to rely on their own personal lived-knowledge and knowhow to become more linguistically responsive. After all, their take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was my focus. As I gathered and analyzed data, evidence of how attempts at linguistically responsive teaching were manifesting for each teacher-participant. Reporting my data and findings through themes emerged as a satisfying way in which to stay true to this study's intent and yet share the wealth of information gleaned. The remainder of this chapter is dedicated to the explication of those themes.

Presentation of Themes

A small qualitative study such as this one is not undertaken with the intent of making broad, generalizable claims; instead, it is designed to add thoughtful and

informed insight into a growing field that is impacted directly by human interactions and reactions. Thus, with the intent of trying to capture as many of the nuances that may possibly comprise take-up of linguistically responsive teaching, the results of this study are presented as multidimensional themes with take-up as the organizing concept.

As a reminder (see Chapter Two for more detail), within the context of this study, “take-up” is the individual act of adopting new content, ideas, practices, reflective stances, linguistic choices, responses, or actions as one’s own by incorporating one or more into his/her current reality that is linked in some way to a specific experience or learning event. Although previous research regarding take-up speaks of “forward momentum” and “backward slides” the data collected in this study strongly suggested instead the metaphorical reference of ebbs and flows to capture the inconsistent, yet persistent nature of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. Just as the ocean water ebbs and flows in response to other natural occurrences—tides, gravitational pull of the moon, wind—but does not just disappear and reappear, teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching—changes in strength and direction, always remains in motion, but doesn’t simply disappear and reappear. The momentum of take-up may change direction, strength, and appearance, but take-up for these women, once put in motion was constantly ebbing and flowing.

Evidence of each teacher’s take-up that is of particular interest to this study’s intent and framing is highlighted to best provide an understanding of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching that indeed adds insight to the field. Therefore, as the themes are presented in what follows, evidence drawn from data gathered about the

teacher-participants will be included. Sharing all of the data gathered would be daunting, but sharing key data excerpts that speak directly to each theme's focus proved useful in helping to explicate these teachers' take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. Excerpts were chosen judiciously, and special care was made to ensure that each teacher was highlighted equally throughout the findings and discussion to maintain a sense of cohesiveness and to build trustworthiness in my analytic results. Although this study tells the story of four teachers' take-up of linguistically responsive teaching as a collective conceptual process by presenting four distinct themes that emerged from the data analysis, the "teacher work" of each teacher-participant was pivotal in developing this larger understanding

Since valuing the ebbs and flows of each teacher-participant's take-up was important to this study, I began to engage in a dialogic understanding that ideas exist and relate to each other and continually inform those who want to know more about the particular phenomenon (Bakhtin, 2004; 2010). For me reflecting upon the take-up of each teacher-participant and the entirety of linguistically responsive teaching and vice versa remained a continuous cyclical process as each informed my understanding of the other. As I generated themes I became better able to articulate what each teacher was doing; and through such articulation I was better able to develop themes. This "redescription" was a most interesting process and led to the development of four pertinent themes.

These themes—rather than simply arriving at categories of activity or patterns of action—enabled me to capture a rich range of possibilities regarding take-up by these four teachers. The four themes that emerged from my analysis are presented in an order

that aims at providing an overall sense of how take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifested during my data collection period. As the focus of this chapter, they are as follows: (1) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching involves personal introspection/reevaluation; (2) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifests as a commitment to giving prominence to home languages in the classroom; (3) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifests as an understanding and incorporation of home language as a learning resource; (4) and the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching evolves over time into *community* sense-making.

Although there was no simple linear growth trajectory to point, data show there nonetheless was an immediate response on the part of the teachers to “do something” and to think deeply about how to be linguistically responsive. This response slowly shifted in depth and breadth as more evidence of linguistically responsive take-up manifested itself within and across the three classrooms. Therefore, the following section begins with *Theme One: The take-up of linguistically responsive teaching involves personal introspection/reevaluation.*

Theme One: Take-up of Linguistically Responsive Teaching Involves Personal Introspection/reevaluation

There was significant evidence in my data regarding personal introspection and thoughtfulness affecting previously held views of language use and learning in the United States based upon lived-experiences and knowhow. The start of this introspection was undoubtedly facilitated by Maria, Dalia, and the mentors as observed during the summer institute, but manifested as a necessary and ongoing aspect of becoming linguistically

responsive for the four teacher-participants. The teacher-participants examined these learned views by discussing and contemplating their own cultural histories and what they had learned about language use and learning in the United States. These particular funds of knowledge became actively employed as the teachers were led through the process of introspection and knowledge shifting that became part of the process of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. The teacher-participants spoke of thinking thoughtfully about what the institute content meant to them and their current work with students as well as how the new content challenged their ways of knowing, especially in regard to the primacy of English in the United States. As will be seen they were questioning what they once assumed to be *the truth* about language, learning English, and the role of home languages. Therefore, this theme was constructed from pertinent evidence each teacher-participant shared about what they previously did *not* know about language use and learning in general and teaching ELLs specifically, and how they were shifting their funds of knowledge and teaching in relation to the results of thinking about and rethinking institute content and ideas as they continued to become more linguistically responsive.

By thinking of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching as it has been defined for this study, this theme describes patterns of evidence that demonstrated shifts of some kind in the teacher-participants' reflective stances (e.g., rethinking language in the classroom), responses (e.g., to being wrong/mislead), and new actions (e.g., trying to be inclusive). However, as will be discussed below, each teacher's introspective work did not automatically lead to long-lasting insights and growth regarding teacher take-up. In

fact, introspection often led the teacher-participants to “take pause” and reassess their roles as teachers today as they acknowledged how strong their prior (mis)beliefs and possibly misguided knowhow were. The introspective nature of this process resonated heavily with Maria’s intentions, the concept of funds of knowledge, and the work and theories of those in the fields of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching.

Facilitating introspection: The churning of funds of knowledge. Maria and Dalia encouraged the beginning of individual introspection during the summer institute by creating opportunities in which their attendees had to think and possibly talk about their knowledge of uncomfortable topics such as race, privilege, and language (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). To reiterate, introspection in this sense refers to reflective contemplation of one’s thoughts, opinions, values, and practices. Particular opportunities such as the Privilege Walk, the Ice Berg Theory discussion, and the sharing of cultural masks and artifacts along with facilitated debriefings (See Chapter Four for descriptions of each) enabled responses among the teacher-participants in which they were observed “thinking out loud” about challenging topics in a way that hinted at (potentially) developing, deeper introspection. After small group and independent reflection, the participants were welcomed to share those immediate reflections with the whole group. Research suggests that cultivating the dispositions necessary to be culturally responsive requires the acknowledgment of personal misconceptions (McIntosh, 1992, 2015), even by those who are well-intentioned (Bartolomé, 2008), and Maria’s explicit emphasis on introspection during the summer institute gave the teacher-

participants time to consider how their own lived-histories and funds of knowledge impacted who they were at that moment in time.

As the days of the summer institute went on, observational evidence demonstrated that Adrianna was thinking more about what she knew and was capable of because she was an Ecuadorian-American mother and teacher; Lucia was thinking and talking about what she knew about how to blend and how to live with the regret of the language she lost; Carley was thinking and sharing about how her young daughter's willingness to speak any language at school was changing what she knew and expected about language in the United States; and Epiphany was talking about her own personal knowledge as an African American teacher regarding the lack of inclusiveness in schools in the past and the need for all students to learn together (Institute Observations Days 1, 2, & 3, August 12, 13, & 14, 2015). Their individual funds of knowledge and ruminations, though unique in many other ways, included similar bits of knowhow that reflected a primacy of English. For example, and significant to this study, it became apparent that prior to being in the institute, these teacher-participants believed that by emphasizing English in the classroom they were helping their ELLs learn English. This aspect of their funds of knowledge was well developed and used often in their decision making in the classroom prior to the summer institute, but was in direct conflict to what they were learning about in the program. However, this knowhow was starting to shift and the shifting began with very specific work at the institute.

Take-up as shifts in reflective stances. This section recounts the first signs of shifts the teachers were making in their reflective stances regarding the value and

importance of languages in the United States. These women did not call the knowledge and views they brought with them to the institute their funds of knowledge, but I am based on my research cited in Chapter Two. These women came to know about, among many bits of knowhow, the primacy of English in society through very different ways, and Maria and Dalia were about to teach them about the importance of all languages. Participating teachers' funds of knowledge pertinent to linguistic responsive teaching were going to be invoked as they grappled with new content, and I was there to document the process of their sense-making.

Adrianna disclosed to the group how she previously was not thinking enough about the challenges of “being cultural” and a bilingual mother (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). She spoke about how she never considered making her own, deep personal culture—her Spanish language, Ecuadorian traditions—as prominent in her home life, and especially not her professional life, as the institute was calling her to do. She was proud of knowing how to speak “American” and now she was weighing this knowledge against how to be linguistically (and culturally) responsive. Lucia became immediately unforgettable to the director, Maria, by divulging how she lost her Spanish as a result of her desire to “be like the other kids” and was starting to realize that her knowhow about which she was once proud was causing her sadness during her days at the summer institute. Lucia was considering her evolving knowhow in relation to her new teaching goals. Carley, the youngest teacher-participant, shared how she never realized how her views, especially her English-only views, impacted others. Carley acknowledged, “I am so concerned about being an African American, single mom and

what others think about me and my situation that I don't think about how '*this hurts her*' or '*that hurts him*' . . . too busy thinking about how I fit" (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015). She later told the whole group, "I just thought teaching in English helped them [ELLs] fit in" and realized that her knowhow was in need of modification. Epiphany spoke about how the lack of inclusiveness in schools which she referred to as "segregation" in lieu of "separation" always bothered her. Epiphany understood bias, how to live successfully in the face of bias, and how to be considerate of others amid bias. This knowhow was ever-present. That was why she returned to school for a master's degree in inclusive education and that was why she applied to the Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015).

Adrianna, Carley, and Lucia seemed to be rethinking their own historically developed knowhow and beliefs in very specific ways while Epiphany was validating her own discomforts with the status quo, as they participated in the program. These early revelations during the days of the summer institute signaled the need to acknowledge and understand particular privileges and lack thereof that McIntosh (1992; 2015) began writing about nearly twenty years ago in which she delineated hidden privileges she was afforded due to her social positioning as a white female. The self-acknowledgment of hidden privileges (and lack thereof) in relation to others was, according to Maria, believed to be a critical aspect of what she and Dalia were asking the teachers to do (Maria, Interview 1, 2015). Maria's belief resonated with research by McIntosh (2015), who wrote:

In most professional, human-service training programs, practitioners are encouraged to acquire specific knowledge and understanding about the groups that they serve clinically. Unfortunately, many clinical programs do not help practitioners examine their own locations in social structures or systems and the associated privileges and disadvantages afforded to them by their respective social locations. (p. 233)

McIntosh (2015) continued to emphasize that programs (such as Northeast Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute) should help practitioners better understand themselves currently and historically so that their work with others is grounded in a deeper understanding of life's privileges and challenges. What began with McIntosh's own recognition of white privilege and has since led McIntosh (2015) to extend her notion of self-awareness to emphasize how all who work with people (e.g., teachers) need to examine critically who they are, for how they relate with others has much to do with their own privileges and the acknowledgment of them (McIntosh, 2015). This particular aspect of knowhow—who I am and my own privileges in relation to my world—became ever present as the teacher-participants worked to take-up linguistically responsive teaching.

The reactions these teacher-participants had to Maria's thoughtfully developed and facilitated opportunities substantiate that, when enacted with intention, opportunities provided by teacher educators can indeed generate an awareness of one's own self that may not have been so apparent or seemed so necessary beforehand. Responsiveness to their students for these teacher-participants seemed to begin with a better awareness of

self and acknowledgement of privileges held and those desired. Interestingly, this resonates with the work of teacher educators who reported similar findings after presenting preservice teachers opportunities to increase their awareness of the lives of ELLs (cf. Baecher et al., 2013; Bollin, 2007; Fitts & Gross, 2012; Hsu, 2009; Marx, 2004). For example, after spending a semester trying to raise awareness of the diversity of the current United States' student population and trying to better prepare preservice teachers for teaching in today's classrooms, Hsu (2009) wrote of the need for self-discovery: "It is easy for individuals to encounter a mismatch when they face the variability of students who enter the classrooms. By encouraging all teachers to examine their own cultural histories and identities, the world of education will enable these teachers to deal positively with differences in their classrooms" (p. 178). Hsu's (2009) suggestion hints at the need to understand and allow individuals to better understand their own growing funds of knowledge regarding culture and language, for it is through the purposeful activation of such that individuals come to know and are able to sense of their current world reality.

Maria, with the help of Dalia and her mentors, was trying to do just that—expose the differences among themselves (i.e., the summer institute attendees) in terms of privileges, their understanding of privileges, and their personal histories in an effort to relate those differences to the "misinterpretation" that often occurred between teacher and student. Maria emphasized, that as teachers "we don't always know what we think we know about a child" (Institute Observation Day 1, August 12, 2015) and tried to help attendees relate their new self-discovery and understanding to their own funds of

knowledge. The evidence gathered and analyzed suggested that Maria's work as discussed above created shifts in each teacher-participant's take-up of linguistically responsive teaching in a positive way as they thought deeply about their own funds of knowledge. Adrianna, Epiphany, Carley and Lucia were learning that their previously good intentions were based on mistruth.

Each of these teacher-participants reported heavily valuing English in the classroom as documented in their early observations by Dalia, interviews, and observations of institute discussions. These well-intentioned teacher-participants, who were raised to believe that all children should know, speak, and be taught in English became teachers who overlooked home languages because they thought they were doing the right thing by emphasizing English. Just as Bartolomé (2008; see also Chapter One) suggested as a result of her knowledge of the field, such mistruths developed as a result of conforming to the status quo, not out of a purposeful desire to deny children that which would help them learn content while learning English more successfully. Not only was it important for these women to acknowledge mistruths, but through introspection to problematize how they came to emphasize English in their classrooms. What proved quite interesting was how these women learned that misbelief, for each of them came to the same English-dominant conclusions in their own ways.

For Adrianna and Lucia, such a notion seemed like a logical extension of their own desires to blend-in in school, and since both of them knew how to blend they were very able to support their students and their families in this goal. Ironically, Lucia and Adrianna, who both experienced "segregation" due to their home languages (i.e., they

were separated into specialized classes to learn English) felt the same way about English; meaning they placed it on an academic pedestal as *the goal* for themselves, their families, and their students. They knew what it was like to *not* be a part of mainstream society, and they both knew how to “work the system” and become more accepted. Their survival skills are a unique brand of funds of knowledge that absolutely impacted their teaching. Both felt like they did not belong until they learned English, and those beliefs and the survival knowledge that went with them were long-lasting. In fact, Lucia recounted, for example, how she once told Carley, “It would be easier if everyone [the students] spoke English” (Lucia, Interview 1, August 26, 2015). Lucia apologetically shared these earlier thoughts with me during our first post-institute meeting: “So I went to the institute thinking I was going to learn how to get them using English. I guess I just assumed that since I did, they should. I was so wrong, wasn’t I?” (Lucia, Interview 1, August 26, 2015). Adrianna expressed a similar initial concern with English: “My goal was too much about getting them to the end, you know, talking in English. I didn’t think about giving them the time and support I should be. Then I think. This is preschool, what was I thinking? Of course they need time to develop” (Adrianna, Interview 1, August 30, 2015).

Lucia and Adrianna, two teachers with very different upbringings regarding language, shared the common personal goals of learning English as children and fighting to get into regular classes as students themselves. Truthfully, when Adrianna and Lucia both learned and/or used “better” English (according to them), they reported feeling as though people treated them better. Lucia talked about having more friends in school once

she learned to speak English well (Lucia, Interview 1, August 26, 2015), and Adrianna talked about how people always looked shocked, but happy, when she spoke English (Adrianna, Interview 1, August 30, 2015). Both women achieved their linguistic goals regarding English when they were young. They also shared common knowledge as to how “to blend” when they were so different. Lucia was a fulltime member of her second grade class, fully accepted; Adrianna was seen by others as “American” per her description of herself when she was a young adult. However, through the institute they realized the loss involved in these “achievements”— Lucia’s complete inability to speak Spanish; Adrianna’s own children’s lack of Spanish fluency. Many of their assumptions previously based on lived-experiences and funds of knowledge were challenged by the institute’s overwhelming emphasis on the support, inclusion, and the importance of home languages. Thus, it seemed that, prior to the summer institute Lucia and Adrianna gave English prominence in their preschool classroom in ways similar to their monolingual, English speaking colleagues because they wanted to get their ELLs speaking English for their sakes because all four women *knew* it would be easier for their students if they did. That was the reality in which they grew up within.

For Carley and Epiphany, they seemed to emphasize English because that’s what their teachers did when they were in school, and they erroneously assumed their teachers were abiding by sound pedagogical practice. They knew how to create English-dominated classrooms because that is what they learned through their own elementary, high school, and college educational experiences. According to both of them they were never guided to know otherwise. The two life-long monolingual English speaking

African American teachers, Epiphany and Carley, grew up in the same urban school system they were currently teaching within and thought English was all they would need. Carley and Epiphany spoke of not even considering the possibility of working in such linguistically diverse classrooms, because as Epiphany said, when they were students, “they [non-English speakers] just weren’t in class with us” (Epiphany, Interview 1, August 29, 2015). Carley said, “I never saw them [ELLs]. I think they were all on the second or third floor” (Carley, Interview 1, August 27, 2015). Epiphany summed up what Bartolomé wrote so well (and discussed earlier), “I thought I was being a good teacher by telling them [her students] to speak only English” (Epiphany, Interview 1, August 29, 2016). Both women similarly ended their initial interviews speaking of the illogic of simply trying to use English all day long. Carley humbly declared, “I can’t believe I didn’t realize how hard it is to learn English” (Carley, Interview 1, August 27, 2015). Epiphany ended her first interview by saying, “Why didn’t someone tell me [to support home languages]? I totally would have tried sooner!” (Epiphany, Interview 1, August 29, 2016).

At the onset of this study Carley and Epiphany were talking about how their own funds of knowledge regarding home language use and English in schools needed to be broadened and improved upon. There were obviously important aspects of how ELLs were “othered” in their interviews and little evidence of how to be inclusive of home language—even their own. When they spoke about English in schools they were clearly referring to the “academic English” they learned and were proud of. During one interview Carley used the phrase “I be buying books” and immediately apologized as if I would

care that she used an invariant “be” regularly found in African American English but not in Standard American English (Carley, Interview 2, October 29, 2015). And, Epiphany often spoke of “speaking proper” with her daughter. Their funds of knowledge regarding the importance of English in the United States were heavily influenced by society’s push toward *proper English*. As an important addendum to their notions of English, they also felt as though they knew how to succeed in America by using proper English, and they were proud of that success.

These four women seemed to be beginning to understand themselves (i.e., their knowledge and beliefs) better in relation to those with whom they worked and in relation to their work as teachers. Indeed, teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching seemed to be very personal for each of the teacher-participants and included individual introspection, a process that Maria and many researchers regarded as imperative to truly become more responsive as a teacher (Anonymized, 2015; Maria, Interview 1, August 17, 2015). I argue they were using their ever-evolving funds of knowledge to become more aware of how their knowhow impacted their teaching. Research in the field of culturally responsive teaching suggests that teachers need to understand themselves and their personal stances on culture, including language, and learning (Gay, 2010; Ladson Billings, 1995, 2014; Villegas & Lucas, 2007) and these teacher-participants exhibited early signs that they were on the path to do so.

By attempting to readjust these aspects of their knowhow and knowledge, that is those that perpetuated English as dominant in classrooms that was part of each teacher’s toolkit for learning prior to the summer institute, Maria’s work set in motion shifts that

demonstrated a movement away from English-only beliefs held by each teacher-participant and a positive flow toward thinking about the importance of languages other than English in the classroom. In many ways Maria's summer institute had similar impact to the work of teacher educators analyzed prior to this study (i.e. Bollin, 2007; Fitts & Gross, 2012; Hsu, 2009). Maria like those teacher educators was able to broaden teacher thinking with regard to language, culture, and home life, and address misconceptions (Baecher et al., 2013; Bollin, 2007; Fitts & Gross, 2012; Hsu, 2009; Marx, 2004). However, unlike these studies, discussed in Chapter Two as part of the incentive study for this dissertation, which did not follow their participants beyond their initial learning experiences, there was evidence of Maria's impact beyond the summer institute. As will be discussed next, the practice of introspection that began with Maria continued beyond the summer institute. There was enough evidence beyond the summer institute to suggest that take-up of linguistically responsive teaching necessitated that individuals *continue* to think deeply about their work long after the seed of take-up is planted, leading to new responses and actions.

Take-up as responses and (re)actions (to being misled). As the study continued and the observations and interviews began, more about the nature of each teacher's introspection was revealed as they each began to take action and respond in light of their emerging knowledge and shifting stances. In fact, the many interesting responses and actions that happened beyond the work of the summer institute warranted attention because they often were not reported in the research literature that tends to be short term in scope and strategy focused (cf. Collucci, 2014). Evidence documented movement from

participating teachers simply understanding their own misperceptions about English to the importance of valuing their students' home languages as a means to value them as individuals.

Epiphany, as demonstrated by her own words, spoke about how she did not consider the importance of home languages before the institute, but was currently trying to take action to show her students that she did indeed value home languages:

For me, I went [to the institute] to get some practical skills. I just knew I needed to know how to teach ELLs. I thought 'these kids need to know English before they go to kindergarten,' so I thought I was going to learn how to help them learn English better. Thank goodness I went. If I didn't I would still just keep pushing English! (Epiphany, Interview 2, October 22, 2015)

By the end of my observations, Epiphany spoke with clarity about how to welcome and value her ELLs:

They are coming from home to school. For a lot of the children in this school, they are coming right from home. This is their first step away from home and they need to keep their culture and language with them. I have seen in the past that when teachers say, don't use Spanish, it shuts kids down. They won't use anything, because they can't speak English well, and they are afraid to use their Spanish, so they use nothing. That's the worst. You want students to say something, anything, just keep trying. They can anchor their first learning steps here with what they know from home. That's key for all kids. (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17, 2015)

From October to December, Epiphany seemed to strengthen her conviction that all languages need to be welcomed and used in an early childhood classroom in order to keep kids learning content and English. Epiphany also spoke at this time, four months after the institute, about her new protective actions with confidence. She seemed certain that what she was led to believe due to her own “poor and unfair” schooling situation was not going to lead her down the “wrong path to English-only anymore” (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17, 2015). She was intent on conveying the importance of home language through her own actions and responses.

Carley discussed how “amazing” (her word) it was to hear that a teacher can do so much more than she thought with ELLs. Indeed, data suggest that the thought of being able to do more seemed exciting to Carley. She remembered, “[Before the institute] I tried to teach them [ELLs] by constantly talking to them so they learned English. I was probably just confusing them with all my chatter and making them feel scared like Maria did [referring to Maria’s discussion of being a little girl and afraid in a classroom in which she could not understand English]” (Carley, Interview 1, August 27, 2016). Carley continued to relate her new understanding to her daughter’s preschool experience which to her seemed “positive and good” and talked about trying to emulate that by “saying a few phrases” when she could and gathering phrases in other languages from books, colleagues, and parents. Finally, Carley took more proactive actions with parents, “I keep saying, ‘Let them be. They will learn English, but let them be close to you, know you, talk to you.’ We are learning [Spanish] too!” (Carley, Interview 2, October 29, 2015).

Carley became a strong proponent of what Maria tried to help the program attendees understand—home languages are invaluable to families.

Through interviews and conversations with a purpose, Lucia shared her new actions with regard to English and Spanish. Although she was never told to abandon her familial language of Spanish, she “picked up” the idea that English was right and Spanish was wrong through her interactions (and lack thereof) with others within the school in which she was enrolled. “I was the only kid, except this boy to get pulled out . . . I didn’t want to be different. I wanted to stay in class, hang with the others, be one of them, so I learned English” (Lucia, Interview 1, August 26, 2015). Even though her father would try to read to her in Spanish, she resisted. “It just wasn’t going to happen. ‘No Dad. I speak English now’ Ugh. That sounds bad” (Lucia, Interview 1, August 26, 2015). Even as a teacher in a linguistically diverse classroom, Lucia maintained the need to be fluent in English with little regard for her paternal home language, except that such a belief made teaching in her school difficult. Lucia shared soon after the summer institute that she realized that maintaining an English-only ideal was not going to be successful. The summer institute heightened her realization and made her regret her intentional language loss, “Ugh. I want to hit myself. I never saw that [speaking Spanish] as a privilege” (Lucia, Interview 1, August 26, 2015). Her realization continued to lead to more introspective discussions and opinions throughout the study. She spoke of using her “mistake” to help her students: “At least I can help them [her students] understand my mistake so they don’t make it” (Lucia, Interview 1, August 26, 2015). Lucia used her story to remind her students of her new goals and to help her students and their families

understand them, too. She explained, “I have become famous for my need to speak English and ignore my dad’s language. It’s terrible what I did. The kids now say, ‘Mrs. Lucia, why did you forget Spanish?’ I usually say, ‘It was the dumbest thing I ever did. Forgive me and don’t make the same mistake’” (Lucia, Interview 2, October 23, 2015). Lucia’s new actions were deeply personal and so too were Adrianna’s.

As a teen immigrant, Adrianna spoke mainly Spanish during her high school experience in the United States as she learned English. Even though she excelled in her English as a Second Language classes, Spanish was still her home and primary language. Not speaking English was a source of frustration, embarrassment, and prejudice at times in her life. She spoke about how the other adolescents would make fun of her and not include her in school activities, and she also spoke of being embarrassed when people could not understand her when she was speaking English (Adrianna, Interview 1, August 30, 2015). However, as she learned English she too believed that “better English” (her words) was the way to be successful. She insisted on practicing and improving her oral English so that she could be a better mother to her children. She reflected: “I always wanted to represent us [her family] as smart *Americans*, not some kids who need help” (Adrianna, Interview 1, August 30, 2015). Adrianna gave several examples of being treated better when she was speaking English such as being at the bank or at her children’s school. She spoke about going to a parent-teacher conference and “surprising” the teacher by speaking so well: “I could tell the teachers were happy they could understand me. When you struggle with English you hold things up, people think you’re dumb” (Adrianna, Interview 1, August 30, 2015). Adrianna emphasized that being made

to feel dumb was painful, and she did not want that for her children or her students. She was intent on conveying a desire to hear everyone's home languages and support their learning. Her actions indicated a clear indication that she was going to use her Spanish as a learning tool more often than she previously did. As the school year began Adrianna reported feeling a sense of freedom, "I should be using my Spanish more [in the classroom], I feel like I can be me and they can be their selves too" (Adrianna, Interview 2, October 20, 2015). As will be seen during the discussion of other themes, Adrianna did indeed use her Spanish more often in her classroom.

