

Pepperdine University
Graduate School of Education and Psychology

DUAL LANGUAGE LEARNERS IN HEAD START: EXAMINING TEACHING
STRATEGIES THAT PROMOTE ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education in Leadership, Administration and Policy

by

Dawn Hendricks

November, 2014

Linda Purrington Ed.D - Dissertation Chairperson

UMI Number: 3645918

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3645918

Published by ProQuest LLC (2014). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

This dissertation, written by

Dawn Hendricks

under the guidance of a Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Doctoral committee:

Linda Purrington, Ed.D., Chairperson

Carol Matera, Ph.D.

Molly McCabe, Ed.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
VITA	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
Chapter One: The Problem	1
Background of Study	1
Problem Statement	4
Purpose Statement	4
Importance of Study	5
Definition of Terms	6
Theoretical Framework	8
Research Questions	10
Limitations	10
Delimitations	11
Assumptions	12
Organization of Study	12
Chapter Two: Review of Relevant Literature	13
Theoretical Framework	14
Historical Context	17
Bilingual Education Act	17
Lau v. Nichols	18
History of Head Start	18

Landmark Reports and Studies	21
Stages of Early Childhood Second Language Acquisition	22
Types of Programs Serving Dual Language Learners	24
Receptive Language Development for Dual Language Learners	26
Expressive Language Development for Dual Language Learners	28
Teaching Strategies	29
Planned Language Approach	31
Home Language Support	33
Social Environment.....	36
Visual Cues	37
Vocabulary Instruction.....	38
Storybook reading.....	41
Culturally Responsive Curriculum	43
Professional Development	46
Teachers' Attitudes and Beliefs	49
Summary	51
 Chapter Three: Methodology and Procedures	 55
Research Questions.....	55
Research Design.....	56
Setting.....	56
Population, Sample and Sampling Procedures	58
Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System	59
Human Subjects Considerations	60
Instrumentation	62
Interview Instrument.....	63
Classroom Observation Instrument.....	63
Artifact Review Instrument.....	66
Data Collection and Data Management Procedures	66
Interviews.....	66
Observations	67
Artifacts.....	68
Data Analysis and Reporting	70
Design Credibility.....	72
Positionality	72
 Chapter Four: Results	 74
Research Questions	74
Research Design	75
Findings	79
Research Question One.....	80
Research Question Two	90
Research Question Three	102

Summary of Key Findings	104
Chapter Five: Discussion	106
Discussion of Key Findings	108
Research Question One	108
Research Question Two	110
Research Question Three	113
Conclusions	115
Home Language	115
Visual Cues	116
Culturally Responsive Curriculum	116
Supportive Social/Emotional Environment	117
Quality of Teachers' Talk	117
Songs with Gestures	118
Professional Development	118
Recommendations for Policy and Practice	119
Required College Coursework	119
Recruitment of Bilingual Teaching Staff	120
Develop and Implement Planned Language Approach Program-wide	121
Provide Pre-service and/or In-service Training on Working with Dual Language Learners for All Teaching Staff	122
Plan for Individual and Small Group Read Alouds in English and the Home Language	123
Recommendations for Future Research	123
Summary	126
REFERENCES	129
APPENDIX A: Consent for Classroom Research	142
APPENDIX B: Informed Consent for Classroom Research: Assistant Teachers	144
APPENDIX C: Informed Consent for Classroom Research: Children	146
APPENDIX D: Forma de Autorización para Los Niños	148
APPENDIX E: Interview Protocol	149
APPENDIX F: Interview Questions Categorized by Themes	151
APPENDIX G: Interview Questions Aligned with Research Questions	152
APPENDIX H: Observation Notes Instrument	155
APPENDIX I: Artifact Review Instrument	156

APPENDIX J: Classroom Assessment of Support for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition
(CASEBA) Preschool Classroom Observation Rating statistics157

APPENDIX K: IRB approval159

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Student Demographics.....	57
Table 2. Participants' Demographics.....	59
Table 3. Data Collection Strategies	68
Table 4. Preschool Classroom Activities Observed in all Six Classrooms.....	76
Table 5. Overview of Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition (CASEBA) Observation Items.....	77
Table 6. How Teachers Support Home Language Development	80
Table 7. Language Demographics of Teaching Staff	82
Table 8. How Teachers Promote Receptive English Language Development	83
Table 9. Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition (CASEBA) Preschool Observation Statistics for Items Relating to RQ1	84
Table 10. How Teachers Introduce and Reinforce Vocabulary Development	91
Table 11. How Teachers Encourage Expressive English Language Development	93
Table 12. CASEBA Preschool Observation Statistics for Items Related to RQ2	94
Table 13. Examples of Vocabulary Words Introduced and Used During the Observations	96

DEDICATION

To my daughters, Della and Soluna, for so patiently and lovingly sharing me with my doctoral studies and dissertation work for the past three years. I hope that by watching me accomplish a dream of mine, you are inspired to dream your own big dreams and make them come true.

To John, your love, support, and encouragement were unwavering. Thank you for believing in me and in us.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The culmination of this incredible journey would not have been possible without the support and guidance of my dissertation committee members, Pepperdine professors, and Divine C-9 cohort members. Dr. Purrington, your passion, responsiveness and keen eye to detail are unparalleled. Thank you for being an inspirational leader and mentor for me these past three years. You are a stellar model of transformational and servant leadership. Dr. McCabe, you are living proof that there is indeed life after the dissertation. Your humor and ability to explain complicated processes in understandable terms is so valuable. Dr. Matera, you consistently demonstrate your passion for working with preschool dual language learners and Head Start. Your willingness to share your time and expertise with me is appreciated. To my dear C-9 colleagues, what a wonderful journey we have had together. I learned so much from each of you and leave this program knowing that life-long friendships have been formed.

There are strong women in my family who deserve acknowledgement in helping me accomplish this milestone. My mother, Beverly, has been a constant example that you are never too old to achieve your dreams. Thank you, Mom, for instilling and modeling a love of learning and adventure. My sister, Debra, has been a model of compassion and nurturing for my children and me during these last few years. Thank you for being such a caregiver. My niece, Alta, likewise, deserves acknowledgement for so willingly taking care of my daughters, often at a moment's notice, when I needed to write, work or commute to Pepperdine. My grandmother, Alta, has consistently led by example by being an independent, determined woman and a model of how to balance work and family.

My brother, Eric, has supported me and encouraged me to pursue my dream of earning a doctorate. He set the bar high and motivated me to do the same.

This work would not have been possible without the six teachers who graciously spoke with me at length and allowed me into their classrooms to observe and learn from them. I am grateful for their willingness to participate and share their knowledge, skills and experiences.

For all of the colleagues, children and families I have had the privilege of working with, learning from and dreaming with over the years as my passion for social justice and education has grown, I thank you.

VITA

ACADEMIC PREPARATION

Portland State University, Portland, OR Master of Arts in Curriculum and Instruction	2000
Portland State University, Portland, OR Bachelor of Arts in Child and Family Studies	1996
Lower Columbia College Associate of Arts	1995

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Clackamas Community College, Oregon City, OR Instructor, Early Childhood Education & Family Studies	2012-present
Teaching Strategies, LLC Director, Head Start Markets	2011- 2012
Teaching Strategies, LLC Director, Diverse Populations Content Development	2009-2011
Dawn Terrill Consulting Consultant/Trainer	2004-present
Oregon Child Development Coalition Associate Director, Early Childhood Services	2003-2005
Oregon Child Development Coalition Education Specialist	2000-2003
Oregon Child Development Coalition Children's Services Program Manager	1998-2000
Portland Community College Adjunct faculty, Early Childhood Education	2001-2008
Oregon Center for Career Development in Childhood Care and Education Interim Coordinator, Professional Development Registry	2000

ABSTRACT

There were dual purposes of this exploratory, case study. The first purpose was to investigate and describe the teaching strategies of six Head Start teachers within one program in Oregon whose dual language learners had shown gains of at least three levels in receptive and expressive English language development, as determined by their assessment ratings in Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System. The second purpose was to identify what, if any, professional development strategies and resources have been beneficial to those teachers in promoting English language development for children who are dual language learners.

This qualitative study utilized three data collection methods: interviews, observations and review of artifacts. The one-on-one interviews with the purposive sample of teachers occurred during the first phase. The interview questions were designed to learn about teaching strategies utilized by Head Start teachers to promote English language development for children who are dual language learners as well as teachers' relevant professional development resources and opportunities. During the second phase of the study, the *Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition* (CASEBA) instrument was used to conduct classroom observations in each of the six teachers' classrooms. Furthermore, a review of relevant artifacts was conducted during the observations.

Seven conclusions emerged from the study. First, home language support in the classrooms contributed to English language development. Second, teachers' use of pictures, gestures and other visual cues promoted children's comprehension of English. Third, culturally responsive curriculum was not necessary for promoting enhanced language outcomes. Fourth, a supportive social/emotional environment in the classroom contributed to progress in expressive language development. Next, singing songs with gestures and high quality teachers' talk in

English also contributed to expressive language development. Lastly, professional development, formal and informal, is beneficial and needed for preschool teachers.

Five recommendations emerged from the study. Policy recommendations are for college teacher preparation programs to require coursework pertaining to dual language learning and for programs to actively recruit bilingual teachers. Practice recommendations are for programs to implement a Planned Language Approach, set up peer mentoring and training opportunities, and for teachers to plan individual and small group read alouds.

Chapter One: The Problem

Background of the Study

Head Start, the federally funded preschool program created in 1965, provides comprehensive quality educational services specifically targeted to three to five year old children who are deemed at-risk of facing academic challenges. The at-risk designation includes children who come from homes where a language other than English is spoken, due to the increased likelihood of challenges these children face in school when they are not yet academically proficient in English (Fry, 2007). In the last 10 years, the focus on educating children who are dual language learners (DLLs) has intensified as the percentage of children in Head Start programs meeting this designation now surpasses 30% (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008). In a recent report to Congress commissioned by the Administration for Children and Families (2010), it was noted that while children who are dual language learners in Head Start do progress in their receptive English language development, the majority still begin and end the school year with receptive English vocabularies significantly below national norms for their age. The disparity is even greater when looking at expressive English language development.

In an effort to improve outcomes, and specifically language and literacy development, for children who are dual language learners (DLL), the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007 mandated that programs must actively and intentionally develop children's receptive and expressive English language skills for children who are dual language learners (Public Law 110-134, 2007). Accordingly, this federal legislation further mandates that Head Start programs assess, support, and document DLL children's progress in meeting these English language development goals. Yet, the resources and knowledge base regarding how to

effectively promote English language development for preschool aged dual language learners has not been solidly established nor agreed upon.

This challenge associated with promoting children's language development is even more heightened now as Head Start programs could be in jeopardy of losing their grant funding if they do not comply with the federal mandates (Public Law 110-134, 2007). Traditionally, each of the more than 1,600 Head Start grantees receives their funding from the Administration for Children and Families. Unless there is a serious grievous issue of non-compliance with the program standards that emerged during the triennial review, grantees continue to receive their funding without re-applying or competing with other potential organizations. However, the recent legislation requires grantees to re-compete for their grant if any key areas are found to be out of compliance with the new law. Compliance with the federal mandate logically requires that administrators and teachers know and implement what the research foundation indicates are best practices for promoting receptive and expressive English acquisition for preschool aged children who are dual language learners. However, because this nascent area of research for dual language acquisition is emerging for this particular age group, Head Start administrators and staff are often left to determine for themselves which factors positively influence classroom interactions and ultimately, English language development.

The question of how to comply with the law has been left up to each Head Start grantee to determine. However, there is no clear formula for grantees to follow, as there is little conclusive evidence about the teacher/child interactions that effectively promote English language development and home language development for young children who are dual language learners (August, 2013). Garcia and Frede (2010), Espinosa (2010b) and Krashen and McField (2005) assert that some level of home language support aids acquisition of English.

However, studies regarding which additional language promotion strategies contribute to receptive and expressive English language development are minimal and do not provide conclusive guidance (Espinosa, 2010b; Garcia & Frede, 2010). Moreover, most research studies on promoting English language development for DLLs have focused primarily on elementary aged children (California State Advisory Council of Early Learning and Care, 2013; Genessee, 2010). While some of the strategies used in elementary grades may also be applicable for preschool aged children, there are distinct differences. Elementary aged DLLs will likely already have a more established foundation in the home language upon which to build a second language (Espinosa, 2010b). Furthermore, while subject area content is more often compartmentalized in the elementary grades, the curriculum in preschool is more integrated and should focus on the whole child's development.

Compounding the absence of studies and inconclusive guidance related to DLL language development is the concern that early childhood teacher preparation programs have not evolved to reflect the children and families served in today's early childhood programs. Less than 20% of faculty in teacher preparation programs in institutions of higher education are identified as having an ethnic background other than white (Freedson, 2010). Consequently, the teacher educators themselves often lack the knowledge, skills and experience to adequately prepare early childhood classroom staff to work with culturally and linguistically diverse children and families. Subsequently, less than 30% of early childhood teacher education programs in two and four-year colleges have coursework specifically pertaining to working with children who are dual language learners. As a result, early childhood teachers are often left to decide for themselves which instructional methods to use and how to best promote English language acquisition for children that are dual language learners.

Problem Statement

The Head Start population is more culturally and linguistically diverse than ever before. Curriculum and strategies that may have worked well at one time are not necessarily deemed to be culturally responsive and effective now in meeting the needs of children who are dual language learners. Dual language learners whose language needs are not met are potentially destined to start behind in kindergarten and continue to fall behind academically. The Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007 that addresses program accountability is intended to close the gap by setting laudable goals for Head Start grantees to achieve in supporting English language development for children who are dual language learners.

However, it is not clear how grantees are to successfully accomplish the task. There is little research focused on Head Start programs exclusively about which teaching practices have been shown to be effective in promoting receptive and expressive English language development for DLLs. When looking at the Pacific Northwest specifically, the researcher has been unable to locate any studies conducted on DLLs in Head Start programs in this area. Furthermore, the studies that have been conducted on DLLs in Head Start in other geographical regions were all undertaken prior to the new legislation for Head Start that finally took effect in 2012. Therefore, a need exists to explore and describe the teaching strategies that effectively promote receptive and expressive English language development in children who are dual language learners in Head Start. An opportunity exists to conduct research of this nature in a metropolitan area in Oregon.

Purpose Statement

There were dual purposes of this exploratory case study. The first purpose was to investigate and describe the teaching strategies of six Head Start teachers within one program in

a metropolitan area in Oregon whose dual language learners had shown gains of at least three levels in receptive and expressive English language acquisition, as determined by their assessment ratings in Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System. The second purpose was to identify what, if any, professional development strategies and resources have been beneficial to those teachers in promoting English language development for children who are dual language learners.

This study utilized an original qualitative instrument to interview Head Start teachers regarding their classroom practices and recommendations related to professional development and an adopted quantitative observation tool for the purposes of conducting classroom observations and triangulating with teacher self-reported responses.

Importance of Study

Early childhood programs will continue to experience an increase in the number of children who are dual language learners as our nation further evolves into a culturally and linguistically diverse society. Unfortunately, the majority of early childhood teacher preparation programs do not include coursework specifically focused on working with culturally and linguistically diverse children (Maxwell, Lim, & Early, 2006). Knowing how to most effectively educate the children during the preschool years will be of critical importance since the disparities in the achievement gap that exist upon kindergarten entry continues to increase (Fry, 2007).

Knowledge of research-based teaching strategies that are effective in promoting English language development may benefit teacher preparation programs, teacher trainers, early childhood program administrators and others who are tasked with providing professional development to preschool teachers. Head Start teachers may benefit from being able to focus on and implement the identified effective strategies. Ultimately, the children in Head Start who are

dual language learners may benefit as they gain the needed receptive and expressive English language development skills to be successful in school. The outcomes of this study may be utilized to plan appropriate, effective pre-service and in-service activities for Head Start programs.

Sanders and Downer (2012) assert that it is not yet clear how, if at all, teacher education or training affects the level of diversity practices in the classroom. This study may potentially contribute to the small but growing body of research about how to best prepare preschool teachers, and specifically Head Start teachers, to promote English language development for children who are dual language learners.

Definition of Terms

Developmentally appropriate practice: Developmentally appropriate practice (DAP) is also frequently called best practices. There are three tenets of developmentally appropriate practice: age-appropriate educational practices and expectations; child appropriate educational practices and expectations; and culturally and linguistically appropriate educational practices and expectations (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009).

Dual language learners: Children who are dual language-learners

are learning two (or more) languages at the same time, as well as those learning a second language while continuing to develop their first (or home) language. The term dual language learners encompasses other terms frequently used, such as Limited English Proficient (LEP), bilingual, English language learners (ELL), English learners (EL), and children who speak a language other than English (LOTE) (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008, p. 8).

Early childhood education: Early childhood education refers to the care and education of children from birth-age 8 (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009).

English language development: English language development (ELD) is also referred to as English language acquisition (ELA) and second language acquisition (SLA). It refers to the process of a person learning English after the primary language has been established (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008). For the purposes of this study, the term English language development will be primarily utilized.

Expressive language development: This refers to the communicative skill of speaking and expressing oneself verbally (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008).

Head Start: Head Start is the federally funded preschool program, which began in 1965 as part of President Johnson's War on Poverty. There are currently over 1,600 Head Start grantees that serve more than 1 million children (Early Childhood Learning and Knowledge Center, 2013).

Home language: Home language refers to the language(s) that children speak at home with their families (Tabors, 2008). This is also referred to as primary language and family language.

Language outcomes: In early childhood education, the term child outcomes refer to the development and learning that occurs across the domains of development. Given the complexity of accurately assessing young children's development, skills and learning, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (2005) recommends that early childhood educators primarily utilize observational tools that gather data from multiple sources of what children know and can do in a natural context. Language outcomes are inclusive of receptive language development, comprehension, expressive language development, grammar and syntax (Espinosa, 2010b).

Performance Standards: Head Start grantees must comply with the Head Start Program Performance Standards. These standards are part of the Federal Register and outline the requirements that grantees must follow in all areas of program operations, including curriculum and assessment practices in the classroom (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008).

Preschool: Preschool refers to a school setting designed to care for and educate children from three years old-five years old who have not yet started kindergarten (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009).

Preservice: Preservice refers to the professional development activities that are offered to teachers, typically at the beginning of a new school year, to provide them with the knowledge and skills to help them effectively do their job (Freedson, 2010).

Receptive language development: This refers to the passive ability to understand oral communication. Receptive language development includes the ability to comprehend and follow directions (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008). It does not require verbal response. Receptive language for children typically begins to develop prior to expressive language.

Teaching strategies: Teaching strategies refers to the interactions, planned and unplanned, facilitated by the teacher to promote children's development and learning (Pianta et al., 2005). The term teaching practices is sometimes also used interchangeably with strategies.

Theoretical Framework

As the topic of preschool aged children who are dual language learners is a relatively new and emerging area of research, there is not yet a widely agreed upon theoretical framework (Beller, 2008; Center for Early Care and Education Research- Dual Language Learners [CECER-

DLL] 2011). Accordingly, rather than viewing this study through a single lens which is inadequate to allow thorough examination of all of the variables, a multi-theoretical framework, combining socio-cultural theory and social-interactionist theory, is utilized.

Vygotsky's (1986) socio-cultural theory posits that children learn through interacting with those around them. Those interactions are more important for facilitating the acquisition of knowledge than is the content of the knowledge itself. Vygotsky asserted that the development of cognitive functioning occurred as a result of contextual social interactions with others. Furthermore, as facilitators of children's learning in the classroom, the teachers have a greater impact on children's language acquisition than does a specific curriculum or set of learning materials (Downer et al., 2011). Socio-cultural theory places critical importance on the interplay between language and thought, asserting that they are independent schema at birth, but at the age of two, the two processes begin to intertwine and are heavily influenced by social interactions and cultural context (Vygotsky, 1986).

Bruner (1978) further elaborated on the social-cultural theory and postulated that learning language cannot be attributed solely to the nativist theory, proposed by Chomsky (1965), nor to the behaviorist theory championed by Skinner (1957). Chomsky (1965) postulated that language acquisition is innate and that humans possess a Language Acquisition Device (LAD) that facilitates language learning. In contrast, Skinner applied his behavioristic theory to language and posited that language learning is not innate but rather learned from both positive and negative responses received when attempts at language are made. Consequently, Bruner positioned the social-interaction theory between these two ends of the spectrum and placed the emphasis on transactional nature of language learning.

Recently, the socio-cultural and social interactionist theories have been applied to learning a second language and as the “social interactionist theory focuses on the bidirectional nature of social interactions in second language learning” (Beller, 2008, p. 4). In examining teaching strategies that positively promote English language development of DLLs, this multi-theoretical foundation is particularly relevant as it provides a framework from which to understand how children learn language through their interactions with the English-speakers around them.

Research questions

The following central questions guided this research study:

1. What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote receptive English language development of dual language learners who have made gains of three levels or more as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?
2. What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote expressive English language development of dual language learners who have made gains of three levels or more as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?
3. What, professional development strategies and resources, if any, have Head Start teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon found to be beneficial in promoting children’s receptive and expressive English language development?

Limitations

There was one acknowledged limitation to this study. The Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System, which was used to determine purposeful participant selection, is an

authentic, observation-based assessment system designed to assess children's development in all domains of development. Formative, observation-based assessments are recommended for assessing the knowledge and skills of children who are dual language learners (National Association for the Education of Young Children [NAEYC], 2005). Teachers gather data on children's development and learning and rate them on a 10-point scale for each of the 51 items. As an authentic formative assessment instrument, it is impossible to fully eliminate all bias and subjectivity. To mitigate this limitation, all teachers in the study received professional development on implementing the tool.

Delimitations

There were four acknowledged delimitations to the research design. First, the researcher intentionally delimited the selection criteria so that only teachers who had shown success in promoting English language development were included. Consequently, this delimitation provided the opportunity to capture in-depth, qualitative description and rich detail, resulting in a small sample size restricting generalizability. A second delimitation was the timeframe of the study. Interviews with teachers occurred 5 ½ months after the school year had begun and classroom observations began two weeks after that. This provided teachers ample time to establish the climate, routines and expectations of the classroom room environment, while also continuing to hone their skills as they got to know their new group of students. The third delimitation was the location. The researcher intentionally chose a metropolitan area Head Start program since the majority of children attending Head Start nationally live in metropolitan areas. The final delimitation was that rather than examine strategies for promoting all components of language and literacy development, only receptive and expressive English language development were included.

Assumptions

There were three primary assumptions in this study. The first assumption was that teachers were honest and forthright in providing answers and sharing information about their teaching strategies during the oral interviews. Second, since extant data on child outcomes from 2012-2013 was used to determine participant selection, it was assumed that teaching strategies utilized in the 2013-2014 year had not changed significantly from the previous year. The third assumption was that the teaching strategies observed when the researcher was in the classroom using the observation instrument to code data were indicative of the typical teacher/child interactions for that class.