Adrianna, Lucia, Carley, and Epiphany were struggling to piece together how their misconceptions arose and what to do now that such "blind spots" (Maria's concept for misunderstandings) had been brought to light. Other teacher educators and theorists warn of similar kinds of heavily valued preconceived ideas regarding language and culture and the fight to break the barriers such ideas can generate within teacher development (Bartolomé, 2008). As discussed in the next section, take-up of linguistically responsive teaching among the teacher-participants was enabled because of their exposure to the truth and willingness to share why they were convinced by mistruths. This required an openness to admit that their own funds of knowledge and knowhow may not have been successful.

Developing funds of knowledge. Data suggest that the teacher-participants' work led to positive shifts in their practices, thinking, stances, and knowhow. Their interactions with Maria and others at the summer institute further emphasized McIntosh's (2015) stance, "At this time, most people in the United States (U.S.) are unaware of how societal

power (and its associated privileges) strongly influences life outcomes” (p. 233). Until these women took part in the institute it seems they were unable to see the power and privilege a particular English affords individuals as it strips others of their culture and identity. McIntosh (2015) also argued that if individuals work with others without such realizations, they could inadvertently patronize or misunderstand those born with a different set of privileges and level of access (to power) in this country. Rethinking long-held misbeliefs about the sole importance of English by understanding how language and identity were interrelated proved pivotal for each teacher-participant.

Data also suggest that each of the teacher-participants was aided in her understanding of her own misperceptions about English by understanding the nature of language and self-identity. As described in Chapter Four, Maria emphasized that culture and language could not be separated. This spoke directly to key ideas within formal conception of linguistically responsive teaching. From this perspective, understanding that language and identity are linked may well help preservice teachers understand the need to value all student languages. In short, my own data and the work of established scholars make it easy to argue that the positive acknowledgment of individuals’ languages supports the positive acknowledgment of their identities regardless of whether they are children or adults (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Valdés, 2001). Evidence of introspection’s impact on the reformulation of significant mistruths and the take-up of more informed understandings regarding language and linguistically responsive teaching for each teacher-participant continued to mount beyond the summer institute and there was definitive forward flow in teacher take-up regarding how the teacher-participants

addressed the importance of English in relation to the home languages represented in their classrooms.

These identifiably new bits of knowledge acquired or developed by all four teacher-participants resonates with the life-narratives of those who have put forward the same views through personal experience and struggles, such as Anzaldúa (1986), an American scholar of Chicano/Chicana cultural theory and feminist theory, whose writings often draw upon her life experiences growing up on the Texas-Mexican border. In explaining her feelings of marginalization, Anzaldúa (1987), wrote about her struggles and desires to truly be herself. She emphasized how valuing an individual's home language was as equal to validating the individual as a whole:

so, if you want to really hurt me, talk badly about my language. Ethnic identity is twin skin to linguistic identity—I am my language. Until I can take pride in my language, I cannot take pride in myself (Anzaldúa, 1986, p. 81)

Anzaldúa's passionate discussion of identity and language stirred conversations over twenty years ago about the importance of allowing others to speak as they know best. Her words remain pertinent to this study and the work of teachers trying to be linguistically responsive to their students and their families.

Each teacher-participant in the present study made dramatic shifts in their original linguistic funds of knowledge. Adrianna spoke of raising awareness in her own home of her Ecuadorian Spanish: "After all, that's who I am and my kids should know it" (Adrianna, Interview 3, November 17, 2015). Lucia continued to speak with guilt about letting go a part of her past and losing an aspect of who she was (Lucia, Interview 3,

November 12). Epiphany continued to validate all languages of her students. And, Carley spoke intently about a little English-only girl in class wanting to speak Spanish to her grandmother, emphasizing how she thought it was the best news her grandmother would hear (Carley, Interview 3, November 12, 2015). As a better understanding of the relationship between language and one's own self continue to develop, their take-up still ebbed and flowed as their musings were challenged by parental input, the English-only views of colleagues, their own funds of knowledge regarding language, and general moments of confusion.

Ebbing and flowing of take-up. Each of the teacher-participants started off their introspective journey with seemingly full commitment and under the guidance of Maria and Dalia. Very willingly they acknowledged the potential problems caused their English-dominated ways. As they began the school year, shifting to be a more inclusive language educator was a shared goal. The goal remained consistent, but the strength of commitment and the ability to bring that commitment to fruition ebbed and flowed as evidenced by what they said and what they did.

After publicly opening up about her loss of Spanish and the disappointment she was feeling during the summer institute, Lucia set out to make sure her students did not make the same mistakes she made. Confidently, she told the students what had happened to her and that she did not want the same for them. She reported telling them the following, "So I told them 'use what you need to in order to learn' and we will figure it out" (Lucia, Interview 2, October 23, 2015). Lucia seemed steadily committed to this idea, but never shared any other thoughts or ponderings about her own thinking and

beliefs moving forward from her “mistake.” However, Lucia did say that she was going to have to delay her chance to “*really* learn Spanish” (her words) until her husband’s health was under control and her five children were older. Lucia’s regret regarding her Spanish fluency remained ever-present, but with no time to relearn Spanish and clearly frustrated by that during her final interview—“just can’t think about it”—citing her husband’s health and caring for her blended family as more imperative for her at that time (Lucia, Interview 4, December 22, 2015).

Ironically, as the study closed, Carley still spoke with confidence about her new linguistically responsive respect for home languages and her need to not overly focus on English. Carley remained so positive and optimistic about her new views on home languages in the classroom that as this study ended she had signed herself up for Spanish I and Spanish II classes at a nearby university. Carley’s efficacy resonated with research on new teacher efficacy. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007), major contributors to research on teacher efficacy, wrote, “novice teachers often enter the profession with high hopes about the kind of impact that they will be able to have on students’ lives, but often encounter a painful ‘reality shock’ when they learn that it may be more difficult than they had realized to have the hoped-for results with students” (p.246). Seemingly, Carley was what new teachers often are—confident she could take-up what was necessary to help her students; in her case, that is linguistically responsive teaching.

Adrianna and Epiphany both talked about how the parents of their students wanted their kids to “fit in” and to speak English. Whereas Adrianna spoke from a similar point of reference saying, “I understand that and now, I tell them, ‘It’s okay. They will

learn English, but they need to speak Spanish too’;” Epiphany did not feel as comfortable as Adrianna speaking with parents about linguistic choices. Adrianna began committed to being more linguistically responsive and, as said before, almost “revitalized” by the idea that she should be using her Spanish at home and at school. However, parents who like her feared that their children would not be seen as truly “American” challenged her new views.

As Adrianna spoke, she remained committed to her evolving views of home language usage in the home and classroom, but was certainly stalled by her commiseration with other parents going through the same issues as she did fifteen to twenty years ago. Indeed, Adrianna still spoke of the strength of the desire to blend as the study ended, “You know, I can relate to wanting to blend. Even my sister doesn’t like my [Spanish-inflected English] accent.” Adrianna’s sister was only two when they immigrated and learned English at a very young age. According to Adrianna her sister speaks with an American “accent” and this is a source of pride in her family (Adrianna, Interview 4, December 21, 2015). Adrianna’s “ways of knowing” were deeply imbedded in who she was as a teacher, and her drive to help her own children conform to English dominated ways of speaking, so that life would “be easier” for them was still impacting her views of becoming linguistically responsive as a teacher.

Epiphany also expressed a similar understanding in her last interview with me, “I get that they don’t want their kids speaking Haitian in school. When I was in school, they [Haitians] were bullied. They hid it and they want to hide it too.” Unlike Adrianna who has lived a similar experience to these parents, Epiphany expressed discomfort telling

them otherwise: “I can understand that you want your kid to blend [in]. It’s easier.” (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17, 2015). Epiphany remained staunchly committed to the inclusion of all students and their culture and languages. However, she clearly felt more confident about culture and learning differences than about language differences. She was able to relate more easily to being culturally unique—she was African American and “never forgot the color of [her] skin for a minute” (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17, 2015). However, she never had to deal with linguisticism and felt compassionately toward parents who believed that if their children learned English, it would be easier for them. Epiphany’s take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was muddied by parental influence and the long-standing “knowledge” she shared with them that English was the language of opportunity and speaking other languages made life more challenging in the United States.

As the honest views about hiding language and non-American accents resurfaced for Epiphany and Adrianna, further introspection by all seemed curtailed due to the overly scheduled days of the students and teachers as they tried to prepare for holiday feasts and programs throughout November and December. Most early childhood educators could relate to how hectic November and December were for each of them due to Thanksgiving Day Feasts, school-wide holiday programs, and all of the many winter holidays. Nonetheless, each teacher-participant did say that they were looking forward to their winter vacations so they could, as Lucia put it, “Take a minute to think” about what has been happening and what could happen (Lucia, interview 4, December 22, 2015). At the end of this study, these women were still left grappling with how to support home

languages when they spent their whole lives believing that English-only classrooms were what was needed. Over time their introspection regarding English became a discussion of wants versus possibilities with the need for time to reflect remaining a major barrier to thinking otherwise. On-going introspection thus was challenged by time, overly committed classroom schedules, and the uncertainty of parents with respect to the emphasis of home languages in the classrooms.

Conclusion. The data that led to the development of this theme, that is the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching includes continual personal introspection and subsequent action regarding their views of languages, showed time and again that introspection regarding views of language, was an integral part of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. Findings from this small-scale study strongly suggest that each of these teacher-participants went through moments of confusion and uncertainty as they began to realize the importance of home languages and to rethink their teaching of ELLs. Although Maria did not specifically use McIntosh (2015) to develop opportunities to problematize one's own privileges and lack thereof in relation to others, such work seems quite pertinent to educators based on the evidence that emerged during this study with regard to introspection and subsequent action on the part of the teacher-participants regarding their views of home languages and what "should" be done in their own classrooms. Acknowledging their own blind spots and mistakes regarding home languages and English dominance, was truly an initial step in what may be a perpetual cycle of contemplation and actualizing. The very nature of teaching and the fact

that new children enter each school year heightens the need to remain committed to home languages no matter what they may be. These four women certainly recognized that their English-only views did not serve their students well, yet this remained deeply personal for them; they challenged their own views, but not those of society. During the course of this study the women were never directly provided with content that explained and problematized the English-only world within which they lived. This suggests to me that there was still much to be learned regarding national and local policy impact and the imperialistic views of English in the United States. Such content through readings and discussions could help contextualize their English-dominant understandings.

Researchers (Bartolomé, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Motha, 2014, & Norton, 2000) promote a need for teachers to understand the sociopolitical and sociocultural world around them, so that they better understand their own misguided views and how others also come to believe those same mistruths and hold similar “blind spots.” These four teacher-participants, like many well-intentioned teachers, held views that were reflective of the time period and culture within which they have lived. When this study ended they were slowly coming to terms with their own misguided views. By openly using their funds of knowledge and keeping present the content learned at the institute, these women demonstrated that take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was indeed possible, was actually happening, and was unique for each of them. The uniqueness of each teacher’s linguistically responsive ways can be better seen across all themes. True to the nature of take-up, each teacher’s overall take-up was uniquely fluid. Often, as one aspect of take-up flowed; others ebbed. The next section focuses on another emerging

aspect of linguistically responsive teaching that emerged through data analysis, and that is how *take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifested as a commitment to giving prominence to home languages within the physical environment.*

Theme Two: Take-up of Linguistically Responsive Teaching Manifests as a Commitment to Giving Prominence to Home Languages in the Classroom

Evidence was gathered and analyzed from each teacher-participant that showed positive take-up in terms of the amount of emphasis placed on home languages within the physical environment of the classroom as compared to the amount of attention home languages prominently displayed and included within the environment prior to the summer institute. After the three-day summer institute, data showed that each teacher-participant layered her classroom with similar displays as modeled by Maria and Dalia (e.g., family trees, flags from different countries, multilingual Word Walls) and emphasized saying and doing that which she never did before to show that home languages were indeed part of the classroom environment, such as playing multilingual music and using simple phrases to greet children each day. Hence, this theme describes repeated evidence of each teacher giving prominence to home languages of their students by visually using home languages around the room as part of various displays and by attempting to use home languages for basic communication inside the classroom.

In some instances the prominence of simply displaying words in other languages seemed to be *the* goal (e.g., labeling the door “porta” as well as “puerta”); in other instances there were observable additional intentions attached to the visual displays. For example, each teacher-participant created a bulletin board typically used for Circle Time

that included the days of the week in English and Spanish that seemingly enabled each of them to conduct this aspect of their daily morning lesson in both languages. In and of itself this prominence of languages other than English in their classrooms may seem shallow, or a “quick fix” to not using home languages previously, but what may seem “decorative” to others was recognized and talked about by these teacher-participants, Maria, Dalia, and by myself in interviews, as enhanced print rich environments.

Creating print rich environments has long been recognized as an integral way in which early childhood teachers support and facilitate early literacy development; an idea supported by research in early literacy instruction (Neuman & Roskos, 1993; Morrow, 2007), district mandates, early childhood standards (Core Standards, 2014; NAEYC, 2009), and research regarding how to support ELLs in the classroom (Cummins, 2000; Hollie, 2011). Therefore, bringing Spanish or other languages into this valuable space was more than just a quick fix and therefore, an important finding regarding these teachers’ take-up of linguistically responsive teaching.

In thinking of “take-up” as it has been defined for this study, much can be said about the new content (e.g., home languages, especially Spanish), ideas (e.g., multilingual Word Walls), linguistic choices/practices (e.g., saying teaching-related and social phrases in home languages), reflective stances (e.g., language matters) and actions (e.g., displaying and bringing in samples of home languages). This section continues with an overview of the evidence that supported how teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was revealed in the classroom environment and the actions of the

teachers that were not necessarily lesson-bound using my working definition of take-up once again to organize the data.

Take-up as new ideas and content. Walking into the classrooms of Adrianna, Epiphany, Carley, and Lucia during my first round of observations, I was struck by the overt similarity of all three rooms (as a reminder, Carley and Lucia are co-teachers). Each teacher-participant created and displayed a family tree bulletin board with their students' photos, family names, and symbols pertaining to their heritage countries; flags from their students' heritage countries along with multi-lingual labels for the country to which the flag belonged (e.g., Peru/ Perú; Bangladesh/ বাংলাদেশ); and world maps upon which each student's heritage countries were pinpointed. Each teacher-participant also labeled environmental items such as the door, musical instruments, and centers in multiple languages (e.g., Music and Movement/Música y el Movimiento); developed dual language bulletin boards (e.g., What's the Weather?/ Cuál es el Clima and) Word Walls; displayed books in the library center that were either bilingual or written in a home language; and played multilingual songs during center time (Lucia & Carley, Classroom Observation 1, September 9, 2015; Adrianna, Classroom Observation 1, September 29, 2015; Epiphany, Classroom Observation 1, September 30, 2015). Although there were students whose families spoke other home languages such as French, Creole, and Bengali, the home language most often included in these teacher-participants' classrooms was Spanish. Epiphany also included Arabic labels in her classroom, but that was because a colleague in the school knew how to write in Arabic and wrote these labels for

Epiphany. Epiphany could not use the labels because she could not read Arabic, nor did she have a student who spoke Arabic.

All of the aforementioned examples of language prominence were modeled during the institute and exemplified how new content (e.g., another language) and ideas (e.g., bulletin boards about the students) quickly became a part of each teacher's attempt at being linguistically responsive. The evidence also demonstrated a shift in reflective stances of the teachers (e.g., home languages matter). For these reasons, my initial observations seemed to indicate—even with little formal data analysis needed—that spending three days in the fully immersive environment facilitated by Maria, who emphasized through the creation of cultural and linguistic displays that home languages belong in schools, had immediate impact on the teacher-participants who returned to their classrooms ready and willing to emulate Maria's own cultural and linguistic displays. Though these changes were relatively quick, they were not “quick fixes,” but instead ways to enhance an integral aspect of the early literacy classroom (i.e., the environment).

The work and take-up of these teacher-participants seems to indicate that they were fully aware of the impact of a well-developed, literacy-rich classroom. As experienced, successful pre-kindergarten educators, these four teacher-participants were undoubtedly aware of the importance of supporting the emergent literacy development of each student as dictated by the following early childhood standards (often posted on lesson plans and on the walls of their rooms), which, in turn, are supported by research outcomes:

Children have opportunities to become familiar with print. They are actively involved in making sense of print, and they have opportunities to become familiar with, recognize, and use print that is accessible throughout the classroom.

(NAEYC, 2009)

Teaching staff reorganize the environment when necessary to help children explore new concepts and topics, sustain their activities, and extend their learning.

(NAEYC, 2009)

These two standards, Standard 2.E.03 and Standard, 3.E.01 respectively, speak to the research-based emphasis on purposefully designed early childhood environments and specifically, the inclusion of print rich environments (Hollie, 2010, 2011; Morrow, 2007; Neuman & Roskos, 1993). Therefore, as the teacher-participants added Spanish to their environments and materials within the environment that highlighted other languages and cultures, they were enriching already pre-established important aspects of their early childhood classrooms. Clearly, the teacher-participants' emphasis on multilingual print, especially regarding their use of Spanish, was not shallow, but, rather, a meaningful attempt at being linguistically responsive.

Displaying language in early childhood classrooms was sound practice on the part of the teacher-participants as it supported emergent literacy development. As a result of their participation in the Northeastern Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute, in each classroom Spanish was being supported in much the same way English was, through a print-rich environment. Their print rich environments offered continuous displays of relevant words for learning (e.g., center names, calendars), product names

easily identifiable by children (e.g., Crayola, Cheerios), and language generated by the students (e.g., a list of each student's favorite color written in English and Spanish); forming much of the content of early literacy learning.

Labeling—that is, clearly identifying the names of objects and learning areas around a classroom with single words or short phrases on index-size cards—has long been used in early childhood classrooms to help emergent readers develop an understanding that language can be spoken, written, read, and heard (Core Standards, 2014; Goodman, 1989; Morrow, 2007; NAEYC, 2009; Neuman & Roskos, 1993). By hearing the teacher say *chair*, and seeing the word *chair* on the back of a chair, the claim is that children can begin to make linguistic connections between written and spoken language. Now, the teacher-participants were layering these connection-making supports with Spanish-language labels; enabling a teacher, aide, and student to say “silla,” hear sill, write silla, and read it. Studying the data through a funds of knowledge lens, I attributed this immediate take-up of home-language-related print rich resources throughout each classroom to how comfortably the ideas meshed with their pre-established “teacher knowhow” and experiences with print-rich environments (i.e., funds of knowledge).

Sound research, policy, previous teacher preparation, knowhow, and experiences seemed to guide these teacher-participants in creating print-rich environments for learning and to change them when necessary, for they all had a plethora of print-rich materials in English already that were seemingly long available to them before their participation in the summer institute. For example, each month the teacher-participants added new thematic words to displays based on their units of study (e.g., the parts of the

body for “All About Me”). Previously created materials were written in English, but this particular year they were adding Spanish words as well to their stockpile of pertinent environmental print based on each unit of study. Assimilating the notion of supporting ELLs in this way seemed to find strong connections within each participating teacher’s funds of knowledge. Therefore, when the teacher-participants so readily layered their existing environmental print with Spanish (and Arabic as in Epiphany’s case) words, I argue that much had to do with the fact that their previous research-based and standards-based early childhood teachers’ funds of knowledge were consonant with what was suggested to them at the summer institute. The inclusion of home languages in these classrooms may well have been a natural extension of these teachers’ previous use and inclusion of English print to accomplish important learning goals (cf. Halliday, Matthiessen, & Yang, 1999; Stauffer, 1970). For this reason this section discusses this evidence in terms of new ideas *and content*, for clearly the immediate inclusion of “ideas” had depth that I believe is best discussed as content.

The bilingual labeling of classroom items and the development of bilingual charts for small group instruction were providing new content for the students—Spanish. According to Lucas (2011), learning, thinking, and language can be depicted as an interlocked circle of interdependence. To support one aspect of the circle (e.g., learning), the other two aspects (e.g., thinking and language) need to be supported. Lucas (2011) asserted, “This deep interconnectedness of language, learning, and knowing is especially pronounced in the school context” (p. 5). By interrelating key aspects of theories proposed by psychologist Lev Vygotsky (1978), who explains how language develops

prior to thought, and linguist M.A.K. Halliday (1977), who emphasized that “knowing involves the use of language,” (Lucas, 2011, p. 5) Lucas reinforced the strength of this circle as a powerful visual reminder of how important home languages are to learners. She emphasized, “language cannot be separated from what is taught and learned in school” (p. 5) because individuals rely on their language to grapple with new content and experiences as they learn. In the present study, as the teacher-participants began to take-up linguistically responsive teaching by giving prominence to home languages as demonstrated through additions of language to the physical environment and in their “doing”/actions that gave languages prominence in the classroom, home languages became equally vital to this interrelated loop.

By including home languages in the classrooms, participating teachers were creating a physical learning context that supported emergent literacy development in those home languages as well as English. The fact that there was a heavy emphasis on Spanish and little on any other home language was an issue which was problematized throughout this study and best discussed in Chapter Six, for not every teacher-participant was as aware of the disparity as Epiphany, and this is something to consider in relation to the larger United States’ context. Interestingly, even monolingual English speaking students were attempting to use Spanish to answer questions and speak to their peers. The teacher-participants’ support of emergent Spanish literacy resonated with Cummins’ (1998, 2000) notion of additive bilingualism as well as Espinosa’s (2008) emphasis on bilingual learning in which the child’s first language, Spanish, continues to be developed (and the home culture to be valued) while the student also learned English. This

realization speaks more to the academic use of home languages in the classroom that is better explored in a following section in this chapter (i.e., *Theme Three: Take-up of Linguistically Responsive Teaching Grounded in a Commitment to All Students' Learning—Including, But Not Limited To—Ells Manifests as an Understanding and Use of Home Languages as Learning Resources in the Classroom*); whereas the present theme (i.e., *Take-Up of Linguistically Responsive Teaching Manifests as a Commitment to Giving Prominence to Home Languages Within the Physical Environment*) focuses mainly on shifts in the physical environment, an important component to the early childhood classroom.

Take-up as shifts in linguistic choices. By the end of September, home languages, especially Spanish, were clearly a part of each teacher's classroom environment and as the evidence demonstrated, students in each classroom took note; making the teachers keenly aware of the importance of having home languages in their classrooms and their linguistic choices. The multilingual, print-rich physical environments of their respective classrooms gave teachers a starting point from which to shift their practices and linguistic choices. As explained by Epiphany "once the words were up I was able to check it myself so I could try to use them [Spanish words]" (Epiphany, Interview 3, November 23, 2015). Epiphany was observed using her own environmental print to remember each learning center's Spanish name. (Centers are best described as small areas around the room that usually accommodate four to five students, are designed by the teacher to facilitate specific learning and discovery, and provide multiple opportunities for students to participate in meaningful experiences

independently and/or with others so that they can practice relevant skills and extend their learning.)

For example, at the start of Epiphany's October observation, the students were observed moving to centers. As the class began their center work, one boy, identified as bilingual in English and Spanish, clung to Epiphany. In an attempt to help him settle into his center work, she walked him around the room narrating what each child was doing. At each center she would say its name in English and Spanish seemingly hopeful that the little boy would find a center in which he was interested. After gently touring him around, he finally decided to work at the Discovery/Descubrimiento center where a group of three boys (one of which was also bilingual in English and Spanish) were painting jack-o-lantern faces on paper plates. Epiphany said, "Have fun at the center of descubrimiento today!" (Epiphany, Classroom Observation 2, October 23, 2015). Whether Epiphany's use of Spanish helped the boy choose his center or not was unknown, but clearly Epiphany was doing as she claimed—using her environmental print as a reference so that *she* could use Spanish—a simple, yet achievable goal and the students were aware of her choice. Epiphany also talked about how her students regularly laughed at her attempts to use Spanish, but as she said, "They totally love it. I want to use their language so much; I am willing to not be perfect" (Epiphany, Interview 3, November 23, 2015).

Similar to Epiphany's story, Lucia talked about how much the students giggled at her attempts to use Spanish, but according to her, "they clearly wanted me to keep doing it, so I do!" (Lucia, Interview 3, November 12, 2015). Making it possible for the children

to see and hear their home languages was a new goal for the teacher-participants. In and of itself this use seemed to impart language inclusivity. Take for example, how Lucia and Carley used their bilingual color chart often to move children to a new activity:

Pointing to the color red, Lucia said, “If you are wearing rojo you may go to the bathroom.” Carley (pointing to the blue on the chart) said, “All those wearing azul get a drink of water” (Lucia & Carley, Classroom Observation 2, October 19, 2015).

There was no evidence of depth of curriculum content involved in this use of Spanish, but the language was present and was clearly a part of the classroom culture; therefore, showing evidence of shifts in each teacher’s linguistic choices, indicating an emerging new stance that home languages of students matter.

Take-up as shifts in reflective stances (e.g., language matters). Data show that these were no longer English-only classrooms, and the inclusion of home languages seemed to send positive messages to the students that their languages mattered in school. Documented expansion of these practices to include languages other than English seemed immediately successful in terms of eliciting positive responses from their students, especially their ELLs, because their take-up gave at least some prominence to Spanish in school. Adrianna explained how the displays around her classroom drew responses from her students: “The kids eyes light up when they see their flags and their faces on the maps. They see the Spanish and it makes them just smile” (Adrianna, Interview 2, October 20, 2015). Carley reported, “[The] kids are going to the displays and they try to read the Spanish and English [text] and their language, as if they are saying ‘Look! It’s

there! It matters” (Carley, Interview 2, October 29, 2015). Lucia said that she was glad the students were using the many books in the classroom library that were bilingual (i.e., mostly Spanish/English texts): “I imagine they see the accents and those other curvy lines that signal ‘Spanish’ to them. Plus, the characters are Hispanic or Mexican usually” (Lucia, Interview 2, October 23, 2015). Research in the areas of bilingual and linguistically responsive education suggests (as well as did Maria during the summer institute) that the prominent inclusion of students’ home languages sends important messages to all students, especially those whose home languages are being included (Espinosa, 2008; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Clearly, the use of home languages was gaining attention from the students and the teacher-participants were continuing an optimistic flow regarding their stances on language use in the classroom.

Possibly the most pertinent evidence of this emerging stance that home language belonged in schools was that teachers were continually sharing with me how they prompt those students who are fluent in English, but who speak another language at home other than Spanish to share their home languages. For these teacher-participants, sending the message that all languages spoken by their students mattered was an initial goal. This type of sharing was not necessarily related to academic or standards-driven learning goals; this was purely for appreciation. However, it is important to note now that the teachers never referred to what they were doing as “valuing” language specifically. They seemed to actively want children to see that their language “mattered” and should be in their classrooms. That was why this particular theme in my results was construed as “giving prominence to language” for without them actually using the word “value”

themselves during interviews this theme was better identified as giving language *prominence*.

Nevertheless, evidence gathered certainly suggested that these teachers were beginning to “value” home languages and the students seemingly felt that their home languages were a special, if not valuable part of their classroom. Linguistically responsive theorists argue that by showing students that their home languages matter and are indeed a necessary part of their school environment, a teacher demonstrates that the students who speak languages other than English offer valuable resources to the learning community (Ladson-Billings, 2014; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Overall, the four teacher-participants reported often to me that the students seemed excited about the overt inclusion of their languages; possibly signaling that these students felt their language did indeed matter and so too did they. By acknowledging the interconnection of language and identity, it could be said that when these teacher-participants signaled that home languages of students mattered, they were sending the message that the students mattered as well.

Interestingly, valuing *individuals* and their home languages as resources for learning are central tenets to culturally responsive teaching. In fact, most of those who research and practice culturally responsive teaching speak of the importance of shifting teacher perceptions of ELL students from a deficit model to a stance that values the resources, specifically the home languages, all children bring with them (Delpit, 1995; Gay, 2000, Ladson-Billings, 1995, 2014; Nieto, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Proponents of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching emphasize that by valuing,

understanding, and acknowledging the home culture and language of students, teachers can better prepare learning opportunities for their students because such emphasis is the beginning of relationship building that often enables teachers to better understand their student resources—home languages and funds of knowledge—and therefore, enables the creation of more successful learning opportunities for their students (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Whether these four teacher-participants remembered the research that informed their environments as they created them or not, it seemed they were often reminded of how important it was to be inclusive of a student's home language by the outwardly positive reactions of the students when they heard and saw their home languages displayed and used in class.

Beyond valuing language, the evidence presented in this theme, that is *Take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifests as a commitment to giving prominence to home languages within the physical environment*, also resonated with research regarding how best to support ELLs' English development. As discussed earlier in Chapter Two, Cummins (2000) has long emphasized the importance of "additive bilingualism." For Cummins, "additive bilingualism refers to the form of bilingualism that results when students add a second language to their intellectual tool-kit while continuing to develop conceptually and academically in their first language" (Cummins, 2000, p. 37). Cummins' claim rests on the realization that students develop a second language faster and with more success if they also continue to nurture their first languages. Therefore, although much was demonstrated and discussed in this theme pertaining to potential evidence of *valuing* language, there were also indications that by giving prominence to

home languages in the classroom, the teacher-participants were inadvertently enabling a more successful way for their ELLs to learn English by supporting their home languages too.

It must be said at this point that these preschool children were still developing emergent literacy skills in *any* given language. Nevertheless, it seems that with the prominence of Spanish in their classrooms they would also need to make connections between spoken words and print words in two languages and to identify Spanish as distinct from English. In short, study evidence suggests strongly that the classroom environments created by the four teacher-participants supported emergent literacy in both Spanish and English, especially for ELLs. Much of the support developed by the teacher-participants for their students was based on each teacher-participant's unique funds of knowledge.

Drawing upon their funds of knowledge. Although there were similarities in the ways in which the new content of Spanish and to a lesser extent other home languages (e.g., Arabic) was included, many of the manifestations of this content were unique to each teacher because they drew differently on their own unique funds of knowledge. Take, for example, Adrianna's bilingual alphabet. She and her aide created a handmade, beautifully colored alphabet that spanned the length of one wall in a fashion typical to that of the store-bought versions of alphabet displays. Adrianna and her aide hung the alphabet prominently along the wall that housed the writing center (which was also where the children ate lunch). For each letter, Adrianna drew an illustration that began with the same letter in Spanish and English. For example, for "C" she drew a car and wrote

underneath it “car/carro.” She purposely did not draw a cat because cat is “gato” in Spanish and does not begin with a “c” sound (Adrianna, Interview 2, October 20, 2015). Some letters proved challenging such as “Q,” but Adrianna reported remaining true to her intent. Referencing her own experience as a teen trying to understand the sounds and letters of the English alphabet, Adrianna said she was trying to eliminate confusion regarding sound-letter correspondence in case some of her students were using their Spanish to understand the English alphabet as she did. (Adrianna, Interview 2, October 20, 2016).

Carley was bothered by the fact that due to her emerging funds of knowledge regarding language (Spanish specifically) and language learning, she could not understand the “simple stuff” children were trying to say, such as “What’s next?” and “Help me,” so she created a growing “cheat sheet” for herself and Lucia of phrases to say to the children that included phrases for basic classroom behavior management. (See Table 7 below).

Table 7
Carley's List of Helpful Translations

Walk—camina

Cross your legs—Cruzas las piernas

Keep your hands to yourself—manten las manos cerca de ti

Sit Still—Senta te derectia

Let's Clean up—vamos a limpear a recojer

Plate—plato

Bowl—sopera

Cup—vaso

Wake up—despertarse

Bring me your mat—traeme tuo camilla

Go to the bathroom—vete al bano

Sit down—sientate

Get your sheet—busca tu sabana

Cover your mouth—cubre tu boca

Fingers out of your mouth—dedos afurera de tu boca

Fingers out of your nose—dedos afuera de tu nariz

Don't play like that—no juegas a se

Listen—escucha

Wash your hands—lavates las manos

(Lucia & Carley, *Conversation with a Purpose*, September 28, 2016)

Carley spoke with satisfaction about her growing list of phrases. They filled in a gap in knowledge she felt was needed when working with small children. To her, the little incidentals—like how to get ready for nap time and snack time—should be easy to convey and understand (Carley, Interview 2, October 29, 2016).

Lucia wanted to relearn her Spanish and build upon her own funds of knowledge, but, as explained earlier, formal learning was not in her near future at any time during the study. She explained, “My husband’s health and my kids; they come first now. Maybe I’ll get there [learning Spanish formally] in 8 to 10 years” (Lucia, Interview 1, August 26, 2015). However, Lucia did report, “I ask them [students] for help now, and I am learning some phrases that way” (Lucia, Interview 2, October 23, 2015). Lucia’s reliance on her students for Spanish translations was observed during my first observation of her classroom. Lucia looked directly at Santiago (pseudonym) as she overtly modelled cleaning up and asked him, “How do I say *clean up*?” He answered by saying, “Limpiar! [Clean up!].” Lucia clarified, “Limpie, por favor?” Santiago nodded in agreement (Lucia, Classroom Observation 1, September 28, 2016). Lucia believed that her ability to once speak Spanish would help her re-learn Spanish. She did not feel as though she was starting from scratch (Lucia, Interview 2, October 23, 2015).

Epiphany, whose knowhow had much to do with overcoming segregation and supporting inclusivity, created a display by the door that listed how to say *hello* and *good-bye* in several languages. Epiphany seemed intent on being responsive to *all* students’ home languages, not just Spanish. However, she could not speak a language other than English, so if she was going to use them in her own talk with her students, she

found she needed environmental print resources to act as quick references for herself (Epiphany, Conversation with a Purpose, September 30, 2015). Her focus on language inclusivity was explained during our last interview together when she retold the story of her class's teacher from the previous year overhearing Epiphany using her chart.

Epiphany explained, "He came to the door and kind of reprimanded the kids, 'What did I tell you about speaking Spanish?' And, I said, 'Oh no that's okay. They can speak Spanish. That's who they are.' I told him, 'In this classroom we are doing all languages. And I am learning with them'" (Epiphany, Interview 3, November 23, 2015).

When these teacher-participants chose to give prominence to language as best as they could, using all they had to offer (i.e., drawing especially on their funds of knowledge), so, too, were they giving culture prominence. For Maria, the institute director, (and seemingly for the teacher-participants), there seemed to be an underlying belief that language use was an integral part of culture. Therefore, these teacher-participants' immediate desire to give language prominence within the physical environment, potentially gave prominence to the ELL students, their cultures, and their families. In terms of becoming more linguistically responsive teachers as demonstrated by evidence from this study, these teachers made progress. Thus, I argue there was a significant amount of "flow" in a positive direction. But true to the nature of take-up, there were fluctuations in consistency further identified below in terms of ebbs and flows.

Ebbing and flowing of take-up. As discussed previously there was much forward "flow" regarding language prominence in relation to this theme, that is, *take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifesting as a commitment to giving prominence*

to home languages as demonstrated through additions of language to the physical environment and in the “doing”/actions of the teachers that gave languages prominence in the classroom. However, in other ways, especially when the visual displays on the classroom walls did not match expectations, teachers seemed to become stalled. Some of the visual displays of Spanish and uses of Spanish (e.g., Adrianna’s alphabet, the Circle Time bulletin boards) continued to remain pertinent to the daily work of the teacher-participants and their students, demonstrating the flow dimensions of take-up; while other displays more so than uses waned or remained decorative thereby emphasizing the “ebb” of take-up. This ebb and flow was distinctive for each of the teacher-participants.

For example, Lucia and Carley started the school year off excited to talk about using and displaying home languages (Carley, Interview 2, October, 29, 2015). Carley was the careful caretaker of the “survival phrases” while Lucia often included Spanish in the classroom’s environmental print displays. However, evidence demonstrated that their momentum stalled. The list of phrases grew from September’s visit to October’s visit by four or five phrases, but there were no additions in November or December. Also, the type of phrases gathered remained very much classroom management-related, such as “Don’t play like that—no juegas asi and Listen—escucha,” (Lucia & Carley, Conversation with a Purpose, December 3, 2016). Moreover, Lucia and Carley felt as though their family bulletin board fell flat. Lucia disclosed how “Without everyone’s poster [on the wall] I feel as though the display doesn’t do what it is supposed to . . . make everyone feel accepted.” Carley added, “We don’t really use it” (Lucia & Carley, Conversation with a Purpose, November 12, 2016). However, the disappointing display

was still hanging on the wall at the time of my final observation, leading to my assumption that this type of inclusion of home language prominence might have been waning in effectiveness (Lucia & Carley, *Conversation with a Purpose*, December 3, 2016).

Similarly, Adrianna found certain displays less helpful than others but did not seem to rethink them or replace them. The center chart and circle time displays of weather, colors, and the calendar in Spanish and English worked well according to Adrianna, but she, too, expressed disappointment with her inability to get all children and families to participate in displays designed to value student's home languages and cultures. Regarding her family tree display, she said, "Not everyone is represented, so I don't think it works" (Adrianna, Interview 2, October 20, 2015). Nevertheless, Adrianna continued to add and create new classroom wall displays. The most important display to her at the end of this study was her bilingual alphabet chart (Adrianna, Interview 4, December 21, 2015). Epiphany's ebbs were slightly different in kind from those of Carley, Lucia, and Adrianna, but seemingly equally challenging nonetheless.

Epiphany remained as positive as her colleagues, but reported being continually bothered by the lack of inclusiveness of everyone's home language. She more than anyone else spoke about how she believed languages other than Spanish such as Bengali and Creole were not integrated well at all into her classroom. Even though Arabic was readily used to label the centers in writing, and Creole and other languages were included in her wall chart of common greetings, she was unable to read these other languages or pronounce the words on the labels and in the displays. Epiphany also spoke about an

issue that she saw herself and other teachers facing: the lack of teaching resources in a range of languages. Research certainly supports her own anecdotal finding (see, for example, Gandara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly, & Callahan, 2003). Spanish books and materials, rather than Bengali and Creole, were much more accessible to Epiphany because of the nature of her school district and the staff with whom she worked. Epiphany worked in a school with many students and colleagues who spoke Spanish. Epiphany described herself by the end of my observations as still struggling to be more language inclusive.

In terms of the momentum of take-up regarding maintaining the overt prominence of home languages in the classroom all of the teacher-participants talked about the need for more time and energy to do what was necessary. Unsurprisingly, time has often been an issue in cases where teachers were trying something new in their classrooms (Collinson & Fedoruk Cook, 2001; Guskey, 2002). They all spoke in December (five months after the institute) about looking forward to their winter breaks so that they could rethink their classroom displays and perhaps make changes in the ways in which they were trying to give home languages prominence, much of which can be related to research reviewed earlier regarding teaching strategies for teaching ELLs.

Research, as shared in Chapter Two and conducted at the preservice level regarding linguistically responsive teaching, spoke to the take-up of *strategies* (Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012; Jimenez-Silva et al., 2012; Olson & Jimenez-Silva, 2008; Sowa, 2009; Virtue, 2009; Zhang & Stephens, 2012) and this aspect of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching resonated well with these earlier findings. After being shown at the

summer institute through modeling and discussions about what *to do*, the teacher-participants *did*. They included many ideas to give language prominence and possibly by doing so conveyed a sense of value for languages. Some of the ways home languages were given prominence in the classrooms were exactly as modeled by Maria at the summer institute (e.g., greeting everyone in various home languages); other examples of prominence demonstrated each teacher's special take on the strategies and suggestions demonstrated during the summer institute (e.g., Adrianna's alphabet) due in great part to each teacher-participant's funds of knowledge. As discussed earlier "welcoming all home languages" may have been taken-up so readily because it was a natural extension of the type of environments these early childhood teachers were already familiar with creating in support of emergent literacy. Adding Spanish to the content that supported emergent literacy may have been a way to reinforce the importance of all languages in learning. With Spanish so prominently surrounding the students, it became an important part of each student's, especially each ELL's, early literacy development.

Conclusion. Research strongly suggests that linguistically responsive teachers must value home languages and the data certainly suggest that these teachers "valued" home languages, but without them actually using such a term this theme is better identified as giving language prominence. After much deliberation, I found "prominence" to be a much more useful descriptor than "value" because of the ebbs and flows. To claim that the language is valued would have required more careful attention to those aspects of the language environment that became overlooked and worn. Yet, clearly languages, at least Spanish, were a part of each teacher-participant's daily work; the emphasis must be

recognized honestly and properly, for data certainly demonstrated impact (e.g., students were exploring books in Spanish and the teacher-participants were using languages other than English during non-academic interactions). Emphasizing home languages other than English was important to each of these teachers' manifestations of linguistic responsiveness; however, their respective emphasis was not necessarily of equal intent from the start of data collection to the end or between classrooms.

Thus, it seems that supporting teachers as they recognize the need to go beyond simply "including" home languages of their students, to hopefully overtly valuing language can be thoughtfully considered by teacher educators, but would certainly require the deliberate development and use of opportunities designed to do so, such as a specific form of reflection. For example, Hsu (2009) found that by blogging about language and issues of diversity with her preservice students that they ended their time with her better able to discuss "how to create an environment in which they could *value* the cultures and the languages that students would bring to school" (p. 177). Being able to discuss the value of classroom students' language seemingly led the preservice teachers in Hsu's study to realize the need to provide opportunities to use students' native languages as resources for learning new content, but without data to substantiate what the preservice students did after their work with Hsu, questions still lingered. In this study, home languages were included, but minimal reflection upon the use of such was documented.

The preschool teachers in my own study were very willing and eager to include language and by doing as much as they did, they seemingly conveyed to their students

and their families a deep respect for all languages. It is important to realize that these teachers were hyper aware of my research question and purpose. Plus, they had monthly visits from mentors who were equally focused on linguistically responsive teaching. If, with all that support and focus, they were still feeling the challenges of ebbs in their forward progress, then I would suspect teachers left on their own to take-up linguistically responsive teaching in this way would struggle in many of the same ways but further research is required to understand how deeply valued home languages were in each classroom and by each teacher-participant. Nevertheless, home languages were being purposely employed as academic tools for learning. This is the focus of theme three.

Theme Three: Take-up of Linguistically Responsive Teaching Manifests as an Understanding and Incorporation of Home Language as a Learning Resource

Whereas the second theme discussed in this chapter was concerned with affording pertinent languages prominence in the classroom, the emergence of this theme concerning a commitment to *all* students' learning emphasizes the fact that the teacher-participants realized being linguistically responsive meant *using* home languages intentionally to support student learning. Home languages (again mainly Spanish) were not only “welcomed” in the classroom, but were viewed as learning resources by each teacher-participant. Each teacher-participant was observed using home languages and/or encouraging her students to use home languages during each observed lesson and spoke often during interviews about how they were trying to include home languages to support learning. Out of a strong commitment to “do right” by each of their students and out of concern for their own accountability—as Epiphany said, “It’s my job to get them all

prepared” (Epiphany, Interview 2, October 22, 2015)—evidence suggested that each of these teacher-participants committed heartily to classroom practices that acknowledged home languages as valuable learning tools to be used in the classroom to learn. Some of these practices were directly adopted from the intentional work of Maria and Dalia, such as their “Literacy Moments;” others were strategies and practices that were seemingly “inspired” by the summer institute as explained by the teacher-participants during interviews and conversations with purpose (e.g., bilingual story readings). By thinking of take-up as it has been defined for this study and looking at the evidence that generated this theme, much can be said about new content (e.g., multilingual stories and literacy moments), ideas (e.g., letting students think in home languages), practices (lesson planning for language differences), and actions (e.g., modeling how to use language, gesturing, strategies to help). Their seemingly newfound commitment to including home languages as a means to be linguistically responsive led to what I saw as an intentional use of home languages for learning.

The length of this theme’s write-up is not indicative of its significance compared to the others, but of the type of evidence shared. To appropriately share how language was incorporated into lessons, excerpts of lesson observations are included to allow for a true sense of how such take-up manifested. To keep this theme’s length readable (and reasonable), key moments from lessons are shared along with summaries when possible. As the teachers discussed the ways in which they integrated home languages into their students’ learning, they did not use theoretical rationales such as providing students with comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985, 1997) or interlocutors (Schleppegrell, 2004), but

many of their successes can be related to these kinds of concepts. These teacher-participants indeed were starting to understand that when school language, or academic language, was different from home languages there was more to be done on the part of the teacher to ensure each child equitable access to important content and learning opportunities (Cummins, 2000; Krashen, 1985, 1997; Lucas, 2011; Schleppegrell, 2004; Valdés, 2001; Wright, 2010). Although such commitment led to many robust, identifiable manifestations of teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching during lesson observations (i.e., flows), much of the follow-through of the take-up described below was challenged by uncertainty and a lack of resources to fully commit to supporting their ELLs' content development simultaneously with their English and home language development (i.e., the ebbs). All of this is discussed in more detail below.

Take-up as new content. Data showed that as the teachers focused on being more linguistically responsive, Spanish became valuable content. Although there were no assessments or curriculum mandates dictating so, the teacher-participants began to actively support their students' learning of Spanish. The evidence collected across the course of this study demonstrated that once English-only lessons typical of "Morning Meeting" or "Circle Time" were infused with Spanish, understanding the Spanish became important to the students and teacher-participants alike. Lucia explained during a conversation with a purpose, for example, that "Now, we do the morning routine in English and Spanish. So we are practicing the days of the week, months, color words, and some weather words in Spanish. When we need help with the pronunciations we just ask the kids!" (Lucia, Conversation with a Purpose, October 3, 2015). Epiphany and

Adrianna reported similar outcomes and were also observed conducting mini-lessons in Spanish and English. How these lessons actually happened—some of which will be shared below—were the result of the teacher-participants doing the best with what they knew (i.e., their particular funds of knowledge) and employing the assistance of others when possible. Epiphany’s lesson below—and a fairly typical lesson it came to be across the five months of my observations—exemplifies what each teacher’s take-up in regard to the inclusion of home languages for academic purposes often looked like.

Including Spanish was clearly important to Epiphany, and she willingly welcomed her aide’s expertise and funds of knowledge to satisfy that goal. As the observation began, Epiphany gathered the children on the carpet and gave them an overview of the day. Upon completion, Epiphany asked the students to stand and get ready to sing “Heads, Shoulders, Knees, and Toes.” The children jumped up, the music was turned on, and the children began moving to the words. After several renditions, Epiphany turned off the music and asked them to listen to Miss Tessa (pseudonym), the aide, who was going to review the lyrics in Spanish. Miss Tessa asked the students to find their “cabezas.” Some students quickly put their hands on their heads; others soon followed. Epiphany walked around making sure everyone had their hands on their heads. She and Miss Tessa did the same for the word *hombro* [shoulder], *rodillas* [knees], and *dedos de los pies* [toes].

Epiphany then asked, “So how do you say *head* in Spanish?” A boy quickly put his hand up and said, “Cabeza” when called on. “Ok, then, let’s get ready to do it in Spanish! Put your hands on your cabezas and listen to Miss Tessa!”

Samuel (pseudonym) raised his hand and asked, “Quien canto?”

Epiphany looked to Miss Tessa for assistance, who promptly translated, “Do you sing? Sí, estamos cantando *La Cabeza, Los Hombros, Las Rodillas y Dedos de los Pies* en español. ¿Quieres ayudar? [Yes, we are singing *Head, Shoulders, Knees, and Toes* in Spanish. Want to help?]”

Samuel quickly scooted next to Miss Tessa. Epiphany stood in the middle of the group facing Miss Tessa, and they sang three renditions of the song in Spanish. Although only a few students were singing with Miss Tessa and Samuel during the first rendition, by the third time through they were all trying to keep up with the words as well as the motions. The song ended with a lot of clapping and high-fiving before the kids had their morning snack. Later that day, Epiphany and Miss Tessa were observed randomly asking the children in Spanish as they worked at centers to touch their head, shoulders, knees, or toes (Epiphany, Classroom Observation 1, September 30, 2015).

This type of sociocultural learning situation in which the teacher-participant, Epiphany, deferred to the more knowledgeable other, Miss Tessa was integral to the inclusive nature of home languages as content for learning in Epiphany’s classrooms. Miss Tessa’s guidance and support of Epiphany and her goals resonated with sociocultural learning theory, especially regarding the importance of social interactions, the guidance of more knowledgeable others, and learning (Vygotsky, 1978). On her own Epiphany could visually include Spanish and try to say a few words, but Miss Tessa was the one who was able to support and extend the ELLs’ learning and their Spanish learning for the other children *and* Epiphany. Epiphany welcomed Miss Tessa’s funds of

knowledge regarding language and how to scaffold language learners, for whether she was taught how to do so or not, Miss Tessa gently supported the use and learning of Spanish and English for the children. Epiphany's funds of knowledge regarding inclusivity enabled Epiphany to establish a respectful learning environment within which the aide was viewed as a co-teacher, and Spanish was important to *all* students. In this way Spanish became school content for the four year olds. The teacher-participants' take-up of linguistically responsive teaching also included new practices. A lesson by Adrianna exemplified some of their new practices, such as increased wait time, scaffolding, enabling the use of home language, translation, and repetition of key words. These new practices are the focus of the next section.

Take-up as new practices. Each teacher-participant spoke of and was observed trying to be more linguistically responsive by incorporating new practices into her typical lessons in order to support the learning of her students, particularly her ELLs. As a bilingual speaker of Spanish and English and because of her participation in the program, Adrianna was able to support and extend the learning of English and Spanish as demonstrated in her morning meeting. During Adrianna's morning meeting, she wrote the following sentences on chart paper with the students' input that included their sight words *have*, *in*, and *household* as well as information about families:

In each household the amount of people is different. Some families have 3 people; others have 4 or 5 people. Families have different cultures, and they come from different places. (Adrianna, Classroom Observation 1, September 29, 2015)

Adrianna called several students up to the chart one at a time to identify words they knew in the sentences. When a young Spanish speaking student, Sabrina (pseudonym), volunteered to come up, Adrianna asked her to find “have.” Sabrina paused. Adrianna waited several seconds. Then, she translated the sentences in Spanish and read them in English again. Sabrina pointed to “have” correctly. Adrianna high-fived her and said “Bien hecho! Well done! ‘Have’ is one of our words. I *have* brown hair [Tugs her hair]. You *have* boots on [points to Sabrina’s boots]. We *have* to go to recess.” Class yelled, “Yay!” Then, Adrianna transitioned the students to recess (Adrianna, Classroom Observation 1, September 29, 2015). Adrianna was not only including Spanish as a learning support, but she was providing access to English and content (i.e. sight words)—three major aspects of being linguistically responsive to students (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Adrianna and the other teacher-participants were often seen providing “wait time” after giving instructions or asking a question and providing the students time to think in Spanish if needed. Adrianna also translated all she could into Spanish, and Epiphany had Miss Tessa do the same. Lucia and Carley also invoked the assistance of students and colleagues to translate when possible.

In fact, each teacher tried to use other in-the-moment strategies to “scaffold” learning such as pointing, gesturing, and highlighting key terms. “Scaffolding” instruction can often be oversimplified to mean just providing adult assistance (Gibbons, 2002); yet, each teacher was doing more than that, but they, even Adrianna who was bilingual, spoke of needing to know more about how to support students. For example, research (Lucas & Villegas, 2011) suggests that when scaffolding is done well,

linguistically responsive teachers: (1) “use extra-linguistic supports”; (2) “supplement and modify written text”; (3) “supplement and modify oral language”; and/or (4) “provide clear and explicit instructions” (pp. 65-66). Knowing their students’ home language, as in the case of Adrianna and Miss Tessa, did not automatically equate to knowing all there is to know about how to scaffold student learning and teach them English. Expectations regarding scaffolding for ELLs can be quite complicated, such as those that require teachers to prepare scaffolding by understanding the language demands of a lesson (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Each teacher-participant’s attempts to scaffold and support her students’ learning were somewhere in between adult assistance and careful linguistic analysis. As demonstrated in the above lesson, Adrianna was still working brilliantly to figure those goals out. Adrianna’s support for Sabrina demonstrates how each teacher’s support often remained in-the-moment strategy-based, but was done in a way that gently facilitated understanding as in the example of Sabrina above.