Organization of the Study

This chapter has introduced the study, the importance of the study, the purpose statement and related research questions. In Chapter 2, a comprehensive review of the relevant literature is presented, delineated into the following sections: historical context and landmark studies pertaining to children who speak a home language other than English; theoretical framework focused on socio-cultural theory and social-interactionist theory; types of programs that serve dual language learners; teaching strategies for encouraging receptive and expressive English language development for children who are dual language learners; and professional development practices for teachers who work with children who are dual language learners. Chapter 3 describes in detail the research design, participants, instrumentation, data collection and analysis, and human subjects considerations. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study and Chapter 5 concludes with the discussion of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter Two: Review of Relevant Research

The population of children who are dual language learners in this country will continue to surge as our pluralistic society persists in becoming more culturally and linguistically diverse (Garcia & Frede, 2010). Head Start programs, charged with educating preschool children in poverty and at-risk of academic challenges, are the point of entry into formal schooling for many children who are dual language learners (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008). Head Start teachers have a vital task of educating children who are dual language learners and preparing them for success when they transition into the K-12 system. While the performance standards and accountability are high, it is important that teachers adhere to developmentally appropriate practices and not feel pressured to implement practices that may not be appropriate for preschool aged children.

This study examined which teaching strategies promote progress in receptive and expressive English language development for children who are dual language learners in Head Start. Additionally, the study explored which professional development strategies and resources Head Start teachers have identified as beneficial in being able to promote the English language development of DLLs. Accordingly, the key variables in this study are teaching strategies, receptive language development, expressive language development and professional development opportunities and resources.

The literature review provides a comprehensive examination of the research regarding the key variables in addition to other foundational aspects that should be addressed in order to garner a solid picture of the study. First, the theoretical framework explores socio-cultural theory, social-interactionist theory and how those relate to other theoretical frameworks that appear in the literature pertaining to dual language learning. Next, a review of the historical context and

landmark studies expand upon the theoretical framework by providing more foundational knowledge to fully understand the variables. A summary of common program models implemented in classrooms that serve children who are dual language learners is provided.

After establishing these paramount concepts, the variables in the study are explored in-depth. The trajectories of receptive and expressive language and the consequential research are examined. Next, teaching strategies that have been identified in the literature as showing positive results in language outcomes for DLLs are examined. The teaching strategies presented include the following topics: planned language approach, home language support, visual cues, social environment, vocabulary instruction, and culturally responsive curriculum. The final section to be explored is teacher preparation, including teachers' attitudes and beliefs. Chapter two concludes with a summary of the main ideas that will carry forward to inform the research questions, methodology and data collection.

Theoretical Framework

As the demographics of dual language learners in early childhood programs have increased, second language learning theories have subsequently evolved as well. The theories have ranged from the learner having a primarily passive role in acquiring language to more recent explanations of a divergent, transactional model of the language learner actively interacting with the environment and those around him. To understand and appreciate the socio-cultural and social interactionist theoretical framework utilized in this study, it is helpful to compare and contrast the most prominent theories found in second language learning.

Cummins (1994) early work was germinal in the field and has been used as a theoretical framework in numerous studies on dual language learners (Beller, 2008). His research focused on comparing submersion (English only) and dual immersion (French and English) school

programs in Canada (Cummins, 1994). As a result, Cummins (1999) postulated the “interdependence hypothesis” of second language development, that a strong foundation in the first language is necessary in order to attain academic proficiency in a second language (p. 2). He coined the acronyms *BICS* to describe “basic interpersonal communication skills” and *CALPS* “cognitive academic language proficiency” to explain the two distinct levels of communication skills (Cummins, 1999, p. 1). *BICS* are the surface level communication skills that children first learn receptively and expressively because that is what they need to communicate their basic thoughts, wants and needs. In contrast, *CALPS* are deeper, more complex, language skills that are needed for academic success.

While Cummins was engaged in his early work, Krashen (1985) was simultaneously positing a theory of second language learning. Of the five theories of language learning Krashen proposed, the acquisition-learning hypothesis is most widely known and gained the most prominence. The main tenet of this theory is that a second language is acquired subconsciously and that language is primarily dependent on acquisition, not learning. He used the formula $i+1$ to illustrate this theory, wherein i represents the current language input and $+1$ indicates the learner beginning to understand or acquire the next level of increasingly, challenging language input. Krashen further asserted that there is a sharp distinction between acquisition and learning. As a result, the terms *second language acquisition* or *English language acquisition*, rather than *second language development* or *second language learning*, have been utilized most frequently in this field. It has not been until the last decade, that the term *English language development* has increased in use, thus signaling a shift in thinking about how children development and learn a second language.

In the last decade, Vygotsky's (1978) socio-cultural theory has been increasingly applied as a theoretical context for language learning. In contrast to Krashen's theory, a principle tenet of Vygotsky's (1986) theory is that learning leads development and consequently emphasizes a more active, rather than passive, role for the learner. When a learning opportunity precedes development, it serves as a catalyst to challenge students' current abilities and helps them extend and expand their cognition and thought processes (Walqui, 2006).

The range that is encompassed from the level of a child's current ability of what he can accomplish independently to the next level of what he can achieve with a bit of assistance from someone else is called the zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Vygostky, 1978). The ZPD is the critical range where learning leads development. The catalyst for this learning and leading a child from his current level of independent functioning to the next level of ability just within this grasp is most frequently referred to as scaffolding (Beller, 2008). Interestingly, even though this concept is often attributed to Vygostky, it was actually Bruner (1985) who first used and described this term.

Bruner built upon Vgotsky's work and defined scaffolding as "a process of 'setting up' the situation to make the child's entry easy and successful and then gradually pulling back and handing the role to the child as he becomes skilled enough to manage it" (Bruner, 1985, p. 60). Scaffolding can be conceptualized in terms of supports offered to the child to help him reach what is just out of grasp, that which is just beyond his current level of maturity and development. Support can be in the form of an adult or other child offering a verbal, physical or visual prompt or assistance in order for the child to be successful. In contrast to Vygotsky, Bruner placed more emphasis on the role of the teacher and asserted that it was the teacher's responsibility to

challenge the students cognitively through contingent responding and pushing them slightly beyond their abilities (Bruner, 1985).

A discussion of scaffolding leads to the third tenet of socio-cultural theory; learning occurs as children interact with adults, with their peers and within the social-cultural environment of the situation (Vygotksy, 1986). Nieto (2010) concisely summarizes that for Vygotskian theory, “development and learning are *mediated* by culture and society” (p. 45). What children learn is influenced by what is important and what is emphasized in their immediate community and culture.

As a result, this focus on the inter-dependent, dynamic contingent relationship between the child, the other adults and the other children, and the social environment itself readily lends itself to application in a dual language learning environment. It takes into account that language learning is not static, but rather is a result of the relationships, culture and social environment of the particular classroom. This bi-theoretical framework provides the structure, or scaffolding, for building this study.

Historical Context

Bilingual Education Act. Educating children who speak a language other than English first gained national recognition with the passage of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968 (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988). The bill was crafted to provide funding to public schools to create programs to educate students who were identified with limited English speaking ability (LESA), an outdated term that is no longer used because of its deficit approach implications. The bill was officially titled the Title VII Elementary and Secondary Education Act and was the first federal bill to include the notion of “equal education opportunity” for linguistically diverse children. It provided funding grants for schools for “(1) resources for educational programs, (2) training for

teachers and teacher aides, (3) development and dissemination of materials, and (4) parent involvement” (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988, p. 2). It did not, however, require schools to provide instruction to students in a way that ensured, or at least, aided, comprehension.

Lau v. Nichols. In 1974, a landmark Supreme Court decision ruled that “sink or swim” immersion for children who were learning English was illegal (Lau et al. v. Nichols et al, 1974). In *Lau v. Nichols* (1974), a group of Chinese immigrants (Lau et al.) sued the San Francisco school district, citing that more than 1,800 students in the district who spoke Chinese, but not English, were not provided instructional supports and assistance in the classroom to understand what was being taught in the classroom. The lower courts ruled in favor of the school district. However, the case reached the Supreme Court and ruled in favor of the Chinese students that schools had to provide some type of aid or assistance to ensure that children understood classroom instruction and received “comprehensible input.” These rulings affected only the public education system operated by the Department of Education. Preschool programs, typically operated by for-profit and not-for-profit entities, are not covered under these laws. However, the Department of Health and Human Services, which oversees the federal Head Start program, does have performance standard regulations relating to dual language learners which Head Start programs must follow.

History of Head Start. The federal Head Start preschool program began in the summer of 1965 as part of President Johnson’s War on Poverty. Head Start was initially conceived as an eight-week summer educational program, to help prepare children from disadvantaged backgrounds enter kindergarten with the skills necessary to be ready to learn (Early Childhood Learning and Knowledge Center, 2013). Based on the public support Project Head Start received and the ongoing focus on eradicating poverty, the program was eventually funded and

expanded to offer full-day, full-year services. Since 1965, over thirty million children have participated in Head Start preschool programs, with over one million children enrolled annually.

From its inception, a vital precept of Head Start has been that each program must be “culturally responsive to the communities served” (Early Childhood Learning and Knowledge Center, 2013, para. 2). Thus, rather than Head Start services being standardized and delivered uniformly across the nation, local Head Start programs are operated through public and private entities that apply for and receive federal grants through the Administration for Children and Families. Until the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, programs were awarded grants that continued indefinitely with no set deadline or termination. However, the 2007 Act mandated that all of the 1,600 grantees be gradually transitioned to a five-year grant cycle. Consequently, program requirements and performance standards grantees must achieve in order to continue their grants have been fortified.

In 1998, the Head Start Act was amended to include program performance standards pertaining to children who are dual language learners (H.R. Res. P.L. 105-285, 1998). The amended act included strengthened requirements for promoting English language acquisition, both receptive and expressive, of children who are dual language learners as well as standards for supporting the development and learning of children in a culturally and linguistically responsive setting (H.R. Res. P.L. 105-285, 1998). In addition, there was more explicit language in the revised performance standards about the importance of programs maintaining and supporting children’s home language development. This shift in the standards presented a paradox for many Head Start programs that had either provided instruction solely in English, or in some cases in Migrant and Seasonal Head Start programs, had provided instruction only in the home language.

It was no longer a question of *either/or*; programs had to find a balance to support both the home language and English language development.

In 2007, the Head Start Act was further amended, subsequently expanding and making more explicit the program requirement for educating children who are dual language learners (H.R. Res. 110-134, 2007). While the new additions to the Head Start Act were not fully implemented until 2012, the amendments were a catalyst for Head Start programs to begin reviewing their curricular and assessment practices of all children, particularly those who are dual language learners. Interestingly, the federal Office of Head Start, which provides oversight and monitoring of the Head Start grantees, outlines *what* needs to be accomplished and *when*, yet it does not provide details on *how*. For example, *The Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework: Promoting Positive Outcomes in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children 3-5 years old* (Office of Head Start, 2010) provides detail on what outcomes should be promoted, and ultimately achieved, in regards to preschool children's knowledge, skills and abilities upon their completion of a Head Start program. However, the Office of Head Start does not mandate which curriculum grantees should use.

While the Office of Head Start does provide guidance to programs on what an effective early childhood curriculum should include, such as the goals and experiences for children, engagement with families, and adequate materials to implement the curriculum (Early Childhood Learning and Knowledge Center, 2013), it does not specify nor endorse any particular curricular program. This has led to great disparity and variance in the quality of educational services delivered in each of the more than 1,600 grantees, based on the comprehensiveness of the selected curriculum and the fidelity of implementation. For many years, Head Start programs used their own *homegrown* in-house developed curriculum. With the increase in accountability

and intensified consequences since the Head Start Re-authorization in 1998 and then the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, the majority of programs have moved to implementation of a commercial curriculum.

Landmark Reports and Studies

In 2008, the Office of Head Start released the landmark report, *Dual language learning: What does it take? Head Start dual language report* (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008). The dual language report provided a thorough synthesis of the Head Start history of working with children who are dual language learners and their families, the demographics, current research pertaining to young children birth-five who are dual language learners, and concluded with findings and recommendations for Head Start programs (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008). The title alone, *Dual Language Learning: What Does it Take? Head Start Dual Language Report* made this a landmark study. This was the first time the term *dual language learning* had been used prominently in a federal document. This marked a departure from previous terms used to describe children who come from homes who speak a language other than English, *Limited English speaking ability (LESA)*, *Limited English Proficient (LEP)*, *English language learners (ELL)*, which took a deficit-approach perspective. Including dual language learning in the title sent a message that Head Start programs do indeed need to recognize and be inclusive of children's home language(s).

A germinal study in the field, outlining the types of bilingualism, emerged from the work of McLaughlin (1984). McLaughlin concluded that there are two pathways to bilingual acquisition: simultaneous and successive. Simultaneous bilingualism occurs when a child is learning and developing two languages during the first years of life, typically before the age of

three (McLaughlin, 1984). Successive or sequential occurs when one language has already been learned or at least partially established and the child begins to have exposure and opportunity to learn another language. Since Head Start children are between the ages of three and five, both simultaneous dual language learners and successive dual language learners are included in the demographic.

Stages of early childhood second language acquisition. Tabors and Snow (1994) identified a developmental pathway through which children progress when learning a second language sequentially. Their work was based primarily on a two-year ethnographic research study of an English language preschool classroom in an urban area of Massachusetts and became a germinal study in the area of early childhood second language acquisition. In addition to English, there were seven other home languages represented in the classroom, which provided a unique opportunity to study the developmental pathway, regardless of the home language spoken.

Tabors and Snow (1994) identified universal stages of language acquisition that children progress through as they learned English:

1. Home language use. When children begin being exposed to a new language in a school or social setting, they will continue to use the home language in an effort to communicate, even though the person to whom they are speaking may not understand nor speak the home language. The children continue to rely upon the language they know even though they may not be understood.
2. Nonverbal period. After many attempts of communicating in the home language and realizing it is not an effective communication tool in the new setting, children enter a non-verbal period. This phase of language development had originally

been called a silent period but is now termed the nonverbal period because children in this stage are indeed communicating, just not with spoken language. Non-verbal communication during this stage encompasses gesturing and facial expressions as well as some vocalizations as children begin rehearsing and trying out the sounds of the new language (Tabors, 2008). How long the non-verbal period last depends on several factors: the temperament of the child, the amount of prior exposure to the language and the amount of opportunity to use the new language (Tabors, 2008).

3. Telegraphic speech. During this stage, children begin to express themselves using their emerging skills in the new language. This stage is called telegraphic speech because children are using just two to three words to express their thoughts and needs. Just as with sending messages via the telegraph in the last century, the words are condensed down to the important ones that will most concisely communicate the desired message. This is similar to the speech pattern used by young children learning their home language (Espinosa, 2010a).
4. Productive language use. In this last stage, children are communicating in longer utterances. They may still make grammatical errors but these are errors that would be typical for children their age. In both the telegraphic speech and productive language use, the first phrases children begin to use are the social communicative phrases that they have often heard other children and adults use in the new setting (Tabors, 2008).

Teachers of young dual language learners should be knowledgeable about these stages of language acquisition and be able to determine the current language learning stage of each dual

language learner in their class (Espinosa, 2010b). This information is crucial for teachers to individualize the curriculum and meet the needs of each child (Espinosa, 2010b; Facella, Rampino, & Shea, 2010; Tabors, 2008).

Types of Programs Serving Dual Language Learners

As a result of the aforementioned landmark cases and studies, schools began creating and implementing programs and classrooms to meet the legal requirements of educating children who are dual language learners. Today there are four main types of bilingual programs in public education, each with different goals: transitional, late-exit, one-way dual language and two-way dual language programs (Espinosa, 2010b; McLaughlin, 1984). In transitional bilingual programs, the goal is for students to acquire enough English to be able to move into an English only classroom as soon as possible. The home language is seen as a temporary scaffold; it is necessary while building the foundation of English, but then is removed once the foundation is solid. In late-exit bilingual programs, the students receive instruction in English as well as the home language for a longer period of times, with the goal of solidifying students' cognitive academic language proficiency (Cummins, 1994).

The two more recent developments in bilingual programs are one-way and two-way dual language programs. In one-way dual language programs, children who all share the same home language (L1) (typically English in the programs in the United States that follow this model) receive intensive instruction, with the goal of becoming fluent and proficient in another language (L2). The two-way dual language programs have a mix of children whose primary language is L1 and children whose primary language is L2. In both one-way and two-way dual language programs, the goal is to be bilingual and bi-literate in two languages.

In one-way and two-way dual language programs, there are variances in the program models (Espinosa, 2010a). Some one-way dual language programs follow a 90/10 model the first year, with 90% of instruction in L1 and 10% of instruction in L2. In these program models, each subsequent year the amount and language of instruction changes by 10%: 80/20, 70/30, etc. until a 50/50 split of instruction in L1 and L2 is reached. In other one-way programs and many two-way dual language programs, the instruction is equally split between L1 and L2 with a 50/50 model.

Even within the same bilingual implementation model, much disparity exists between how frequently each language is used for instruction by the teachers. A mixed methods study of six self-identified Spanish/English bilingual two-way classrooms found considerable variance in the language of instruction. Freedson (2005) reported that one of the bilingual classrooms used Spanish for 87% of the classroom instruction, while in contrast, another bilingual classroom used Spanish for 53% of the instructional time. Furthermore, classrooms that were reported as being primarily English only also showed considerable variance. One classroom increasingly used Spanish over the course of the year while another classroom implemented only exclusively English instruction. Thus, even within a reported program model, the actual implementation of the model may not be consistent with the stated goal. Freedson concluded that the various bilingual models “may best be conceptualized along a continuum of dual language practices” (p. 144).

In Head Start programs, it is challenging to implement and adhere to one of the aforementioned bilingual models due to the number of different home languages represented (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008). A report to Congress on the status of dual language learners in Head Start found that the majority of DLLs

attended classrooms with an English speaking teaching, while there was some varying level of support for the home language (Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, 2010). What is most common is for the teacher to be English speaking and employ a variety of instructional practices in an effort to communicate with children who are dual language learners, while trying to promote their emerging English language abilities. Herein lies the challenge for teachers in knowing which teaching practices have been shown to be effective and should be implemented.

Receptive Language Development for Dual Language Learners

Before discussing the literature on which teaching practices promote children's English language development, it is important to understand the difference between receptive language development and expressive language development. Receptive language development "relies on interpreting language that is heard or read" (Jalongo & Sobolak, 2010, p. 422). Receptive language begins to develop before expressive language as the former is a precursor to the latter. Accordingly, receptive language grows at a rate faster than expressive language and that trajectory continues throughout the life span (Byrnes & Wasik, 2009). Likewise, for children who are dual language learners, receptive vocabulary development of English also begins before expressive does (Cummins, 1994; Espinosa, 2010b; Tabors, 2008).

Children's receptive language development grows rapidly. Byrnes and Wasik (2009) estimate that during the toddler and preschool years, children need to add six to nine new words a day to their receptive vocabulary in order to reach the threshold of comprehending 10,000 words by the age of six. Interestingly, Burnes and Wasik assert that 10,000 is the average number of words that an educated adult commands in their expressive vocabulary, yet their receptive language vocabulary is much higher than that, with an estimated 100,000 words that

they know and understand, even though they may not use them regularly. Children can understand and comprehend a word before they have the facility to use it expressively.

One of the eleven domains of *The Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework* is English language development (Office of Head Start, 2010). The first element within this domain is receptive English language skills. There are five examples specifically listed to help Head Start staff understand what this element entails:

- “Participates with movement and gestures while other children and the teachers dance and sing in English.
- Acknowledges or responds non-verbally to common words or phrases, such as ‘hello’, ‘good bye’, ‘snack time’ ‘bathroom’, when accompanied by adult gestures.
- Points to body parts when asked, ‘Where is your nose, hand, leg...?’
- Comprehends and responds to increasingly complex and varied English vocabulary, such as ‘Which stick is the longest?’ ‘Why do you think the caterpillar is hungry?’
- Follows multi-step directions in English with minimal cues” (Office of Head Start, 2010, p. 22).

A 2010 report to Congress on the status of dual language learners in Head Start programs nationwide found that while DLLs did make some progress in receptive language development during their participation in the program, the majority still ended the year below the national norms for receptive language development as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) (Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, 2010). This is alarming considering that the disparity in achievement that exists between dual

language learners and their English speaking peers upon kindergarten entry typically widens, not shrinks, as their years in school increase (Fry, 2007).

Expressive Language Development for Dual Language Learners

Expressive language development refers to “producing language through speech and writing (Jalongo & Sobolak, 2010, p. 422). For this purposes of this study, the expressive language variable will focus on verbal production. Expressive language development in children learning English as their first language begins to emerge around 12 months old as children say their first words. Given that children begin hearing language in the womb approximately six months past conception, children typically spend 15 months hearing their home language before they begin to speak it.

The range of vocabulary words that a child possesses varies considerably. In a landmark study, Hart and Risley (1995) and their team of researchers observed the interactions of parents with their children from birth until the child reached 36 months of age. The observations occurred weekly and were recorded for later transcribing and coding. The families participating in the study included families on welfare, families that were considered working class and professional families. By the age of three years, there was already significant disparity in the vocabulary size of the children, based on their family background. Children from families on welfare had half the vocabulary size of children from professional families. When Hart and Risley did a frequency count of the number of different words the children had heard, not surprisingly, the children from professional families had heard more than twice as many words spoken to them during their first three years of life. Furthermore, not only did the children hear words more often in the professional families, but they also were exposed to a greater variety of words.

While this study did not focus directly on children who are dual language learners, it did focus on children who are in poverty and thus considered at-risk of facing academic challenges when entering school. Children in poverty and children who come from homes where a language other than English is spoken enter school with a command of fewer vocabulary words than their peers (Hernandez, McCartney, & Denton, 2010). Thus, while targeted vocabulary development is beneficial to all children, it is especially crucial for children who are dual language learners (California State Advisory Council of Early Learning and Care, 2013).

“Expressive English language skills” is one of the domain elements in *The Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework* (Office of Head Start, 2010 p. 22). Five examples are listed to help teachers and staff understand what this may look like in action in the classroom.

- “Repeats word or phrase to self, such as “bus” while group sings the ‘Wheels on the Bus’ or ‘brush teeth’ after lunch.
- Requests items in English, such as ‘car’, ‘milk’, ‘book’, ‘ball’
- Uses one or two English words, sometimes joined to represent a bigger idea, such as ‘throwball.’
- Uses increasingly complex and varied English vocabulary.
- Constructs sentences, such as ‘The apple is round.’ Or ‘I see a fire truck with lights on’” (Office of Head Start, 2010, p. 22).

Teaching Strategies

The existing literature on teaching strategies in early childhood for working with children who are dual language learners has been historically focused on the K-3 age range although studies targeted for the birth-preschool population have started to emerge in recent years.

Examining preschool teaching practices that promote language development for DLLs is crucial because there is a strong correlation between oral language proficiency and subsequent literacy development (Espinosa, 2010a; National Early Literacy Panel, 2008). Oral language development includes receptive and expressive vocabulary, grammar and listening comprehension (Espinosa, 2010b). Phonological awareness (the ability to hear and discriminate the different sounds in language) is included as an oral language skill by some researchers while others assert phonological awareness is primarily a literacy skill, not language (Espinosa, 2010b; Lopez & Greenfield, 2004).

In examining teaching strategies and classroom quality overall, a 2010 report to Congress found that children who are dual language learners in Head Start programs nationally attended classrooms that were only rated as minimal to good in terms of meeting overall recommended best practices (Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, 2010). This conclusion was based on the Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale- Revised (ECERS-R) scores that Head Start programs submitted for each classroom as part of their ongoing monitoring. When teachers' instructional practices were reviewed, the results were even lower.