Each teacher-participant reported that she rarely spent time thinking ahead about how to break a lesson down for her ELLs. Adrianna said that she very much relied on her ability to translate—everything if necessary. Similarly, Epiphany relied heavily on the aide’s ability to translate everything. Translating was one way Adrianna (and Epiphany with Miss Tessa’s help) “scaffolded” learning for the students and this type of support resonates with the research that supports the practices of linguistically responsive teaching (Cummins, 2000; Gibbons, 2002; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzales, 2008; Schleppegrell, 2004; Valdés, 2001; Wright, 2010). Translating was a key strategy for both these teacher-participants and one few teachers can employ

unless they speak the home languages of their ELLs or have a colleague who does, and even with such linguistic ability scaffolding can be challenged. Adrianna recounted, “Sometimes I feel like a lesson takes forever, so I am still figuring out when to translate and when to summarize” or how to support her ELLs in other ways during whole class lessons (Adrianna, Interview 4, December 21, 2015).

In contrast, Lucia and Carley, the two monolingual English women, could not translate readily for their students in the moment. These teacher-participants found other ways to use home languages to support academic learning. For example, they labeled the important words for their morning meeting in Spanish, so they could reference them, and Carley and Lucia asked their students who were either bilingual or monolingual in Spanish to help out. All was done to enable Spanish speaking children access to content, a major goal emphasized by proponents of linguistically responsive teaching and those whose work offers sound suggestions for supporting ELL learning (Cummins, 2000; Gibbons, 2002; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Schleppegrell, 2004; Valdés, 2001; Wright, 2010). Their consistency and repetition of circle time lessons could also be seen as perhaps an unconscious scaffold for their ELLs. If every day the students talked about the weather, the date, their sight words, and their color words in some way, the predictability of language use could act as a natural scaffold according to research (Gibbons, 2002; Lucas & Villegas, 2011).

The evidence of the breadth and depth of scaffolding is enough to comfortably claim the teacher-participants were in the process of trying to add scaffolds in order to support the learning of their ELLs, but perhaps more needed to be considered when

planning instruction for ELLs as Adrianna suggested earlier. These teacher-participants were not micro-analyzing their language use, nor were they pre-planning lesson-specific strategies. In addition to new practices such as learning scaffolds within their classrooms, each teacher-participant was taking up new *ideas* as exemplified by the work of Lucia and Carley below.

Take-up as new ideas. At the summer institute Maria suggested the new idea of using peers as translators. This was heartily embraced by the teacher-participants to support the academic learning of their ELLs. Lucia and Carley explained to me that Santiago, their ELL who only speaks Spanish, was often paired with the same bilingual student who acted as a translator (similar to an interlocutor as espoused by Schleppegrell, 2004) for him—even when they conducted small group instruction. This relationship worked well for both boys according to Lucia and Carley, because the peer-translator previously would only use his English in class. Although he was quite conversationally fluent in English, Lucia and Carley believed, after hearing Maria speak about young bilingual students, that he needed to use his Spanish more than he allowed himself to in order to fully understand and complete certain assignments. As translator he had to use Spanish to help his classmate, and Lucia and Carley agreed that his use of Spanish helped him as well. Take for example the following vignette:

Lucia pulls five children to the writing table. One is Santiago who only speaks Spanish; one is the boy identified as his peer-translator.

Lucia begins, “Who remembers what we are drawing today?”

The children chime in together, “Families!” Santiago remains quiet.

Lucia passes out paper and asks, “Whose family? Any family?”

Kids start to take paper and set up for writing.

Kids giggle, “OUR family.”

“Right. So go ahead, get started, and make sure there is room for everyone.”

Lucia looks directly at Santiago. She says his name. He looks up. “Your familia has mamma, papá, hermano, and you.” Lucia is counting with fingers going up. “So, four?”

The peer-translator chimes in. “Me too. Mi familia tiene cuatro personas: mamá, papá, hermana, y yo. [My family has 4 people. Mommy, daddy, sister, and me.]” Santiago smiles.

Lucia repeats, “So four, right?” And he says, “Si”. Lucia says “Si, four. Quatro. Good.” Both boys start drawing.

Lucia chats with the students about their pictures. She is observed asking each student questions such as: “Who’s that? Where are you? Anyone else?”

A little girl asks if she can include her aunt.

Lucia asks if she lives with her. The little girl says that she lives on the second floor.

Lucia says, “Yes, you should put her.”

Lucia asks Santiago and his peer-translator to identify family members in their pictures.

Peer-translator says, “Mami and papi driving the car.” Lucia tells him it looks great.

In English, Lucia points to Santiago’s picture and asks, “Who’s this?” Santiago is silent. Lucia asks “Mamá?” Santiago says “Si.”

Lucia responds, “Bien. Good, draw more. Holds up three fingers— papá, hermano, and tu.”

Santiago finishes. Shows Lucia. She gives him a high five and sends him to see Miss Carley.

Lucia to Carley, “Take him next door so she can write his words for us in Spanish.”

Miss Carley takes Santiago next door to the Spanish speaking aide to translate what he had written.

When Carley and Santiago return he is holding an index card that says, “Mamá, hermano, y papá viven en mi casa.” Carley copies the Spanish neatly with the translation underneath on his paper.

Carley says to him, “So this is your familia. They are going home para la casa.”

Carley helps Santiago write his name by having him trace his name. She helps him hang his picture with his group’s pictures.

Carley says, “Bien, now we know whose familia it is.” Santiago smiles. Carley gives him high five. Santiago returns to the centers. He spends most of the

time in the kitchen, chatting on the play phone in Spanish, pausing and chatting as if someone is on the other line.

Lucia and Carley clearly were working hard to enable Santiago's completion of his assignment and to hopefully learn. A lot of supportive practices went into those 15 minutes. He was paired with his peer-translator, a support endorsed by research (Schleppegrell, 2004). Lucia used gestures, spoke basic Spanish words in a mix of Spanish and English, and was assisted by the peer-translator just as research would suggest be done (Cummins, 2000; Krashen, 2003; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Carley also spoke a few words in Spanish and brought Santiago to an aide who was fully literate in Spanish and able to translate for everyone. Santiago was visibly happy with his completed project and seemed to be a full participant in this family themed project. In this way, the two teachers also enabled his bilingual peer to employ his Spanish more. Peer relationships, as advocated by Maria, were also employed by the other teacher-participants as observed during Center Time when the children were often making their own choices. Center time was an opportune time to watch the ELLs navigate their teacher-facilitated classroom learning environments independently and in small groups. The strength of these peer relationships was evident in the classrooms of Epiphany and Adrianna as well as Lucia and Carley.

Of particular interest was the self-directed use of peer-translators in Epiphany's class. Often Samuel (pseudonym) was observed engaging in center time activities with his bilingual peers that he was regularly teamed with during lessons. On one occasion he began his center time in the dramatic play area "chatting" on the pretend phone in

Spanish whispers and sharing his conversation with a little girl who was bilingual in English and Spanish. At one point they seemed to be engaged in a conversation about a baby doll. Samuel asked his bilingual peer about a note she wrote by pointing to the note and saying, “Qué es esto?” She answered him in English, “Get the medicine for the bebe.” At that point Samuel left the center. He then joined two boys who were both identified as bilingual, on the floor completing a large puzzle of the human body. As they completed the large puzzle together, the three boys talked together in Spanish and English; Samuel was heard using only Spanish. I observed them looking for pieces while speaking in Spanish to identify the hand (i.e., mano) and head (i.e., cabeza). The aide, Miss Tessa, popped by and asked, “¿Dónde está la cabeza?” The boys pointed to the head. She asked, “¿Dónde está el hombro?” The boys pointed to one shoulder (Epiphany, Classroom Observation 2, October 23, 2015). Center time in Epiphany’s class and each of the other teacher-participants’ classrooms was consistently seen as a chance for the children to work together in natural, peer supportive situations, which resonated directly with research on successful peer interactions by Cummins (2000) and Gibbons (2003).

The invaluable use of peers as supportive partners was substantiated in research by Cummins (2000) who espoused positive, equitable interactions within a classroom and Wright (2010) who referenced the importance of “collaborative dialogues” (p. 41) between language learners and native speakers. Citing Interaction Theory, Wright (2010) explained how the “right” interactions lead to enhanced learning situations and those situations in which the target language speaker scaffolds language through “corrective feedback” and “modified interactions” provide the necessary access for second language

learners to learn English (p. 41). Wright (2010) further discussed how sociocultural theorists have taken the idea of interactions and placed them in the greater context of the *social world* of learning to emphasize the effectiveness of “collaborative dialogues” and the larger “language community” (p. 41). These classrooms were demonstrating evidence of both.

Not only did the teachers provide supportive language interactions—Lucia and Carley with Santiago—so too did their peers. Epiphany’s classroom gave the students a chance to seek interactions with peers with whom they wanted to work and with whom they could communicate. This self-direction led to interactions that gave the ELLs access to English at a supportive level; that is, self-directed learning times enabled students to find those peers who provided natural and understandable support without taxing the teachers with the job of figuring out how to provide the proper support. As highlighted earlier, many times in all the teacher’s classrooms it could be said that the peers were acting as interlocutors (i.e., supportive speakers; Schleppegrell, 2004) for their ELL classmates without much input from their teachers. Cummins (2000) also addressed the importance of interactions in terms of power by emphasizing that the teacher can inhibit students’ learning simply by overlooking their home language use in the classroom and working in English all day. These teacher-participants were working hard to avoid both of these pitfalls.

Adrianna truly attempted to give private, personal support to her ELLs without being didactic; Lucia and Carley embraced their “just trying to let everyone be who they are” philosophy by enacting several small supports to help get Santiago’s work

accomplished and learning underway (Lucia, Conversation with a Purpose, October 19); and Epiphany facilitated child-directed center time that allowed for all uses of language. In these classrooms, center time was a time for the students to feel independent as they chose what center to go to and with whom to work. Through classroom interactions of a collaborative nature as described above and used as evidence for this theme, all languages and experiences were valued and the students seemed to learn as the teacher-participants took up new ideas in an effort to be linguistically responsive. New linguistic choices were also a benefit to all learners.

Take-up as new linguistic choices. In several instances above, each teacher-participant was clearly making new linguistic choices that highlighted their efforts to be inclusive of home languages for learning purposes. However, none were as overt as the inclusion of new linguistic choices that were made during literacy moments and bilingual story times. As instructed by Maria, Dalia, and the mentors during the summer institute, each teacher attempted to use their story time as a time to be *purposefully inclusive of home languages*. Two major types of practices arose during this time period: multilingual story reading and literacy moments. Multilingual story readings included the use of bilingual books or the use of translation to read aloud a picture book. Literacy moments as defined by Maria and the mentors at the summer institute, included home languages, props, student involvement, and extension activities.

The work of Carley is highlighted in the vignette below, because she purposefully planned a literacy moment just as instructed by the institute whereas Lucia and Epiphany were only observed modifying story readings. Adrianna who often modified stories did

plan a literacy moment that was not particularly successful and that will be included later in this section to demonstrate how complicated the process can be. During the following literacy moment, Carley included pertinent home languages, used expressions and props, and directly involved the students in the reading. All this was done to help the students feel as if this story was meant for them, just as Maria had recommended (Maria, Interview 1, August 17, 2015). Carley's literacy moment was planned well in advance and as seen in the next section touched upon key elements of scaffolding instruction to enable access to the story:

Carley's literacy moment. The whole class gathers around Miss Carley, sitting “crisscross applesauce” as requested and looking at Miss Carley. Miss Carley is sitting on the floor with a book in her hands titled *Green is a Chile Pepper El Chile es Verde*. Several books written in English and Spanish about colors are displayed on the floor next to her such as *Growing Vegetable Soup* by Lois Ehlert, and *A Sembrar Sopa de Verduras*. She spread before her on the carpet a real eggplant, orange, banana, loaf of bread, and other props. She also has a hand-made large poster of stars and a blue sky to share.

Carley: “Today we are going to read *Green is a Chile Pepper El Chile es Verde*.”

Children are chatty.

Carley says softly: “*IF* you have something to say, you can wait until I am finished reading.”

Lucia joins the group, but remains standing in the back.

Carley shows the books she has displayed as well as the food and colorful items she has brought with her. Carley lets the children know that as she reads the book, the items are going to be important, “So use your best listening, please. I might need your help.”

Carley begins reading. “Red is a ristra. Red is a spice. Red is our salsa, On top of rice. Roja es una ristra. Roja es un condiment. Roja es la salsa, Que servimos con el arroz.”

Carley, looks at a little boy, “Can you find the rice?” The little boy goes to the front and finds the rice among the items.

Carley tries to say rice in Spanish, but has trouble. Lucia helps her. “Arroz.”

Carley continues reading the sing-song verse in this way. Of interest is the segment that follows when about half way through the book Santiago volunteers.

Carley reads: “Yellow. Yellow is masa, we use to make tortillas, tamales, and sweet corn cake!” Carley holds up tortilla. “Amarilla es la masa. Que usamos para hacer. Tortillas, tamales Y el pan de elote! Yellow are the stars that lighten the night. Yellow are faroles, Flickering bright. Amarillas son las estre . . .” Santiago chimes in, “Estrellas.” Carley, nods a thank you and repeats her sentence “Amarillas son las ester- estrellas, Que iluminan la noche, Amarillos son los faroles, Que brillan y parpadean. Yellow is Amarillo. Yellow es Amarillo”

Carley: “Can someone find something yellow on the carpet?”

Santiago volunteers, goes up, and finds star and says “star.”

With a big high five, Carley says “Gracias, Santiago. Estrellas are yellow.” And continues reading.

Santiago’s response was surprising to Carley, because as reported by Lucia and Carley, he rarely participates and never in English.

When the story was over, several exchanges happened with all of the children as Carley asked some literal questions, and Santiago once again participated in English.

Carley ends the story by say, “So many beautiful colors to talk about.”

A handful of children chime in, “I like that story”

Carley: “What language did you hear?”

Class [speaking at the same time]: “Spanish,” “English,” “Spanish and English.”

Carley: “Can you guys name a color I read in the book?”

Boy calls out: “Blue . . . azul.”

Santiago calls out: “Verde”

Carley: “Good what is that in English?”

Santiago: “Green.”

Carley responds: “Muy bien”

Carley: “Another color?”

Peer translator: “Amarillo”

Carley: “Bien or bueno. What is that in English?”

A little girl helps him, “Yellow.”

Carley: “Very good. Can you name another color?”

Little girl: “Pink. Rosa”

Carley: “Can you find something rosa on the wall?”

Carley: “What did they dance with that was roja?”

A few kids answer: “Ribbons.”

Carley asks Mia: “What color is the Ribbon?”

Mia answered with a smile: “Roja.”

Carley: “Bueno, what vegetable did I have out that is purple?”

Children chime: “Eggplant.”

“How do you say purple in Spanish?”

Boy: “Purpura.”

Carley: “Tell me something that is yellow?”

Kids [all answering together] “Estrellas. Tortillas”

The exchange bounced back and forth between Spanish and English fluidly (Carley, Classroom Observation 2, October 19, 2015).

Carley explained during a follow-up conversation that this was the second time they had read the story as a whole class and since that first reading, the materials were made available during center time so the children could practice the story (Carley, Conversation with a Purpose, October 19, 2015). These extension opportunities allowed the students time and opportunity to use language that worked best for them. Gephardt (2011) expands on this idea in her discussion of the linguistic choices made for various audiences and purposes. As she sees it, “from an SFL (systematic functional linguistics) perspective the job of the teacher is to broaden students’ ability to use language more

expertly across a variety of social and academic contexts to accomplish specific kinds of work” (Gebhard et al., 2011, p. 93). Arguably, the fluidity of Carley’s literacy moment, that is the students’ ability to jump back and forth between languages, was enabled by the previous exposure to the book, the time to practice independently, and the materials (e.g., the props and illustrations). ELLs were supported in their attempts to understand and appreciate the story, and the class as a whole took strides in using Spanish as a natural part of their story time and as a class community of learners. Specifically, Santiago successfully chose to speak in English. Assumptions could be made about the supportive environment and the well told story, but perhaps it was a combination of all of the work on the part of Lucia and Carley from which Santiago and his classmates were benefitting. The impact of the literacy moment was very much what Maria intended—all kids were included, the supports were in place, and the learning did not end with one story reading.

Each of the teacher-participants were observed embedding languages other than English (typically Spanish) into story time, but actual literacy moments with props and drama were not the typical way in which this was achieved. The teacher-participants (Carley included) mainly relied on reading stories with Spanish translations or translating English-only stories into Spanish. Typically, during story time Adrianna used Spanish in her story reading; Epiphany was aided by Miss Tessa who added another language through Spanish translations; and in the case of Carley and Lucia their use of Spanish was supported by bilingual texts. Because of the importance placed on these types of learning experiences by Maria and research, an example lesson conducted by Lucia, Epiphany, and Adrianna is included below.

Lucia's Story Time. Lucia gathered a small group of children (Santiago and his peer-translator were included) to the reading table and prepared to read, *My Five Senses* by Alik.

She reintroduced the story, “Who remembers what this story is called?” The students chimed in “My Five Senses.” Santiago smiled. Lucia told the students, “When I am done rereading the story, you need to draw a picture about what you learned.” Lucia gestured by turning pages and then pretending to draw on Santiago’s paper. She was very expressive and used exaggerated motions. As she read the story she used hand motions, exaggerated pronunciations, and then she acted it out. For example, when reading the page about hearing she said loud and clear, “I am hearing” and pointed to her ears. Then, she cupped her ear while reading, “I use my ears to hear.” Then, she softened her voice with her ear still cupped and said, “I hear kids playing with blocks. What do you hear?” A little girl answered by cupping her ear, “I hear Miss Carley talking.” Lucia went around the table asking the children to do the same thing: cup their ear and tell her what they heard. When it was the Santiago’s turn, he cupped his ear and said, “Escucho musica [I hear music].” Lucia said, “Great we hear lots of things—blocks, Miss Carley, toys, water, and musica.” The story reading continued for about 8-10 minutes in like manner. Santiago was always the last to share, and always answered in Spanish, but always contributed appropriately in terms of content and the like (perhaps watching and listening was a support to him in addition to Lucia’s expression, exaggerated hand motions, and modeling).

Lucia told the group and acted out her directions, “Now, it is time to draw a picture [Lucia draws face with big eyes]. I see. I see with my eyes. Mis ojos.”

Lucia made her eyes real big, pointed to them and looked around the room. “Now, you do [points to kids and holds up paper]. Draw a picture about the book. One thing you learned.” The student’s resulting pictures varied from faces eating ice-cream to hands touching cats. Santiago’s picture was of a boy with big eyes looking at a book (quite similar to Lucia’s sample). Santiago was talking quietly to himself as he was drawing. Then, Lucia asked, “What did you learn?” Santiago answered, “Veo el libro!” Lucia, “Bueno, I see the book too.” He smiled and left to head back to the centers (Lucia & Carley, Classroom Observation 3, December 3, 2015).

Lucia was actively trying to keep Santiago engaged and understanding using both English and Spanish. Her directions were very simple and included many gestures. She later said, “We are definitely more able to understand each other. I use my hands . . . I point . . . I dance if I have to, but he gets it more now. I think he is even understanding the English more, but we try to use Spanish words when we can” (Lucia, Classroom Observation 3, December 22, 2015). This emphasis on new linguistic choices (i.e., teachers challenging themselves to use Spanish and all attempts at meaning making) was apparent throughout my observations in her classroom. With hand motions, eye contact, and shorter phrases Lucia was working hard to keep him on track with his peers. Her work with him speaks to the research on “collaborative dialogues” in which participants

work together to create meaning (Wright, 2010, p. 41) in unique ways comfortable to each conversant and particular to each situation.

Lucia was also “scaffolding” Santiago’s work because she used gestures, pictures, simple phrasing, and even Spanish when possible, helping him to demonstrate his own knowledge without hiding what he does not know with too much support (Gibbons, 2002; Krashen, 2003; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Schleppegrell, 2004). Lucia included several strategies to overcome her inability to speak Spanish fluently, and her new practices were observably successful during this lesson. Epiphany also had success but she employed slightly different practices; the most significant being the assistance of her aide who was bilingual in English and Spanish. The reading event shared below concerning the big book *Mouth/Boca* was full of many successes and interesting moments regarding linguistically responsive take-up.

Epiphany’s Story Time. Epiphany gathered the students onto the carpet and introduced the big book entitled *Mouth/Boca*.

Epiphany says, “Our book is about our bocas. Point to your boca.”

The students point to their mouths. “That’s right.” Epiphany is sitting in a chair in front of the class. Children are sitting on the carpet. Miss Tessa is sitting next to Epiphany, but positioned on a slant so she can see the book well. The story reading begins as follows:

Epiphany reads the English, “This is my mouth.” Miss Tessa reads the Spanish “Este es mi boca.” Epiphany reads, “I can eat with my mouth.” Miss Tessa reads, “Puedo comer con la boca.” Miss Tessa asks, “What is she doing?”

Kids say, “Eating.”

Miss Tessa answers, “Si, puedo.”

Epiphany reads, “I can talk with my mouth.” Miss Tessa reads, “Puedo hablar con la boca.”

Epiphany reads, “My teeth are in my mouth. I brush my teeth every morning and every night.” Miss Tessa read, “Los dientes estan en la boca. Me cepillo los dientes cada mañana y cada noche.”

Epiphany reads, “I take care of my mouth. I go to the dentist.” Miss Tessa invited kids to repeat the Spanish. Miss Tessa and kids read, “Me cuido la boca. Voy al dentista.”

Miss Tessa asks, “What is dentista?”

Kids chime in, saying, “Dentist.”

One little girl said, “That was an easy one!”

The story continued for several pages. Epiphany and Miss Tessa continued to work together to foster an understanding of the book. When the story ended, Epiphany and the Miss Tessa asked more questions about what happened in the story. At one point Miss Tessa asked, “What did she do to the baby?” and Samuel gestured a kiss instead of answering with words. Miss Tessa responded, “Si! Besa. She kisses the baby. Yes, with her mouth.” Miss Tessa blew a kiss. Everyone copied her as she said, “Besa, kiss, besa!”

Many noteworthy practices supporting that of linguistically responsive teaching happened during this reading event and in relation to new linguistic choices. Epiphany and Miss Tessa were seamlessly reading and sharing two languages. This resonates

strongly with research on the effectiveness of co-teaching (cf. Murphy & Martin, 2015). Miss Tessa asked questions and accepted answers in English and Spanish. Samuel, the bilingual boy, gestured his answer and Miss Tessa used the Spanish and English to share his answer with the group. These practices are supported by advocates and researchers of bilingual education and second language learning (Cummins, 2000; Gibbons, 2002; Krashen, 2003; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Schleppegrell, 2004). Epiphany and Miss Tessa were teaching and learning in a sociocultural way that welcomed all forms of language use and communication the children offered to build knowledge together as a class. Such social knowledge building resonated with sociocultural research in the sense that Epiphany welcomed Miss Tessa as the more knowledgeable other, and Miss Tessa supported Epiphany's Spanish learning as well as that of the students. Their work together was well-received by the students and successful for their ELL and bilingual students as well as everyone else. Just as with Lucia's rereading of *My Five Senses*, this story time was a scaffolded experience with translations, repeated questions, gestures, and a supportive book. Once these teachers made the linguistic choice to be inclusive of home languages and thus, immediately challenge themselves to do so, they humbly acknowledged the need for help from aids, prepared materials, and even students.

The book no doubt lent itself to the bilingual reading and its structure was key to the seeming success of that story reading. However, Epiphany shared, "You know, not all story readings were *that* successful" (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17, 2015). Other stories conducted in like manner such as *Rainbow Fish* "fell flat" according to Epiphany (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17, 2015). Such was documented when Epiphany and

Miss Tessa read *Rainbow Fish* (Epiphany, Classroom Observation 3, December 1, 2015); the results were not as positive. During that observation Epiphany and Miss Tessa tried to translate each page and ask questions, but the length of text and the depth of story were making the bilingual reading feel arduous to all. The children were restless; the adults were losing their patience; and finally, Epiphany wrapped it up by saying they would reread the book later “to find out what happens next” (Epiphany, Classroom Observation 3, December 1, 2015).

During our conversation with a purpose after this event, Epiphany reflected, “That was just not the right book to try and translate. We don’t practice and winging it sometimes causes confusion like that” (Epiphany, Conversation with a Purpose, December 1, 2015). She seemed to realize that translating text like that word for word was causing more confusion than understanding, proving that scaffolding was a challenging process with nuances that were not always easily understood even by teachers with the best of intentions, which speaks to the complicated nature of scaffolding as discussed by research (Gibbons, 2002; Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Adrianna’s literacy moment demonstrates other challenges these reading moments posed. Adrianna was the only other teacher-participant to conduct a literacy moment during this study. Data from her observation follows.

Adrianna’s literacy moment. Adrianna gathers the class to the carpet. They form a circle around the edge of the carpet. Adrianna’s mentor was there and joined the circle. Sabrina and Mateo sit near the front of the group. Adrianna picks up the book to be read.

Several kids chime in, “On Soup Day!”

Adrianna, “Yes we loved this story, right? We did this last week, but now we are going to read it and then we are going to make soup today. What do we need to make soup? Do you remember?” Kids are quiet.

“Ok. I am going to show you what was used in the story to make soup. Let’s see if you can name them.” Adrianna opens a picnic basket filled with vegetables and puts it in the middle of the circle.

Adrianna holds up carrots.

Student: “Carrots.”

Adrianna: “Right, Ms. Adrianna has a carrot.”

Students: “Wow, that is big!”

Adrianna: “Yes. It is a big carrot. That’s so you can look at it using your senses. I am going to use my senses to look, smell, and touch. Don’t use taste yet. No eating.” Adrianna examines the carrot and passes it along.

Adrianna: “Look at this, what is this?” [holds up a bunch of celery]

Students: “Celery.”

Observing Mentor to class: “Do you know how to say that in Spanish?”

Adrianna: “Apio.”

Some students repeat “Apio.”

Mentor: “What about carrot in Spanish?”

Adrianna: “Zanahoria.”

Again, a handful of student repeat, “Zanahoria.”

Adrianna: “Look what else?” [holds up zucchini]

Students are confused by the zucchini. Many thought it was a cucumber.

Adrianna emphasizes: “Zucchini” and the children repeat what she said.

Adrianna holds up an onion and continues the same pattern of identifying the vegetable in English and then in Spanish. As she passes the onion, mushrooms, and potatoes to students she reminds them to use their senses. She moves around the circle asking the children how each vegetable smelled, felt, and looked. What became immediately interesting was that Adrianna kept the discussion solely in English. Once all of the vegetables made it around the circle, Adrianna said, “I am going to read the story, but I need some friends to help me.” Adrianna passed out sheets of paper with a picture of each vegetable and a number indicating how many were needed for the soup. The vegetables stayed on the carpet. Adrianna reviewed what everyone needed to give her when the time came in the story, “She is going to have *three* carrots. He is going to have *five* zucchini . . . Most of you are going to help me. When it’s your turn to give me the material, I need you to do so” (Adrianna, Classroom Observation 3, December 2, 2015).

Adrianna then began to read the story which talked about a little girl helping her mother make soup. As she read the name of each vegetable the child in charge of that vegetable jumped up and put their vegetable in the basket. The entire story was told in English. Then, Adrianna began to ask questions about the story. When she did, Sabrina began to answer some questions in Spanish. At that point, Adrianna took the time to review the names of the vegetables in Spanish by holding them up, giving the English,

then the Spanish, and asking the students to echo her. Of significance in this lesson was Adrianna's immediate response as soon as the story time ended: "I don't know what happened. I just blanked out. I was so focused on reviewing the five senses and the numbers I totally forgot to translate. I am so glad Sabrina chimed in at the end. At least I reviewed the vegetables. I'll do it again [the literacy moment] tomorrow" (Adrianna, Classroom Observation 3, December 2, 2015).

According to our last interview, she did repeat the story and focused on Spanish. "Everything was translated that time" (Adrianna, Interview 4, December 21, 2015). She also extended this opportunity by actually making soup with the students and creating a class book of recipes for soup from different cultures that included recipes in the home languages of the students. Even though Adrianna's first literacy moment was not as intentionally enacted with regard to Spanish as other lessons she conducted, she did manage to bring in home languages during the extension activity—the family recipe book for the class. This lesson will be discussed later as an example of how take-up can ebb.

Even though Adrianna's lesson did not go as planned due to her close focus on the content she was trying to teach, she remained responsive to Sabrina and quickly put in place some language supports for her. Overall, her literacy moments and story readings as well as those conducted by Lucia, Epiphany, and Carley resonated heavily with research on multilingual story readings and interactive read alouds in which the research points to the ability of children to use the pictures and bits of their home language to increase their comprehension (Naqvi, McKeough, Thorne, & Phetscher, 2012; Pendergast, May, Bingham, & Kuremada, 2015). By doing so, these researchers argue,

students have better access to each story and are able to better comprehend the literal plot line. Research cited by Maria—the summer institute director—also suggests that multilingual readings will help students develop a sense of community. The “ideal” Maria discussed was that each child feels as though “the book is for me” (Maria, Interview 1, August 17, 2015) which was her way of emphasizing that the languages included should be relevant to the students. In contrast she explained that reading a story with Japanese to a class of English-only and Spanish bilingual children was not what she was asking her participants to do. In most cases the evidence showed an emphasis on English and Spanish only, but little attention to any other home language.

Important to remember was that not only did teacher-participants in their more linguistically responsive classrooms need to support home languages, they needed to provide access to English, too. Their stories and literacy moments do just that. Valdés (2000) clearly observed how interactions positively and negatively affected the acquisition of English for each student in her study. Key to the learning and not-learning of the students discussed by Valdés (2000) was individual access to English. Therefore, a teacher should balance the use and inclusiveness of home language with a sufficient amount of supportive exposure to English. The bilingual story readings and literacy moments seemed to be natural places to include languages other than English and to scaffold student comprehension of the stories by means of pictures, props and interactions with the students; much of which finds support in research (see, for example, Naqvi, McKeough, Thorne, & Phetscher, 2012; Pendergast, May, Bingham, Kuremada, 2015).

Drawing upon funds of knowledge. The ways in which home languages were included in the academic-related learning opportunities delineated above clearly relied heavily on each teacher-participant's funds of knowledge. Epiphany had little knowledge of a language other than English, but was a strong early childhood teacher and intuitively knew the types of supports to offer her students (e.g., teacher facilitated, child directed center time). Epiphany had the benefit of a being teamed with a bilingual aide, Miss Tessa, for the first time and took full advantage of Miss Tessa's funds of knowledge. Together they included home languages in what Epiphany already was doing in the classroom. This allowed for the inclusion of Spanish at least when they sang and read stories. At some point during each of my three observations of Epiphany, she was always observed conducting a bilingual story reading. She later explained that she could only do so two to three times a week, because they were time consuming to prepare, so she would time them for when I was coming (Epiphany, interview 4, December 17, 2015). The time consuming nature of the preparation and actualization of these lessons of which Epiphany spoke was one of the many challenges that led to natural ebbs and flows of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching for her. Specific to these bilingual story readings within her class, there was much to discuss in terms of variation (ebbing and flowing) and effectiveness as seen through Epiphany's eyes. The picture book, *Mouth/Boca* was successful; *Rainbow Fish* was not. This will be discussed in the section regarding ebbing and flowing that follows.

Lucia and Carley were both monolingual and emphasized using each child's home language. Although their funds of knowledge regarding language were still

developing, Lucia and Carley found several ways to access home language support for Santiago. Lucia and Carley relied on the Spanish included in bilingual children's books to create bilingual story times and displayed necessary Spanish for other daily lessons, yet were also able to have the children who speak Spanish help with explanations and pronunciations. They enabled Santiago to complete his oral and written work in Spanish. When speaking, Carley and Lucia would work together to translate what he was saying; they also welcomed the help of two bilingual students; and sometimes sought the help of other aides in the building, especially when writing was involved. Santiago was often paired with a bilingual peer for center work. Similar to Epiphany this team had a strong sense of effective instruction and upheld that goal for Santiago, but as will be discussed in the next section, there were moments when the flow forward seemed to be slowed down.

Finally, Adrianna, the teacher-participant whose funds of knowledge included Spanish and knowhow about learning English as an ELL student herself, along with being a strong early childhood teacher, would read and then translate the story page by page. She would ask questions and receive answers in English and Spanish. Adrianna, now more confident than ever about using her Spanish due to her work at the summer institute, developed bilingual story readings and literacy moments, and used Spanish to support her multilingual-Spanish speaking students by rephrasing questions in Spanish; allowing students to "work in Spanish first," and translating with them. Adrianna added many scaffolds and strategies to her teaching that focused on supporting home language

use in the classroom, but as demonstrated by her literacy moment observation, even she had moments of visible ebbing with respect to her linguistically responsive teaching.

Ebbing and flowing of take-up. Take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was strong in September as the teacher-participants adjusted existing English-only aspects of their day to include Spanish (i.e., the Morning Meeting, story time). However, by November evidence indicated that the inclusion of Spanish during academic learning time was challenged by demanding timetables and curriculum mandates that affected planning as well as the actualization of planned lessons, ideas, and practices. For example, Lucia never implemented her own literacy moment citing that she simply ran out of time. Even Adrianna, who confidently included her Spanish in her teaching, struggled to always include Spanish in her content teaching as seen during my observation of her literacy moment when she was so focused on reviewing content—the five senses and numerals—that she overlooked speaking in Spanish almost completely. The strength of her take-up flow seemed to be ebbing in December, but she was determined to learn from what she saw as her literacy moment “blunder” and move forward.

Similarly, Epiphany had success with including home language in literacy moments early in the school year with Miss Tessa’s help. However, not all moments were positive, such as her confusing attempt at translating *Rainbow Fish*. For Epiphany, the biggest challenge for her was the still unequal development and support of different home languages in her classroom: “I feel good about the way we can get the Spanish speaking children involved, but I don’t want my boy who speaks Bengali to feel that his language

isn't wanted here . . . but I have no easy way to access that for learning" (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17, 2015). Epiphany ended the study hopeful that she would have time to plan a literacy moment over the winter break, because like the other teacher-participants she referenced the need for time (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17, 2015). Likewise, Lucia and Carley seemed hopeful that their winter break would help them regain forward momentum in their desire to be linguistically responsive. Although they often selected bilingual books and used as many other supports as possible such as the aide next door, as the year got busier taking the time to find bilingual books and ask the aide next door to help became challenged by tight timetables and other objectives.

Conclusion. Through the inclusion of new content, practices, ideas, and linguistic choices, Adrianna, Epiphany, Carley, and Lucia demonstrated to their students that home languages were important resources for learning. Their take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was overt. Research shows that a child's home language needs to be viewed as a resource for learning and children need to be able to access their dominant language in order to learn content while also learning English (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Valdés, 2001). Data collected in this study certainly seem to suggest that each teacher-participant worked to do just that in regard to those who spoke Spanish. During story readings and literacy moments, each teacher was able to enable access to at least Spanish for many of their ELLs. They also enabled supportive learning through the use of peer buddies, self-directed learning times such as centers, and the inclusion of Spanish in daily routine-type lessons such as their Morning Meetings. However, the impact of their efforts was not consistent; often other academic concerns and school-related issues such as the

vacation schedule and holiday show rehearsals muddied their intentions. Also, this new access remained heavily focused on Spanish, which, from a linguistically responsive teaching position cannot be seen as the end goal, but only as evidence that responsiveness regarding at least Spanish speaking students was happening. Though incomplete, the inclusion of Spanish can still be seen as evidence that the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was beginning to manifest.

Important to note at this point was that Spanish seemed to be readily addressed because the teacher-participants had relatively easy access to it, even if it was in the form of a colleague down the hall, a student, or a student's parent. In cases where the home languages were not so prevalent in the classroom or school, little of what was done by these teachers to access Spanish could be transferred to support those languages, for they relied heavily on individuals who knew the language and published materials in Spanish and English. Therefore, the inclusion of home languages remained dominated by Spanish in all classes. The reasons as discussed by the teacher-participants are three-fold: after English, Spanish was the most dominant home language in all the classes; typically Spanish was another language spoken by either the teacher or support staff; and the children whose home languages were not Spanish spoke conversational English, so not even those children were speaking their home languages in school until the work of the teacher-participants asked them to share their home languages. Significant to this inequitable treatment of home languages from a researcher perspective was that lack of information either presented by Maria and the institute content or in research that affirms linguistically responsive teaching. There is limited practical advice for dealing with

multiple languages in a classroom, especially when one or two languages (e.g., Spanish) can be supported through multiple resources based on availability and others such as Bengali and Arabic are languages for which there are limited easy-access type resources such as aides who speak those languages, published picture books, and produced music.

All in all, impressive efforts went into being linguistically responsive, especially in regard to recognizing home languages as resources for learning. Even more astonishing for me was finding out that teacher take-up of linguistically responsive teaching became a phenomenon best described as *community* take-up. In this sense, *community* refers to all the classroom members (i.e., students, teachers, and aides) along with the students' families. This outcome is the focus of the next section.

Theme Four: The Take-up of Linguistically Responsive Teaching Evolves over Time into *Community* Sense-making

As previously discussed in the first three themes, the teacher-participants returned to their classrooms post-summer institute thinking differently about home languages and doing more to make home languages prominent while incorporating ideas about how to create more successful learning opportunities for their ELLs and for all of their students. Much of what was discussed in the three previous themes addressed these understandings and enactments; however, the theme reported in this section focused on an aspect of take-up that was not expected based on Maria's goals and the research reviewed, and that was the realization that take-up was not an easily bounded concept.

As will be shown below, take-up of linguistically responsive teaching comprised more than one teacher being exposed to content relevant to the teaching of ELLs,

employing all they know as teachers and individuals (funds of knowledge), and then walking into a classroom saying, doing, and thinking more about language and how to teach ELLs seamlessly and successfully. Data showed repeatedly that take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifested across all four teacher-participants as a personal commitment on the part of the teachers that evolved into being linguistically responsive in their *everyday lives* as well and that reorientation proved pervasive. Many of the manifestations of linguistic responsiveness by all the teachers were identifiable not only within the thinking, saying, and doing of the teacher-participants, but within the subsequent thinking, saying, and doing of the students and their families as reported by the teacher-participants. By October, evidence of student and family take-up, that is *community* take-up of linguistically responsive teaching, began to steadily emerge.

I needed to revisit my definition of “take-up” crafted prior to my study, for these findings were too rich to be deemed outside the scope of this study and because my initial, literature-only informed definition of take-up proved to be too narrow. This study’s working definition of take-up was expanded to capture evidence of take-up demonstrated by students and some of their family members. Similar to the second theme reported in this chapter (that is take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifested as a commitment to giving prominence to home languages as demonstrated through additions of language to the physical environment), this final theme was constructed by means of evidence of the increased use and inclusion of home languages. However, in this final theme evidence of use was not only provided by either the teacher or ELL

students alone. In each class, take-up of linguistically responsive teaching involved *all* students and many of their family members as well.

The four teachers' take-up of linguistically responsive teaching evolved into *community* sense-making inside and outside the classroom, and this meant that some of their students and their families were actively impacting and participating in the take-up of linguistic responsiveness—though no one referred to it as such—inside the classroom (e.g., visiting the classroom to read books in their home languages) and outside of school (e.g., parents actively helping their students learn a familial home language). By thinking of “take-up” as the act of adopting new content, ideas, practices, reflective stances, linguistic choices, responses, or actions as one's own by incorporating one or more of these elements into his/her current reality, and looking closely at the data, much can be said about new content (e.g., bringing or drawing on cultural and linguistic information from home), reflective stances (e.g., *we* can learn *their* language), linguistic choices (e.g., English-speaking peers asking how to speak Spanish), practices (e.g., time allotted for sharing language for language sake), and actions (e.g., kids reaching out to ELL peers). This forms the focus of the following discussion.

Because the children and parents were not part of my formal data collection process, much of the evidence for this theme was reported in interviews and conversations with a purpose with the four teacher-participants and then substantiated by observations. Clearly there would be a need to revisit this particular angle on “take-up” in a subsequent study with a deliberate “researcher eye” focused on the students and their families (see Chapter Six for more on this). Unfortunately, my data only allowed access

to what the teachers were thinking, doing, and saying. To more effectively report about the take-up of the students and their families, a study that includes some family members and students as participants would afford greater access to evidence to support such a claim. This study relies only on what the teachers shared during interviews and conversations with a purpose and what was corroborated by observation data.

Beginning in September when Epiphany, Lucia, Adrianna, and Carley modified their language arts block to include home languages, *all* students were involved. That is, the teacher-participants did not gather their ELLs to the side and conduct separate whole class-style lessons for them. Instead, they transformed their old ways of teaching to be more inclusive of home languages, particularly of Spanish. Therefore, as the teacher-participants read stories and conducted circle-time lessons, *all* of the students were privy to both languages. (As discussed in Theme Three concerning the teacher-participants' use of home languages for academic purposes, such time included teachers and students using Spanish and English). The responses of students other than the ELLs were unexpected. Below, evidence of this interesting manifestation of take-up from each class is described in order to document linguistically responsive take-up of the classroom *community* members.

Take-up as linguistic choices. During observations, evidence of peers independently choosing and/or with some teacher-facilitated guidance to use Spanish emerged in all three classrooms. When Epiphany reviewed the five senses during circle time, Miss Tessa chimed in and asked a question in Spanish to the class: “¿Qué gusto con? [What do you taste with?]”

A non-ELL student answered proudly, “La boca!” Miss Tessa answered, “Si, su boca!”

Epiphany laughed and said, “Yes, the mouth” (Epiphany, Classroom Observation 3, December 1, 2015).

During our conversation with a purpose that day, Epiphany remarked, “I was watching my ELLs to call on them and then, she answered . . . I was shocked!” Similarly, Adrianna reviewed the sense of touch using cotton balls, sticks, and some other classroom objects. As she did so she translated the names of the objects for the class into Spanish. When she asked, “Lo que se siente suave? [Which feels soft?]” A little boy who speaks only English chimed in with the Spanish “bola de algodón [cotton ball]” instead of the English term. Adrianna remarked immediately, “Si, si, usted habla español. He speaks Spanish, too!” (Adrianna, Classroom Observation 2, October 22, 2015). Adrianna looked up at her aide, winked, and said, “We are comfortable talking in many languages here” (Adrianna, Classroom Observation 2, October 22, 2015). The class giggled.

Lucia and Carley also witnessed hints of such community responsiveness. When Lucia reviewed the weather during her second observation, she tried to include some Spanish words previously posted on the weather chart. She stopped to allow the students time to practice the words with her as a whole class. When she came to the word “ventoso,” which means “windy,” she asked Santiago to help them all say it correctly (Lucia, Classroom Observation 2, October 19, 2015). Lucia tried to repeat the word after him, and then she invited the students to try to say the word as Santiago had “with your best Spanish.” Several non-ELLs tried. Carley said directly to me (she was at the back of

the group of children sitting on the carpet), “We try to get them involved . . . I think since we don’t do so well [speaking Spanish] the other children are okay with just trying” (Carley, *Conversation with a Purpose*, October 19, 2015). This whole class, inclusive approach to language use speaks directly to the sociocultural nature of linguistically responsive teaching that is not simply about getting ELLs “up to speed” but is concerned with creating a classroom culture based on making meaning together as best as possible.

Those who adopt sociocultural perspectives typically are concerned with foregrounding learning as a social and cultural process (Healey, 2005; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978). Each of these women did just that—all of the students were guided to learn together (i.e., the social) and consider everyone’s home languages (i.e., the deep culture Maria emphasized that also includes family language, values, and traditions). Quite possibly the teacher-participants created a context within which all of the children were at ease with accepting all attempts at language as simply a means to “language negotiation;” that is, they were using words and sentences with which each child was comfortable (Auer, 2013, p. 3). To further explain, the teachers and students were engaging in a kind of “code switching;” they were switching comfortably between two or more languages to make sense together (Auer, 2013; Brice & Brice, 2009). Welcoming code-switching by all the students—native English speakers and ELLs—seemed to create a community within each classroom that supported negotiating meaning to learn, interact, participate, and play. These noteworthy and fluid language choices suggest that take-up of linguistically responsive teaching in these classroom contexts included a willingness among all learners to see meaning-making as the end goal

and accept all language use as the means. These communities also seemed to embrace (and be supported in their responsiveness) by the take-up of new content (i.e., learning multilingual songs) as a means to be more linguistically responsive. This is the focus of the next section.

Take-up as new content. My observation data suggested that languages other than English (mostly Spanish) became new content for these teacher-participants and their students, and that music seemed to make such content most accessible. Music was an important medium that all four teacher-participants used to fully include *all* students in the use of other languages. Indeed, music was a mainstay for circle time activities with the teacher-participants and was often used to enrich the environment during center time in all three classrooms. Data from September onwards—that is, from the beginning of the school year—showed that students in all classes sang along with their respective teachers and aides in all languages presented either through audio recordings or by the teachers and aides. Once practiced several times, many students, regardless of their own home language, would sing the same songs in English and Spanish during center time.

For example, during an observation of Lucia and Carley, a little girl, Mia (pseudonym) who spoke some English, but mainly used Spanish when I was observing the class, was observed singing a song about the human body that the class had previously practiced in both languages during circle time. Mia manipulated props as she sang in Spanish and English so that when put together they formed a stick person about 2 feet tall. When done, she mixed up the pieces and did it again. She repeated the song for

about 15 minutes alone, alternating between English and Spanish (Lucia & Carley, Classroom Observation 1, September 28, 2016).

Adrianna and her aide guided the children through *Heads, Shoulders, Knees, and Toes* in both languages several times from beginning to end. During breaks in the music, Adrianna would ask questions to check for literal understanding of the Spanish. When she asked, “Where is your cabeza?” Most of the children pointed to their heads. “Your head!” Adrianna exclaimed as she tapped the head of a boy who did not answer with the rest of the class and then Adrianna and the class continued singing (Adrianna, Classroom Observation 2, October 22, 2015).

Epiphany always had music playing in several different languages during center time (e.g., *Multicultural Children’s Songs* compiled by Ella Jenkins). On each occasion, the children were observed singing along with these recorded songs (Epiphany, Classroom Observations 1,2, & 3, September 30, October 23, December 1, 2016). During my second observation of her classroom, Epiphany was called from the room by central administration and Miss Tessa finished singing and acting out the song *Heads, Shoulders, Knees, and Toes* in English and Spanish (i.e., *Cabezas, Hombros, Rodillas y Dedos de los Pies*). When Epiphany reentered, the students performed for her. When done, Epiphany, put her hands together and exclaimed, “You are all singing so beautifully in both languages!” (October 23, 2016).

As demonstrated by the data and as presented by the teacher-participants, using languages other than English was not specifically for the teachers and the ELLs. Data demonstrated that the students who were *not* ELLs were trying to use Spanish themselves

as a means to learn and to simply be with their friends. This addition of new content and new possibilities speaks directly to the positive impact of learning environments that make use of sociocultural methods. Learning songs together with more than one language and gestures seemed to enable meaning making for the individual students. Whereas some children were able to use props to practice language terms and learn the human body parts in English and Spanish, others were guided by their more fluent friends and aides to learn similar content. Music also provided a way (as in Epiphany's class) to hear and appreciate the language of other world locales such as Trinidad, Mexico, China, and parts of Africa. This type of meaning making continued into independent learning times.

Take-up as actions. ELL students were observed finding buddies during independent learning times (e.g., centers, reading time) and play times who used Spanish, but they also worked with their monolingual English speaking peers when the activity supported their meaning-making. More surprisingly, monolingual English speaking children sought out the companionship of ELLs during learning and play times. The monolingual English speaking students even initiated such interactions by speaking Spanish—albeit simple greetings or words (e.g., “¿Hola. Cómo estás?” Hello, how are you?)—but the overarching desire to connect was readily observed too many times to ignore. In Adrianna's classroom Mateo often was observed playing in the block and building center with bilingual boys; Sabrina often sat with the girls at the arts and craft center; and the aide bounced between centers to facilitate interactions as Adrianna worked with small groups of students.

On one particular occasion a young monolingual English speaking girl was observed talking to the aide, then talking to Sabrina. All body language—smiles, passing of materials, and verbal interactions—seemed positive from afar. When I talked with Adrianna later that day, she explained that the aide was providing Spanish phrases to the English speaking girl, so she and Sabrina could create an art project together. Most interesting was what Adrianna said next, “She [the English only little girl] is always asking ‘Ms. Adrianna, how do I say *need help?* in Spanish *or Can I help you?* in Spanish.’ She is always trying to connect with her [Sabrina]” (Adrianna, Conversation with a Purpose, December 2, 2015). When asked if this happens often Adrianna said, “She [the little girl observed asking for Spanish phrases] is my little helper, so yes, but they all don’t care who speaks what. They just want to be friends, help, have fun . . . do their thing!” (Adrianna, Conversation with a Purpose, December 2, 2015).

In this regard, I believe it is fair to say that within their classroom communities, the ELLs were able to find interlocutors, those willing to make meaning with non-native speakers, to support their English usage and some of the monolingual English speakers were seeking out interlocutors of their own—the aide or bilingual peers—so they could use Spanish more effectively. And as children simply looking to play or create together, they were not thinking about *how best to communicate*, they were just communicating. Whereas Schleppegrell (2004) wrote of creating teacher facilitated opportunities for ELLs to work with supportive peers, the children I observed were not privy to popular theories of language learning, but simply were using whatever linguistic resources they had available to them to interact, learn, and play with peers. Again, considering that

linguistically responsive teaching research and academic commentary has mainly focused on the teacher (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 1995, 2014; Lucas & Villegas, 2011) instances such as this demonstrate that becoming linguistically responsive is *not* necessarily an isolated act of one individual, but can—and, I would argue, ideally—include the responsiveness of others and these *others* can very well be the students, even those as young as four.

In fact, Epiphany spoke about the learning impact one of her students had on her learning and the learning of others in the classroom; seemingly a willing and effective interlocutor. Epiphany did not use “interlocutor” herself, but referred to the child as her “little helper.” Epiphany explained, “She [the young student] is bilingual and just amazingly intuitive.” Epiphany shared how she independently goes to the Spanish speakers to make sure they know what is happening next (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17, 2015). Not only was this little girl a help to her peers, but she was a help to Epiphany during instruction and transitions between activities. Epiphany remarked, “Especially when the aide is gone, she’s my second in command” (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17, 2015). Epiphany further discussed how the young child would provide translations and the correct phrasing needed in English and/or Spanish depending on with whom she was engaging.

Carley and Lucia also spoke of situations in which their English speaking students were seeking help from their classroom “translators” who (as described in *Theme Three: Take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifests as an understanding and use of home languages as learning resources in the classroom*) often helped to translate for other Spanish speaking students in the classroom. Now, the preschool students were

being asked to translate sentences into Spanish on behalf of their English peers, so *the English speaking children* could talk to their *Spanish* classmates: “I think they [the English speakers] saw us [Carley and myself] asking them [the student translators] for help and they just decided to do it, too” (Lucia, Interview 3, November 12, 2016). Lucia’s logical analysis of how this peer-to-peer translation work came about resonates with the scholarly work of those who emphasize language production as meaning making (Auer, 2013; Brice & Brice, 2009). The human need to communicate and connect with others seemed to guide these classmates to a take-up a very real linguistically responsiveness that responded directly to their teachers and fellow classmates newfound interests in creating meaning by using all language knowledge to do so.

The linguistically responsive take-up of students in each class was initiated by the teacher-participants, but the data show that take-up itself was a truly class-wide occurrence. This whole class take-up of linguistic responsiveness was two-fold. On one hand, non-Spanish speakers were trying to use Spanish to start communicating with Spanish speaking peers. On the other hand, increased interactions between English speaking students (this includes those with other home languages who were conversationally fluent in English) with ELLs was supporting the English use and possibly English development of the ELLs. As Wright (2010) would say, the use of both languages during these interactions acted as a natural scaffold and linguistic resource bank for both kinds of language speakers and led to the formation of “collaborative dialogues” (p. 41). In the case of what I was seeing in these classrooms, child peers were creating collaborative dialogues that included supports for meaning making as described

by and advocated for by scholars like Wright argues are, but these interactions certainly were not pre-planned by the teachers (and it's highly likely they were unplanned by the students as well). These dialogues were natural outcomes of children wanting to interact and undeterred by variances in language acquisition. In short, the data suggest that such dialogues are useful because they explicitly welcome all attempts at using language as equal and positive; thereby, welcoming all funds of knowledge regarding language use and language knowhow. By doing so evidence hints that they were also teaching each other Spanish and English as they sought to generate shared understandings and were forming what could be described as a truly dynamic "language community" within their classrooms (cf. Wright, 2010). Interestingly, the collective desire to speak, make meaning, code switch at times, and communicate seemed to spread to some students' homes, too. This is the focus of the next section.