In Head Start, the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) is used to assess the quality of teacher/child interactions, as described in three main domain areas: emotional climate, classroom management and instructional support (Downer et al., 2011). Within the domain of instructional support, there are three domain elements: concept development, quality of feedback, and language modeling. Each domain element is rated on a scale of one to seven, with one being the lowest, indicating minimal evidence of the identified quality indicators and seven being the highest, indicating exemplary teacher/child interactions occurring consistently. Of the

three domains, instructional support consistently receives the lowest ratings throughout early childhood programs nationally. In a report to Congress outlining the experiences of dual language learners in Head Start programs (Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, 2010), it was noted that in the domain of instructional support, the average rating for Head Start classrooms serving dual language learners was a 1.9, which is in the low range of quality.

Planned language approach. A current focus in Head Start programs currently is to implement a planned language approach for working with children and families that speak languages other than English. This current trend of a planned language approach was a result of a previous emphasis in Head Start programs developing a program-specific language policy for meeting the needs of dual language learners. The difference between a language policy and a planned language approach is more than just semantics. A planned language approach takes into account that the language demographics of the children and families, the program staff and respective available resources continue to evolve and change (Head Start National Center on Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness, 2013).

The language demographics of a program include the languages spoken by the children and families in a program, the prior language experiences and language exposure children have had, the languages spoken by the teachers and staff and the languages in the community. As such, three main types of classrooms, in regards to language features, have been identified in the planned language approach materials (Matera, 2013). The first type is the English only classroom where the staff speak only English even though two or more home languages are represented by the children. Another classroom type is identified are those in which English is primarily spoken and there is some support for the home language(s) of the children. The home

language support can be from the teacher or other classroom staff who speak and use the home language(s) of the children. The third type of classroom identified is the one that takes a dual language approach, with intentional support for the development of English and the home language(s). In the dual language classrooms, consideration needs to be given to whether the language of instruction used will be time-based or teacher-based (Matera, 2013). Thus, based on the type of classroom, languages spoken by the staff and languages spoken by the children, the resulting targeted instructional strategies for English language development in Head Start classrooms will and should differ.

Because each Head Start program has its own unique language demographics, Head Start grantees are encouraged to develop a written planned language approach and update it as needed to meet the needs of their particular children and families (Head Start National Center on Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness, 2013; Knapp-Philo & Stechuk, 2013; Matera, 2013). A main component of the planned language approach focuses on how teachers will incorporate the *Big Five* into their daily and weekly instructional plans: alphabet knowledge and early writing, background knowledge, book knowledge and print concepts, oral language and vocabulary, phonological awareness.

Recent studies indicate that there is some emerging agreement in regards to instructional support strategies for working with children who are dual language learners (Facella, Rampino, & Shea, 2010; Lopez & Greenfield, 2004; Magruder, Hayslip, Espinosa, & Matera, 2013). In a qualitative study conducted in kindergarten classrooms in two public school districts in urban areas of Massachusetts, researchers found that early childhood teachers primarily used 10 different strategies each when working with children who are DLLs, resulting in a compilation of 28 different strategies (Facella et al., 2005). Interestingly, a similar finding was noted in a quantitative study of 119 Head Start preschool teachers in Florida; an estimated 75% utilized ten

to twelve strategies when working with children who are dual language learners (Lopez & Greenfield, 2004). There were many commonalities in the strategies used by the teachers in these two distinct studies: repetition; gestures and body language; use of real objects and materials; multi-sensory opportunities to reach all learning styles and vocabulary instruction. In their work with Los Angeles Unified School District's transitional kindergarten program, Magruder and colleagues (2013), developed Personalized Oral Language Learning (POLL) strategies to help teachers learn techniques for how to support the language development of the dual language learners in the program. This section on teaching strategies will explore these common techniques found in the research.

Home language support. Research on the use of the home language (L1) as an instructional strategy for supporting the acquisition of English (L2) has been contradictory. Lonigan (2006) asserts that use of the home language is neither realistic nor necessary in a linguistically diverse classroom. Other scholars contend that intentional and planned use of home language is a key teaching practice for positive outcomes for DLLs (Espinosa, 2010b; Goldenberg, 2006; Lopez & Greenfield, 2004; National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008; Office of Head Start, 2009; Tabors, 2008; Tabors & Terrill, 2011). Goldenberg (2006) asserts that teachers should ideally use the home language as a foundation from which to begin building English skills. Durgunoglu, Mir, and Arino-Marti (2002) conclude that similar results of dual language learning children's outcomes on certain language and literacy measures in L1 and L2 supports the notion that cross transference occurs between the established home language and the new language being learned. McCabe et al (2013) assert that early education settings should provide high quality input in the home language.

A trend in the literature is questioning how much language support is needed and how it can be accomplished. Pearson (2008) asserts that in order to be fluent in any language, at least 25% of a child's linguistic exposure needs to be in the home language (Pearson, 2008). In a study of a large citywide preschool program in California, Espinosa (2010a) observed classrooms with 90% of the children coming from low-income homes where the families spoke Spanish. Staff in the program said they were committed to being a bilingual program and supporting children's home language development. Yet, upon observation, Espinosa (2010a) noted that almost all of the instructional time was conducted in English, including one-on-one conversations, small group times and large group meetings.

In a 2007 report summarizing the outcomes of New Jersey's state funded Abbott preschool program, about 53% of the students were Hispanic, with approximately 25% from homes where Spanish was spoken (Frede, Jung, Barnett, Lamy, & Figueras, 2007). Due to targeted teacher recruitment efforts, about half of the teachers who had Spanish-speaking children in their classroom spoke Spanish themselves. Yet, during the early stages of the program, observations indicated that the Spanish-speaking teachers primarily used Spanish to give directives and reprimands to the children, not for instruction and support of new concepts. It was only after additional professional development and solidification of program goals that bilingual instructional strategies were more consistently implemented.

One of the new requirements of the amended Head Start Act of 1998 intended to support home language development required Head Start programs to ensure that one of the classroom staff persons spoke the children's home language in classrooms where at least 50% of the children in a Head Start classroom shared the same home language (H.R. Res. P.L. 105-285, 1998). However, no further direction was given on how much, how often or when the staff

person was to use the home language. As a result, if programs do have the resources to comply with the mandate, it is often the classroom assistant that speaks the home language and the language is used primarily for giving directives (i.e. “please go wash your hands”) rather than presenting new concepts or promoting academic content.

Lopez and Greenfield (2004) conducted a study of 100 Spanish-speaking children in Head Start programs in Miami-Dade County in Florida. She concluded that providing instruction in L1 not only helped children make gains in their home language, but it also gave them transferrable skills to be able to better understand and decode English. Particular benefits were observed as children’s phonological processing skills in Spanish had significant correlation with their phonological processing skills in English.

In her mixed-methods dissertation study focused on 51 Spanish-speaking children preschool programs in Texas, Freedson (2005) also found a significant correlation between children’s Spanish and English phonological processing skills. This was surprising because most of the children started the preschool year with developed Spanish language skills but limited English skills. However, end of the year testing indicated that children’s English phonological awareness was on par with their Spanish phonological awareness.

A more recent study conducted by Chang and colleagues (2007) at Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center does not answer the question of how much home language instruction is needed, but rather illustrates the connection between the amount of home language and the social development of the children. The study utilized extant data collected from two previous large-scale studies: the State-Wide Early Education Program (SWEET) Study and the National Center for Early Development and Learning Multi-state study. In total, the resulting data set of the purposive sampling focused on 345 Spanish-speaking children in 11 states. There

were 587 children whose families reported speaking Spanish at home. Of those 587, 345 did not pass the English language screener conducted at the beginning of the pre-kindergarten year. Consequently, these 345 students with little to no English language proficiency became the focus of the study.

The research team coded the language of instruction (Spanish or English) in the classroom as well as the frequency and quality of the interaction. The results showed that less than 18% of the language interactions the Spanish-speaking children had with their teachers were in Spanish (Chang et al., 2007). Furthermore, the teachers that spoke less Spanish with the children also reported have higher conflicts with the Spanish-speaking and strained relationships. Interestingly, in the classrooms where teachers spoke English more frequently, children's English development outcomes were not higher than the children's in classrooms where Spanish was spoken more often. Yet, the reported social development of the children was lower.

Connecting with families. Home language development is integrally linked with strong connections with families (Espinosa, 2010b; Magruder et al., 2013; National Center for Cultural and Linguistic Diversity, 2012; Tabors & Terrill, 2011). Supporting families to continue to use their family language with their child is important not only for development of the home language but also development in English (Cummins, 1994; Magruder et al., 2013). Teachers should gather information from families upon the child's enrollment about the language(s) the child hears and uses in the home, who speaks which language(s) in the home, and the families goals are for the child's language development.

Social environment. Social development is interwoven with language development for children who are dual language learners (Espinosa, 2010b; Nieto, 2010; Tabors, 2008). The affective filter refers to the idea of children feeling confident and secure in their social

environment, which is a necessary prerequisite to language learning (Krashen, 1985). When children feel under pressure or at risk of embarrassing themselves by uttering an incorrect word or phrase, their affective filter figuratively closes, thus prohibiting the input of new information. In contrast, if children feel socially comfortable and accepted while not being pressured to perform or give the correct answer, their affective filter is open, thus enabling the learning of new information (Krashen, 1985).

The physical arrangement of the environment affects the social climate of the classroom (Magruder et al., 2013; Tabors, 2008). Well-defined learning centers help create a more intimate setting which facilitates small group learning activities. Working in small groups may be less over-stimulating and provide DLLs a secure environment in which they can practice their emerging English skills (Magruder et al., 2013; Nemeth, 2009; Tabors, 2008).

Visual cues. Physical gestures help aid comprehension of English by providing visual cues to support the spoken word (Brydon, 2010; Facella et al., 2010; Goldenberg, 2006; Nemeth, 2009; Tabors, 2008; Tabors & Terrill, 2011). Physical gestures include hand motions, facial expressions, body language and other corporal movements to complement the verbal message being communicated. Other visual cues such as holding up the object being discussed helps provide context to supplement the verbal message (Tabors, 2008). Tabors (2008, p.91) refers to this as “buttressing communication” and “doubling the message.” Even an adult’s directed gaze towards the object being discussed with the child can serve as a visual support.

Gestures and visual cues should be used intentionally with targeted vocabulary words (Magruder et al., 2013). Every spoken word should not have an accompanying action or gesture. This intentionality helps the children not to become overwhelmed with the amount of gesturing and instead be able to focus on comprehension of the specific words targeted by the teachers.

Vocabulary instruction. Intentional instruction in and promotion of vocabulary development is vital to DLLs receptive language development, expressive language development and literacy learning (California State Advisory Council of Early Learning and Care, 2013; Espinosa, 2010b; Freedson, 2005). Vocabulary development for young learners has been conceptualized as having three primary tiers (August et al., 2008). The first tier is composed of the words of which children commonly have early receptive recognition. These are the words that adults often use when *labeling* the items children see and come in contact with in their environment by saying the name of the object, item, or person, i.e. “Look, a kitten. Kitten. A playful kitten.” (Tabors, 2008). Tier one words also include items that can easily be understood via a picture or other symbol. As such, tier one words include many nouns and basic communicative concepts that are readily understood. Tier two words are more complex and typically not nouns, which makes them harder to describe and consequently conceptualize. Tier two words are often multi-syllabic and not as widely used in every day conversation. For example, to describe size, *small* would be an example of a tier one word while *miniscule* is an example of tier two word. Tier three words are generally more subject specific and focus on terminology related to a particular discipline of study (Jalongo & Sobolak, 2010). Researchers (August et al., 2008; Brydon, 2010; Jalongo & Sobolak, 2010) suggest vocabulary instruction should primarily target tier two words.

The literature does not specifically focuses on applying these tiered concepts to children who are dual language learners. However, this aligns with Cummins (1994) hypothesis of basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). He asserts that too often teachers view a child as being proficient in English when they demonstrate expressive BICS. Children at this level can communicate their needs, engage in

classroom conversations and have a foundation of receptive language skills. However, the CALP or Tier 2 words (August et al., 2008) are not developed and still need targeting and strengthening.

Despite the need for specific strategies for teachers to follow, only a few researchers provide such guidance on how to promote receptive and expressive vocabulary development for children who are dual language learners (Collins, 2010; Espinosa, 2010b; Nemeth, 2009; Tabors, 2008). Providing synonyms and definitions when new words are introduced is one strategy (Collins, 2010). Creating a list of key vocabulary words related to the current study topic in the classroom helps teachers focus on the repetition and intentional teaching of these words (Nemeth, 2009). The vocabulary list should be in English for the teachers to re-inforce those new terms as well as in the home languages of the children to support home language development. Additionally teachers should use repetition to emphasize important new words in English (Nemeth, 2009). An extension of this strategy to promote vocabulary development is asking children to repeat words themselves after the teacher introduces them and says them (Castro, Gillanders, Machado-Casas, & Buysse, 2006).

Questioning techniques frequently appear in literature pertaining to early childhood literacy as an effective strategy to encourage to children's vocabulary and expressive language development. While many early childhood researchers encourage the use of open-ended questions for monolingual children, researchers of DLLs support close-ended questions (Espinosa, 2010b; Facella et al., 2010) specifically for children in the early stages of English language development. This technique of asking questions that can be answered with a yes/no response or one-word answer switches the focus from expressive language to primarily receptive language development. Simultaneously, this puts less pressure on the dual language learning

child and allows them to gain confidence in their emerging skills by using a simple one word answer which they likely already know.

Teacher talk in the classroom can be used intentionally to aid both receptive and expressive communication. Talking about what is happening in the present, as opposed to what happened yesterday or what is going to happen, has proven to be a successful tool for children's receptive language development (Tabors, 2008). It provides children with the opportunity to hear and focus on what is happening around them at the moment. It is more concrete and again, provides context. Two other strategies include expansions and extensions when responding to children's utterances. An expansion occurs when an adult responds to a child's utterance by inserting the missing words that the child inadvertently left out. Building upon this is an extension. An extension occurs when an adult adds in new vocabulary words that are relevant and extends the child's original utterance.

A concept that has gained prominence as a result of work in bilingual preschools in California is *vocabulary imprinting* (Magruder et al., 2013, p. 12). This focuses on the use of pictures, photographs and other realia to help build children's receptive language development of new vocabulary words. The visual image presented by the realia helps create a mental imprint of the word meaning which children can draw upon for comprehension and later expressive use.

One dual language strategy that is frequently observed in bilingual classrooms was not supported by the research: concurrent interpretation (Freedson, 2005; Genesee, 2008). This occurs when a teacher makes a request or statement in English and then immediately repeats the same request or statement in the home. A variation of this that the assistant teacher or other adult in the classroom who speaks the home language interprets for the children what was said in English. This model of concurrent interpretation yielded no significant gains in English

vocabulary. When this strategy is used, children do not have to rely on their cognitive skills and emerging English vocabulary to decode what was said. Instead, they simply wait to hear the message repeated in their home language.

Storybook reading. Reading with children is a vocabulary-building strategy commonly found in the literature (Castro et al., 2006; Collins, 2010; Espinosa, 2010b; Freedson, 2005; National Early Literacy Panel, 2008; Tabors, 2008). An *anchor text* is a storybook that a teacher selects specifically to introduce new vocabulary (Magruder et al., 2013, p. 12). Reading the anchor text several times with children over a one-two week period provides opportunities to reinforce the new vocabulary and builds children's confidence as their word knowledge increases.

Reading books in small groups with DLLs helps increase their comfort level and likelihood of interacting with the story as well as the opportunity for individualized support and interaction from the teacher (Espinosa, 2010b). Before reading a book all the way through with preschool DLLs, Castro et al. (2006) contend that teachers should first pre-read the book with children to point out and discuss vocabulary words that may be new and unfamiliar to children. Selecting three to five new vocabulary words helps focus children's attention to those words specifically (Magruder et al., 2013). For DLLs, teachers should pre-read the book with them first in a small group and intentionally teach the vocabulary before reading the book later in the large group (Magruder et al., 2013). Explaining new vocabulary in English by providing the equivalent word in Spanish has proven beneficial (Lugo-Neris, Jackson, & Goldstein, 2010). Specifically, pointing to the word in the book and the corresponding picture helps children's comprehension (Collins, 2010). Keeping story time short for DLLs is essential to keep their attention and active engagement (Espinosa, 2010b).

Dialogic reading is also beneficial to facilitate children's comprehension during story reading while simultaneously supporting vocabulary acquisition (California State Advisory Council of Early Learning and Care, 2013; Castro et al., 2006; Magruder et al., 2013). Dialogic reading involves a sequence of prompting children respond to the text through use of question or comment, then expanding and extending the response to add in new vocabulary and finally closing the cycle by repeating what the child last said in response (Whitehurst, 2004). Matera, Lavadenz, and Armas (2013) assert that dialogic reading is a key instructional strategy to build vocabulary development for DLLs and as such, they developed a series of professional development modules for transitional kindergarten teachers in California, focusing on dialogic reading strategies.

Dialogic reading focuses on a three level framework (Matera et al., 2013). The goal of the first level and initial reading is to build children's vocabulary by labeling the pictures and prompting them to answer questions about the text and/or describe what they think is going to happen. At this initial level, it is key to ask children what they know about the story or topic and help them connect the book to their own experiences. When reading the story with the children at later times, the level two interactions focus on eliciting more complex expressive vocabulary from the children, encouraging explanations and answers with longer, more detailed sentences that contain specific vocabulary learned previously in the story. At the third level of the framework, after children have heard the story several times over an extended period, the goal is for children to take the lead in retelling the story, using language that closely matches the text. This sequence and framework helps build oral fluency as well as receptive and expressive language development.

Brydon (2010) conducted a mixed-methods, comparative study of targeted vocabulary instruction built around interactive storybook reading with preschool dual language learners. The experimental group participated in the targeted storybook reading and vocabulary instruction twice a week. The intervention included the following sequence of activities:

1. introducing the focus words for the week through an interactive, reading of a children's picture book;
2. explaining the meaning of the focus words with definitions the children could understand and connect to known concepts,
3. asking children open-ended questions to prompt their thinking about the story,
4. using the words in various contexts,
5. asking children to pronounce the words,
6. repeating the target words in discussions that occurred throughout the day after the story reading and,
7. tactile activities for children to actively interact with and explore materials that represented the words.

The experimental group did demonstrate significant growth in both receptive and expressive vocabulary development and showed greater gains than the control group.

Book reading with children should happen frequently throughout the day (Zurer Pearson & Burns, 2008). Sharing books individually or in small groups with children significantly influences their language development (Espinosa, 2010b; Zurer Pearson & Burns, 2008). Thus, it should not just happen once during the day but several times.

Culturally responsive curriculum. Curriculum in an early childhood classroom should be reflective and responsive of the language and cultures of the children and families served in

that particular classroom (Espinosa, 2010b; Head Start National Center for Cultural and Linguistic Diversity, 2012; Nieto, 2010; Office of Head Start, 2009; Sanders & Downer, 2012). Monkman, MacGillivray and Hernandez Leyva (2003) assert “consciously incorporating the cultural plane into classrooms makes education experiences relevant and meaningful” (p. 256). However, not many studies exist regarding how to achieve this specifically. Nieto (2010) contends that “reluctance to espouse specific strategies or content is based on the belief that these do not exist in a vacuum but within the larger sociopolitical context of schools and society” (p. 135). Nevertheless, some common trends emerge in a review of the literature.

Educators need to first be aware of their own heritage and cultural background and how it influences their communication styles, values and beliefs before beginning to learn about others (Espinosa, 2010b; Nieto, 2010; Santos & Reese, 1999). This is particularly important considering that majority of the nation’s preschool and elementary teachers are white, monolingual English-speakers (Freedson, 2010; Zacarian, 2011). This has changed little over recent decades even though the percentage of young English language learners enrolled in school has continued to increase dramatically.

Teachers and school administrators are often not familiar with the cultural norms and expectations of the various groups of English language learners and their families, thus increasing the likelihood of misunderstanding and mis-communication (Zacarian, 2011). According to Samson and Collins (2012), “the reality is that most, if not all teachers have or can expect to have ELL students in their classroom and therefore must be prepared to support these children” (p. 2). Teachers should ideally be bicultural and bilingual, speaking the home language(s) of the children in their classrooms and possessing an understanding of their cultural background (Garcia & Garcia, 2012). However, that is often not possible in the pluralistic

classrooms of today's Head Start programs, in which four or more home languages may be present in one classroom (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Paltech, 2008).

One of the seminal studies on critical pedagogy occurred in the 1980s in Hawaii's Kamehameha schools. Kamehameha schools educate children primarily of Hawaiian ancestry (Au, 1993). The Kamehameha Early Education Project (KEEP) focused on incorporating students' native culture, language and ways of communicating into instructional activities. As a result, students were more engaged and provided more responses during classroom instruction, specifically during reading time. Results showed that students did demonstrate small, but positive gains, in reading achievement.

Curriculum should build upon the past and immediate experiences of the children (Espinosa, 2010b; Nieto, 2010; Office of Head Start, 2009). Children's language(s) and culture(s) should be reflected in the materials, displays and artifacts present in the classroom (Magruder et al., 2013). While this concept has generally received support in the field, there is not a strong research basis to support the notion that a culturally responsive curriculum itself is correlated with improved outcomes for dual language learners (California State Advisory Council of Early Learning and Care, 2013). Rather what is more important than tying the curriculum to children's culture is connecting the curriculum to children's lived experiences. When children's learning experiences are tied directly to what interests them and what they see in their immediate community, the learning can be assimilated more readily because it can tie into an existing schema of what they already know. The academic learning teachers focus on in the classroom needs to be socially relevant and connected to the personal lives of the students (Zacarian, 2011).

Professional Development

When examining teaching strategies utilized by preschool teachers to educate children who are dual language learners, it is imperative that teacher preparation programs are also examined. In recent years, national teacher accreditation bodies have included standards pertaining to working with children who are dual language learners. For example, the National Council for Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE) recently adopted a standard to incorporate diversity perspectives across curricular areas, with particular focus on dual language learners (Zepeda, Castro, & Cronin, 2011). Additionally, Teachers of English as Second Language (TESOL) are revising its guidelines to include content on first and second language acquisition for P-12 teacher education (Zepeda et al., 2011). It is laudable that state and federal programs have increased teaching standards required of preschool teachers as the need for children's outcomes and program accountability have also increased. Yet, the content of the teacher preparation programs has not kept pace with the changing demographics of the children and families served in early childhood programs (Freedson, 2010).

A study conducted by the National Center for Early Development and Learning compiled statistics about the teacher preparation programs at institutions of higher education, particularly focused on courses and requirements pertaining to working with children who are dual language learners (Maxwell et al., 2006). For community and technical colleges offering an Associate's degree in Early Childhood Education (ECE), 41% required a course that focused on working with children and families from diverse backgrounds. For example, the common *multicultural education* which has a broad focus on covers many topics and age ranges would fall under this category. For institutions granting Bachelor's degrees and higher, the percentage requiring such a course increased slightly to 46%. However, when looking at coursework aimed specifically

aimed second language learning and dual language learners, the numbers decrease significantly; between 13%-15% of Associates degree programs and Bachelor's degree program have a core course requirement focusing on primarily on such content. In fact, coursework pertaining to working with children who are culturally and linguistically diverse is the least like topic to be included in required practicum content in any degree level (Zepeda et al., 2011).