Take-up as shifts in reflective stances. Each of the teacher-participants talked often of parental help and involvement in relation to their linguistically responsive goals which is not surprising since these students were young and the possible involvement of parents in any capacity was certainly a worthwhile goal. However, it was parental support of meaning-making that was of interest to this study. Lucia and Carley were quick to recount what they thought was a surprising example of greater community take-up during a November conversation with a purpose. Carley explained, "We have a little girl who is trying to learn Spanish here [in the classroom] so she can speak to her grandmother at home" (Carley, Interview 3, November 12, 2015). In fact, this girl's mother met with Lucia and Carley to express her concerns about her daughter learning Spanish, fearing

doing so could interfere with her English development. Lucia shared what she said to the mother, “Her English is great. She is not going to be slowed down by learning Spanish. Let her. Teach her, so she can get to know her grandmother” (Lucia, Interview 3, November 12, 2015). According to Lucia, the mother was previously reluctant to teach her daughter Spanish because she wanted her to learn English well. Lucia believed she convinced the mother to let her daughter learn Spanish, too. In the meantime, Carley added, “She [the little girl in question] seems very busy doing all she can learning Spanish from these guys, so hopefully she is talking to her grandmother” (Carley, Interview 3, November 12, 2015). The other teacher-participants also spoke of language learning that went beyond the classroom.

When Epiphany introduced her linguistically responsive goals for her students at Back to School Night some of the parents whose home languages were not English or Spanish expressed an immediate interest in reading to the class in their home languages, sending in phrases with their children, and attending the multicultural day celebration in December. Epiphany explained “They [parents of the students] are always so willing.” When reporting that the parents of her student from Bangladesh sent in phrases, Epiphany said, “It makes him so excited to share his mom’s language and it kind of shows that other languages matter too. But you know that bothers me still [referring to disappointment with her knowhow regarding how to include all of her students’ home languages].” As the study ended, another parent was trying to schedule time to read a book in French to the class. Epiphany explained why this was important to her: “I am excited about that. It’s another language to share” (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17,

2015). For Epiphany, this extension beyond the classroom—and bringing this extension back into the classroom—became a way to include all pertinent home languages, but with a realization that more needed to be done.

Similarly, Adrianna had positive responses from parents when asking for their help with their home languages, but she also received negative responses from parents that also need to be taken into account. Even though she was fluent in Ecuadorian Spanish, Adrianna reminded me that “It’s not always the same [Spanish] as what others speak, so I say, ‘I don’t think I am saying this right, can you help me tell him blah blah blah?’ And they do. I need that. It makes me seem like I am trying. I am trying, you know that, but parents, well . . . they are not sure of me sometimes” (Adrianna, Interview 3, November 17, 2015). Adrianna openly discussed the many challenges she received from parents. One parent questioned Adrianna’s use of Spanish in a way no other teacher-participant was challenged. Adrianna reported, “She [a particular mom] asked me if I use proper Spanish. I said, ‘I do the best I can, so let me know what you think.’ It made me a little nervous, but she hasn’t complained, so I guess I am using proper Spanish [Adrianna winks and laughs]” (Adrianna, Interview 4, December 21, 2015). Adrianna did report success with recent discussions with parents about speaking Spanish at home: “I told them, just like Maria told us, they should be speaking in Spanish. It will help [their children] learn in English too. Learning English and Spanish is a good thing. It helps because I know how they [the parents] feel. We are similar” (Adrianna, Interview 4, December 21, 2015). Adrianna’s personal experience and knowhow perhaps made it easier for her to understand the concerns of her students’ parents. After all, it wasn’t long

ago that she held the same beliefs herself and her funds of knowledge, language use, and learning was ever present. Adrianna knew all too well why a parent would want her children to blend into an American classroom, shed signs of home language (especially in relation to accent), and become fluent in “American” English.

Adrianna’s experiences with parents resonate with suggestions made by Guðjónsdóttir, Cacciattolo, Dakich, Davies, Kelly and Dalmau, (2008) after conducting a three year international study designed to investigate teacher education that supports the growth of responsive teachers. Guðjónsdóttir, Cacciattolo, Dakich, Davies, Kelly, and Dalmau, (2008) reported an emerging “dialectic” in which the “the attainment of inclusive community responsive pedagogies” was often situated “between the transformation of individual values, world views, ethics and practice, and the sociocultural . . . factors that mediate equity, access, and opportunity in educational systems” (p.165). In the case of the present study, the dialectic that emerged in this study between the teacher-participants, the students, and their parents developed out of personal concern to balance home values, beliefs, and parental practices that were seemingly influenced by sociocultural factors with the educational focus—advancing linguistic responsiveness.

In some ways the home values and beliefs of the parents complemented the linguistically responsive nature of the teacher and class, such as in the case of Epiphany’s student from Bangladesh. With parent input Epiphany could include his home language and hopefully convey a sense that this language was also valued and valuable as a meaning making resource. In other ways, the changing views of the teacher and class due

to their emerging linguistically responsiveness did not complement home values and beliefs. Many parents clearly wanted their children to be seen as *American* and speaking English was a part of that goal. Nonetheless, for these teacher-participants evidence demonstrates that their explicit and implicit inclusion of families and home languages was impacting the wider classroom community take-up of linguistically responsive teaching in that parents seemed to embrace the importance of also speaking their home language with their children. Much of this had to do with each teacher-participant's own funds of knowledge as well as the funds of knowledge of those involved in the dialectic. This is the focus of the next section.

Drawing upon funds of knowledge. The teacher-participants were continually grappling with their new roles as linguistically responsive educators with the knowhow they developed over life times. At times they were able to take pause, rethink an aspect of their work and move forward; at other times they were stalled by a seeming lack of knowhow or available time to plan or reflect. However, these teachers' openness and willingness to take on this challenge made them receptive seekers of others' knowledge and support. This can be described as a kind of humbleness, and it is possible to argue that it led to an unexpected breadth of take-up in which students and parents added to the ebbs and flows of take-up by shifting their own beliefs, behaviors, and actions in response to the teacher-participants' new sense-making approaches, strategies, and resources.

Epiphany's dedication to all students seemed well received by parents. Through continued discussion with students and parents, support for her intentions became more

visible as parents began to send their children to school with samples of language (e.g., books, phrases, songs) and come in themselves to read books and share about their language and culture. Possibly it was Epiphany's willingness to try using Spanish and to share other languages that enabled her non-ELL students' take-up of linguistically responsiveness as well. Languages other than English became important to the children, too, if they were going to understand the story or chat with their friends and, as such, my observations show that an in-class emphasis on English-only began to fade. Carley and Lucia, two monolingual teachers who began the school year dedicated to making linguistically responsive teaching work in their classroom, remained open to everyone who would discuss, support, and even question their work. Their honesty and openness led to significant take-up among their students (more so than parents for them). Out of responsiveness to their peers and family members, monolingual English speaking students sought out Spanish speaking peers and actively tried to learn enough Spanish to be able to engage in conversational interactions with their classmates. Similarly, Adrianna had one particular student who created her own mental Spanish cheat "sheet" of phrases that were completely memorized, not written so that she could be a more responsive classmate. Adrianna, whose own worries about raising Spanish-speaking children in America were ever-present during this study, drew upon those fears and concerns to engage honestly and often with parents of her ELLs and bilingual students about her current desire to be more linguistically responsive.

The unique personalities and funds of knowledge of the teacher-participants led to recognizable shifts within their classrooms, much of which started with their participation

in the summer institute where they became aware of their own blind spots and how they impacted the education of their students. As Greene (1988) wrote almost thirty years ago, “There is, however, no orientation to bringing something into being if there is no awareness of something lacking in a situation” (p. 22). This certainly holds true today. Each of these teacher-participants and their support network of students and parents were now keenly aware of the lack of linguistically responsiveness prior to the summer institute and were taking strides to remedy their situation often by welcoming others to help them. However, I do not mean to suggest that it was always “flowing” forward. Evidence suggests that the ebbs and flows of take-up in relation to data that informed this theme’s development were ever-present. Just as it was with the other themes presented. To fully discuss the findings that led to this theme’s creation, that is *Theme Four: the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching seemed to evolve into community sense-making inside and outside the classroom*, a section was dedicated to the ebbs and flows of this particular aspect of take-up of linguistically responsive teaching.

Ebbs and flows of take-up. Flows seemed to be enabled in great part by these particular teacher-participants’ willingness to establish environments within which the children could make meaning using all their resources. Many ebbs that I observed or that teachers spoke of had to do with relationship-building and finding the kind of parent involvement that would work for their class. For Epiphany, moments that stalled this aspect of take-up occurred as early as September when Epiphany reported that the parents “[Saw] Miss Tessa as *the* teacher” because she spoke to them in Spanish (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17, 2015). Epiphany felt left out. However, by December she was

able to find a way to be included in those brief, yet important check-in conversations at drop-off and pick-up: “I just stayed with them and Miss Tessa would translate.

Eventually, they started to look at me when they talked and even waited for me [to catch up through translation on what was being discussed] before talking [in Spanish again to Miss Tessa] about their child” (Epiphany, Interview 4, December 17, 2015). Relationship building was important to Epiphany as she took up linguistically responsive practices.

Similarly, Adrianna spoke of this delicate relational process. Adrianna reported that she was continually talking to parents about their questions pertaining to the use of home languages in the classroom or in other ways. The conversations were always one of honest worry. While some parents were starting to feel more certain of Adrianna’s insistence that home languages belonged in the classroom by the end of the study, Adrianna reported that the conversations were consuming because of the delicate nature in which they had to be handled (Adrianna, Interview 4, December 21, 2015). She spoke of not wanting to sound didactic, but wanting to gently guide them to understand her feelings about choosing to allow home languages in the classroom. Adrianna described the various levels of concern and/or input as challenging to navigate. Parent involvement was no less challenging for Lucia and Carley who spoke of the struggles of simply getting parents involved in any educational capacity. In their class, few requests for family projects developed with the intent of sharing family culture and language were ever returned and even fewer parents showed up for special days such as the feast day and holiday concert. This is of course complicated by the fact that school occurs during the work day and getting to events is often difficult for any parent particularly those who

are working full time in an attempt to provide for their families, as is the case for many of the families as reported by the teacher-participants. Although all three classrooms had truly unique examples of community take-up among their students' families and the few contributing parents, the breadth of such take-up remained relatively narrow.

As previously explained, the barrier most commonly identified by the teachers to take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was parental desire to have their children speak "good English." This led to a complicated, yet necessary dialectic between the teacher-participants and parents. By deliberately taking-up linguistically responsive teaching, the teacher-participants opened up incredibly challenging yet exciting dialogue between some of their students' parents, their students, their aides, and themselves. Some parents outwardly challenged the idea of their children using their home languages in school while other parents supported the linguistic responsiveness of their children's teachers, thereby truly creating a dialectic—a discourse between two or more people holding different points of view about a subject but wishing to establish the truth through reasoned arguments—among those involved. Critical theorists such as Greene (1995) embrace the challenges of dialectic as a means to work collaboratively to establish an agreed upon position. Greene (1995) wrote:

[People] do not reach out for fulfillment if they do not feel impeded somehow, and if they are not enabled to name the obstacles that stand in their way. At once, the very existence of obstacles depends on the desire to reach toward wider spaces for fulfillment, to expand options, to know alternatives. As has been said, a rock is an obstacle only to the one who wants to climb the hill. (p .5)

In the case of these children, their parents, and the teacher-participants, their rock was old notions of English primacy and their hill was to ease communication by negotiating language together, thereby opening spaces for learning and enjoyment.

Conclusion. After the teacher-participants began to raise awareness among the students and their families of the importance of being linguistically responsive, these teacher-participants, many of their students, and some of their students' parents were better able to understand the obstacles that once stood in their way (e.g., lack of understanding of the importance of home languages and the inability to create supportive access to English) and consider shifting to address or circumvent their previous hesitations. Although they never described these discussions and interactions with students and parents as dialectic in nature, in many ways the teacher-participants facilitated the rich dialectic, for they were neither swayed from their take-up nor personally offended by the differing viewpoints of others. Due in great part to their funds of knowledge regarding the sociopolitical nature of language use and culture, each teacher-participant seemed to embrace these obstacles and the challenging discussions that surrounded the education of ELLs and remained committed to their linguistically responsive intentions.

As the teacher-participants continued to take-up linguistically responsive teaching, evidence that this take-up shifted with the engagement of others (e.g., teachers readily deferred to "more knowledgeable others") emerged inside and outside of the classroom. What began as teachers simply "giving language prominence" to home languages evolved into students and parents shifting their own behaviors, thoughts, and

actions regarding home languages and English. Community take-up evolved as the teacher-participants welcomed shifts from *all* students and parents, many of which seemed related to their willingness to seek support and assistance from more knowledgeable others as they continued to extend support to all students by acknowledging their language and their unique cultures.

Conclusion to the Chapter

This chapter thoughtfully presented the results and discussion of months of careful data collection and analysis. This iterative process led to the development of four themes. They were as follows: (1) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching involves personal introspection/reevaluation; (2) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifests as a commitment to giving prominence to home languages in the classroom; (3) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifests as an understanding and incorporation of home language as a learning resource; (4) and the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching evolves over time into *community* sense-making. These themes enabled me to capture a rich range of nuances regarding take-up of linguistically responsive teaching as demonstrated by these four teacher-participants during their summer institute participation and four months of classroom teaching.

All four of the teacher-participants began their school year doing what they could to take-up linguistically responsive teaching. To recap, the immediate rush to add Spanish to the environment seemingly sent the message to students and families that Spanish belonged in school and so, too, do Spanish speaking students. Spanish became new content for these classrooms and many students benefitted from this expansion of

meaning making resources available to them. ELLs were provided supportive access to English while keeping their Spanish present with them as they learned; and monolingual English students were learning to make meaning with their ELL peers by experimenting with and using Spanish. Together the students with the help of their teachers and aides made meaning (especially shared meaning) during academic and non-academic learning times by welcoming languages other than English (mainly Spanish) into their classroom interactions. Among peers, Spanish and English were part of the meaning making process, but so too were gestures and common “kid-goals” of building and playing.

As all of this meaning making was going on, the teacher-participants were continually being introspective about their teaching and their own lives; very purposefully deliberating about how they once taught ELLs and why and how they wanted to be linguistically responsive. Each teacher-participant faced a range of challenges or problems as they tried to “take-up” linguistically responsive teaching by adopting new content, ideas, practices, reflective stances, linguistic choices, responses, or actions as their own by incorporating one or more into her current classroom. However, the sense that these classrooms were no longer English only was palpable, and I saw much being achieved during the course of a semester. The take-up of linguistically responsive teaching was certainly not complete for these teacher-participants, but that only reinforced the conceptual use of take-up in lieu of change.

The teacher-participants truly brought *something into being* that did not exist six months earlier; that is linguistic responsiveness. Students were breaking down language barriers just to talk with their friends and enjoy a book or song; many, if not most, parents

were actively considering and supporting the prominence of other languages in the classroom, and not throwing up major barriers to the linguistically responsive shifts occurring in their children's classrooms. Many parents were actively contributing to the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching by acting as language resources and by supporting their own children's curiosities about home languages. Findings brought to light in this small study regarding how the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching seemed to evolve into community sense-making inside and outside the classroom resonated strongly with sociocultural understandings of language use and the concept of funds of knowledge. The teacher-participants willingly acknowledged what they knew and could share with students, and essential to this aspect of linguistically responsive take-up, they sought the assistance of others when they did not have anything in their "toolkit" from which to pull. It may be that teachers at all levels need to feel comfortable with not knowing how to do it all while at the same time have access to others' funds of knowledge.

Gonzalez, Moll, and Amanti (2005), proponents of the concept of funds of knowledge, wrote about the development within classrooms of what Latin American cultures refer to as *confianza* (trust). *Confianza* describes a form of mutual reciprocity based on trust and respect for all members of a particular group. Accordingly, in classrooms where *confianza* has been established, "the students, teachers, and parents value the relationships and therefore recognize a mutual duty to honor their relationship by extending especially favorable treatment even during moments of disagreement or confusion" (Gonzalez, Moll, and Amanti, 2005, p. 22). For the teacher-participants in this

study, it is easy to argue that *confianza* developed among the members of each classroom community (i.e., students, teachers, parents, and aides) through their open and honest attempts at take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. Even though there was ebbing and flowing in terms of degree of take-up, and the teachers' take-up may have been slowed at times towards the end of my study, the support and willingness on the teacher-participants' part to engage in conversations with their students and their families about the importance of enabling the use of home languages while they provided access to English had breadth of impact. The openness on the part of the teachers seemingly allowed for a mutual trust among many of the classroom members and their families to emerge as the issues of language could be sorted out through their developing classroom community dialectics. Further discussion of the outcomes and potential work suggested by these revelations is discussed in Chapter Six: Conclusion along with suggestions for future research and practice.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

This dissertation's small qualitative study was designed to answer the following question:

While following general education early childhood teachers through a formal learning program and into their classrooms, what “take-up” from the range of opportunities designed to help this small group of teachers become more linguistically responsive in their classrooms seems to be demonstrated?

To address this research question, systematic data collection and analysis were undertaken to identify pertinent evidence regarding this important question. In response, four salient themes were developed—rather than simply presenting categories of activity or patterns of action. These themes are as follows: (1) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching involves personal introspection; (2) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifests as a commitment to giving prominence to home languages in the classroom; (3) take-up of linguistically responsive teaching manifests as an understanding and incorporation of home language as a learning resource; (4) and the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching evolves over time into *community* sense-making. Their development demonstrates that much was discovered as a result of this small qualitative study.

In fact, the findings of this study demonstrate that as of now, no clear expectations for how teachers *become linguistically responsive* can be clearly delineated nor should they necessarily be. Of course, there is sound research that guides the development of teacher education coursework as well as teacher practice and pedagogy (e.g., the

Linguistically Responsive Framework as discussed in Chapter Two). However, in terms of being able to articulate all possible dimensions of how teachers *become* linguistically responsive, I believe this study shows that much still needs to be understood. As the field develops I believe this study offers significant contributions. These will be discussed in turn below, followed by suggestions for future research based on the usefulness of specific design elements of this study, the results gleaned from it, and some lingering questions that remain with me.

Contributions to the Field

First and foremost, I believe this study helps to problematize the misuse of frameworks when they are translated into prescriptions or overly-simplified checklists used to “rate” teachers or decide “when” a teacher can be deemed linguistically responsive according to researcher conceptions or pronouncements. As demonstrated by the ebbs and flows of each teacher-participant particular to each theme, as well as how each teacher took up the same idea in slightly different ways (e.g., multilingual story readings), this study is a reminder that linguistically responsive teaching is an ongoing process and not a fixed destination point. For example, Epiphany’s immediate use (and reported success) of translations provided by her aide were later challenged by attempts to translate that seemed to be too confusing and possibly ineffective (e.g., their translation of *Rainbow Fish* (1999) at which time the translation of such detailed text simply overwhelmed the lesson causing Epiphany to end the lesson early and return to it later in the day with a better strategy). If an evaluator was trying to identify when Epiphany was “linguistically responsive” based on a positivist-type of evaluation, the evaluation easily

could be invalid depending on what time of day it was and what lesson was observed. Adrianna's linguistic responsiveness, for example, may not be sufficiently "identifiable" through a positivist, either/or lens of an ill-conceived checklist if the observer only witnessed her literacy moment during which she focused so heavily on math concepts and making soup. She, a bilingual woman, forgot to include Spanish without prompting from her mentor. Instead, the entirety of each teacher's take-up of linguistically responsive teaching—including their attempts at creating multilingual environments to their trialing of multilingual story readings and literacy moments—needs to be respected, acknowledged, and documented to better understand how teachers *become* linguistically responsive. This strongly suggests that more studies are called for that start with gathering data in classrooms rather than with pre-existing and predetermined benchmarks or expectations.

The second contribution this study makes to the fields of teacher education and development and linguistically responsive education is due to its emphasis on looking at participating teachers as individuals who bring their own knowledge to their professional work. What stands out in this study is that there is no *one way* to be a linguistically responsive teacher. Certainly, no one would make such a claim, but often the misuse of frameworks, checklists, and pre-existing evaluation protocols send the message that there is a specific way *to be* (in this case linguistically responsive). This study reminds researchers that there is a need to continually identify and report what teachers are doing, thinking, saying, and trying out as they try to be more linguistically responsive. This kind of research will increase our understanding of what the entire concept of linguistically

responsive teaching may look like and how such development can be supported—just like coaching an athlete (see my earlier discussion of the growing concept of linguistically responsive teaching in the introductory section of Chapter Five). This study affirms that there is not one ideal way to be linguistically responsive, nor is there a finalized way to be linguistically responsive. Instead, the outcomes of this study strongly suggest that educators should embrace and recognize early hints of linguistically responsiveness (e.g., classroom print and wall displays) as much as those overt well established attempts (e.g., scaffolding learning opportunities specifically for ELLs), so that all efforts on the part of teachers to be linguistically responsive can be duly recognized and supported as they continue to manifest.

The development of these contributions had much to do with this qualitative study's design, specifically with my use of "take-up" in lieu of "change" as an operational concept for describing what the participants "did" with the experiences and learning opportunities they encountered within their intensive three-day summer institute when they "returned" to their own classrooms and my use of funds of knowledge as a conceptual framework. For me, both enabled more evidence to be deemed pertinent to "being linguistically responsive" and in doing so allowed for more manifestations of linguistically responsive teaching to be identified within each teacher's practice than might otherwise have been the case. Below I expand upon these contribution overviews and identify how my study design afforded their identification.

Take-up: A usefully ever-evolving concept. My study strongly suggests that *take-up* is a useful and worthwhile concept to employ when studying teachers as they

progress from a point of introduction to a concept or an idea, content, and/or practice that they intend to include in their teaching from that point forward. This study was designed intentionally to expand upon the current discussion of researchers and teacher educators in the field of linguistically responsive teaching and take-up worked well for my purposes and could do similarly well for others' purposes as well. My own assumption was that teachers who want to be linguistically responsive and take the steps to learn to be such (e.g., by attending the summer institute) should be viewed as somewhere on their way toward their goal and acknowledged for their efforts by being considered a linguistically responsive teacher.

As the participating teachers moved beyond that initial introduction phase, a focus on take-up enabled a usefully broad scope for data collection and interpretation. For example, if this study was framed using "change" or "growth" to study the teachers, certain actions or non-actions might have been seen as resistance or stagnation (cf. Guskey, 2002) such as when Adrianna's literacy moment clearly omitted the inclusion of her students' home languages. Instead, when Adrianna's literacy moment lesson lacked support for home languages, I was able to identify this as a moment of "fraughtness" (cf. Buehler, Gere, Dallavis, & Haviland, 2009, p. 408); that is, a moment of confusion, at which time linguistically responsive teaching was not visibly present, but still an important way of teaching for Adrianna. Everything, even these fraught moments, was useful data because take-up was expected from the start to be about ebbs and flows rather than a neat trajectory of "improvement" that can often wrongly be assumed when particular frameworks or evaluation procedures are used to document "change," such as

those used by Maria and her colleagues as part of the teachers' and aides' participation in the North Eastern Teacher Education for Diverse Classrooms Institute. Overly simplified conceptions regarding improvement or change tend to guide assumptions and lead to misguided judgements. In the example given, Adrianna *bounced forward* according to her own words, and demonstrated that one unsuccessful lesson did not mean she was somehow no long linguistically responsive (See Chapter Five for discussion of evidence). My study's findings show that when dealing with the complexity of teaching, the concept of take-up enables a researcher to study the work of teachers with respect for the individual teachers as well as with respect for the profession on the whole by considering the need for time and space within which to continue adjusting to and tinkering with new ideas, practices, and content.

Perhaps, right now, when teachers are faced with more and more accountability pressures, the time has come to develop a more nuanced understanding of linguistically responsive teaching that is not an either/or, yes/no conception but one that more realistically looks at what is being expected of teachers as they engage with content and strategies relevant to how they can better support their ELL students' learning. Such rejection of a neat forward trajectory accepts that what is often asked of teachers—whether it is to take-up linguistically responsive teaching or to embrace inclusive education and so on—cannot simply be identified as achieved or not achieved. There is no simple or single way in which teachers can and will “change” their practice and the thinking, actions, and talk that support any such differences. In fact, quite relevantly, Buehler and colleagues (2009) affirmed that take-up of a new disposition (in their study

this was cultural responsiveness) is “not a simple cognitive task that can be modeled and transferred to beginning teachers—it is a personal struggle that challenges affective as well as cognitive capacities” (p. 409). Therefore, I have come to believe that fostering complicated dispositions, knowledge, and skills when working with teachers needs to be done with an open mind and a willingness to accept those manifestations, in this case, of linguistically responsive teaching, which were not intended or expected by research. Indeed, this becomes a very individual process and not a neat process of providing a path for teacher change. This realization was also supported by my use of funds of knowledge as the conceptual framing for this study

Funds of knowledge: A useful framing. By applying a funds of knowledge framing, I have been able to call attention to another important personal learning dimension that teachers bring to their professional practice as well as their professional development that needs to be considered in light of the goals of any teacher education program. Funds of knowledge was developed to acknowledge what students who were often marginalized and seen as “lacking” important school-valued skills and understandings actually brought to their classrooms. In this study I expanded that notion to consider all the knowledge, knowhow, and life experiences individuals rely upon, no matter who they are, as they take-up something new. Although much has been written about the influence of past experience, background knowledge, and prior learning on individual learning, funds of knowledge acknowledges that every day individuals are using their very relevant skills, knowhow, and knowledge to accomplish all they need to do to thrive. This active use of one’s own funds of knowledge is a moment to moment

fluid engagement of one's own tools for learning with the current content, context, and/or opportunity that never ends. Teachers do not leave particular funds of knowledge at home—no one does—they are a part of who they are whether they are teaching or at home (or elsewhere). The opposite also needs to be realized. Teachers do not leave their funds of knowledge in their classrooms as they return home for the night. An individual's knowledge resources and tools are ever-present and ever changing. By accepting such, I was able to see evidence of linguistically responsive teaching that might have been overlooked if I only examined the teacher-participants' teaching practice, such as Adrianna's struggle to push her own children to speak Spanish more often or Carley's excitement over her own daughter's use of Spanish. In many ways this study demonstrated the usefulness of a qualitative methodology in examining what it means to become linguistic responsive in the classroom.

Recommendations for Research Regarding Linguistically Responsive Teaching

My findings certainly resonate with a range of existing and valuable insights researchers have already contributed to the field of linguistically responsive teaching. Teachers participating in this study clearly made shifts in their dispositions and/or orientations toward ELLs and their families and their everyday practices. The four teacher-participants each demonstrated an understanding of aspects of second language acquisition theory that were presented to them during the summer institute without being called such—mainly those ideas and strategies that focused on in-the-moment-support (e.g., translating, visuals, rewording). Adrianna, Lucia, Carley, and Epiphany used that knowledge to support their ELLs with in-the-moment supports and sometimes scaffolds

(cf. Cummins, 2000; Krashen, 2003; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Wright, 2010). The teacher-participants fostered within themselves and among their students positive behaviors and responses that involved ELLs and what they offered to the class no matter what the level of their English mastery (cf. Schleppegrell, 2004; Valdés, 2001). The teacher-participants also facilitated supportive language interactions and the positive response among ELLs to feeling good about doing so (Norton, 2000; Wright, 2010). Finally, through introspection each teacher-participant seemed more aware of the contextual issues surrounding them (e.g., ill-conceived school policies of their youth). However, they did not (nor were they guided to) focus their attention on the sociopolitical issues concerning language use in the United States, such as language discrimination (Crawford, 2000; Cummins & Ogbu, 2000; Gandara, 2000; Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Motha, 2014; Norton, 2000). This is an area that begs to be further researched, and I have included below suggestions for future work.

Emphasize sociopolitical issues. Research pertaining to the facilitation of teacher awareness of larger sociopolitical happenings in relation to their current evolving practice is recommended. If successful ways of teacher development and learning are undertaken and documented that guide teachers to look specifically at the primacy of English in the United States, as Motha (2014) did in her work with teachers of English language learners, then possibly teachers can feel more confident in dealing with some of the ebbs in their practice or positions. For example, Lucia spoke of feeling guilty and “dumb” about her younger self’s desire to speak only English, but she never spoke about how others made her feel as though that was the right thing to do. As a young first grade

student the views of others must have had some impact on her and for which she cannot take the blame. Epiphany and Carley acknowledged that they did not know that English only was wrong because that is how they were schooled, but they were not involved in a discussion that questioned the practices supported during their school years, and how they often are still supported. And finally, Adrianna took on a lot of responsibility for the choices she made to be seen as *American* and her parental desire for her children to speak *good English*. She spoke of understanding the parents who questioned her use of Spanish in their child's classroom because she could relate to wanting others to view your kids as American, but she rarely had the chance to talk about why she felt such a need to sound American. Problematizing the primacy placed on English and monolingualism in the United States seems to be a necessary component to becoming linguistically responsive.

Many of these same feelings have been shared and identified by other researchers, but were not shared with the teacher-participants (see also: Crawford 2000; Gandara, Losen, August, Uriarte, Gomez, & Hopkins, 2010; Motha, 2014). Instead, at the end of this study these teachers still harbored quite a confused sense of responsibility to their students as they acknowledged their blind spots (or mistruths). Often what amounted to self-reproach seemed to visibly slow each teacher's forward momentum. This is not to say that they stopped trying to be linguistically responsive, but that their ebbs could be understood and, if the study continued, predicted. Others who work with teachers in a similar capacity would benefit to note this area of research and teacher education practice that is in need of being addressed. What Bartolomé (2008) suggested about other teachers can be related to these teacher-participants, too, for these were simply teachers thinking

they were doing what was best for their ELLs. Similar to Motha's (2014) suggestion to ground theory in practice and to study teachers in their practice as they critique and theorize issues surrounding English instruction in American schools, I suggest that there is a need for more research that grounds the study of teacher and teacher education practice in more sociopolitical theory. There is reason to believe that Adrianna, Carley, Lucia, and Epiphany would benefit from opportunities that present research in a way that would encourage them to critique how sociolinguistic policies and rhetoric impacted their misguided beliefs about teaching ELLs. There is more at play here than simply individual misunderstandings, and they can be guided to understand that through opportunities that problematize the political and social influences that afford English primacy in a nation without a national language. As teachers are guided to think beyond their classrooms in terms of the sociopolitical dimensions of their own language beliefs, researchers and teacher educators can better foster their linguistic responsiveness.

Replicate and extend the participant pool. Questions regarding other members of the learning community also arose in the course of my study and are worth further investigation, particularly those concerning the students and their families. Clearly, student and family engagement impacted each teacher's take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. However, most research on teacher development does not include input from students and their families. I have come to understand that more studies of teacher learning need to take other individuals within the larger context into account. In fact, I believe that it is fair to assume that even more was happening than my research

allowed me to discover. Therefore, I believe it would be worthwhile to design a study that extends the participant pool to include students and families.

Had I had the foresight to know that my fourth theme (that is, “take-up of linguistically responsive teaching evolved into *community take-up*”) would emerge, I would have added to my study’s design. These insights into how linguistically responsive teaching is not necessarily a classroom-only practice would have benefitted from interviews with the ELLs, the students who showed an interest in learning Spanish to speak to their peers and to their own extended family, and their families—those who were supporting each teacher’s interest as well as those parents who were still unsure about the inclusion of home language in the classroom. Understanding what the families and the students were doing and wondering would help me and other researchers and/or teacher educators interested in the field of linguistically responsive teaching understand what needs to be considered as supportive learning and development opportunities regarding the take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. Future research pertaining to linguistically responsive teaching that includes data collection specific to the other “players” who are involved in the process of take-up will add insight to the field in terms of what parents and students themselves take-up regarding linguistically responsive teaching (and learning) and how their take-up be can supported or encouraged effectively. Certainly, this study could be replicated and extended to include other participants (e.g., students, parents, aides) as discussed above, but it could also be replicated and extended in other ways, particularly by extending the study’s timetable and participant pool.

Extend the timetable. A study of this kind could be conducted over a full year of teaching and should begin prior to the teacher's engagement with the learning opportunities designed to facilitate their take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. This study originally sought approval to begin data collection before the summer institute and that would remain a goal. Having the chance to personally see each teacher in action and talk to each teacher before the institute would have enabled more reliable comparisons of linguistically responsive teaching prior to the start of linguistically responsive take-up. Though this qualitative study absorbed the human issues that prevented me from getting into their classrooms before the summer institute, I believe that seeing the teachers prior to their participation in the learning opportunities designed to foster linguistically responsive teaching is still an ideal for which to aim. Also, at the end of my data collection period, the teacher-participants were about to have a week off after a long month of holiday preparations and celebrations that impacted their teaching as a whole. Inevitably their take-up of linguistically responsiveness and that of their students and their families was going to continue to ebb and flow and looking at such after a week's vacation would be of interest especially in regard to identifying more trends across each teacher-participant's take-up and that of their students and their families. A week's vacation may in and of itself have impact worthy of noting, especially considering how much each teacher-participant expressed a need for the break to regroup and/or think about next steps.

Address the ethnic and gender teacher majority. This kind of a study could be replicated and extended to include teachers who fit the dominant demographic

characteristics of the teacher population within the United States (i.e., white, middle class females). The present study is not generalizable, but findings from this study suggest that establishing a more nuanced understanding of the degree to which funds of knowledge plays into linguistically responsive take-up would help teacher educators foster the development of teachers of all students regardless of their personal characteristics and funds of knowledge. This is not to say that characteristics of race, gender, and ethnicity should not be taken into account. Rather this study suggests that funds of knowledge of individuals should become part of the characteristics considered by teacher educators. Where funds of knowledge were once used to push back against the idea that particular, marginalized students do not have X or Y, now funds of knowledge can be used to consider what all individuals have, and pertinent to this study, those individuals would be the teachers. Research suggests time and again that most teacher educators find themselves supporting the teacher development of individuals who are ethnically and linguistically different from their students (Sleeter, 2002). Using a funds of knowledge framing could help to generate information regarding teachers who fit the demographic majority and yet unearth the uniqueness of each individual so that homogeneous understandings of teachers are challenged in an effort to continue the development of effective teacher education opportunities.

As these recommendations for research are considered and possibly undertaken, there are also considerations to be made by those who are practicing educators. Many of the recommendations for practice resonate with the recommendations for research above, such as the need to establish more realistic goals, thoughtfully consider the diversity of

home languages, and cultivate a mindfulness that teachers are individuals with their own rich funds of knowledge and histories. Each will be discussed briefly in the next section.

Recommendations for Practice Regarding Linguistically Responsive Teaching

Cultivating a mindfulness that teachers are individuals. Although trying to understand the needs in terms of education and development of the teaching workforce is still a worthy discussion, Adrianna's experience demonstrates the importance of avoiding over generalizations when discussing the preparation of teachers for particular populations of students. This study was not about rating or comparing teachers, but it nonetheless was obvious that no one teacher stood out as being far more linguistically responsive than the others. They were all ebbing and flowing throughout the semester—even Adrianna who was bilingual and Ecuadorian. In fact, according to her own reports it was the very fact that she could relate to the parents and understand their need to push English that actually slowed down her forward momentum of linguistically responsive take-up. This merely emphasizes how generalities cannot be made concerning the type of teacher workforce teacher educators try to cultivate. Understanding teachers truly comes down to understanding individuals and their own particular matrix of life experiences, values, experiences, and funds of knowledge. This is not to suggest that teacher education needs to be individualized, but to suggest that teacher educators should consider creating opportunities that enable preservice and practicing teachers the time and space to consider what they are bringing with them in terms of lived-experiences and funds of knowledge to their professional work, and how their own experiences, funds of knowledge, and values impact their professional work. This leads me to my next section,

which focuses on recommendations for how best to cultivate the individuals who want be teachers.

Funds of knowledge and teacher development. In my study, understanding individual teacher-participants' own funds of knowledge in relation to what they were trying to do became essential to my greater understanding of what they were accomplishing and how they went about doing what they did in pursuit of their goal to become more linguistically responsive to all of their students. This understanding enabled me to recognize the deeply sociocultural nature of their work, too. For example, what the teachers did not know in terms of how best to support their ELLs, they sought out help from knowledgeable others (e.g., Epiphany could not include Spanish language phrases without Miss Tessa.) Again, this is not a generalizable study, but it can be said that each teacher benefitted from understanding herself, her own funds of knowledge, and the gaps within the latter. Whether that understanding was self-generated or facilitated by Maria's work during the summer institute, or even perhaps by my questions to them each month, the fact is that these teachers did indeed benefit from knowing themselves in regard to what they could and could not do to be more linguistically responsive on their own.

Therefore, it certainly seemed that this self-acknowledgment made them better able to teach "diverse" students. It seemed from my vantage point that each teacher's take-up of linguistic responsiveness was supported by this self-knowing and as a result a willingness to defer to more knowledgeable others—even if they were their four year old students. As teacher educators work with preservice and practicing teachers, enabling them to embrace their own funds of knowledge with respect to the content and

knowledge they are trying to take-up will help teachers and soon-to-be-teachers plan for possible paths of insight and support. Much of the introspective work facilitated by Maria helped Lucia, Carley, Epiphany, and Adrianna know what needed to be done in relation to what they were already equipped to do. As said before, each teacher eventually found ways to include her own funds of knowledge and those of others to achieve particular goals. By foregrounding the possibility of such work, teacher educators can better prepare teachers to plot their own way forward. The experiences and accounts documented in this study offer sound suggestions for how teacher educators could begin the process of deep self-reflection and awareness.

Consideration of all languages. The emphasis on Spanish in each teacher-participant's classroom and practice needs to be (re)considered in light of the number other languages that were included and not included in the three classrooms in this study. Other home languages beyond Spanish were rarely observed or even referenced as tools for learning—which was well recognized by at least one teacher-participant (i.e., Epiphany). Evidence regarding languages other than Spanish shows that they were welcome and shared in a “physical” or “environmental” sense (e.g., environmental labels, bulletin boards, and songs), but not purposefully drawn on for learning purposes in the way that Spanish was. For example, Epiphany's Arabic labels were never used or discussed; they were simply there. Teacher educators and teachers should be guided to problematize the lack of materials in other languages that are prominently spoken in the United States, especially by students. They also should strategize and trouble shoot this

current dearth of materials in order to be prepared to access support and information from alternative sources (e.g., the Internet, students' families) when necessary.

Realistic goal setting. Theoretically, a teacher with a commitment to linguistically responsive teaching helps ELLs feel able to “swim” in classrooms in which their teachers and peers mainly speak English. From lesson-specific strategies and scaffolds that were often modeled at the summer institute (e.g., translations, rewording) to the vigilant maintenance of a more global understanding of the sociolinguistic and sociopolitical issues impacting ELLs that was not overtly addressed for the teachers in this study, there is much for general education teachers to take-up if they are going to become linguistically responsive in their classrooms; and, theoretically there are many ways in which a teacher can embody linguistic responsiveness. Based on this study several recommendations can be made. Clearly these teachers evidenced signs of linguistically responsive teaching. However, if they were held to all of the elements suggested by the evaluation documents used by Maria and Dalia or research regarding linguistically responsive teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Moth, 2013), they would fall short in some areas. For example, no teacher-participant showed signs of identifying the language demands of books or texts within the classroom (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). This is a key element of the linguistically responsive teaching framework. However, these teacher-participants often created supportive story reading situations that seemingly supported all learners without such complicated linguistic knowledge.

Although there is much research available as to how to be considered linguistically responsive (e.g., the linguistically responsive framework; Lucas & Villegas,

2011), there is clearly no single comprehensive formula for how linguistic responsiveness “looks” or “sounds.” As found in this study, many of the manifestations of linguistically responsive teaching for each teacher-participant depended upon who they were and what they brought to their classrooms each day in regard to their funds of knowledge, despite having been engaged in the same opportunities during the summer institute.

Lucia, the participant who lost her home language, worked hard to include Spanish every day for her ELLs and her class as a whole. For example, Lucia (with the help of Carley) used Spanish vocabulary in whole class routines and lessons. She also enabled her ELLs to use Spanish daily by involving a colleague within her school as a translator and by using some Spanish phrases herself. Carley, the young highly efficacious teacher, worked with Lucia to be linguistically responsive in the aforementioned manner and also personally set out to learn Spanish as a way to more successfully connect with the students in her school. Adrianna, the participant who was once an immigrant and ELL herself, used her Spanish to translate often for her ELLs and her class; she allowed her ELLs time to process their thoughts and work in Spanish; and supported her other students’ attempts to use Spanish in their efforts to engage with their peers. Epiphany, the participant dedicated to inclusive education, embraced her aide Miss Tess as an equal partner in the process of becoming linguistically responsive and in light of such willingness created a bilingual environment that supported the use of Spanish in most story reading events and whole class lessons. Although each teacher was clearly more linguistically responsive than when they began the program, no one teacher’s manifestations of their take-up of opportunities were completely similar to another’s—

even Lucia and Carley who worked together. Therefore, employing a mindset that allows for realistic goal setting and welcomes individuality in term of take-up is highly recommended.

Final Thoughts for Teacher Development

The results of my five month study demonstrated that teachers *can* take-up linguistically responsive teaching after taking part in a teacher education program explicitly designed to help them become more linguistically responsive. Each theme developed out of the data afforded insights into what a teacher educator can expect to support as they prepare teachers to navigate their own take-up of linguistically responsive teaching. Although there is no single “how to” manual for becoming linguistically responsive, nor should there be, these teacher-participants began their shifts under the guidance of Maria, Dalia, and the supportive mentors. Therefore, for any educator—aide, teacher, teacher educator, or administrator—interested in furthering their own personal growth regarding linguistically responsive teaching, finding a situation in which there are opportunities for support throughout the process of take-up is a key recommendation, for there will be moments of confusion and calls for clarity.

Through continued efforts on the part of all educators, the benefits of sound research and practice regarding linguistically responsive teaching can begin to outweigh the disadvantages of misguided policy and accountability pressures. Moving forward, there is more to learn about what preservice teachers take-up from opportunities encountered in their coursework that address how to be more linguistically responsive; how said opportunities impact mainstream classroom practice regarding ELLs; and

finally, how the learning of ELLs is impacted. As teacher educators continue to share the results of their efforts, a body of working knowledge will add insight to this growing area of research and practice in teacher education, and hopefully, improve upon the preparation of all teachers in mainstream classrooms for all students.

References

- Addleman, R. A., Brazo, C. J., Dixon, K., Cevallos, T., & Wortman, S. (2014). Teacher candidates' perceptions of debriefing circles to facilitate self-reflection during a cultural immersion experience. *New Educator, 10*(2), 112-128.
- Aguirre, J. M., Turner, E. E., Bartell, T. G., Kalinec-Craig, C., Foote, M. Q., Roth McDuffie, A., & Drake, C. (2013). Making connections in practice: How prospective elementary teachers connect to children's mathematical thinking and community funds of knowledge in mathematics instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(2), 178-192.
- Angermuller, J. (2015). *Why there is no poststructuralism in France. The making of an intellectual generation*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Anonymized. (2008). *Threads of cultures*. Trenton, NJ: John S. Watson Institute for Public Policy of Thomas Edison State College.
- Anonymized. (2010). *Cultural conversations: Linking culture and languages in early childhood classrooms*. Trenton, NJ: John S. Watson Institute for Public Policy of Thomas Edison State College.
- Anonymized. (2011) *Cultural and linguistic connections: Linking what matters to families to what matters for school success*. Trenton, NJ: John S. Watson Institute for Public Policy of Thomas Edison State College.
- Anonymized. (2013). *Cultural consciousness blinders on-blinders off: Supporting New Jersey's teachers in becoming culturally responsive*. Trenton, NJ: John S. Watson Institute for Public Policy of Thomas Edison State College.

Anonymized. (2014) *Closing the cultural gap: Transforming early childhood teachers' thinking about culture and language*. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association's Annual Conference, New Orleans, LA.

Anonymized. (2015). *Curriculum Guide*. Trenton, NJ: John S. Watson Institute for Public Policy of Thomas Edison State College.

Auer, P. (Ed.). (2013). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Auerbach & Silverstein Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Epigenesis of identity: Identity, youth and crisis*. New York: Norton & Company.

Anzaldúa, G. (2012). *Borderlands: La frontera* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Amanti, C. (2005). Beyond a beads and feathers approach. In N. Gonzalez, L. Moll, & C. Amanti (Eds.), *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*, 131-143. New York, NY: Routledge.

Baecher, L., Schieble, M., Rosalia, C., & Rorimer, S. (2013). Blogging for academic purposes with English language learners: An online fieldwork initiative. *Teacher Education*, 13(1), 1-21.

Bakhtin, M. M. (2004). Dialogic origin and dialogic pedagogy of grammar. *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, 42(6), 12-49.

Bakhtin, M. M. (2010). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (Vol. 1). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

- Ball, D. L. (1993). With an eye on the mathematical horizon: Dilemmas of teaching elementary school mathematics. *Elementary School Journal*, 93, 373-397.
- Bartolomé, L. (2008) *Ideologies in education: Unmasking the trap of teacher neutrality*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Bialystok, E. (2011). Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology; Revue Canadienne de Psychologie Expérimentale*, 65(4), 229-242.
- Blommaert, J. & Jie, D. (2010). *Ethnographic fieldwork*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Bollin, G. G. (2007). Preparing teachers for Hispanic immigrant children: A service learning approach. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 6(2), 177-189.
- Brice, A., & Brice, R. (2009). *Language development: Monolingual and bilingual acquisition*. Old Tappan, NJ: Merrill / Prentice Hall.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social science information*, 16(6), 645-668.
- Bourn, C. E. (2015). The professional development needs of early childhood providers in Connecticut: A Focus Group Study. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/>
- Bower-Phipps, L., Klecka, C. S., & Sature, A. L. (2016). Developing mentors: An analysis of shared mentoring practices. *New Educator*, 12(3), 289-308.
doi:10.1080/1547688X.2016.1187979

- Buehler, J., Gere, A. R., Dallavis, C., & Haviland, V. S. (2009). Normalizing the fraughtness: How emotion, race, and school context complicate cultural competence. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *60*(4), 408-418.
- Bunch, G. C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*(1), 298-341. doi:10.3102/0091732X12461772
- Burgess, R. G. (1984). *In the field: An introduction to field research*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Cadiero-Kaplan, K., & Rodríguez, J. L. (2008). The preparation of highly qualified teachers for English language learners: Educational responsiveness for unmet needs. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *41*(3), 372-387.
- Calderón, M., Slavin, R., & Sánchez, M. (2011). Effective instruction for English learners. *Future of Children*, *21*(1), 103-127. doi:10.1353/foc.2011.0007
- Canrinus, E. T., Helms-Lorenz, M., Beijaard, D., Buitink, J., & Hofman, A. (2012). Self-efficacy, job satisfaction, motivation and commitment: Exploring the relationships between indicators of teachers' professional identity. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *27*(1), 115-132. doi:10.1007/s10212-011-0069-2
- Castro, D. C., Ayankoya, B., & Kasprzak, C. (2011). *The new voices=nuevas voces guide to cultural and linguistic diversity in early childhood/the new voices= nuevas voces facilitator's guide to cultural and linguistic diversity in early childhood*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing Company.

- Civic Impulse. (2016). S. 1177 — 114th Congress: Every Student Succeeds Act.
Retrieved from <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/114/s1177>
- Cole, S. (2005). Action ethnography: Using participant observation. In R. Brent W., P.M. Burns, and C.A. Palmer, (Eds), *Tourism research methods: Integrating theory with practice* (pp. 63-72). London, UK: Cabi Publishing.
- Coleman, J. (2015). Accessing the linguistic "funds of knowledge" of students in teacher education programmes. *English in Australia*, 50(1), 29-37.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed). London: Routledge.
- Collinson, V., & Fedoruk Cook, T. (2001). "I don't have enough time:" Teachers' interpretations of time as a key to learning and school change. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(3), 266-281.
- Collucci, M. (2014). *Preparing teachers to teach ELLs in the mainstream classroom: A review of the empirical literature on learning opportunities provided to preservice Teachers*. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Teacher Education and Development. Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ
- Common Core Standards Initiative. (2014). Core Standards. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/>
- Conteh, J., & Riasat, S. (2014). A multilingual learning community: researching funds of knowledge with children, families and teachers. *Multilingual: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 33(5-6), 601-622.

- Costa, A. L., & Kallick, B. (1993). Through the lens of a critical friend. *Educational leadership, 51*, 49-49.
- Crawford, J. (2000). *At war with diversity: U.S. language policy in an age of anxiety* (Vol. 25). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Crawford, J. (2007). The decline of bilingual education: How to reverse a troubling trend? *International Multilingual Research Journal, 1*(1), 33-37.
doi:10.1080/19313150709336863
- Crawford, J. (2008, November). *Frequently asked questions about official English*
Retrieved from <http://www.elladvocates.org/documents/englishonly/OfficialEnglishFAQ.pdf>
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cummins, J. (1980). The construct of language proficiency in bilingual education. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 81-103). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1998). Bilingual education in the United States: Power, pedagogy, and possibility. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 20*(3), 255-270.
doi:10.1080/1071441980200305
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- De Jong, E., & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(2), 101-124.
- de Oliveira, L. C. & Athanases, S. Z. (2007). Graduates' reports of advocating for English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(3), 202-215.
- de Oliveira, L. C., & Shoffner, M. (2009). Addressing the needs of English language learners in an English education methods course. *English Education*, 42(1), 91-111.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The press. 連結.
- Dong, Y. R. (2004). Preparing secondary subject area teachers to teach linguistically and culturally diverse students. *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 77(5), 202-208.
- Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. (2011, September 19). Issues A-Z: No Child Left Behind. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/no-child-left-behind/NoChildLeftBehind>.
- Education Week. (2015, December 8). *The Every Student Succeeds Act: Explained*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2015/12/07/the-every-student-succeeds-act-explained.html>
- Equal Educational Opportunities Act, (1974). 20 U.S.C. § 1701 et seq.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Epigenesis of identity: Identity, youth and crisis*. New York: Norton & Company.

- Espinosa, L. M. (2008). *Challenging common myths about young English language learners. FCD Policy Brief, Advancing PK-3*, (8). Retrieved from <http://fcd-us.org/sites/default/files/MythsOfTeachingELLsEspinosa.pdf>
- Evans, B. A., & Hornberger, N. H. (2005). No Child Left Behind: Repealing and unpeeling federal language education policy in the United States. *Language Policy*, 4(1), 87-106. doi:10.1007/s10993-004-6566-2
- Fairbanks, C. M., Duffy, G. G., Faircloth, B. S., He, Y., Levin, B., Rohr, J., & Stein, C. (2010). Beyond knowledge: Exploring why some teachers are more thoughtfully adaptive than others. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 161-171.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to support and sustain practice. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055.
- Fetterman, D. M. (1988). Qualitative approaches to evaluating education. *Educational Researcher*, 17(8), 17-23.
- Fernandez, M. (1992). They don't prepare me for this. In A. H. Lopez., *Barrio teacher*. San Diego, CA: Sandcastle Publishing.
- Fitts, S., & Gross, L. A. (2012). Teacher candidates learning from English learners: Constructing concepts of language and culture in Tuesday's tutors after-school program. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 39(4), 75-95.
- Fix, M., & Capps, R. (2005). *Immigrant children, urban schools, and the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Foster, M. (1994). The power to know one thing is never the power to know all things: Methodological notes on two studies of Black American teachers. In A. Gitlin (Ed.), *Power and Method: Political activism and educational research* (pp. 129-146). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fragoulis, I. (2014). Recording of primary education teachers' opinions on the use of mentoring in the frame of implementation of innovative educational programmes. *International Education Studies*, 7(3), 51-59.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (Myra Bergman Ramos, Trans.) New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (Myra Bergman Ramos, Trans.) New York: Bloomsbury Publishing. (Original work published 1970).
- Gandara, P., Losen, D., August, D., Uriarte, M., Gomez, M. C., & Hopkins, M. (2010). Forbidden language: A brief history of U.S. language policy. In P. Gandara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 20-33). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gandara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). Listening to teachers of English language learners: A survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs. *Policy Analysis for California Education*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED491701.pdf>
- Gandara, P., Rumberger, R., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Callahan, R. (2003). English learners in California schools: Unequal resources, unequal outcomes. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 11(36).

- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106-116.
- Gebhard, M., Willett, J., Jimenez, J., & Piedra, A. (2010). Systemic functional linguistics, teachers' professional development, and ELLs' academic literacy practices. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators* (pp. 91-110). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gere, A. R., Buehler, J., Dallavis, C., & Haviland, V. S. (2009). A visibility project: Learning to see how preservice teachers take up culturally responsive pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(3), 816-852.
- Gettier, E. (1963). Is justified true belief knowledge? *Analysis*, 23(6): 121-23.
doi:10.2307/3326922.
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Giroir, S., Grimaldo, L. R., Vaughn, S., & Roberts, G. (2015). Interactive read-alouds for English learners in the elementary grades. *Reading Teacher*, 68(8), 639-648.
doi:10.1002/trtr.1354.
- Goldenberg, B. M. (2014). White teachers in urban classrooms: embracing non-white students' cultural capital for better teaching and learning. *Urban Education*, 49(1), 111-144. doi:10.1177/0042085912472510.