Compounding the issue of the minimal coursework offered in teaching training programs is the low rate of rate of teachers who have taken any such coursework. In California, one of the top ten states serving children who are dual language learners, a study focusing on state-funded center-based early childhood programs found that only a little over 40% of the children had teachers who had any specialized training in working with children who are dual language learners (Karoly, Ghosh-Dastidar, Zellman, Perlman, & Fernybough, 2008). In a quantitative study of Head Start teachers working with DLLs in Florida, one third of the 119 participants reported having zero hours of training related to working with DLLs (Sanchez, 2011).

Given the lack of diversity requirements in ECE teacher preparation programs, it is not astounding to learn teacher preparation program faculty themselves are not a diverse group; over 80% of full-time ECE program faculty are white and non-Hispanic (Maxwell et al., 2006). The National Association for the Education of Young Children (2005) urges institutions of higher education to actively recruit culturally and linguistically diverse faculty to work in teacher education programs. If faculty come diverse backgrounds themselves, they are more likely to actively recruit and provide supports to culturally and linguistically diverse teacher candidates in teacher preparation programs. The lack of teacher diversity can be seen across all sectors. In Oregon, 35% of the students in the K-12 system come from diverse backgrounds, yet only 8.3% of the teacher workforce does (Rosselli, 2014).

The issue of preparing teachers to work with children who are dual language learners is further complicated by the lack of agreement in the field. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2008), largely responsible for disseminating pre-service standards and guidance for pre-kindergarten through 12th grade educators, asserts that instruction on working with culturally and linguistically diverse children should be integrated throughout all curriculum trainings and has a specific standard addressing this criteria. Other scholars contend that training on dual language learners should be a stand-alone course or training (Castro et al., 2006; Freedson, 2010). However, there is agreement that, at a minimum, professional development on first and second language development of dual language learners should be provided to all teachers (Head Start National Center for Cultural and Linguistic Diversity, 2012; Zepeda et al., 2011).

Additionally, there is little conclusive evidence on which professional development practices for preschool teachers of children who are dual language learners actually improves the outcomes for the children. A recent evaluation of the *Nuestros Niños* professional development program (Buysse, Castro, & Peisner-Feinberg, 2010) found that while a three day professional development institute followed by four classroom mentoring consultations provided to each teacher did result in increased quality of teaching practices, there was not a subsequent improvement in children's language and literacy outcomes. The authors commented that this could possibly be attributed to a lack of time to see the long-term effect the teachers' instructional improvements had on the children's outcomes.

When examining professional development materials specifically, case studies, exercises and vignettes should incorporate diverse cultural perspectives (Goode, Sockalingam, Bronheim, Brown & Jones, 2000). Adapting to diversity and learning about other cultures reflects cultural

pre-competence along the continuum of cultural proficiency (Lindsey, Robbins & Terrell, 2009). Furthermore, presenters should provide multiple modalities for participants to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding to be respectful of different learning styles (Goode et al., 2000).

In addition to looking at what should be included in the professional development of teachers who work with children who are dual language learners, attention should also be given to how professional development is delivered. Zepeda et al. (2011) assert that a cohort model for teachers in training would be beneficial to allow teachers to share their reflections and experiences in working within culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. They further contend that professional development of teachers should include classroom observations and individualized feedback (Freedson, Figueras-Daniel, Frede, Jung & Sideris, 2011). This is particularly important for teachers who are already working in the classroom and need opportunities to reflect on and refine on their current teaching practices.

Teachers' attitudes and beliefs. How to educate children who are dual language learners is not just an educational issue but also a social and political one (Goodwin, 2002). Dual language learners and their families may face bias and prejudice because of their immigration status, either perceived or real. Dual language learning children are also more likely to live in poverty (Hernandez et al., 2010) which potentially carries its own implications for class and socio-economic bias assumptions. Nieto (2010) emphasizes that “the way students are thought about and treated by society and consequently by schools they attend and the educators who teach them is fundamental in creating success or failure” (p. 188). Teachers should be knowledgeable about the potentially negative stereotypes surrounding children who are dual language learners (Goodwin, 2002; Zepeda et al., 2011).

It is important to examine teachers' beliefs and attitudes because they do influence classroom practices (McMullen et al., 2006; Sanchez, 2011). McCarty, Abbott-Shim and Lambert (2001) conducted a mixed methods study in 190 Head Start classrooms in Georgia. Teachers were asked to complete the Teacher Beliefs Scale, which utilized a Likert scale, asking teachers to rate their degree of agreement with statements pertaining to developmentally appropriate practices for preschoolers. Teachers were then observed in their classroom by researchers who coded and quantified the appropriateness of the teaching practices. Based on the observations, there were groups of teachers assessed as demonstrating *appropriate practices* and other demonstrating *inappropriate* practices; generally, the teachers who reported less agreement with the statements of best practices also demonstrated classrooms that were rated lower in appropriate practices. Conversely, the teachers who reported higher agreement with statements of best practices demonstrated teaching practices that were rated as *high quality* by the observers. When teaching practices do differ from the self-reported beliefs, it is usually when the teachers report that their teaching practices are more progressive and developmentally appropriate than what it actually observed in the classroom (McMullen et al., 2006).

Nieto (2010) asserts that some teachers “may be quite eager to institute changes in pedagogy but less willing to make more substantive changes in their overall teaching philosophy or their perspectives concerning the nature of difference, privilege and power” (p. 134). It is crucial for Head Start programs to include teachers in professional development opportunities that engage them in practices to critically examine their beliefs and attitudes (McCarty et al., 2001). To truly change practice, changing beliefs have to be part of the curriculum for teacher preparation, pre-service and in-service programs (Espinosa, 2010a; McCarty et al., 2001; Nieto, 2010; Sanchez, 2011).

While the majority of studies found in the literature pertaining to teachers' attitudes and beliefs have primarily focused on elementary aged children, a few key studies have been done with preschool teachers and specifically in Head Start (McCarty et al., 2001; McMullen et al., 2006; Sanchez, 2011). Sanchez (2011) found that 96% of Head Start teachers believed children can learn English relatively quickly. Moreover, nearly 30% of the teachers indicated that families should speak English to their children in the home to assist children in learning English as quickly as possible. This is alarming since studies show that it takes five to seven years to gain academic proficiency in a second language (Thomas & Collier, 2002). When children engage in basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS), teachers may mistakenly assume that children are fluent in English and consequently, cease to provide the aforementioned supports to further develop their academic language proficiency. Additionally, Sanchez (2011) noted that 28% of teachers reported a belief that increased bilingual education services in preschool programs correlated with a need for increased special education services. This illustrates the concept that dual language learning may be seen as a detriment to children and something that needs corrected, rather than as a benefit and something advantageous to the child.

Summary

The review of the literature provides a solid knowledge base for proceeding with this qualitative study on teaching strategies for promoting English language development of dual language learners in Head Start. The socio-cultural and social interactionist theoretical framework provides a lens from which to view the language development of the children as they interact with the teachers and other adults in the classroom. Consequently, the specific instructional strategies utilized by the classroom for supporting and scaffolding language development are vital for providing a stimulating environment for language learning. While most

studies in this area pertain to elementary aged children, there were a surprising number that focused on preschool aged children and specifically Head Start.

A review of the teaching strategies for working with children who are dual language learners, while not considered robust, does illuminate some trends and promising practices. Head Start grantees are encouraged to develop a planned language approach to meet the needs of the culturally and linguistically children and families in the program (Head Start National Center on Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness, 2013; Knapp-Philo & Stechuk, 2013). The environment, both the physical and social aspects, can provide a basis for children to feel secure, supported, and nurtured in regards to their needs and interests. Well-defined learning centers with engaging materials, based on children's interests, experiences and culture, should be available for children to work in small groups, and at times, individually (Tabors, 2008). Intentional, planned support of the children's home language(s) has been proven effective in English language development (Castro et al., 2006; Castro, Garcia, & Markos, 2013; Espinosa, 2010b; Magruder et al., 2013). While children are in the process of learning English, use of visual cues and gestures helps aid their comprehension and receptive language development targeted (Espinosa, 2010a; Magruder et al., 2013; Tabors, 2008).

To promote children's receptive and expressive vocabulary development, intentional instructional strategies including expansions and extensions of children's utterances (Tabors, 2008), vocabulary imprinting (Magruder et al., 2013), and repetition (Castro et al., 2006) are recommended and supported by research. Additionally, particular attention was given to purposeful storybook reading (Castro et al., 2006; Collins, 2010) and dialogic reading strategies (Espinosa, 2010; Magruder et al., 2013) to help deliberately augment children's vocabulary. These strategies are most effective when teachers utilize them, based on the knowledge of each

child's current level of English language development, thus providing them appropriate, stimulating scaffolds (Castro et al., 2013; Espinosa, 2010b). Furthermore, research confirms that children are more likely to be engaged in the classrooms and thus demonstrate positive outcomes when their prior experiences and knowledge are built upon through implementation of culturally responsive curriculum (Head Start National Center for Cultural and Linguistic Diversity, 2012; Nieto, 2010; Sanders & Downer, 2012).

In addition to these practices, professional development opportunities for teachers to increase their knowledge of working with children who are dual language learners is critical (August, 2013; Espinosa, 2010a; Freedson, 2010). Disagreement persists as to whether information on working with culturally and linguistically diverse children should be stand-alone coursework or infused throughout the early childhood teacher preparation curriculum (Freedson, 2010; Nieto, 2010). Perhaps rather than this being viewed as an *either/or* dichotomy, the solution is a *both/and* approach; a required course on working with culturally and linguistically diverse children could be offered in addition to integrating this information into all coursework. At a minimum, all teachers should receive training on first and second language acquisition (Castro et al., 2013; Zepeda et al., 2011).

Particularly for teachers who are already working in the field, it is imperative that the professional development opportunities and practices be embedded in their current work and classrooms (Zepeda et al., 2011). This can be accomplished through creation of cohort models where teachers share ideas and best practices as well as brainstorm solutions to challenges. Additionally, mentoring in the form of observation and feedback of the DLL specific teaching practices can help teachers engage in an ongoing process of self-reflection and growth (Zepeda et al., 2011).

The goal of professional development for both new and practicing teachers should not only be to increase curricular knowledge but also encourage critical self-reflection and analysis of teacher beliefs and attitudes. Teachers must be aware of how their own biases and perceptions, as well as those of the greater society, could affect their interactions with young diverse learners (McCarty et al., 2001; Nieto, 2010). It is through these combined, targeted efforts that positive outcomes for children who are dual language learners may indeed occur.

Chapter Three: Methodology and Procedures

There were two primary goals of this study. The first goal was to investigate and describe the teaching strategies of at least five Head Start teachers within one program in an urban school district in Oregon whose dual language learners have shown progress of at three levels in receptive and expressive English language acquisition, as determined by their assessment ratings in Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System. The second goal was to identify any professional development strategies and resources that have been beneficial to those teachers in promoting English language development for children who are dual language learners. This chapter will explain in detail the qualitative methodology that was employed in the study.

Research Questions

The following central questions guided this research study:

1. What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote receptive English language development of dual language learners who made gains of at least three levels, as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?
2. What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote expressive English language development of dual language learners who made gains of at least three levels, as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?
3. What professional development strategies and resources, if any, have Head Start teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon found beneficial in promoting children's receptive and expressive English language development?

Research Design

A qualitative exploratory case study methodology was utilized for the purposes of this research. Creswell (2007) defines a case study as research that “involves the study of an issue explored through one or more cases within a bounded system” (p. 73). Furthermore, there are three main types of case studies: intrinsic, instrumental and collective (Creswell, 2007; Richards & Morse, 2013). Intrinsic, as the name indicates, centers on an internal, intrinsic, desire to learn about a particular case. Instrumental case studies seek to answer a particular question or questions by studying a case. Collective goes beyond looking one case and instead seeks to understand identify patterns related to an issue by comparing cases.

For this research, an instrumental case study was selected because it allows for a detailed and comprehensive examination of the teaching strategies utilized in the Head Start classrooms. Teachers’ self-reported practices may differ from their actual practices observed in the classroom. The data collection methods of interviews and observations provided robust data which was coded, analyzed, compared and interpreted to gain a better understanding of what teaching strategies are indeed promoting English language development for children who are dual language learners.

Setting

A Head Start program in a metropolitan area of Oregon was selected for this exploratory case study. Head Start is a federally funded preschool program intended to educate children and families from low socio-economic status backgrounds. This Oregon Head Start program offers half-day preschool classes to 618 eligible children from low-income families at nine sites throughout the metropolitan area in which it is located. The program receives approximately \$6.5 million annually in federal and state funding.

Of the four Head Start grantees in this metropolitan area, this program was selected specifically for two main reasons: the education level of the teachers and the demographics of the children in the program. Nearly 60% of the lead teachers in the classroom have at least a Bachelor's degree in Early Childhood Education or a related field. The remainder have an Associate's degree in Early Childhood Education. In the Head Start Re-authorization Act of 2007, Congress mandated that by 2013, 50% of Head Start teachers had to have an Associate's degree (Improving Head Start for School Readiness, 2007). Thus, the educational level of the teachers in this site is representative of the Head Start teachers nationwide.

In terms of the demographics of the children, there are notable differences between the selected Head Start program and Head Start children nationally. Most notably, there is less ethnic diversity among the children in the participating Head Start program. This is reflective of the minimal ethnic diversity in Oregon overall. However, it is of particular interest to note that 24% of the students in the program are Hispanic/Latino and 37% of Head Start students nationally are Hispanic/Latino. Hispanic/Latinos are the second largest population served in Head Start programs. Table 1 depicts the demographics of the children enrolled in the selected Head Start program and nationally.

Table 1

Student Demographics

Category	% in selected Head Start program	% in Head Start nationally
4 year olds	67	68
3 year olds	33	32
Hispanic	24	36
White	73	26

(Continued)

African-American	< 1	24
Asian	< 1	8
Bi-racial/multi-racial	1	2

Note. Adapted from Early Childhood Learning and Knowledge Center, 2013.

Population, Sample and Sampling Procedure

Participants included six lead teachers who work in preschool classrooms in a metropolitan area Head Start program in Oregon. Each of the teachers selected had dual language learners who demonstrated gains of three or more levels in receptive and expressive English language acquisition in the 2012-2013 school year, as measured by the Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment tool, Oregon's mandated Pre-K assessment instrument. Progress of approximately 2.7 levels is the mean for DLLs currently served in the selected program (S. Elder, personal communication, August 28th, 2013). Thus, a standard of progress of three or more levels surpasses the average.

The data for this purposive sample was gathered by meeting with the program's Education/Disabilities Director and reviewing the report of aggregated electronic assessment data from 2012-2013 for progress in English language development for dual language learners. There were seven teachers who met the criteria and six teachers ultimately participated in the study. The researcher notified teachers of their selection to participate in the study via e-mail and shared the purpose of the study as well as the informed consent document. Based on the teachers' willingness to participate in the study and positive response to the e-mail, the researcher scheduled interviews with each teacher at his/her work site during scheduled work hours. At that time, an informed consent document was shared, signed and collected (Appendix A). In addition, the informed consent documents for the parents of the children in the classroom were given to the teachers for them to distribute to the parents (Appendices C and D). Table 2

presents the demographics of the teachers in the purposive sample as well as the languages spoken by the children in their classrooms.

Table 2

Participants' Demographics

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Degree Held</i>	<i>Language(s) spoken</i>	<i>% of DLLs</i>	<i>Home language Of DLLs</i>
Teacher 1	Bachelor's	English, Spanish	30	Spanish
Teacher 2	Associate's degree	English	26	Spanish
Teacher 3	Associate's degree	English, Spanish	45	Spanish
Teacher 4	Bachelor's degree	Spanish, English	55	Spanish
Teacher 5	Associate's degree	English	10	Spanish
Teacher 6	Bachelor's degree	Spanish, English	30	Spanish

Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System. Extant data from Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System from the 2012-2013 school year was reviewed to determine the purposive sample of teachers who meet the criteria for participation in the study. Teaching Strategies GOLD is a statistically valid and reliable assessment instrument for English-speaking children from birth-kindergarten and for children who are dual language learners (Teaching Strategies, 2011). Given the length and complexity of the instrument as well as copyright issues, it was not feasible to include a copy of the assessment in the appendix. However, additional information on the structure and content of Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System can

be found online at www.teachingstrategies.com. In addition to three English language objectives and five literacy objectives, there are two objectives that specifically assess receptive English acquisition and expressive English acquisition for children who are dual language learners. This tool was specifically selected to determine the purposive sampling because it is the mandated assessment tool for Head Start programs in Oregon and the most widely implemented assessment tool in Head Start programs nationally. Validity and reliability of the tool was established in a representative sample of 10,963 children in Head Start programs, public and private early childhood programs. The study included 2,525 early childhood centers and 4,580 teachers (Teaching Strategies, 2011). The validity and reliability calculations were determined by Lambert, Kim, Taylor and McGee at The Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (Lambert, Kim, Taylor & McGee, 2010). Pearson's reliability fell in the .95-.98 range while item reliability scales fell in the .99 range. These ranges indicate a very high rate of reliability, which aligns with the scale and item analysis, which was also determined.

Furthermore, GOLD has established reliability and validity for use with children who are dual language learners (Kim, Lambert, & Burts, 2013). Of the 38 total objectives on which teachers gather data in GOLD, for the purposes of this study, only the ten pertaining to language and literacy development were reviewed. GOLD includes three English language development objectives, five literacy development objectives, and two objectives that specifically assess receptive English acquisition and expressive English acquisition for children who are dual language learners. Furthermore, each objective is divided into measurable dimensions. Each dimension of development and learning is then rated on a scale of one through nine, with one being the lowest and nine indicating mastery.

Human Subjects Considerations

This study was approved by Pepperdine University's Graduate and Professional Schools Institutional Review Board. Additionally, the researcher gained permission from the selected Head Start program. Participation was voluntary for all participants at every stage of the study including review of extant data, interviews, and classroom observations. The researcher developed an informed consent document, containing all of the information required by IRB, for each teacher and assistant teacher to sign (Appendix A, Appendix B respectively). Additionally, an informed consent letter was created for the parents/guardians of the children in the participating classrooms (Appendix C). The letter was distributed to each child's family in a language they can understand. The informed consent letter for children was translated into Spanish (Appendix D). Spanish was the only home language other than English spoken by the children. Translation was done by an experienced translator who is fluent in Spanish. The letter explained the purpose of the study and gave parents/guardians the option for their child not to participate in classroom activities during the time that the researcher will be observing. An alternative activity was available for children's who did not receive consent to be observed.

Data collection ensured confidentiality of the teachers. The identities of the teachers were coded using pseudonyms. The documents identifying the pseudonyms are kept in a separate file on the computer. All data collected by the researcher has been kept confidential and will not be disclosed. Data is kept in files on a home laptop computer, for which only the researcher has the password. Upon completion of this study, data will be kept for three years and then destroyed.

The risks and benefits to the teachers were minimal. Psychologically, teachers could have perceived that their teaching skills were being judged and rated and could potentially have been shared with their supervisors, even though confidentiality was assured. Teachers could also

potentially have experienced an increase in anxiety when they had to honestly reflect on their perceptions about children who are dual language learners. Socially, teachers may have felt that they were being compared against other teachers, which could social anxiety or discomfort.

Potential legal and physical risks to the teachers were minimal. Attempts to minimize any such risks included the following: teacher interviews were scheduled to occur during work time at their work site to avoid economic impacts of time and transportation costs; and teacher interviews took place in adult-sized chairs (as opposed to child-sized chairs) to avoid physical discomfort. A potential benefit is that, in the future, teachers could receive professional development opportunities to enhance their knowledge and skills based on the results of the study. There was no direct gain, and participants were not remunerated for their participation.

For the data collection measures, the instrument used to assess teacher/child interactions is available to researchers but is not yet commercially available and is intended for use in school environments. Permission was granted by National Institute of Early Education Research (NIEER), the developers of the Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition (CASEBA), for the use of the instrument in this study. No licensing or copyright clearance is required for the use of Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System, the tool used for the purposive sampling. Additionally, the cross-sectional survey and aforementioned instruments were used as intended and no deception was included in the study.

Instrumentation

Four instruments were utilized during this research study. The interviews, which occurred during the first phase of the study, were guided by an original interview instrument. The observations, which occurred after the interviews during the second phase of study, were documented with the aforementioned Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual

Acquisition (CASEBA) and with an original field note instrument. Finally, the fourth instrument was an original document that was used to review records and artifacts.

Interview instrument. The data collection tool for the interviews was an original instrument developed specifically to target teaching strategies and professional development resources utilized by the Head Start teachers. The interview questions focused on the instructional practices and processes the teachers found successful in working with children who speak languages other than English as home (Appendix E). Dr. Patton Tabors, a content expert in dual language learning, reviewed the interview questions for content validity. Based on her feedback that there was overlap between questions and redundancy, revisions were made to the interview instrument, resulting in eight questions rather than the original ten. Next, the interview questions were piloted with two preschool teachers in another Head Start program in the same geographic area, with children from similar demographic backgrounds. The purpose of the pilot was to verify if indeed the interview questions elicited the quality and quantity of responses desired to the questions. No changes to the questions were made after the pilot interviews. The pilot interviews did confirm that the time necessary to conduct each interview was thirty minutes. To help ensure that the interview questions targeted the receptive and expressive English language development strategies as well as the professional development resources and opportunities, the interview questions were grouped into themes and aligned with the three research questions and relevant literature citations (Appendix F; Appendix G).

Classroom observation instrument. Two instruments were used to collect data during the observations of the teachers in the classroom.

Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition (CASEBA).

The instrument was used for observations of the teachers in response to central research

questions one and two is the Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition (CASEBA). Due to the length and complexity of the instrument as well as copyright issues, it was not feasible to include a copy in the appendix. Further information about the instrument will be found at www.nieer.org when the tool becomes commercially available in Summer 2014. The instrument was developed primarily by Dr. Freedson of Monclair University with the support of the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER). The CASEBA was selected for this study because of its alignment with the teaching strategies for English language development that emerged from the literature review.

Interestingly, the Office of Head Start requires that Head Start classrooms be observed with the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) as part of their triennial review to comply with the new accountability regulations and assess the quality of teacher/child interactions. Yet, the developers admit that “the CLASS measure does not specifically assess cultural competence, cultural sensitivity, or teaching strategies specific to dual language learners” (Vitiello, 2013, p. 7). This is troubling considering that over 30% of children served in Head Start programs are indeed dual language learners. Assessment of instructional strategies in preschool classrooms should certainly take into account a child’s cultural background, linguistic abilities and the knowledge of how those impact learning and development (Campaign for Quality Early Education, 2013).

The CASEBA is divided into five main categorical concepts: supports for English language acquisition, supports for English print literacy, supports for home language, culturally responsive curriculum, knowledge of child background. These five main categories were developed as a result of the review of the literature pertaining to best practices for promoting

preschool children's home language and English language development (Freedson et al., 2011).

The CASEBA is

designed to assess the degree to which preschool teachers and classrooms provide support for the social, cognitive, and linguistic development of DLLs, with a focus on supports for language and literacy development in both the home language and English (Freedson et al., 2011, p. 238).

The instrument has 27 items on a seven-point Likert scale (Freedson et al., 2011) which the observer completes based on observing each teacher in his/her classroom. Guidance indicates that each observation should last at least two hours to adequately gather enough information to complete each of the 27 items.

As a newly developed instrument, the CASEBA is still being researched to establish predictive validity. The data available to date has focused on concurrent validity. A widely utilized method to establish concurrent validity is to compare the results garnered with the new instrument with a currently validated instrument designed to capture the same or similar information (Freedson et al., 2011). For the purposes of establishing concurrent validity for the CASEBA, a study of teaching practices in 100 bilingual classrooms in New Jersey was undertaken, using the CASEBA and the Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale-revised (ECERS-R). Results indicated that CASEBA had acceptable concurrent validity. Additionally, a confirmatory factor analysis established that

the CASEBA measures five related but distinct dimensions in the quality of classroom supports for DLLs: 1) Supports for English Acquisition, 2) Supports for English Print Literacy, 3) Supports for Home Language, 4) Culturally Responsive Environment, and 5) Knowledge of Child Background (Freedson et al., 2011, p. 251).

Furthermore, the study found that the instrument shows good construct validity and is “a promising new measure of classroom quality for preschool DLLs” (p. 251).

Original form for field notes. The second instrument was a simple, open-ended form used to write notes during the observations that are not captured in the pre-determined categories of the CASEBA (Appendix H).

Artifact review instrument. An original instrument was created to record data captured during the review of artifacts (Appendix I). Further detail on the types of artifacts that may be reviewed with this instrument can be found in Table 3 *Data Collection Strategies*.

Data Collection and Data Management Procedures

The data gathering process focused on three strategies: interviews, observations and review of records and artifacts as needed. The research questions and aligned data collection strategies are summarized in Table 3 *Data Collection Strategies*. The interviews occurred first, followed by observations of the teachers in the classrooms to provide additional detail and depth about the teaching strategies when working with children who are dual language learners. Review of respective records and artifacts occurred during the observation phase.

Interviews. The interviews were semi-structured and occurred at the onset of the research, prior to the teacher observations. Based on the results of the pilot, each interview was scheduled for ½ an hour although actual time varied depending on the detail of the participants’ experiences and shared responses. The interviews took place at each teacher’s work site, thus eliminating the need for them to travel to another location and minimize time cost to the teachers. Interviews were done individually with each teacher. Arrangements were made to hold the interviews either in the teacher’s classroom, when other children and staff were not present or in the teacher’s

office space. In two of the six interviews, the assistant teacher was also in the room but did not actively participate in the interview.

All selected teachers were initially interviewed at the onset of the study in February and March 2014. The interview instrument protocol guided the flow of the interview (Appendix E). In addition, eight questions from the CASEBA observation instrument were included in the interview. These were questions that probed for information that would not be readily evident during the classroom observation, such as the number of dual language learners enrolled in the classroom and what guidance, if any, teachers provided to parents about which language to use at the home.

At the beginning of the interview, teachers were briefed about the nature and intent of the research study. They were also assured of the confidentiality of the information that they shared as well as the option of opting out of the interview and the study at any time. When needed, the interviewer utilized prompts to encourage the teachers to answer more thoroughly.

Observations. The second data collection strategy were observations. Observations in each classroom took place in March 2014, after the initial interviews with the teachers. At the conclusion of each interview, the researcher scheduled the subsequent observation with the teacher. Each observation lasted two and a half hours, as per the recommendation of the CASEBA developers (A. Figueras Daniel, personal communication, February 25th, 2014) and included observation of the large group learning time as well as small group activities. The focus of each observation was the participating teacher who was previously interviewed. The researcher followed a non-participant observational technique to minimize the potential influence on the dynamics of the classroom (Richards & Morse, 2013). Observations were used to verify and support and/or supplement the responses provided by the teachers during the interviews. The

CASEBA was used to quantify the observable teaching practices. In addition, field notes were taken on the observation notes form (Appendix H) to capture any pertinent information not included in the CASEBA. The researcher conducted each observation and completed the CASEBA.

The security and confidentiality of the data has been maintained through several measures. Within a day after each interview, the audio files of the interview were transcribed and stored in a file on researcher's personal computer. Additionally, each audio file of the interview was also stored electronically with a passcode. Neither the audio files nor the transcriptions have any identifying personal information. The identities of the teachers were coded using pseudonyms. The documents identifying the pseudonyms were kept in a separate file on the computer. Given the importance of emergent thoughts and connections potentially captured in the memos, those handwritten notes were transcribed electronically and saved in a file on the computer. The process of transcription itself may contribute to initial analysis as themes and patterns become apparent.

Artifacts. The third method of data collection was reviewing artifacts and records as appropriate. Records included children's individual learning plans developed by the teachers, group weekly planning forms, and college coursework requirements.

Table 3 below aligns the research questions with the data collection strategies.

Table 3

Data Collection Strategies

Research Question	Data Collection Strategy
1. What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews • Observations

(Continued)

<p>metropolitan area in Oregon to promote receptive English language development of dual language learners who made gains of at least three levels, as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Artifact Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planned Language Approach documents ○ Weekly planning forms
<p>2. What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote expressive English language development of dual language learners who made gains of at least three levels as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews • Observations • Artifact Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planned Language Approach documents ○ Weekly planning forms
<p>3. What professional development strategies and resources, if any, have Head Start teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon found beneficial in promoting children's receptive and expressive English language development?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews • Artifact Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Professional Development Plans ○ College coursework requirements

Data Analysis and Reporting

Interview and observation procedures were structured to allow for efficient data collection and analysis. The interview instrument protocol was utilized to take notes during the interview. Additionally, an audio recorder was used to capture the interviews verbatim and later transcribed. Interviewees were given the opportunity to review their interview transcripts for accuracy and representative responses. All of the interviewees agreed with the accuracy and had not requested revisions or deletions.

Immediately after each interview, memoing occurred. Memoing is both a data collection process and an early step in the data analysis. Memoing is a process in which researchers write down their thoughts, questions and reflections for later reference and analysis. Birks and Mills (2011) contend that a researcher should never discard a memo, no matter how brief or seemingly minute, as every piece of data has the potential to become vitally important as patterns of thought and reflections emerge. Memoing is primarily open-ended, loosely structured and has been described as being similar to free writing or stream of consciousness writing (Mills, Bonner & Franci, 2006).

Given the emergent, dynamic nature of qualitative studies, data analysis was an ongoing process. Creswell (2007) explains that ongoing coding is key to identifying emerging trends in the data. Open coding is the first coding step in analyzing the data. Open coding consists of the researcher reviewing the transcribed interviews and memos and identifying categories of information shared by the respondents (Creswell, 2007). Coding was done by hand, rather than using a software program. A code book with initial categories, based on the results of the literature review, was developed to aid in the coding process. The interviews with the teachers were coded to identify themes in the responses of the participants.

The next step in the coding process was axial coding (Creswell, 2007). Axial coding occurs after open coding and explores the “Cs, which identifies the causes, consequences, and conditions affecting the categories” (Mills et al., 2006, p. 5). Axial coding is often the core of a qualitative study (Creswell, 2007). Properties within each category were identified to help identify causal factors resulting in the increased language outcomes for children who are dual language learners. Two experienced coders, in addition to the researcher, coded the data as well. This helped ensure the validity and the accuracy of the data. The experienced external coders shared their findings with the researcher and in turn, all findings were compared and any discrepancies were addressed.

For the observations, the field notes and resulting CASEBA data from each classroom were analyzed. For each of the 27 measures on the CASEBA, the minimum, maximum, mode, median and mean were calculated. A table displaying this data is included in the appendices (Appendix J).

Triangulation occurred when interview codes, CASEBA data and observations notes, and reviews of artifacts were compared and analyzed to see what commonalities surface among the teaching strategies utilized. First, the interview codes from the researcher and the outside coders were compared to ensure accuracy and consistency in coding procedures. The resulting categories of strategies that emerged from the interviews were then compared and contrasted with the classroom observations and the quantified, aggregated CASEBA ratings. Categories that emerged from the interviews were compared with the similar, related items on the CASEBA to see if those strategies were also present in the observation. Additionally, items that received high ratings on the CASEBA were examined to see if those had been reported in the interviews. Furthermore, the results of the artifacts, when applicable, were compared with the CASEBA

ratings and the interview categories. The data obtained from the classroom observation notes, CASEBA scores and artifacts corroborated and at times contradicted the responses gathered from the teachers during the interview process. Drilling down into the data permitted multi-faceted analysis and helped themes of language development promotion strategies emerge. The resulting effect allowed for commonalities to emerge in the responses of the teachers and in their observed instructional strategies.

Design Credibility

In a qualitative study, it is critical to ensure that validity of the data collection methods and analysis utilized (Creswell, 2007; Richards & Morse, 2013). Creswell (2007) outlines eight primary strategies for achieving accuracy of the findings and validation of the design. This study employs six of the recommended eight strategies. First, trust building and learning the culture occurred as the researcher had an ongoing presence in the sites for the purposes of the interviews and classroom observations. The researcher also has a previous professional relationship with the program, beginning in the 2012-2013 school year. Second, triangulation of data occurred as evidence from interviews, observations and artifact reviews were compared and corroborated. Third, expert review of the original interview instrument helped ensure content and construct validity. Next, the researcher has clearly articulated her positionality and bias on the topic. Additionally, member checking occurred as participants had the chance to review the results and findings for representativeness and accuracy. Finally, detailed description was used to help determine transferability of the findings (Creswell, 2007).

Positionality

Researchers engaging in qualitative research must acknowledge their own values, biases and experiences in relation to the topic of study (Creswell, 2007). The fact that the researcher

has selected a specific topic demonstrates, at a minimum, an interest in that area of studying and finds it worth exploring. Consequently, it is important to the validity of the study for the researcher to disclose possible bias, subscribed operational theoretical framework beliefs and other experiences which may influence their perspective and objectivity on the subject.

I am bilingual Spanish/English and have spent 18 years working with children from birth-eight years old, who are dual language learners in bilingual classrooms, monolingual English classrooms and dual immersion classrooms. In addition, I have provided professional development trainings and college courses to teachers, specifically on second language acquisition and promoting optimal language and literacy development for children. Consequently, I have co-authored a booklet for parents on strategies for maintaining their home language and culture even as children matriculate into the educational system in the United States and develop English language proficiency.

While we know that home language support is important, the evidence on which strategies best promote English language acquisition remains inconclusive and often contradictory (Espinosa, 2010b). Furthermore, what research says regarding best practices for promoting English language development and what strategies successful teachers actually use, may differ. It is with this motivation and passion that I was compelled to examine which teaching strategies promote English language development in children who are dual language learners in Head Start classrooms.

Chapter Four: Results

There were dual purposes of this exploratory case study. The first purpose was to investigate and describe the teaching strategies of six Head Start teachers within one program in a metropolitan area in Oregon whose dual language learners had shown gains of at least three levels in receptive and expressive English language acquisition, as determined by their assessment ratings in Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System. The second purpose was to identify what, if any, professional development strategies and resources have been beneficial to those teachers in promoting English language development for children who are dual language learners. In this chapter, the results of the data collected to investigate the three research questions are presented.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this dissertation study:

1. What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote receptive English language development of dual language learners who have made gains of three levels or more as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?
2. What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote expressive English language development of dual language learners who have made gains of three levels or more as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?
3. What, professional development strategies and resources, if any, have Head Start teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon found to be beneficial in promoting children's receptive and expressive English language development?

Research Design

The study utilized a qualitative, exploratory case study design with three data collection methods: interviews, observations and review of artifacts. The one-on-one interviews with the purposive sample of six teachers occurred during the first phase of the study. The interviews were guided by an original instrument developed by the researcher to learn about teaching strategies utilized by Head Start teachers to promote English language development for children who are dual language learners. Interview questions also focused on the teachers' relevant professional development resources and opportunities. There were eight interview questions developed by the researcher and an additional nine questions that were included from the interview instrument, the *Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition* CASEBA, for a total of 17 questions (Appendix E).

During the second phase of the study, the CASEBA instrument was used to conduct classroom observations in each of the six teachers' classrooms. The duration of each observation was 2 ½ hours and was conducted directly by the researcher, utilizing a non-participant method. The length and the content of the observed activities varied, depending upon each classroom's adopted daily schedule. However, all classrooms had the following activities observed: circle time, teeth brushing, outside play time, indoor choice time, mealtime (breakfast and lunch), small group activities and transitions from one activity to another. Table 4 below presents the activities observed in each of the six classrooms and the number and range of minutes that each activity was observed.

Table 4

Preschool Classroom Activities Observed in all Six Classrooms

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Duration of Observation</i>
Breakfast	15-25 minutes
Circle time	7-15 minutes
Teeth brushing	3-5 minutes
Outside play time	30-65 minutes
Indoor choice time	35-65 minutes
Small group activities	5-15 minutes
Lunch	15-25 minutes
Transitions	3-6 minutes each

Note: All eight activities listed were observed in all six preschool classrooms. The length and the content of the observed activities varied, depending upon each classroom's adopted daily schedule, therefore a range of minutes observed is presented.

While all of the elements were evident in each classroom, the length and frequency of the activities varied. For example, in Teacher 3's classroom, there were 3 different large group, circle time activities observed. However, in Teacher 6's classroom, only one circle time activity was observed. In the other four classrooms, two circle times were on the daily schedule and observed during the visit. In all classrooms, circle time was the planned time of the day for engaging in read alouds, group literacy instruction and music and movement activity. Thus, there were not as many opportunities to observe the aforementioned activities in the classroom that held only one circle time.

Nonetheless, teachers and teacher assistants engaged and interacted with children during all parts of the daily schedule. In each classroom, there were at least three teaching staff members present: the lead teacher, the teacher assistant and the teacher's aide. The focus of the

observation was primarily on the lead teacher in each classroom. However, because there are two CASEBA items that focus exclusively on the teacher assistants, part of the observation concentrated on the assistants as well. The aides, although they were present in the classroom, were not a focus of the observation.

The CASEBA instrument was utilized to record the classroom observations. The instrument has 27 items organized in five main categories: knowledge of child background, culturally responsive curriculum, supports for home language, supports for English language acquisition and supports for English print literacy. Table 5 below presents the CASEBA items and the related research question.

Table 5

Overview of Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition (CASEBA)

Observation Items

Item	Description	Related RQ
1.	The teacher and/or center collect systematic information on the language and cultural background of each child in the classroom.	2
2.	The lead teacher knows the language and cultural background of each child in the classroom.	2
3.	The cultural backgrounds and life experiences of the DLL children are incorporated into the life of the classroom.	2
4.	The lead teacher uses a home language of the DLL children for instructional purposes.	1
5.	The paraprofessional or assistant teacher uses a home language of the DLL children for instructional purposes.	1
6.	The lead teacher attempts to learn and use the home language/s spoken by the DLL children in the classroom, although she/he lacks proficiency in the language.	1

(Continued)

7.	The lead teacher uses high quality talk in the students' home language.	1
8.	The assistant teacher uses high quality talk in the students' home language.	1
9.	Teaching staff use effective strategies during group instruction to support on-going development of the home language.	1
10.	Teaching staff provide rich read-aloud experiences in the home language.	1
11.	Teaching staff interact one-on-one with individual DLL children in ways that support the development of the home language.	1
12.	Teaching staff expand children's repertoire of concepts and vocabulary in the home language.	1
13.	Books, print, and literacy props are available in the DLL children's home language/s.	1
14.	Teaching staff support the learning of print-related early literacy skills in the DLL children's home language/s.	1
15.	The lead teacher uses high quality talk in English.	2
16.	The assistant teacher uses high quality talk in English.	2
17.	Teaching staff use effective strategies to scaffold children's comprehension of instructional content in English.	1
18.	Teaching staff use effective strategies during group instruction to build children's communicative skills in English.	2
19.	Teaching staff provide rich read-aloud experiences in English.	2
20.	Teaching staff interact one-on-one with individual DLL children in ways that support the acquisition of English.	2
21.	Teaching staff expand children's repertoire of concepts and vocabulary in English.	2
22.	Books, print and literacy props are available in English.	
23.	Teaching staff support the learning of print-related early literacy skills in English.	
24.	Teaching staff provide a warm, emotionally supportive and low-anxiety classroom environment for English language learners.	2

(Continued)

-
- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 25. | Teaching staff create a content-rich curriculum that offers meaningful opportunities to acquire and use new language skills. | 2 |
| 26. | Teaching staff help DLL parents support their children's language and literacy development at home. | 1 |
| 27. | Teaching staff use appropriate assessment practices to identify children's language strengths and needs in their home language/s and in English. | |
-

Note: RQ= Research Question

Each of the 27 CASEBA items were rated on a 1-7 scale with 1 indicating no evidence of the item, 3 indicating there was minimal evidence, 5 indicating there was good evidence and 7 indicating that there was strong evidence. Beneath each of the 1, 3, 5 and 7 levels, there are indicators that must be present in order for an item to receive that respective rating. The in-between levels of 2, 4, and 6 are used when an item has all of the indicators present in the previous numerical rating, but does not have all of the indicators present to warrant the next numerical rating. The developers of the CASEBA note “for many items, what distinguishes one rating from another will not be altogether different practices or language use strategies by teachers but rather, the same practices or strategies used to different degrees or in different quantities” (Freedson et al., 2013, p. 3).

Findings

The findings are organized by research question. Considering that many strategies found in the literature for promoting receptive language development and expressive language are the same, there is also overlap in the findings for these two research questions. The findings are presented first by the themes that emerged from the interviews, then by the quantitative results of the CASEBA garnered from the classroom observations and finally by the findings from the artifact review, when applicable. The results from the interviews, observations and artifact

review are then triangulated to corroborate and, at times, contradict each other to present a more comprehensive examination of the data.

Research question one

What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote receptive English language development of dual language learners who have made gains of three levels or more as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?

Data collection to answer RQ1 included two questions from the interview instrument, 12 items from the CASEBA, observation field notes, and artifacts.

Interview results. The first interview question related to RQ1 asked teachers “How do you support home language development for children who are dual language learners?” This was included as a question pertaining to promoting receptive vocabulary development in English since home language support is a strategy that emerged in the literature review. Table 6 below presents the categories that emerged in the responses from the six teachers.

Table 6

How Teachers Support Home Language Development

Categories	Number of Coded Responses
Books, reading aloud	5
Encouraging parents to speak the home language	5
Talking to children in the home language in the classroom	5
Songs	3
Cognates	2

Reading books in the home language was one of the most common strategies reported by teachers for encouraging home language development, with five of the six teachers mentioning books or reading in their responses. Teacher 1 said she tries to “choose literature that has both an English and Spanish translation if at all possible.” Teacher 5 shared that even though she is not fluent in Spanish, she is still able to read children’s books in Spanish to support the home language. Teacher 6 commented that “reading is the number one” way to support home language.

Five of the six teachers reported in the interviews that they and/or the other teaching staff spoke the home language in the classroom. Three of the teachers stated that the Head Start program is intentionally trying to have a Spanish-speaking staff person in each classroom. As per the Head Start Performance Standards, if 50% or more of the children in a Head Start classroom share the same home language, it is required that “at least classroom staff person or home visitor interacting regularly with the children must speak their language” (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2001, p. 202). Only one classroom of the six in the study had more than 50% of the children who spoke the same home language and thus would be required to follow that performance standard. However, the Head Start program intentionally staffed each classroom with at least one Spanish-speaking staff person and in five of the six classrooms, two of the three staff spoke Spanish. Table 7 below presents the languages spoken by the teaching staff in each of the classrooms in the study.

Table 7

Language Demographics of Teaching Staff

Classroom	Lead Teacher	Teacher Assistant	Teacher Aide
1	English/Proficient Spanish	English	English
2	English	Spanish	Spanish
3	English/Fluent Spanish	English	Spanish
4	English/Fluent Spanish	Spanish	English
5	English	Spanish	Spanish
6	English/Fluent Spanish	English	Spanish

Table 7 indicates that in each of the six classrooms included in this study, there was at least one staff person who was fluent in and actively used Spanish for interacting with the children. In three of the six classrooms, the lead teacher was fluently bilingual Spanish/English. In one of the classrooms, the lead teacher was not fluent but had a high rate of proficiency. In the remaining two classrooms, the lead teachers were not proficient in Spanish, but reported that they did know and use some basic words and phrases in Spanish. In five of the six classrooms, the classroom assistants were fluent Spanish speakers.

Furthermore, the results of the interviews indicate that five of the six teachers encourage parents to speak the home language to their children. Four of the six teachers reported that they had a lending library and would send books home regularly with children in the home language. Additionally, those same four teachers commented that during home visits and family

conferences, they talk with the parents about the importance of speaking and supporting the home language. Teacher 4 shared the following:

I always give the suggestion that if they keep speaking the mother language at home, they will learn both equally in the same way. They will be bilingual. I told them too most of the kids pick up language early when they are young. So, it will be nice. I always encourage them to keep the language.

In contrast, Teacher 6 shared that she did not give parents advice about which language to speak at home. She shared that language choice is a very personal option, and while she did think home language development was important, she did not think she had the right to tell parents which language to use.

The second question on the interview instrument asked teachers “How do you promote children’s receptive English language development?” The use of gestures, realia and visual cues emerged as common strategies each of the teachers used for helping children develop their receptive English skills. Table 8 presents the frequency with which each of these categories was mentioned.

Table 8

How Teachers Promote Receptive English Language Development

Categories	Number of Coded responses
Gestures	6
Pictures	6
Repeat in Spanish	3

Each teacher mentioned gestures and pictures during the interview. For example, Teacher 1 said, “I use a lot of gestures, tone of voice, facial expressions, and they are generally very exaggerated when they are first learning the language.” Teacher 3 reported, “I do a lot of modeling of what we are going to do, how we are going to wash our hands, how we are going to walk.” Teacher 5 articulated, “I do a lot of hand motions I didn’t even realize I was doing, pointing to objects, showing them things. Trying to make it more basic by showing them things.”

Three of the teachers mentioned that to help children understand what they say in English, they will often immediately repeat the sentence(s) in Spanish. Teacher 2, who does not speak Spanish stated, “Most everything we do is bilingual. And using their home language with them. And simultaneously, to me, like I said, is how I learned Spanish. So, I am asking my aids to speak Spanish to translate what I say.” Teacher 3, who is bilingual English/Spanish, shared that she does repeat in Spanish if a child does not understand what was said in English.

CASEBA results. There were 12 items from the CASEBA that were analyzed in response to RQ1: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 17. Eleven of the items pertained to aspects of supporting home language development and one item, 17, directly related to “scaffolding children’s comprehension of instructional content in English” (Freedson et al., 2011, p. 2). Table 9 below presents the findings for these selected CASEBA items.