- González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Goodman, K. S. (1989). Whole-language research: Foundations and development. *Elementary School Journal, 90*(2), 207-21.
- Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Greene, M. (1984). The art of being present: Educating for aesthetic encounters. *Journal of Education, 166*(2), 123-135.
- Greehow, C. and Robelia, B. (2009). Old communication, new literacies, social network sites as social learning resources. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication, 14*(4), 1130-1161.
- Grossman, P. (2011). Framework for teaching practice: A brief history of an idea. *Teachers College Record, 113*(12), 2836-2843.
- Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record, 111*(9), 2055-2100.
- Guðjónsdóttir, H., Cacciattolo, M., Dakich, E., Davies, A., Kelly, C., & Dalmau, M. C. (2007). Transformative pathways: Inclusive pedagogies in teacher education. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 40*(2), 165-182.
- Gupta, A. (2010). African-American English: Teacher beliefs, teacher needs and teacher preparation programs. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal, 10*(2), 152-164.

- Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 8(3), 381-391.
- Halliday, M. K. (1975). *Learning how to mean: Explorations in the development of language*. London, UK: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. K., Matthiessen, C. M., & Yang, X. (1999). *Construing experience through meaning: A language-based approach to cognition*. London: Cassell.
- Haviland, V. S., Gere, A. R., Buehler, J., & Dallavis, C. (2009). Making the journey toward cultural competence with poetry. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 11(1), 19-26.
- Haviland, W., Prins, H., Walrath, D., & McBride, B. (2012). *The essence of anthropology*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Healey, M. (2005). Linking research and teaching exploring disciplinary spaces and the role of inquiry-based learning. In Barnett, R (Ed). *Reshaping the university: New relationships between research, scholarship and teaching*. (pp. 67-78). McGraw Hill / Open University Press.
- Hedges, H. (2012). Teachers' funds of knowledge: A challenge to evidence-based practice. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 18(1), 7-24.
- Haneda, M., & Wells, G. (2012). Some key pedagogic principles for helping ELLs to succeed in school. *Theory into Practice*, 51(4), 297-304.
- Herron, C. (1997). *Nappy hair*. New York: Alfred A.Knopf.

- Hogg, L., & Yates, A. (2013). Walking the talk in initial teacher education: Making teacher educator modeling effective. *Studying Teacher Education: Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices*, 9(3), 311-328.
doi:10.1080/17425964.2013.831757
- Hollie, S. (2010). Getting your classroom environment in shape. Retrieved from <http://www.culturallyresponsive.org/resources/42-news/92-synopsis-of-clr-from-dr-hollie>
- Hollie, S. (2011). *Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and learning*. Huntington Beach, CA: Shell Education.
- Holloway-Libell, J., Amrein-Beardsley, A., & Collins, C. (2012). All hat & no cattle. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 65-68.
- Hsu, H. (2009). Preparing teachers to teach literacy in responsive ways that capitalize on students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds through weblog technology. *Multicultural Education and Technology Journal*, 3(3), 168-181.
- Improving America's School Act. (1994, October). P. L. 103-382; 108 Stat. 3518 (1994)
- Ingersoll, R., Merrill, L., & Stuckey, D. (2014). *Seven trends: The transformation of the teaching force* (CPRE Research Report # RR-80). Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Jimenez-Silva, M., & Olson, K. (2012). A community of practice in teacher education: Insights and perceptions. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 24(3), 335-348.

- Jimenez-Silva, M., Olson, K., & Hernandez, N. (2011). The confidence to teach English language learners: Exploring coursework's role in developing preservice teachers' efficacy. *Teacher Educator, 47*(1), 9-28.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1987). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning*. Prentice Hall.
- John-Steiner, V., & Mahn, H. (1996). Sociocultural approaches to learning and development: A Vygotskian framework. *Educational Psychologist, 31*(3-4), 191-206
- Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Krashen, S. (1997). The comprehension hypothesis: Recent evidence. *English Teachers' Journal (Israel), 5*(1), 17-29.
- Krashen, S. D. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition and use*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Krashen, S. (2008). Language education: Past, present and future. *RELC Journal, 39*(2), 178-187. doi:10.1177/0033688208092183
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491.
- Leander, K. M. (2002). Locating Latanya: The situated production of identity artifacts in classroom interaction. *Research in the Teaching English, 37*(2), 198-250.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). *Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy*. In J.A. Banks and C.A. McGee, (Eds.). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*, 2, 747-759
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: A.k.a. the remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 74-84.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2004). *A handbook for teacher research*. Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill International.
- Latham, R., Connors, M., Walter, J., & Eubank, G. (2009). *Starting points teaching English-language learners video training series [DVD]*. Teaching Strategies Inc.
- Lau v. Nichols*. (1974). 414 U.S. 563.
- LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (with Tesch, R.). (1993). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. *Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lindroth, J. T. (2015). Reflective journals: A review of the literature. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 34(1), 66-72.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Loos, E., Gonzalez, G. G., Cuartas, L., Miller, M., Abdo, R., & Bogart, S. (2014).

Current issues: History of the United States current legislative policy and English language learners. Retrieved from

<https://greensboro.edu/couch/uploads/file/history-of-the-united-states-legislative-policy-and-ell-handbook-corrected.pdf>

Lucas, T. (Ed.). (2011). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Lucas, T., & Grinberg, J. (2008). Responding to the linguistic reality of the mainstream classroom: Preparing all teachers to teach English language learner. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 606-636). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 361-373.
doi:0.1177/0022487108322110

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators* (pp. 55-72). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice, 52*(2), 989-109.
- Maalouf, A. (2001). *In the name of identity: Violence and the need to belong*. New York, NY: Arcade Publishing.
- Mapping Ignorance. (2014, February 2). Mandela was right: The foreign language effect. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/search?q=nelson+mandela+if+you+ speak+to+a+man&newwindow=1&biw=1524&bih=746&ei=hN0YV-iqDMPk-QGMw52oDA&start=0&sa=N>
- Manatowa-Bailey, J. (2007). On the brink. *Cultural Survival Quarterly, 31*(2), 12-16.
- Mantei, J., & Kervin, L. (2014). Interpreting the images in a picture book: Students make connections to themselves, their lives and experiences. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 13*(2), 76-92.
- Marley, C. (2011). *One love*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books LLC.
- Martins, M., Costa, J., & Onofre, M. (2015). Practicum experiences as sources of pre-service teachers' self-efficacy. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(2), 263-279.
- Marx, S. (2004). Regarding whiteness: Exploring and intervening in the effects of white racism in teacher education. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 37*(1), 31-43.
- McCarty, T. L., Romero, M. E., & Zepeda, O. (2006). Reclaiming the gift: Indigenous youth counter-narratives on native language loss and revitalization. *American Indian Quarterly, 30*(1/2), 28-48.

- McIntosh, P. (1992). White privilege and male privilege. In M. L. Andersen & P. H. Collins (Eds.), *Race, Class, and Gender* (pp. 70-81). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- McIntosh, P. (2015). Extending the knapsack: Using the white privilege analysis to examine conferred advantage and disadvantage. *Women & Therapy, 38*(3-4), 232-245. doi:10.1080/02703149.2015.1059195
- McLaughlin, D. S., & Barton, A. C. (2013). Preservice teachers' uptake and understanding of funds of knowledge in elementary science. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24*(1), 13-36.
- McNiff, J., Lomax, P., & Whitehead, J. (1996). *You and your action research project*. London: Routledge.
- Menken, K., & Solorza, C. (2014). No child left bilingual: Accountability and the elimination of bilingual education programs in New York City schools. *Educational Policy, 28*(1), 96-125.
- Menard-Warwick, J., & Palmer, D. (2012). Eight versions of the visit to "La Barranca": Critical discourse analysis of a study-abroad narrative from Mexico. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 39*(1), 121-138.
- Mercado, C. (2005). Reflections on the study of households in New York City and Long Island: A different route, a common destination. In N. Gonzalez, L. Moll, & C. Amanti (Eds.), *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*, (pp. 233-256). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education. revised and expanded*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. London: John Wiley.
- Moll, L. C. (1992). Bilingual classroom studies and community analysis: Some recent trends. *Educational Researcher*, 21(2), 20-24.
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132-141.
- Moll, L. C., & Greenberg, J. B. (1992). Creating zones of possibilities: Combining social contexts for instruction. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 319-348). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mora, J. K. (2009). From the ballot box to the classroom. *Educational Leadership*, 66(7), 14-19.
- Morrow, L. M. (2007). *Developing literacy in preschool*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Motha, S. (2006). Racializing ESOL teacher identities in U.S. K-12 public schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 495-518.
- Motha, S. (2014). *Race, empire, and English language teaching: Creating responsible and ethical anti-racist practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Murphy, C., & Martin, S. N. (2015). Coteaching in teacher education: Research and practice. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 277-280.
doi:10.1080/1359866X.2015.1060927
- Naqvi, R., McKeough, A., Thorne, K., & Pfitscher, C. (2013). Dual-language books as an emergent-literacy resource: Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and learning. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 13(4), 501-528.
- National Association of Educators of Young Children. (2012). *The Common Core State Standards: Caution and opportunity for early childhood education*. Retrieved from https://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/11_CommonCore_1_2A_rv2.pdf
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2011). *The growing number of English learner students*. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/9/growing_EL_0910.pdf
- National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). *The standard of excellence in teacher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncate.org/standards/tabid/107/default.aspx>
- National Education Association. (2011). *An NEA policy brief: Professional development for general education teachers of English language learners*. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/PB32_ELL11.pdf
- National Park Service, Independence National Historical Park Archives. (2014). *Historic resource study collection*. Retrieved from <http://www.nps.gov/inde/index.htm>

- Neuman, S. B., & Kamil, M. L. (Eds.). (2010). *Preparing teachers for the early childhood classroom: Proven models and key principles*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- Neuman, S. B., & Roskos, K. (1993). Access to print for children of poverty: Differential effects of adult mediation and literacy-enriched play settings on environmental and functional print tasks. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30(1), 95-122.
- New Jersey Department of Education. (2014). New Jersey home language usage. Retrieved from <http://www.state.nj.us/education/bilingual/policy/>
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002).
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. New York, NY: Pearson Educational.
- Norton, B. (2006). Identity as a sociocultural construct in second language research. In K. Cadman & K. O'Regan (Eds.), *Tales out of school identity and English language teaching* (pp. 22-33). Adelaide, Australia.: Australian Council of TESOL Associations.
- Ogbu, J. (1978). *Minority education and caste*. (Vol. 581). New York: Academic Press.
- Olson, K., & Jimenez-Silva, M. (2008). The campfire effect: A preliminary analysis of preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching English language learners after state-mandated endorsement courses. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 22(3), 246-260.

- Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and using reflective journals in the qualitative research process. *Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 695-705. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/sss/QR/QR13-4/ortlipp.pdf>
- Palmer, P. J. (2010). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Pass, C., & Mantero, M. (2009). (Un)covering the ideal: Investigating exemplary language arts teachers' beliefs and instruction of English language learners. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 6*(4), 269-291.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. London: Sage.
- Patton, M.Q. (2014). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory into practice* (4th Ed.). London: Sage.
- Pendergast, M., May, L., Bingham, G., & Kurumada, K. S. (2015). Acquiring responsive practices: Preservice teachers learn to conduct interactive read-alouds. *Action in Teacher Education, 37*(1), 65-81.
- Pfister, M. (1999). *Rainbow fish*. New York: North-South Books.
- Piaget, J. (1983). Piaget's theory, In P. Mussen (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (4thEd, Vol.1). *New York: Wiley*.
- Pritchard, D., & Turri, J. (2014).The value of knowledge. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/knowledge-value/#Bib>

Pritchard, D. (2013). *What is this thing called knowledge?* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Pritchard, Duncan (2007, April). Recent work on epistemic value. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 44(2), 85-110.

Prochaska, J. O., Norcross, J. C., & DiClemente, C. C. (1995). *Changing for good*. New York, NY: Avon Books.

Proposition 203. (2000). Arizona Department of Education. Retrieved from www.ade.state.az.us/oelas/PROPOSITION203.pdf

Proposition 227. (1998). California's English Language in Public Schools Initiative Statute, California Law. Retrieved from <http://vigarchive.sos.ca.gov/1998/primary/propositions/227text.htm>

Pole, C. (Ed.). (2005). *SAGE Benchmarks in Social Research Methods: Fieldwork* (Vols. 1-4). London: Sage. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446261637>

Question 2. (2002). Massachusetts English in Public Schools Initiative. Retrieved from <https://www.sec.state.ma.us/ele/elepdf/ifv02.pdf>

Race to the Top Act. (2011). Retrieved from <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/112/hr1532>

Rao, S. M., Newlin-Haus, E., & Ehrhardt, K. (2016). Repeated interactive read-aloud: Enhancing literacy using story props. *Childhood Education*, 92(3), 226-235.

Ravitch, D. (2016, March 16). John Thompson: The utter failure of standardized teacher evaluation. [Weblog comment]. Retrieved from <http://dianeravitch.net/category/race-to-the-top/>

- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, J. (2015, February 14). *What that Cruz-Rubio 'He doesn't speak Spanish' thing was about*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/02/14/what-that-cruz-rubio-he-doesnt-speak-spanish-thing-was-about/>
- Rowe, D., & Fain, J. G. (2013). The family backpack project: Responding to dual-language texts through family journals. *Language Arts*, 90(6), 402-416.
- Rowsell, J., & Abrams, S. S. (2011). (Re)conceptualizing I/identity: an introduction. *National Society for the Study of Education*. 110 (1), 1-16.
- Safford, K., & Kelly, A. (2010). Linguistic capital of trainee teachers: knowledge worth having? *Language & Education: An International Journal*, 24(5), 401-414.
doi:10.1080/09500781003695567
- Saldaña, J. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London, UK: Sage.
- Sandoval-Taylor, P. (2005). Home is where the heart is: A funds of knowledge-based curriculum module. In N. Gonzalez, L. Moll, & C. Amanti (Eds.), *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*, (pp.153-167). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sassi, K., & Thomas, E. E. (2008). Walking the talk: Examining privilege and race in a ninth-grade classroom. *English Journal*, 97(6), 25-31.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistic perspective*. Mahway, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum.

- Scott, S., & Palincsar, A. (2009). Sociocultural theory. *Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.education.com/reference/article/sociocultural-theory/>
- Segall, A., & Garrett, J. (2013). White teachers talking race. *Teaching Education*, 24(3), 265-291.
- Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). *A pedagogy for liberation: Dialogues on transforming education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Siefert, B., Salas, S., & D'amico, M. M. (2015). "I understand the struggle:" Leveraging the lived experiences of African American teachers in TESOL. *TESOL Journal*, 6(4), 731-750.
- Singh, G., & Richards, J. C. (2006). Teaching and learning in the language teacher education course room: A critical sociocultural perspective. *RELC Journal*, 37(2), 149-175. doi:10.1177/0033688206067
- Slavin, R. E., & Cheung, A. (2005). A synthesis of research on language of reading instruction for English language learners. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(2), 247-284. doi:10.3102/00346543075002247
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 94-106.

- Sleeter, C. E. (2016). Wrestling with problematics of whiteness in teacher education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 29(8), 1065-1068.
doi:10.1080/09518398.2016.1174904
- Sowa, P. A. (2009). Understanding our learners and developing reflective practice: Conducting action research with English language learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 25(8), 1026-1032.
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stauffer, R. G. (1970). *The language-experience approach to the teaching of reading*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(3), 224-237.
- Stein, M. K., & Wang, M. C. (1988). Teacher development and school improvement: The process of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4(2), 171-187.
- Sugarman, S. (2010). Seeing past the fences: Finding funds of knowledge for ethical teaching. *New Educator*, 6(2), 96-117.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds). *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(6), 944-956.
- Tudge, J., & Scrimsher, S. (2003). Lev S. Vygotsky on education: A cultural-historical, interpersonal, and individual approach to development. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Educational psychology: A century of contributions* (pp. 207–228). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2002). No Child Left Behind. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2010). Race to the Top. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-assessment/index.html>.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2011). Our future, our teachers: The Obama administration's plan for teacher education reform and improvement. Retrieved from <https://www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/our-future-our-teachers.pdf>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). Language usage in the United States. 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/topics/population/language-use.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2013). Language usage in the United States. 2011. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/acs-22.pdf>
- Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Valdés, G., Bunch, G., Snow, C., Lee, C., & Matos, L. (2005). Enhancing the development of students' language(s). In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 126-168). San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass.
- Valdes, G., & Castellon, M. (2011). English language learners in American schools: Characteristics and challenges. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators* (pp. 18-34). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of teacher education*, 53(1), 20-32.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2007). The culturally responsive teacher. *Educational Leadership*, 64(6), 28-33.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2011). Preparing classroom teachers for English language learners: The policy context. In T. Lucas (Ed.), *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators* (pp. 35-52). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Virtue, D. C. (2009). Using "ESOL Rounds" to prepare middle level candidates for work with English language learners. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, 4(1), 1-24.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1997). Genesis of higher mental functions. In R. W. Rieber (Ed.) *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky, Vol. 4: The history of the development of higher mental functions* (pp. 97-122). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Wang, Z., Arndt, A. D., Singh, S. N., & Biernat, M. (2015). Linguistic stereotyping in call centers. In *Proceedings of the 2008 Academy of Marketing Science (AMS) Annual Conference* (pp. 71-75). New York City: Springer International Publishing.
- Washburn, G. N. (2008). Alone, confused, and frustrated: Developing empathy and strategies for working with English language learners. *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 81(6), 247-250.
- Wertsch J. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wiley, T. G. (2014). Diversity, super-diversity, and monolingual language ideology in the United States: Tolerance or intolerance? *Review of Research in Education*, 38(1), 1-32.
- Williams, R. (2016). Seeing whiteness. *Christian Century*, 133(15), 22-25.
- Wright, W. E. (2010). *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy, and practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college-and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 89-99.

Zhang, S., & Stephens, V. (2013). Learning to teach English language learners in mainstreamed secondary classrooms. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 26(1), 9-116.

Appendix A: Interview Protocols

Teacher Interview One Questions (June 2015)

Thank you for volunteering for my study. As you know I am planning to study how teachers such as yourself “take-up” linguistically responsive teaching after participating in the Summer institute. Today, I want to get a sense of who you are and how you came to be a part of the institute. If you are uncertain about answering any question, just let me know.

3. I would like to get to know you better. Can you tell me a little bit about yourself?
Prompt for...
 - Years of teaching
 - Grades taught
 - Grade currently teaching
 - Check to see if he/she speaks another language other than English
4. (If he/she speaks another language ask...)Tell me about your experience as a student who spoke another language at home.
 - Prompt about what teachers did to help him/her
 - Prompt about peer relationships

OR

As a student were you in class with students who would be considered English Language Learners? Tell me about your experiences as a student in class with ELL.

- Prompt how teacher worked with ELL students.
 - Prompt about his/her relationship with ELL students
5. What drew you to enroll in the institute?
 - Prompt to get a sense of where he/she is currently “at” in terms of teaching ELLs
 6. Tell me about the students in your class this year.
 - Prompt: For those who are considered “English Language Learners” what are their home languages?
 7. Tell me a little bit about teaching the ELLs you have.
 - Prompt for benefits and challenges
 - Can you give me an example of a recent lesson that you feel was successful for your ELLs?
 8. Offer vignette.

Teacher Interview Two (August 2015)

Introduce the interview: Your summer institute experience is over, so today we are going to see how it is all settling in with you as you prepare for the next school year. As always if you are not comfortable with any question, let me know. This is strictly voluntary. Thank you.

1. What did you think of the summer institute?

Would you recommend it to your peers? Why? Why Not?

Do you have any new insights about teaching ELLs?

2. What do you see yourself taking up and using in relation to teaching your ELLs in the future?
 - Prompt explicitly for linguistically responsive behaviors, orientations, and knowledge that were addressed in the summer institute
3. Are you getting ready for your new class? How many ELLs will you have?
 - Tell me about specific ways you are planning for your ELLs this year?
4. Thinking back to the Summer institute, are you going to try anything new?
 - How are you feeling about such a decision?
5. Thinking about the year ahead, what are you excited about in terms of teacher your ELL students?
 - What concerns you?
6. Anything else you want to share at this time?
7. Finally, what do you hope to get out of this institute?
8. Anything else you would like me to know at this time?

Interview 3 (October) and 4 (November)

At this point you have had some mentor observations (approximately 2 in October and 3 in November). You have also had the chance to participate in on-line chats. As always if you are not comfortable with any question, let me know. This is strictly voluntary. Thank you.

1. What have you taken up in terms of being a linguistically responsive teacher?

What are you doing?

What are you saying?

How has your teaching changed at all?
2. What are you finding out about what you have learned and included in your classroom?
 - Are the changes working?
3. Give me an example about a decision you made since the start of the school year about one of your ELLs that you feel is an example of something you have taken up from your summer institute experience.
4. Tell me about your experiences with linguistically responsive teaching.
 - Prompt for positive and negative experiences.
 - Prompt for specific examples of linguistically responsive teaching.
5. What would you like the director of the summer institute to know good/bad about where you are right now?
6. What's next for you and your students?
7. A second vignette will be presented at this time. The vignette will be developed after observing the summer institute. The purpose of the vignette will be to give the teachers a chance to talk about the linguistically responsive teaching, or lack thereof, documented in the vignette.
8. What else would you like me to know at this time?

Director Interview 1 (June 2015)

As you know I am interested in finding out what teachers participating in your institute take-up regarding linguistic responsive teaching. By looking at take-up I am allowing for a realistic look at how individuals assimilate are there is to understand. This is not an evaluative study at all. As I watch and observe the institute in action, I will pay careful attention to the opportunities you present and prepare for the teachers to take part in. Today, I want to find out more about you, your background and how you came to develop the institute. As always if you are not comfortable with any question, let me know. This is strictly voluntary. Thank you.

1. Tell me a little bit about yourself.
 - Prompt to find out if she speaks another language.
 - Where she grew up
 - What her schooling was like
 - Educational background
 - Professional background
2. Why did you create the summer institute?
 - Prompt to find out why an explicit focus on cultural competence and teaching ELLs
3. What learning opportunities for teachers did include specific to teaching ELLs?
 - Prompt to find out specifics about each
 - Prompt to find out about her rationale for each
4. How do you feel teachers have taken-up linguistically responsive teaching in the past after participating in the institute?
 - Prompt for concrete examples
5. I read your reports and was interested in learning more about your concept of “blind spots.”
 - Tell me about the blind spots you have documented in the past?
 - Any thoughts about why they persist?
6. Thinking about successes and blind spots, what changes have you made to this year’s institute? Why?
7. Specific to this year’s group of teachers, do you have any special plans?

8. Is there anything else you would like me to know about you or about the summer institute?

Director Interview 2 (August 2015)

Now that the summer institute is over, I would like to get a sense for how you feel it went. As always if you are not comfortable with any question, let me know. This is strictly voluntary. Thank you.

1. What is your initial reaction to this year's summer institute?
 - How did it go compared to other years?
 - Prompt about positive feelings/negative feelings
2. Let's talk about the learning opportunities you think impacted the participating teachers and why.
 - Prompt for specific opportunities that addressed linguistically responsive teaching
3. Based on spending 3 intensive days with all of the participants, what are your hopes for them in terms of what they take-up for the learning opportunities you engaged them in?
 - Prompt for specifics about the teacher-participants
 - Prompt for individual hopes/goals for the teacher-participants
4. Do you think you were able to address blind spots?
 - Prompt to find out why or why not?
5. Is there anything else you would have done differently?
 - Prompt to find out why or why not?
6. What else would you like me to know?

Appendix B: Interview Vignette

Vignette

Prompt: Read this short description of a preschool lesson last spring and tell me your thoughts about what the teacher did with regard to the student named Rosa. You should know that Rosa is a 4 year old Hispanic girl who enrolled mid-year (January) in the school Mrs. Donnelly teaches at. The school is in a suburban area. Most of the students are white, middle class. Mrs. Donnelly has been teaching in this same school for 15 years. She is Irish-American and monolingual.

Mrs. Donnelly turned off the classical music playing in the classroom and asked the students to clean up snack and sit on the carpet for story-time. The students, nineteen four-year olds, hustled about and found their pre-assigned spots designated by colored rectangles on the rug by the rocking chair. Rosa was the last to sit. At first she sat at the back of the group, but Mrs. Donnelly gently reminded her to find her correct spot. Rosa slowly found her way to the front of the group and sat down. Mrs. Donnelly eased back into the rocking chair and introduced the book, A Great Day for Up. Immediately the students jumped up to their feet as if they had done this before. Rosa remained sitting until Mrs. Donnelly happily told her “It’s A Great Day for Up, so get up on your feet.” Rosa bounced up with the kids. As the story began and continued, the students acted out the story and bounced around on their particular carpet rectangle. Rosa was a few beats behind the group. When done, the teacher asked the students to sit and share what they feel like doing on a great big beautiful sunny day. The students all called out ideas as Mrs. Donnelly wrote them on the chart. Some included “go bike riding”, “walk the dog”, “go to the beach”. Once all the kids answered Mrs. Donnelly called on Rosa who sat looking at her shoes most of the time. Rosa asked her to repeat the question. Mrs. Donnelly sighed and said, “What do you do on a sunny day?” Rosa

said that she collects the eggs. Mrs. Donnelly chuckled as she wrote it down. Some of the kids responded by saying “It’s not Easter! It’s just sunny.” As several students laughed, Rosa’s face flushed, but nothing more was said about her answer. After she was done writing Mrs. Donnelly thanked everyone for their answers and announced that they were going to enjoy the sunshine out on the playground. All but Rosa jumped up and scurried to their desks. Mrs. Donnelly nudged Rosa along with her hand. Rosa, looking quite serious, made it back to her desk and sat with her hands folded and her eyes watchful. When she saw kids pulling toys out of their desks and grabbing their jackets, Rosa buttoned her sweater and lined up to go outside. Once on the playground Rosa ran for the swings and joyfully swung for the entire playtime. While outside Mrs. Donnelly expressed concern to her aide about Rosa “I am just not sure this is a good fit.”

Prompt for information specific to Mrs. Donnelly’s behaviors or lack thereof.