Table 9

Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition (CASEBA)

Preschool Observation Statistics for Items Relating to RQ1

Item	Description	Min	Max	Mo	Mdn	M
4	Teacher uses home language (HL)for instructional purposes	2	5	3,5	3.7	3.5
5	Asst. teacher uses HL for instructional purposes	2	6	4,5	4.5	4.3

6	Teacher not proficient in HL yet attempts to use it	4	4	4	4	4
7	Teacher uses high-quality talk in HL	3	7	6	6	5.3
8	Asst. teacher uses high quality talk in HL	5	7	6	6	6.2
9	HL use during group instruction	2	7	2,5	3.5	4
10	Read alouds in HL	1	1	1	1	1
11	One-on-one interaction in HL	3	7	7	6	6
12	Vocabulary development in HL	1	5	4	4	3.3
13	Literacy materials in HL	2	4	3	3	2.8
14	Literacy supports in HL	1	5	2	2	2.2
17	Scaffolding comprehension of English	7	7	7	7	7

Table 9 indicates that the highest rated item was 17, which focuses on how teaching staff support children's understanding of English through the use of real-life objects, pictures, body language and other visual cues. In all classrooms observed, there was strong evidence of teachers consistently utilizing a variety of the aforementioned strategies. In addition, a level 7 rating indicates that classrooms follow a predictable daily schedule with visual cues that help DLLs know what to do in the present and what comes next. Furthermore, the level 7 rating documents that teachers use oral strategies such as speaking slower, repeating important words and/or phrases and interpreting new words into the home language at times to help children understand. These strategies provided context to support the verbal message teachers were communicating in English.

Visual cues utilizing pictures was a common strategy observed. In five of the classrooms, teachers had small, approximately 2" by 2" cards that each displayed an illustration for all of the

activities of the daily schedule such as mealtime, circle, washing hands, free choice, and teeth brushing. These cards, frequently kept on a ring and hooked to a lanyard around the teachers' neck, were referenced often during transitions to help DLLs understand what was happening and what the next activity was. For example, during the observation, Teacher 6 stated in English that it was time for the circle gathering. When the teacher noticed that a child who was a dual language learner was wandering around the classroom rather than moving towards the gathering area for circle, she approached the child, bent down to his level, pulled out the circle time picture from her set and repeated slowly that it was time to go to circle and then pointed to the gathering area.

The other highest rated items, with evidence emerging between good and strong, were items, 7, 8 and 11. Items 7 and 8 address how the quality and complexity of the language teachers and teacher assistants, respectively, use when speaking in the home language, which was Spanish in all classrooms. Teaching staff consistently used grammatically correct language and complex structure in Spanish and also used a “variety of descriptive, precise and less commonly-used words” (Freedson et al., 2013, p. 12). The reason this was scored a 6, rather than a 7, is because there was no evidence of teaching staff reading “aloud books in a home language represented by DLL children” which is an indicator required for a level 7 rating (Freedson et al., 2013, p. 11).

Artifacts review. The artifacts reviewed to answer RQ 1 were the weekly planning forms. The weekly planning forms were posted on the bulletin board in each classroom and document the large group, small group and individual learning activities planned for the week to support children's learning and development. Only one of the weekly planning forms specifically noted

activities and experiences planned to support DLLs. This planned activity was a read aloud of children's book in Spanish.

Triangulation of data. The triangulation of data collected from the interviews, the observations and the artifacts provided interesting insights into the strategies teachers are using to promote English language development for children who are dual language learners.

Home language. The interviews and the observations both validated that the teachers who are effective in promoting English language development for dual language learners are providing support for the home language in the classroom. Five of the teachers reported speaking to children in the home language. This was supported by the CASEBA results as there was good evidence of home language being used by teaching staff throughout the day. Item 11, "Teaching staff interact one-on-one with individual DLL children in ways that support the development of the home language" (Freedson et al., p. 2) had a median score of 6. Teachers were observed talking with children in Spanish primarily in one-on-one situations. This corroborated what was shared in the interviews by several of the teachers. Teacher 3 said she believed strongly that she should respond to children in the language in which they initiate the conversation. If a child speaks to her in Spanish, Teacher 3 will respond in Spanish. If that same child later initiates a conversation with her in English, then she will respond in English. Teacher 3 explained that it was important to her to respect and validate children's choices of communication by responding in the same language in which they spoke to her.

Scaffolding and individualizing the strategies based on the needs of the particular child was observed in all of the classrooms. For example, Teacher 6 carried on extensive conversations in English with several of the children who were dual language learners. However, there were two children she indicated to me, that were in the stage of home language

use or non-verbal (Tabors, 2008). When talking with those children, the teacher would use Spanish. In addition, when directions were given in English, the teacher would often then follow up with those children, check for comprehension and then explain what had been said in Spanish if necessary.

Teacher 4 shared that she “scaffolded” her language interactions based on the individual needs and language abilities of each child. For example, she explained that at the beginning of the year she typically used more Spanish in the classroom since for many children, the school setting was their first exposure to English and they did not yet have a foundation in English. Then, as the school year went on and children’s understanding of English increased, she began using more English. Yet, for a couple of children, such as the child who started the program halfway through the year, she continued to speak primarily in Spanish because they did not understand her instructions or interactions in English. Teacher 4 commented that difference in ability is often due to the amount of exposure children have, or don’t have, to English in the home. For example, she has noticed that if children have older siblings in the home who are learning English too, the child is able to more quickly understand and start speaking English.

While there was strong evidence of individual support for the home language, there was only minimal to good evidence of teaching staff using the home language for group instruction. Item 9, focused on group instruction in the home language, had a median score of 3.5 in contrast to the median score of 6 for Item 11, which focus on one-on-on support. Most examples of home language used for group instruction occurred during small group activities, which took place as an option during free choice time. The other most common time home language was used for group instruction, albeit briefly, was during transitions. For example, while seated at the tables

waiting to begin breakfast, one of the monolingual English teachers lead children in an activity counting to ten in English and then immediately counted to ten in Spanish.

The results of the interviews and observations conclude that of the six teachers in this study, four spoke and actively used the home language of Spanish in the classroom. This is of particular interest because of the thirty lead teachers total in the selected Head Start program, approximately 30% are functionally or fluently bilingual. Yet, in the purposive sample for this study which identified teachers whose dual language learners progressed three levels or more on Teaching Strategies GOLD, 66% of the teachers are functionally or fluently bilingual. Additionally, all classrooms studied incorporated Spanish, the only other home language aside from English, into teacher/child interactions to some extent.

Read alouds in the home language. In regards to using read alouds to support home language development in the classroom, what is being espoused is not what is being practiced. Reading books aloud in Spanish was one of the most reported ways that teachers said they support the home language in the classroom. Yet, item 10 of the CASEBA, which focuses on the quantity and quality of read aloud experiences in the home language, received a rating of a 1 in each classroom. There were no read aloud experiences in the home language observed during any of the six 2 ½ hour observations. The review of the artifacts indicated that one read aloud in Spanish was listed on the weekly planning form and was scheduled to take the place the day the researcher was observing, but it did not occur. Item 13 of the CASEBA further examines the amount of print and literacy props, in addition to books, available in the home language in the classroom. This item had a median score of three, which indicates minimal evidence.

The majority of classrooms displayed one or fewer books in Spanish per each DLL child. These findings were consistent with the median rating of a 2 on Item 14, which examines the

extent of teacher support and materials to promote home language literacy. The majority of classrooms had only minimal evidence of materials such as alphabet visuals or alphabet manipulatives (puzzles, cards) in the home language. The print that was visible in the home language was not consistent from classroom to classroom. For example, one classroom had the learning centers labels in English and Spanish, but the other five did not. Two classrooms had the daily schedule and classroom expectations in Spanish, but the three others did not. These CASEBA items related to home language literacy received the lowest ratings of all items.

Use of visual cues, realia and gestures. As presented in the previous interview results, all of the teachers reported using pictures and gestures to help build children's receptive understanding of English. The subsequent observations corroborated that teachers did indeed intentionally and effectively utilize body language, pointing, concrete objects and other visual cues to aid children's comprehension when being spoken to in English. On CASEBA item 17, "Teaching staff use effective strategies to scaffold children's comprehension of instructional content in English" the mean score was a 7, indicating that all teachers displayed strong evidence of this. Although the type of visual cues, realia and body language varied from classroom to classroom, all teaching staff did consistently use their strategies. In addition, teaching staff adjusted their rate of speaking in English and used repetition. None of these strategies were documented on the weekly planning form.

Research question two. *What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote expressive English language development of dual language learners who have made gains of three levels or more as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?*

Data collection for RQ2 included four interview questions, 11 CASEBA items and a review of artifacts.

Interviews. There were a total of four interview questions that were used to collect data on RQ2. The first two questions came directly from the CASEBA and the remaining two were from the interview instrument developed by the researcher. The two questions from the CASEBA pertained to culturally and linguistically responsive curriculum. Culturally responsive curriculum is included in the question for encouraging expressive language development because researchers have found that children are more likely to converse and engage in discussions that connect to their lives and their homes (Espinosa, 2010b; Nieto & Bode, 2008). Based on the teachers' responses to the interview questions, two of the highest scored items on the CASEBA, each with a median of 6.2, were Item 1, "the teacher and/or center collect systematic information on the language and cultural background of each child in the classroom" and Item 2, "the lead teacher knows the language and cultural background of each child in the classroom" (Freedson et al., 2013, p. 2). All teachers reported that the center gathers this information at enrollment from the families. Furthermore, the majority of teachers stated that they also talk with families about their cultural and linguistic background during the home visit.

Interview question three asked teachers "How do you introduce and reinforce new vocabulary?" Table 10 presents the categories that emerged from teachers' responses.

Table 10

How teachers introduce and reinforce vocabulary development

Categories	Number of Coded responses
Repetition	4
Books, Read aloud	3

(Continued)

Explain the meaning/synonyms	3
Say the equivalent in Spanish	3

Each of the teachers reported using at least one of the strategies in Table 9. Teacher 1, for example, commented that “sometimes we define them or give alternative words that are similar, like synonyms. And, I will often translate a word into Spanish for them to have more of an understanding. But, I have some really immature threes, so I have to do a lot of repetition with them.” Teacher 3 shared the following:

On our word wall I will introduce new words and show them the picture, the name and then ask them, “What do you think it is?” We talk about it together and I also have done it to where they get to tell me where they have seen it. We do books a lot. I ask them questions about what we are reading to see if they are comprehending what we are talking about. A lot of feelings are done in both languages. I am trying to give them a lot of visuals, a lot of repetition, a lot of action words that they can do as they are saying the words. We do a lot of songs to repeat what we are saying.

Three of the teachers reported that they often say the equivalent word in phrase in Spanish to help children understand the meaning of the word. For example, Teacher 5 said,

Let’s say we have a food on the table and I know what that food is. If I am trying to talk to them, I will try to speak whatever Spanish I know and then I will point to it and then I will repeat it. Let’s say if we have apples. I will say “manzanas” and then say “apples”, just so they can kind of grasp what I am saying and learn it as well.

Interview question four asked teachers “How do you encourage children to use their emerging expressive English skills?” This question prompted the most varied responses of all of the questions. Table 11 below presents the categories that emerged from the teachers.

Table 11

How teachers encourage expressive English language development

Categories	Number of Coded responses
Expand and extend	3
Ask the child to say it in English	2
Repeat what the child says	2
Wait/give response time	2
Songs	2
Provide positive re-enforcement	1

Table 11 indicates that most common strategy reported by the teachers is to extend and expand what children say in English. Two of the teachers who used this strategy also reported repeating back what children say in English and employing these two strategies together.

Teacher 4 shared

I keep talking to them in English. We repeat the whole sentence, like if she [the child] just says one word like “Quiero the doll.” “Oh, do you want the doll?” We repeat the whole sentence to her. “You want the doll?” And she goes, “yes!” or “Si, yo quiero the doll.” It depends how advanced they are, they will get it. But some of them will go “Oh yes” because they understand the whole sentence. Now, when I say, “Do you want the doll?” They are hearing the whole sentence and may say “I want the doll.” I repeat, “I am hearing you want the doll.” So, I am kind of repeating the whole thing when they are starting to use one or two words.

Given the variety and disbursement of responses, there was no clear strategy that each teacher mentioned. It is interesting to note that each teacher did mention two strategies. The strategy that was only mentioned by one teacher was giving positive re-enforcement to children when they spoke in English, so that they would be motivated to speak more in English.

CASEBA results. There were 11 CASEBA items that were used to answer RQ2. Six of the items pertained to the quality and quantity of interactions in English between the teaching staff of the DLL children, three of the items pertained to culturally responsive knowledge and practices, two of the items related to the quality of the implemented curriculum and emotional climate of the classroom. Table 12 below presents the results of the related CASEBA items.

Table 12

CASEBA Preschool Observation Statistics for Items Related to RQ2

Item	Description	Min	Max	Mo	Mdn	M
1	Collection of language & cultural background of each child	6	7	6	6.5	6.2
2	Teacher knowledge of language and cultural background of each child	6	7	6	6.5	6.2
3	Incorporation of culture into curriculum	1	4	1,4	2,5	2.5
15	Teacher uses high quality in English	5	7	7	6.5	6.3
16	Asst. teacher uses high quality talk in English	5	7	6	6	6.2
18	English use during group instruction	7	7	7	7	7
19	Read alouds in English	4	6	4,5,6	5	5
20	One-on-one support in English	6	7	7	7	6.8
21	Vocabulary and concepts in English	4	7	6	6	5.8
24	Supportive Environment	6	7	7	7	6.7
25	Content rich curriculum	4	7	7	6.5	6

The highest rated item was 18, which received a score of 7 in each of the teacher's classrooms. To provide an example of the indicators necessary to receive the highest ratings, to have rated a 7 in this category, teachers demonstrated evidence of all of the following indicators:

- “Teachers use English-language songs, chants and finger-plays throughout the day, for different instructional purposes (e.g., helping with transitions, teaching academic content of skills). Meaning is made clear with pictures, objects, and actions.
- During large group learning activities, the teacher asks questions that are adapted to individual DLL children's level of English acquisition (e.g. children in the telegraphic speech stage are asked questions to which they can respond with a one- or two-word answer.)
- The teacher organizes hands-on, small group experiences (e.g. cooking, science experiments, craft projects, small manipulative math experiences) during which she models meaningful language use in English (e.g. running commentary focused on the here and now) and engages DLL children in extended discussions about the topic of study.
- Small group instruction includes children at varying levels of English proficiency, including native speakers.”

(Freedson et al., 2013, p. 22)

Observations validated that teachers consistently and intentionally supported expressive English language development through large group and small group activities, both planned and spontaneous.

Classroom observations indicated that all teachers were actively introducing and discussing new vocabulary words in English. CASEBA item 21 focuses on how teaching staff

actively expand children’s vocabulary and concept development. The median for this item was a 6, which indicates good to strong evidence in the classrooms. Table 13 below presents an illustrative, not exhaustive, list of the vocabulary words that were introduced and re-enforced during the observations and how teaching staff used discussion questions and comments to ensure children’s understanding of the words.

Table 13

Examples of Vocabulary Words Introduced and Used During the Observations

Word	Discussion questions/comments from teaching staff
rectangle	“How do you know this is a rectangle?” (showed a rectangle) “What can you tell me about a rectangle?” “How is a rectangle different from a square?” (showed a square) “How are they the same?”
trade	“He wants to trade with you. Do you know what trading is?” “Trade is like <i>inter-cambio</i> .”
wobbly	“This is wobbly. It is not flat on the bottom so it is not balancing.” (points to the bottom of the object and demonstrates.)
digital clock	“This is a digital clock. It shows you the numbers all together in a line.” (points to the numbers)
stretching	“Stretching is when we raise our arms like this. (raises arms in the air) And we move our bodies.” (leans left and then leans right)
lungs	“Lungs are <i>pulmones</i> in Spanish. Our lungs hold our air and help us breath.” (points to chest and models taking a breath)
habitat	“A habitat is where animals live. Worms live in dirt. Dirt is their habitat. We are going to make a habitat for the worms today.”

(Continued)

shovel

“We need a shovel to dig this dirt. A shovel is a tool to scoop things. Let’s find a shovel outside to help us do this.” (goes outside with child and returns with a shovel)

In addition to facilitating children’s understanding of new vocabulary by using language strategies illustrated in Table 10, teachers often used real objects to help children learn and connect with the new words. For example, Teacher 4 was focusing on the letter “S” for that week. During circle time, she brought out a bag and first pulled out the letter “S” to show the children. Next, she pulled out a strawberry and asked children if anyone knew the name of that fruit in English. When several children responded “strawberry”, Teacher 4 asked all of the children to say “strawberry” then gave the strawberry to a child to touch and then pass on to the next child. Teacher 4 then proceeded to pull out a scarf from the bag. This process and discussion continued as the teacher pulled out a square, a shell, socks, soap, and a sun.

Artifacts review. The weekly planning forms posted in each classroom were reviewed to ascertain if teachers were documenting the strategies they used to promote expressive English development for children who are dual language learners. While there was no specific mention on the weekly planning forms of strategies to support English language development, there were activities planned and documented such as read-alouds, hands-on exploration of materials related to the current study topic, and small group experiences.

Triangulation of data. When the data was triangulated, interesting findings emerged. In some cases, themes were mentioned in the interviews and subsequently validated in the observations. In other cases, only a couple of teachers reported using a specific strategy but then observations and CASEBA data indicated that the majority of teachers did utilize a strategy even

though they did respond accordingly. In yet other instances, some strategies that teachers were observed implementing consistently in the classroom were not included at all in the responses.

Culturally responsive practices is one category on the CASEBA that yielded a wide disparity of responses. As reported in the interview section, Items 1 and 2 on the CASEBA indicate strong evidence that the Head Start program and teachers systemically collected data on the language(s) and cultural background of the children and families. Teachers reported that the program collects this information on a form at enrollment and teachers further discuss it with families during the first home visit. Yet, one of the lowest scored items from the observation, with a median of 2.8, was item 3 that “the cultural backgrounds and life experiences of the DLL children are incorporated into the life of the classroom” (Freedson et al., 2013, p. 2). Thus, even though Head Start program and the teachers had a documented system for asking about and recording the culture of the children and families served, that information was not intentionally integrated into the classroom curriculum and experiences. When asked if they conducted any activities or lessons during the school year that explore children’s and families cultures, four of the six teachers responded negatively. For example, Teacher 1 reported “I don’t. It would be a good thing. No. I would have to say no.”

Two of the six teachers responded positively. Yet in their answers, these two teachers who did answer affirmatively, did not mention culture but rather only mentioned lived experiences. For example, both of the teachers mentioned that a recent study topic focused on where children lived. They asked children if they lived in a house, in an apartment, with other family members, etc. and then compared and contrasted children’s responses. Thus, the focus was not on the cultural and/or ethnic heritage of the children but rather on the children’s experiences in their daily lives. Consequently, the subsequent observations supported the

interviewed responses and found that the classrooms displayed less than minimal evidence of the culture of children and families.

Reading books was mentioned by half of the participants in the interviews as a way to promote vocabulary development. Item 19 of the CASEBA, pertaining to read aloud experiences, had a median score of 5, which indicates good evidence, but not strong evidence of these practices. It is important to note that the indicators pertaining to the high quality nature of the read aloud experiences were present. When teachers did read books, they engaged in interactive book reading strategies including pre-reading discussions and asking children questions to encourage connections to their lives and make predictions about what would happen next. However, given the limited read alouds observed in the classroom, this item received a lower overall score. In five of the six classrooms, book reading only occurred once and that was during the large group circle time. Additionally, only one book was read during those planned read aloud times. In those five classrooms, there were no instances of individual or small group book reading happening during free choice or other parts of the day. Only in one of the six classrooms did a spontaneous read-aloud take place between a teacher's aide and an individual child during free choice. This was in addition to the read aloud that happened later in the large group time.

Some of the strategies listed in Table 11 were only mentioned by two teachers, but were observed in all classrooms and recorded on the CASEBA. For example, only two teachers mentioned songs as a strategy for encouraging expressive English language development. One teacher specifically noted that singing is often when children who are just starting to learn English will feel comfortable saying a few words. She mentioned that this is because children often already know the words after hearing the song in class many time and don't feel the

pressure of thinking of words in English themselves. In addition, she stated that when all the children are singing together, the child who is learning English can practice singing and saying things in English without standing out. Consequently, all of the classroom teachers were observed singing songs with hand motions in English throughout the daily schedule. Songs were primarily used during transition times such as when lining up to go outside and waiting for all children to come to the tables for mealtime and during circle time before reading the story or discussing the topic of the day.

Classroom observations supported that teachers not only utilized the aforementioned strategies, but several others that were not mentioned in the interviews. Item 20 of the CASEBA focuses on how “teaching staff interact one-on-one with DLL children in ways that support the acquisition of English” (Freedson et al., 2013, p. 24). The median was a 7 and the mean was a 6.8, indicating that strong evidence of this item was present in each classroom. One of the indicators to support the 7 rating is that “conversations in English often involve more than one back and forth exchange and leave ample time for children to respond (Freedson et al., 2013, p. 24). One-on-one extended conversations between teaching staff and individual children were observed frequently in each classroom. These in-depth conversations particularly occurred during free choice time, outside play and mealtime. Even though these parts of the day are not typically as teacher-led as other group times such as circle and small group, the teachers still consistently and intentionally supported children’s language development through their language rich conversations. Teaching staff were actively engaged with children, initiating conversations, asking them open-ended questions, prompting them to expand their thinking and conversing about relevant topics. These conversations often lasted for eight or more back and forth exchanges between the adult and the child.

High quality talk is another item that was not included in responses to the interview questions but was included in the CASEBA. Item 15 focuses on the quality of the talk used by the teacher while item 16 focuses on the quality of the talk used by the teacher assistants. The median scores for 15 and 16 were 6.5 and 6, respectively. This indicates that teaching staff, when speaking English, are using language that is consistently grammatically correct and “lexically complex” in nature (Freedson et al., 2013, p. 19). This item also includes an indicator which focuses on the “variety of descriptive, precise and less commonly-used words” (Freedson et al., 2013, p. 19), which partially overlaps with item 21, which was previously discussed.

Another item that was rated highly on the CASEBA, but not included in responses to the interview questions, pertained to the quality of social/emotional climate that had been established in the classroom. Item 24 had a median score of a 7 and a mean of 6.8. Classroom observations indicated that teachers were responsive to the needs of all children, including those who were dual language learners. Teaching staff made sure children not only had their basic physical needs met, but also their needs for security, socialization and comfort. For example, Teacher 5 noticed a dual language learning child was wandering from one activity to another during free choice time, not integrating with the other children but rather engaging in onlooker behavior. The teacher asked the child, “What would you like to do?” The child responded by shrugging her shoulders. The teacher pulled up a chair next to two English speaking children who were playing with color tiles and said, “Why don’t we play here together with your friends? Let’s see what shapes we can make with these tiles.” The teacher modeled how to use the materials and encouraged language interaction between the DLL child and the English speaking children. This is an illustrative example of how the teaching staff were aware of and responsive to children’s needs.

Research question three. *What, professional development strategies and resources, if any, have Head Start teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon found to be beneficial in promoting children's receptive and expressive English language development?*

For this question, the data collection strategy relied on interviews as well as an artifact review. One of the interview questions asked of teachers was, "What training or coursework have you had on working with children who are dual language learners?" Of the six teachers in the study, three have a Bachelor's degree and three have an Associate's degree. For the three teachers with an Associate's degree, two report that they had no coursework in college specific to working with children who are dual language learners. The third teacher with an Associate's degree reported that she did take one course specifically on working with children who are dual language learners.

For the three teachers that have their Bachelor's degree, only one reported having a course on dual language learners as part of the Bachelor's coursework. Yet, this teacher reported that the required course focused more on cultural diversity and not specifically on dual language learning strategies. The other two teachers reported no courses neither required nor taken pertaining to dual language learning. Two of these three teachers have taken post-Bachelor's coursework. One teacher earned her ESL endorsement and took 18 credits related to English as Second Language, focused primarily on elementary aged students. Another teacher is currently working on a Master's and has taken a required course on English Language Learners. This teacher reported that the course "barely grazed the top" of the content for dual language learners and did not cover much depth.

Three teachers commented about in-service and/or conference trainings related to dual language learners that were offered through the Head Start program. One teacher noted that

several years ago she attended a training in Denver that was a Head Start conference specific to dual language learners. She said it was very helpful information. Two other teachers noted that the program had recently offered cohort trainings in Spanish to the Spanish speaking teachers around topics such as literacy and math development. The teachers further commented that the trainings did not necessarily address dual language learning strategies but rather were the equivalent of the English trainings, but offered in Spanish instead.

Another interview question for teachers was, “What opportunities have you had to share your challenges, successes and brainstorm ideas?” Five of the six teachers responded that there had not been formal opportunities for teachers to share ideas around working with children who are dual language learners. One teacher responded by saying

We are not clear. I don't feel that we're clear about it. I do observations for my Spanish speakers about how far they are in their own language and I do it in English too. But, we [the teachers] haven't met and I don't have a clear opportunity to know this is the way we want to teach them [the children]. I think they are just getting what they are getting depending on the teacher they have. One teacher can be bilingual, but the strongest, like mine I know is Spanish, but you can have a bilingual teacher that is strongest in English. So, she would be speaking more English to the kids, so probably they would be getting a different experience than with a teacher that has Spanish as the primary language, who would be understanding all that the Spanish-speakers speak or are doing or saying. I don't think we have the straight basics like how we should be addressing that.

One teacher said that just recently the Head Start program had offered a training for the bilingual teachers on how to work with children who are dual language learners. This teacher reported that the training was very helpful and stated that more training like that would be useful

because it is more relevant to learn from other teachers about what works and what doesn't instead of just learning about it from research or books.

Review of artifacts. The artifacts reviewed included the degree requirements at the colleges where the teachers earned their degrees. Based on the review of the ECE teacher preparation requirements at the college where the one teacher earned her Associate's degree and reported taking a course on dual language learning, it was discovered that this was not a required course but rather was as an elective. The course taken as part of the degree for the teacher who earned a Bachelor's was titled Diversity in Families and did not specifically focus on dual language learning.

Summary of Key Findings

The triangulation of data from the interviews, observations and, when applicable, artifacts review concluded with findings for each of the research questions. In summary, in response to research question one, the most commonly utilized strategies for encouraging children's receptive English language development are use of the home language, gestures, pictures and other visual cues. These strategies were self-reported in the interviews and subsequently verified in the observations. The strategy of book reading in the home language, which was reported in five of the interviews, was not evident in any of the classroom observations.

For the second research question regarding strategies teachers use to promote expressive English language development, the triangulation of data validated some strategies that were reported in the interviews and observed in the classroom, others that were reported in the interviews yet not supported by the observations and a third group that were not captured in the interviews yet were documented during the observations. The most common strategies reported by teachers and observed in the interviews were repeating children's utterances in English,

expanding and extending children's utterances in English by adding in the missing words and/or including new words, and introducing new vocabulary by explaining the word, providing synonyms and asking children questions about the word. Strategies that were observed frequently in the classroom but did not have a high frequency of being mentioned in the interviews were singing songs in English with accompanying gestures, giving children ample response time to formulate their thoughts when asked a question in English. Finally, strategies that were not captured in the interviews but were observed in the classroom included providing a nurturing social/emotional environment for children, using high quality talk when conversing with children and engaging in extended conversations.

The third research question, focused on professional development opportunities, was answered through interviews and a review of artifacts. Three of the six teachers had taken at least one college course on dual language learning; one of the courses had been taken in a community college ECE teacher preparation program as an elective, one had been taken as part of a Bachelor's program and the remainder had an 18 credit post Bachelor's ESL endorsement. The other three teachers had not had any coursework on the topic. Furthermore, the majority of teachers reported that they have not had formal opportunities within the Head Start program to network and share with other colleagues' ideas and strategies for working with children who are dual language learners.

Chapter Five: Discussion

Head Start programs are tasked with promoting receptive and expressive English language development for children who are dual language learners. This is of critical importance since over 30% of children served in Head Start programs come from homes that speak languages other than English (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008). However, in this nascent area of research, there is not a solid foundation indicating which teaching strategies for promoting English language development are most effective for preschool aged children. The majority of research on English language development for dual language learners focuses on elementary aged children (California State Advisory Council of Early Learning and Care, 2013). A more robust research foundation on English language development strategies, specifically focused on Head Start teachers and children, may help deepen the current knowledge base and ultimately improve English outcomes for some of our most vulnerable children.

This chapter explores the results presented in Chapter Four and discusses the key findings and strategies identified through the two-phased data collection of teacher interviews and observations. Following the discussion of the findings, conclusions are presented and recommendations for policy and practice. The chapter concludes with recommendations for future research, based on the limitations of this study as well as additional research questions that warrant exploration.

There were dual purposes of this exploratory case study. The first purpose was to investigate and describe the teaching strategies of six Head Start teachers within one program in a metropolitan area in Oregon whose dual language learners had shown gains of at least three

levels in receptive and expressive English language development, as determined by their assessment ratings in Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System. The second purpose was to identify what, if any, professional development strategies and resources have been beneficial to those teachers in promoting English language development for children who are dual language learners.

The following research questions guided this dissertation study:

1. What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote receptive English language development of dual language learners who have made gains of three levels or more as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?
2. What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote expressive English language development of dual language learners who have made gains of three levels or more as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?
3. What, professional development strategies and resources, if any, have Head Start teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon found to be beneficial in promoting children's receptive and expressive English language development?

The study utilized three data collection methods: interviews, observations and review of artifacts. The one-on-one interviews with the purposive sample of six teachers occurred during the first phase of the study. The interviews were guided by an original instrument developed by the researcher to learn about teaching strategies utilized by Head Start teachers to promote English language development for children who are dual language learners. Interview questions also focused on the teachers' relevant professional development resources and opportunities.

There were eight interview questions developed by the researcher and an additional nine questions that were included from the interview instrument, the *Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition* (CASEBA), for a total of 17 questions (Appendix E).

During the second phase of the study, the CASEBA instrument was used to conduct classroom observations in each of the six teachers' classroom. The duration of each observation was 2 ½ hours and was conducted directly by the researcher, utilizing a non-participant method. Field notes during the observation were taken on the field notes template (Appendix H). In addition, a review of relevant artifacts was conducted during each observation (Appendix I).

Discussion of Key Findings

Research question one. In response to research question one, the most commonly utilized strategies for encouraging children's receptive English language development are use of the home language, gestures, pictures and other visual cues. These strategies were self-reported in the interviews and subsequently verified in the observations. The strategy of book reading in the home language, which was reported in five of the interviews, was not evident in any of the classroom observations.

Home language use. This study found that all of the classrooms in the purposive sample had at least one staff person who was proficient in Spanish, which was the home language of all the children who were dual language learners. In five of the six classrooms, two of the three teaching staff present were proficient or fluent in Spanish. Furthermore, three of the six lead teachers were bilingual Spanish/English as well as being bicultural. Additionally, a fourth lead teacher was proficient in Spanish. This purposive sample of lead teachers who effectively promote English language development has a high level of Spanish speakers, 66%, in

comparison to the general population of teachers in this program, which is about 30%. This is supported by the research that support for and use of the home language in the classroom benefits English language development for young dual language learners (Cummins, 2001; Espinosa, 2010a; Espinosa, 2010b; Krashen & McField, 2005; Magruder et al., 2013). This also aligns with the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework that includes guidance that program staff need to “keep in mind that they are serving children who need to continue to develop their first language while they acquire English” (Office of Head Start, 2010, p. 4).

What still remains in question is how much home language support in the classroom is optimal. The results in this study indicated a range of 10% to almost 50% of the language spoken by teaching staff in the classrooms was in Spanish. This is a wide range, particularly considering that one of the classrooms that used the least amount of Spanish was a designated dual language classroom and had a bilingual lead teacher. Similar disparities in home language use have been found in other preschool dual language research studies as well (Espinosa, 2010b; Freedson, 2005).

Use of visual cues, gestures and realia. This study found that visual cues, gestures and realia were strategies that teachers who are effective in promoting receptive English language development use to help aid children’s comprehension. This supports research findings by Brydon (2010), Facella (2010), Goldenberg (2006) and Tabors (2008) that the use of non-verbal communication and realia buttresses the spoken language for children by providing context. Perhaps one of the reasons that these strategies are so readily used by teachers is because they are not curriculum-specific and do not require the purchase of expensive materials. The teachers

used gestures, visual cues and pictures during all parts of the day from brushing teeth to large group discussions to interacting with individual children during outside time.

Read alouds. The absence of read alouds in Spanish was surprising, given the interview responses from the teachers. Five of the teachers reported book reading in Spanish as a prime way for supporting home language development, yet no read alouds in Spanish were observed during any of the six observations. The lack of read alouds is in contrast to the intentional home language supports that have been implemented in the classroom. That could be attributed to the fact that much of current Head Start message regarding children who are dual language learners focuses on the concept of home language development and does not necessarily mention home language literacy.

Research question two. For the second research question regarding strategies teachers use to promote expressive English language development, the triangulation of data validated some strategies that were reported in the interviews and observed in the classroom, others that were reported in the interviews yet not supported by the observations and a third group that were not captured in the interviews yet were documented during the observations. The most common strategies reported by teachers and observed in the interviews were repeating children's utterances in English, expanding and extending children's utterances in English by adding in the missing words and/or including new words, and introducing new vocabulary by explaining the word, providing synonyms and asking children questions about the word. Strategies that were observed frequently in the classroom but did not have a high frequency of being mentioned in the interviews were singing songs in English with accompanying gestures and giving children ample response time to formulate their thoughts when asked a question in English. Finally, strategies that were not captured in the interviews but were observed in the classroom included providing a

nurturing social/emotional environment for children, using high quality talk when conversing with children and engaging in extended conversations.

Culturally responsive curriculum. An unanticipated finding is that teachers are not implementing a culturally responsive curriculum. Both the reported and the observed data indicate that teachers are not intentionally implementing curriculum that is reflective and inclusive of the culture of the children and families. This finding contradicts Nieto's research that culturally responsive curriculum is essential for engaging diverse students (2010). Yet, this finding supports the conclusions drawn by the California Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care (2013) that culturally responsive curriculum is not empirically tied to improved outcomes for children. Rather, the emphasis should be on children's lived experiences (Espinosa, 2010a; California State Advisory Council of Early Learning and Care, 2013). As Head Start programs, and in early childhood programs in general, face greater pressure to implement a standardized, research-based curriculum, teachers may find it challenging to incorporate children's culture into the preset themes or study topics. However, given that this study and others have found that incorporating lived experiences, rather than ethnic heritage, into the curriculum is more strongly correlated with positive outcomes for linguistically diverse children, teachers may be able to more readily follow that guidance.

Positive social/emotional environment. A hallmark of Head Start since its inception has been the social/emotional supports it provides for preschool children in the classroom. In the last decade, however, Head Start has come under scrutiny from opponents for placing too much importance on social/emotional development and not enough emphasis on academics, such as literacy and preparing children for success in kindergarten. Thus, it is of interest to note that in this study, one of the highest rated items on the CASEBA demonstrated strong evidence of a

supportive social/emotional environment for children in all of the classrooms. Since these teachers have DLLs who have shown the most progress in receptive and expressive English language development, it can be inferred that a supportive classroom environment does indeed contribute to academic and future school success. This supports Krashen's (1985) postulate that when DLLs feel comfortable and secure in their environment, their affective filter is open, and thus, they are more apt to acquire and use English language they hear around them. In addition, this substantiates the research by Espinosa (2010b), Nieto (2010) and Tabors (2008) that the social/emotional environment is critical for supporting language learning.

High quality teacher talk in English. The items related to the quality of teachers' talk in English were consistently rate amongst the highest CASEBA items. It is important to note that this could be due in part to the intensive, ongoing training Head Start teaching staff have received on *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS)* since 2008. CLASS is used to assess the quality of teacher/child interactions in the classroom. Because Head Start classrooms are now observed and assessed with the CLASS as part of their federal review, in accordance with the Head Start Act of 2007, teachers have received targeted and intensive professional development on the CLASS domains and dimensions. One of the CLASS domains "Language Modeling" focuses on strategies teaching staff use to intentionally promote language development for all children. Two of the indicators in that dimension focus on extensive conversations that teaching staff have with children and how teachers introduce new vocabulary and map the new words to concepts and words children already know. Not surprisingly, these are two of the CASEBA items with the strongest evidence in each of the observed classrooms.

Read alouds in English. In examining the fact that read alouds in English only occurred once in each of the five of the classrooms during the 2 ½ observations, this could be attributed to

a couple of different reasons. First, these Head Start classrooms implement a 3 ½ hour a day schedule. Teachers in half day programs often face the challenge of trying to accommodate all of the daily required elements into half of the time as a full-day program. Furthermore, it is not unusual that a preschool classroom only has one large group scheduled read-aloud. Typically, additional book reading often occurs spontaneously during free choice time. Yet, if these are spontaneous and not planned for, it is hard to ensure that they do indeed take place. With three teaching staff in each classroom, it is reasonable to conclude that each staff person might expect or assume that someone else will read with an individual child or small group of children.

It is important to note that when the read alouds did occur in each classroom, they followed the sequence and structure of the dialogic reading method. This finding corroborates the multiple research studies that have found dialogic reading practices promote vocabulary development (California State Advisory Council of Early Learning and Care, 2013; Castro et al., 2006; Magruder et al., 2013; Matera et al., 2013).

Research question three. The third research question, focused on professional development opportunities, was answered through interviews and a review of artifacts. Three of the six teachers had taken at least one college course on dual language learning; one of the courses had been taken in a community college ECE teacher preparation program as an elective, one had been taken as part of a Bachelor's program and the remainder had an 18 credit post Bachelor's ESL endorsement. The other three teachers had not had any coursework on the topic. Furthermore, the majority of teachers reported that they have not had formal opportunities within the Head Start program to network and share with other colleagues ideas and strategies for working with children who are dual language learners.

Coursework on Dual Language Learners in Teacher Preparation Programs. The lack of college coursework pertaining to working with children who are dual language learners is alarming but not surprising. This finding is consistent with research reported by Espinosa (2010b) and Freedson (2010). As the children in early childhood classrooms have become increasingly more diverse, the teacher preparation programs, unfortunately, have not kept pace. The only teacher in the study who had a course on dual language learning in her Associate's degree coursework took it as an elective, not as a required coursework. The teacher who had a course in the Bachelor's level coursework reported that it was more focused on diversity in general than dual language learning. The only teacher who had focused, intensive coursework on working with dual language learners took an 18 credit post-Bachelor's ESL endorsement. While this is useful, the majority of teachers in Head Start nationwide have not taken post-Bachelor's coursework. It would be more beneficial for such coursework to be part of an Associate's or Bachelor's early childhood teaching degree.

Planned language approach. Even though a Planned Language Approach has been emphasized in recent years for all Head Start grantees and emerged in the current literature on dual language learners in Head Start, none of the participating teachers mentioned a Planned Language Approach in how they support children who are dual language learners. In fact, five of the teachers reported in the interviews that they received little or no guidance from the program on how to intentionally use both the home language and English in the classroom. This was particularly interesting since the program has made a concerted effort to ensure at least one Spanish-speaking teaching staff is in each classroom. Yet, it is left up to each individual teacher to decide which instructional strategies they will use to support English language development,

how they will intentionally do that in each part of the daily schedule and which staff person will support which language.

The resulting effect, as noted by several of the teachers, is that children may have very different experiences and, thus, different outcomes in English language development, depending upon in which classroom they were placed. Fortunately, the teachers included in the purposive sample of this study have documented skills in promoting English language development and have been effective in determining what to do in their classrooms. However, teachers who have not had similar results with their children who are dual language learners, may benefit from additional structure and guidance.

Conclusions

Seven conclusions can be made from the data that was collected in response to the research questions. The data was collected from the interviews with teachers, observations of teaching staff and review of relevant artifacts. Furthermore, the data was triangulated and then compared with current research to substantiate findings.

Home language. The findings from this study conclude that home language support in the classroom contributes to improved receptive and expressive English language development for preschool dual language learners. This substantiates the growing body of research and acknowledgements that a foundation in the home language is beneficial for learning English (California State Advisory Council of Early Learning and Care, 2013; Castro et al., 2013; Espinosa, 2010b; Goldenberg, 2006; Krashen & McField, 2005; Magruder et al., 2013). All of the classrooms in the purposive sample had at least one classroom staff person who spoke and actively used the home language of the children, which was Spanish in all classrooms. Additionally, five of the six classrooms had two teaching staff that actively supported and

promoted the home language. What is still unclear is exactly how much home language support is optimal.

Visual cues. The findings from the study conclude that the teachers' use of pictures, gestures and other visual cues does promote children's comprehension of English and improved outcomes in receptive English language development. All teaching staff observed actively and consistently accompanied their verbal message in English with gestures, pointing to pictures, showing real objects and other visual cues. During the interviews, all teachers also reported using at least one of these strategies and often times two or more. This double message utilizing both verbal and non-verbal communication bolstered children's understanding and contributed to enhanced receptive English language development. This finding adds to the body of research that has also concluded that realia, visual cues and corporal actions, when accompanying the verbal message in English, promote children's receptive language development. (Brydon, 2010; Facella et al., 2005; Tabors, 2008).

Culturally responsive curriculum. This study has found that culturally responsive curriculum is not tied to promoting English language development for children who are dual language learners. None of the Head Start teachers interviewed for this study reported implementing specific activities related to children's culture. Subsequent observations substantiated these responses and found minimal to no evidence of children's culture reflected in the classrooms. While there certainly may be other benefits to reflecting the culture of the children and the families in the classroom, it is not correlated with language promoting language development. What, in fact, was reported and more likely to be observed in the classroom was evidence of children's lived experiences and daily lives.

Supportive social/emotional environment. The findings from this study conclude that a supportive social/emotional environment in the classroom contributes to progress in expressive English language development for children who are dual language learners. Item 24 on the CASEBA, related to the quality of the supportive environment in the classroom, received the highest rating, with each classroom earning a 7. When children are in classrooms that are predictable, have ample opportunities for choice and autonomy and are supported by responsive teachers who meet and respect their needs, both physically and linguistically, they are more likely to feel confident in practicing their emerging English skills. This conclusion adds to a body of supportive evidence that has been mounting for decades, dating back to Krashen's hypothesis of the affective filter (1985). The literature illustrates the importance of providing a supportive social/emotional environment for young dual language learners (Espinosa, 2010b; Magruder et al., 2013; Nieto, 2010; Tabors, 2008).

Quality of teachers' talk. The quality of the teachers' talk in English contributes to expressive English language development for dual language learners. The items that were related to this were among the highest rated on the CASEBA. Quality of teachers' talk includes how teachers actively introduce and use new vocabulary words and scaffold children's understanding. While this may not be a surprise since these teachers were already selected for the gains their dual language learners had made in receptive and expressive English language development, it does underscore the importance of *how* teachers talk, *when* they talk and *what* they are talking about. These highly rated items on the CASEBA measured how teachers used questions and how they introduced and re-enforced vocabulary. These items also measure when teachers talked. For example, group instruction and one-on-one support for dual language learners both received a median rating of 7. Thus, the individualized support in English for dual language learners is

just as important, if not more so, than the group instruction. The literature underscores the importance of the quality, complexity and kinds of talk that teachers use when interacting with children who are dual language learners (Espinosa, 2010b; Freedson, 2005; Matera, 2013; Zurer Pearson & Burns, 2008).

Songs with gestures. Singing songs in English with accompanying gestures promotes children's expressive English language development. Although only two of the teachers mentioned this as a strategy during the interviews, all of the teachers used songs with gestures throughout the day. This was observed during a myriad of activities such as teeth brushing, large group circle time, lining to transition indoors and outdoors, and beginning mealtimes. This substantiates the research reported by the Head Start National Center for Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness (2013) that using songs is an effective strategy when working with children who are dual language learners. Furthermore, as Tabors (2008) asserts, when a dual language learning child participates in an activity when all children are speaking or singing in unison, it lessens the pressure to use grammatically correct utterances when singled out and instead, allows the child to practice his/her emerging skills as one voice of many. Tabors elaborates further by explaining that children may simply mimic the mouth movements during these times and/or watch others as they form the words in English.

Professional development. College courses and other less formal professional development pertaining to working with children who are dual language learners are beneficial to preschool teachers. Three of the teachers reported having taken at least one college course on the topic. The courses were taken at the Associate's, Bachelor's and Master's level.

In addition to formal for-credit college courses, other types of professional development were found beneficial as well. One of the teachers reported attending a conference specific to

working with dual language learners in Head Start. She reported that the sessions she attended at the conference gave her specific hands-on strategies to use as well as an overview of the research foundation. Two of the teachers responded that informal trainings on dual language learning recently offered within the Head Start programs were very helpful and informative.

Consequently, even though the teachers' responses showed disparity in the amount and types of training and/or coursework attended, professional development opportunities benefit teachers' effectiveness in the classroom. This corroborates the research highlighting the need for training and coursework specific to dual language learning (August, 2013; Freedson, 2010; McCabe et al., 2013; Sanchez, 2011; Roselli, 2014).

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

The findings from the study support five policy and practice recommendations. The first two are policy recommendations to improve the preparation of ECE teachers and increase the number of bilingual teachers working in preschool classrooms. The other three recommendations focus on program and classroom practices to improve English language development for children who are dual language learners.

Required college coursework. One policy recommendation is that all college ECE teacher preparation programs should require a course on working with children who are dual language learners. It is no longer a question of if a teacher will have children who are learning English a second or third language, but rather when and how many. It is imperative that ECE teacher preparation programs evolve to meet the changing demographics of children served in all early childhood programs, not only Head Start. Coursework should not focus only on cultural diversity but also on specific teaching strategies for working with young dual language learners. The literature review highlighted the lack of teacher preparation in this area and the need for

community college and university teacher education programs to require courses on culturally and linguistically responsive practices (Espinosa, 2010a; Freedson, 2010; Lopez, 2013; McCabe et al., 2013; Zepeda et al., 2011). This recommendation applies to community college and university teacher preparation programs.

This policy recommendation is aligned with current initiatives in early childhood teacher preparation. For example, in Oregon, where this study was focused, a Request for Proposals (RFP) was recently released by the Department of Education, focused on college teacher preparation programs that are able to build upon and expand existing efforts to prepare teachers to work with dual language learning preschoolers. With initial funding set at just \$400,000, it is not broad enough in scope nor depth to impact all of the teacher preparation programs and targeted early childhood delivery systems. However, it is a step in the right direction to discover promising practices and create models for other academic teacher preparation programs to follow.

Recruitment of bilingual teaching staff. A second policy recommendation is that Head Start programs should actively recruit bilingual teaching staff in an effort to support the home language development in the classroom. While this has been a strategic initiative for many Head Start programs since the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007 and the introduction of the updated Head Start Child Development and Outcomes Framework in 2012, there have not necessarily been incentives to help them obtain this goal. One way to help achieve this is through sign-on bonuses or an increased rate in salary for staff that are bilingual. This should apply to not only teachers, but also assistant teachers, as they, too, have responsibility for promoting children's language development in the classroom. Additionally, colleges serve as the pipeline for providing educated teaching staff to early childhood programs.

ECE teacher preparation programs should actively recruit potential bilingual ECE teachers. Successful examples of programs such as these do exist such as the Hispanic Head Start grants and bilingual teacher pathways (Freedson, 2010). Ultimately, the diversity of our teacher workforce should reflect the diversity of the children served (Rosselli, 2014).

Develop and implement planned language approach program-wide. A practice recommendation is for Head Start programs to develop and implement a planned language approach. While this guidance has already been forthcoming from the Head Start National Center for Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness (NCCLR), it is still a relatively new initiative that many Head Start grantees have yet to develop. Grantees should create a committee of parents and staff to develop a planned language approach and include staff from diverse classroom demographics and experience with dual language learners to ensure the guidance is applicable in all classroom situations. Given the disparity in the amount of home language and English language use that was evident among six classrooms within the same program, it would be beneficial for programs to have a consistent approach and plan for working with children and families from culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. This will provide teachers with concrete guidance about how to support children who are dual language learners and minimize the guesswork many teachers currently report.

The goal is not to create cookie-cutter classrooms, but rather have plans and strategies in place to support all of the languages present in a classroom, inclusive of the languages spoken by the staff and in the community. All program staff should receive training on the Planned Language Approach to help ensure understanding and consistency of implementation. This cohesive approach will help ensure the consistency and quality of language promotion and education children experience in a Head Start program.

The planned language approach should guide the overall systemic framework of working with children who are dual language learners. Another aspect of that framework would be for Head Start programs to adopt and implement a supplemental tool to authentically assess children's home language and English development to know how to fully support both, not just English. Additionally, when assessing the quality of teacher/child interactions in the classrooms, particular attention should be focused on the interactions with dual language learners and how home language and English language supports are intentionally used.

Provide pre-service and/or in-service training on working with dual language learners for all teaching staff, not just the bilingual staff. A practice recommendation is for programs to utilize teachers who are effective in promoting English language development to facilitate discussion groups and/or provide trainings on the topic. This can further be developed by setting up peer mentoring and coaching for new and/or less experienced teachers to shadow the teachers who are effective in promoting English language development. Time for teachers to collaborate within the program as well as with teachers from other Head Start programs would allow for collective impact in sharing of knowledge and ideas for working with children who are dual language learners. This supports the research by Zepeda et al. (2011) that professional development for teachers working with dual language learners is most effective when it is job-embedded and teachers have opportunities to learn from and share with other colleagues.

The content of the training would include practices, such as those found in this study, that have been proven effective for promoting English language development. These would include intentional use of the home language, creating a supportive environment for DLLs to practice and begin using their emerging English skills, actively introducing and discussing new

vocabulary words in English, and engaging DLLs in meaningful, extensive one-on-one conversations.

Plan for individual and small group read alouds in the home language and English.

A practice recommendation is for classroom teachers to intentionally plan for book reading to occur with individual children and small groups. Just as teachers write down their planned read alouds for the large group, small group and individual book reading should adhere to the same level of forecasting and preparation. A robust body of research confirms that book reading and specifically dialogic reading correlates with increased outcomes in vocabulary development (Castro et al., 2006; Collins, 2010; Magruder et al., 2013; Matera et al., 2013; Whitehurst, 2004). Furthermore, book reading should happen frequently, not just once, to promote optimal outcomes (Zurer Pearson & Burns, 2008). This study adds to that foundation by finding that Head Start teachers who are effective in promoting English language development for DLLs are indeed engaging in dialogic reading strategies. However, book reading only occurred once during 2 ½ hours and then only in a large group setting. If book reading, and specifically dialogic reading can occur more frequently throughout the day, it is likely that children's vocabulary development would be enhanced.

Recommendation for Further Research

Six recommendations for future research emerged from this study. The order of this list does not indicate level of importance as each research topic listed would contribute to deepening the understanding of effective teaching strategies for promoting English language development for preschool dual language learners.

1. Create a comparison group and experimental group. As the result of purposive sampling, this study focused solely on teachers who were identified as effective in promoting

English language development. If this study were to be replicated, the results would be more powerful if a comparison group of classrooms were included. Subsequently, this would allow for comparison between the strategies utilized in the effective and ineffective classrooms. If found that the specific strategies identified in the effective classrooms were not present in the comparison ineffective classrooms, this would be particularly compelling.

2. Investigate the causal effects of having bilingual/bicultural teachers in the preschool classrooms. In this purposive sample, three of the six participating teachers were fluently bilingual speakers of Spanish and also bicultural. A fourth teacher had a high level of proficiency in Spanish. Each of the four teachers actively used Spanish in the classroom to support home language development and used it as scaffold to support comprehension of new vocabulary in English. What remains unclear is whether the increased progress in English language development is a result of the home language support offered to the dual language learners. Or could it be the result of those teachers, being bilingual themselves, having more favorable perceptions of children who are dual language learners and subsequently, having higher expectations for the children and providing them the appropriate supports to reach those higher outcomes?

3. Explore the quantity and quality of required coursework pertaining to working with children who are dual language learners in teacher preparation programs at institutes of higher education. There are initiatives to improve child outcomes in preschool classrooms by increasing teachers' educational attainment. For example, until the Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, a lead teacher in a Head Start classroom needed to have obtained at least an Associate's degree. Now, staffing requirements for all Head Start programs have increased and at least 50% of teachers in each program need to have a Bachelor's degree. However, in this

study, a Bachelor's degree alone did not correlate with teachers being the more effective in promoting English language development.

In the selected setting, over 60% of the teachers have a Bachelor's degree. Yet, the purposive sample of thirty teachers in the program yielded three teachers with Associate's degree and three teachers with Bachelor's degrees. Thus, simply attaining a Bachelor's degree does not necessarily indicate the teachers have the training and/or knowledge to effectively promote English development of children who are dual language learners. The degree in itself does not indicate quality; the contents and the coursework included in the core requirements of the early childhood teacher preparation programs warrant closer examination (Freedson, 2010).

4. Employ mixed-methods and/or quantitative methodology. This study utilized a qualitative case study methodology which allowed for capturing rich detail of teachers' instructional strategies through the use of interviews and observations. However, due to the small sample size, the generalizability is limited. A similar multi-state study of Head Start classrooms utilizing self-reported teacher surveys and the CASEBA for observation would yield more substantiated results. A quantitative study would also increase the diversity of the teacher and child demographics to compile a more comprehensive data set.

5. Explore teaching strategies in classrooms where there are two or more home languages, other than English, spoken by the children. It was not the intent of this study to only include teachers whose dual language learning children all spoke Spanish as their home language. However, the purposive sampling procedure resulted in classrooms where only Spanish and English were the home languages. Given that there are more than 140 different languages spoken in Head Start programs, it would be helpful to further examine how teachers support home language development and English language development in classrooms where

three or more home languages are represented (National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008).

6. Conduct a longitudinal study that examines the performance of dual language learning children in high performing preschool classrooms once they have transitioned into kindergarten. The teachers in this purposive sample were selected because of the gains the dual language learning children in their classrooms made during the 2012-2013 school year. It would provide additional insight into the effectiveness of the teaching strategies to see how these children performed once they entered kindergarten. Since Oregon now has a state-wide kindergarten assessment that measures language outcomes, it would be interesting to see how these children who made substantial English language progress in preschool did upon kindergarten entry.

Summary

This study examined the teaching strategies six Head Start teachers use in their classrooms to promote effective receptive and expressive English language development for children who are dual language learners. This is a topic of critical importance as the number of children who are dual language learners continues to increase in early childhood settings across the country. The teachers in this study were selected because of their demonstrated effectiveness in promoting English language development. Because of the minimal studies in this nascent area of research on preschool dual language learning, the intent of the study was to learn more about how to effectively help children learn English, thus preparing them for future success in school and life. In addition, the study sought to examine what professional development strategies and resources teachers had found most beneficial.

The findings of the study confirmed some of the trends highlighted in the recent literature on preschool dual language learning. For example, home language support, visual cues, and

gestures were found to contribute to receptive English language development. In response to expressive English language development strategies, a supportive social/emotional environment, singing songs with accompanying gestures, use of high quality teacher talk, dialogic reading during storybook reading in English and high quality teacher talk all were found to be positive factors.

Interestingly, the findings also yielded some surprising results. While there was strong evidence of support for home language, there was minimal evidence of support for home literacy, including no evidence of book reading. Culturally responsive curriculum, while often cited in the literature for as a positive practice both preschool and elementary settings, was not evident in the classrooms. Yet, the dual language learners in these classrooms did demonstrate higher than average progress in receptive and expressive English language development.

The professional development findings, likewise, generated thought-provoking results. There was not one common response given by the majority of teachers, regarding professional development offerings they have taken nor what they have found beneficial. Only half of the teachers had taken a college course on dual language learning and only two had mentioned relevant trainings offered on dual language learning within the program. Thus, that was not the commonality to which they could contribute their knowledge and skills. Yet, they still had the skills necessary to be successful in promoting English language development.

These findings, though mixed, help illuminate the need for further study and exploration in this area. This multi-faceted issue of preschool dual language learning in Head Start warrants attention from policy-makers, college teacher preparation programs and Head Start grantees themselves. To achieve optimal outcomes for our preschool dual language learners, we need to

ensure the teachers who educate them have access to the research-based knowledge and strategies to effectively do so.

REFERENCES

- Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services. (2010). *Report to Congress on dual language learners in Early Head Start and Head Start programs*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Au, K. H. (1993). *Literacy instruction in multicultural settings*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.
- August, D. (2013). Multilingual children: Developing and disseminating knowledge to support successful language development. *Social Policy Report* 27(4), 29-31. Retrieved from www.srcd.org/publications/social-policy-report
- August, D., Beck, I., Calderon, M., Francis, D., Lesaux, N., & Shanahan, T. (2008). Instruction and professional development. In D. August, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing reading and writing in second language learners* (pp. 131-250). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Beller, S. (2008). *Fostering language acquisition in daycare settings: What does the research tell us?* (Bernard van Leer Foundation-49). Retrieved from Bernard van Leer Foundation website: www.bernardvanleer.org
- Birks, M., & Mills, J. (2011). *Grounded theory: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bruner, J. (1978). The role of dialogue in language acquisition. In A. Sinclair, R. Jarvella, & W. Levelt (Eds.), *The child's conception of language* (pp. 241-256). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Bruner, J. (1985). *Child's talk: Learning to use language*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Brydon, M. (2010). *The effect of rich instruction on the vocabulary acquisition of preschool dual language learners* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.lib.pepperdine.edu>

- Buyse, V., Castro, D., & Peisner-Feinberg, E. (2010). Effects of a professional development program on classroom practices and outcomes for Latino dual language learners. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 25*, 194-206 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2009.10.001>
- Byrnes, J. P., & Wasik, B. A. (2009). *Language and literacy development: What educators need to know*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- California State Advisory Council of Early Learning and Care. (2013). *California's best practices for young dual language learners: Research overview paper* [Educational Standards]. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ce/documents/dllresearchpapers>
- Campaign for Quality Early Education Coalition. (2013). *Rejoinder to Teachstone's "Dual language learners and the CLASS measure"*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- Castro, D. C., Gillanders, C., Machado-Casas, M., & Buyse, V. (2006). *Nuestros niños early language and literacy program*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.
- Castro, D., Garcia, E., & Markos, A. (2013). *Dual language learners: Research informing policy*. Retrieved from www.nieer.org
- Center for Early Care and Education Research- Dual Language Learners. (2011). *Considerations for future research with young dual language learners* (Research brief #3). Retrieved from [ww.cecerdll.fpg.unc.edu](http://www.cecerdll.fpg.unc.edu)
- Chang, F., Crawford, G., Early, D., Bryant, D., Howes, C., Burchinal, M., ... Pianta, R. (2007). Spanish-speaking children's social and language development in pre-kindergarten classrooms. *Early Education and Development, 18*(2), 243-269. <http://dx.doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10409280701282959>
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Collins, M. F. (2010). ELL preschoolers' English vocabulary acquisition from storybook reading. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 25(1), 84-97. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j/eceresq.2009.07.009](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eceresq.2009.07.009)
- Copple, C., & Bredekamp, S. (2009). *Developmentally appropriate practices in early childhood programs* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cummins, J. (1999). BICS and CALPS: Clarifying the distinction. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED438551.pdf>
- Cummins, J. (2001). Bilingual mother's tongue: Why is it important for education? Retrieved from <http://www.fiplv.org/Issues/CumminsENG.pdf>
- Cummins, J. (1994). Knowledge, power and identity in teaching English as second language. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (pp. 33-58). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Downer, J., Lopez, M., Grimm, K., Hamagami, A., Pianta, R., & Howes, C. (2011, July). Observations of teacher/child interactions in classrooms serving Latino and dual language learners: Applicability of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System in diverse classrooms. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 27(27), 21-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eceresq.2011.07.005>
- Durgunoglu, A., Mir, M., & Arino-Marti, S. (2002). The relationship between bilingual children's reading and writing in their two languages. In S. Ransdell, & M. L. Barbier

(Eds.), *Psycholinguistic approaches to understanding second language learning*. (pp. 80-100).

Early Childhood Learning and Knowledge Center. (2013). Retrieved from www.eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov.

Espinosa, L. (2010a). Classroom teaching and instruction: Best practices for young English language learners. In E. Garcia, & E. Frede (Eds.), *Young English language learners: Current research and emerging directions for practice and policy* (pp. 143-164). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Espinosa, L. (2010b). *Getting it right for young children from diverse backgrounds: Applying research to improve practice*. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Facella, M., Rampino, K., & Shea, E. (2010). Effective strategies for English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(1), 209-221. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2005.10162832>

Frede, E., Jung, K., Barnett, W. S., Lamy, C. E., & Figueras, A. (2007). *The Abbott Preschool Program longitudinal effects study: Interim report*. Retrieved from www.nieer.org

Freedson, M. (2005). *Language of instruction and literacy talk in bilingual and English immersion preschool classrooms: Contributions to the early literacy development of Spanish-speaking children* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.lib.pepperdine.edu>

Freedson, M. (2010). Educating preschool teachers to support English language learners. In E. Garcia, & E. Frede (Eds.), *Young English language learners: Current research and*

- emerging directions for practice and policy* (pp. 165-183). New York, NY: Teachers College.
- Freedson, M., Figueras-Daniel, A., & Frede, E. (2013). *Classroom assessment of support for emergent bilingual acquisition* [Measurement instrument]. Rutgers University: National Institute for Early Education Research.
- Freedson, M., Figueras-Daniel, A., Frede, E., Jung, K., & Sideris, J. (2011). The Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition. In C. Howes, J. Downer, & R. Pianta (Eds.), *Dual language learners in the early childhood classroom* (pp. 233-258). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- Fry, R. (2007). *How far behind in math and reading are English language learners?* Los Angeles, CA: Pew Charitable Trust.
- Garcia, E. E., & Garcia, E. H. (2012). *Understanding the language development and early education of Hispanic children*. New York, NY: Teachers' College Press.
- Garcia, E., & Frede, E. (Eds.). (2010). *Young English language learners: Current research and emerging directions for practice and policy*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Genesee, F. (2008, October). *Myths and realities about early dual language learning*. Presented at Office of Head Start Dual Language Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Genesee, F. (2010). Dual language development in preschool children. In E. Garcia, & E. Frede (Eds.), *Young English language learners: Current research and emerging directions for practice and policy* (pp. 59-79). News York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Goldenberg, C. (2006). Improving achievement for English learners: What research tells us. *Education Week*, 25, 34-36.

- Goode, T., Sockalingam, S., Bronheim, S., Brown, M., & Jones, W. (2000). A Planner's Guide: Infusing Principles, Content and Themes Related to Cultural and Linguistic Competence into Meetings and Conferences. Retrieved from www.dml.georgetown.edu/depts/pediatrics/gucdc
- Goodwin, A. (2002). Teacher preparation and the education of immigrant children. *Education and Urban Society*, 34, 156-172.
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experiences of young American children*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- Head Start Act 1998, H.R. Res. P.L. 105-285, 101st Cong., 144 Congressional Record 7620 (7643) (enacted).
- Head Start National Center for Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness. (2012). *Strategies for supporting dual language learners* [Issue brief]. Retrieved from <http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/tta-system/cultural-linguistic>
- Head Start National Center on Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness. (2013). *A planned language approach* [Draft]. Washington, D.C.: Bank Street College of Education.
- Hernandez, D., McCartney, S., & Denton, N. (2010). A demographic portrait of young English language learners. In E. Garcia, & E. Frede (Eds.), *Young English language learners: Current research and emerging directions for policy and practice* (pp. 10-41). New York, NY : Teachers College.
- Improving Head Start for School Readiness Act of 2007, H.R. Res. 110-134, 110th Cong., (2007) (enacted).

- Jalongo, M., & Sobolak, M. (2010, November 20). Supporting young children's vocabulary growth: The challenges, the benefits and evidenced based strategies. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 38(0), 421-429. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10643-010-0433-x>
- Karoly, L., Ghosh-Dastidar, B., Zellman, G., Perlman, M., & Fernybough, L. (2008). *Prepared to learn: The nature and quality of early care and education for preschool-age children in California*. (TR539). Retrieved from Rand Corporation:
www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR539
- Kim, D., Lambert, R., & Burts, D. (2013). Evidence of the validity of Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment tool for English Language Learners and Children with Disabilities. *Early Education and Development*, 24, 574-595. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2012.701500>
- Knapp-Philo, J., & Stechuk, R. (2013, July). *Planned language approach: What is it? Why should we do it?* Paper presented at the Head Start National Center for Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness, Portland, OR.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Krashen, S., & McField, G. (2005). What works? Reviewing the latest evidence on bilingual education. *Language Learner*. Retrieved from <http://users.rcn.com/crawj/langpol>
- Lambert, R. & Kim, D-H., Taylor, H., & McGee, J. (2010). *Technical manual for the Teaching Strategies GOLD assessment system*. Technical Report. Charlotte, N.C.: Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation, University of North Carolina, Charlotte.
- Lau et al v. Nichols et al, 414 S. Ct. (1974).
- Lindsey, R., Robbins, K. N., & Terrell, R. D. (2009). *Cultural proficiency: A manual for school leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

- Lonigan, C. (2006). Development, assessment and promotion of pre-literacy skills. *Early Education and Development, 17*(1), 91-114.
- Lopez, L.M. (2013). Promoting positive development among young multilingual learners. *Social Policy Report 27*(4), 22-23. Retrieved from www.srcd.org/publications/social-policy-report
- Lopez, L. M., & Greenfield, D. B. (2004). Cross-language transfer of phonological skills of Hispanic Head Start children. *Bilingual Research Journal, 28*(1), 1-18.
- Lugo-Neris, M. J., Jackson, C. W., & Goldstein, H. (2010). Facilitating vocabulary acquisition of young English Language Learners. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools, 41*, 314-327. doi:10.1044/0161-1461(2009/07-0082)
- Magruder, E., Hayslip, W., Espinosa, L., & Matera, C. (2013, March). Many languages, one teacher: Supporting language and literacy development for preschool dual language learners. *Young Children, 8*-15.
- Matera, C. (2013). *Planned language approach* [Webinar]. Washington, DC: National Center for Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness.
- Matera, C., Lavadenz, M., & Armas, E. (2013). Dialogic reading and the development of transitional kindergarten teachers' expertise with dual language learners. *Voice for Change: The Multilingual Educator, 37*-39.
- Maxwell, K., Lim, C., & Early, D. (2006). *Early childhood teacher preparation program in the United States: National report*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute.

- McCabe, A., Tamis-LeMonda, C., Bornstein, M., Brockmeyer Cates, C., Golinkoff, R., ... Song, L. (2013). Multilingual children: Beyond myths and towards best practices. *Social Policy Report* 27(4), 1-19. Retrieved from www.srcd.org/publications/social-policy-report
- McCarty, F., Abbott-Shim, M., & Lambert, R. (2001, April). The relationship between teacher beliefs and practices and Head Start classroom quality. *Early Education & Development*, 12(2), 225-238. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15566935eed1202_4
- McLaughlin, B. (1984). Are immersion programs the answer for bilingual education in the United States? *Bilingual Review*, 11, 3-11.
- McMullen, M., Elicker, J., Goetze, G., Huang, H., Lee, S., Mathers, C., ... Yang, H. (2006, August). Using collaborative assessment to examine the relationship between self-reported beliefs and the documentable practices of preschool teachers. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, (34), 81-91. DOI: 10.1007/s10643-006-0081-3
- Mills, J., Bonner, A., & Francis, K. (2006). The development of constructivist grounded theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 1-10.
- Monkman, K., MacGillivray, L., & Hernandez Leyva, C. (2003, Summer). Literacy on three planes: Infusing social justice and culture into classroom instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal* (27), 245-258.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children. (2005). *Screening and assessment of young English language learners* [Position statement]. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation instruction*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- National Early Literacy Panel. (2008). *Developing early literacy: Report of National Early Literacy Panel, A scientific synthesis of early literacy development and scientific*

- implications for intervention*. Retrieved from www.lincs.ed.gov/publications/pdf/NELPReport09.pdf
- National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech. (2008). *Dual language learning: What does it take? Head Start dual language report*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Head Start.
- Nemeth, K. (2009). *Many languages, one classroom: Teaching dual and English language learners*. Beltsville, MD: Gryphon House.
- Nieto, S. (2010). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities* (10th anniversary ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2008). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Office of Head Start. (2009). *Revisiting and updating the multicultural principles for Head Start programs serving children ages birth to five*. Washington D.C.: Author.
- Office of Head Start. (2010). *The Head Start child development and early learning framework: Promoting positive outcomes in early childhood programs serving children 3-5 years old* [Educational standards]. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Pearson, B. (2008, October). *Promoting linguistic competence in bilingual children*. Paper presented at the Office of Head Start Dual Language Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Pianta, R., Howes, C., Burchinal, M., Bryant, D., Clifford, R., Early, D., & Barbarin, O. (2005). Features of pre-kindergarten programs, classrooms and teachers: Do they predict observed classroom quality and child-teacher interactions? *Applied Developmental Science*, 9(3), 144-159. Retrieved from www.tandfonline.com

- Richards, L., & Morse, J. (2013). *Readme first for a user's guide to qualitative methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rosselli, H. (April, 2014). *Achieving Oregon's 40/40/20 goal*. Presented at Oregon's Early Childhood Education Grand Articulation Summit xxii, Eugene, OR.
- Samson, J., & Collins, B. (2012). *Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English language learners: Applying research to policy and practice for teacher effectiveness*. Retrieved from www.americanprogress.org.
- Sanchez, G. (2011). *Analyses of language and culture beliefs and reported practices of pre-kindergarten and kindergarten teachers working with dual language learners* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from www.usf.edu
- Sanders, K., & Downer, J. (2012). Predicting acceptance of diversity in pre-k classrooms. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 27(), 503-511. Retrieved from www.journals.elsevier.com
- Santos, R. M., & Reese, D. (June 1999). Selecting culturally and linguistically appropriate materials: Suggestions for Service Providers. *ERIC DIGEST, PS-99-6*. Retrieved from www.ericcece.org
- Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal Behavior*. Acton, MA: Copley.
- Stewner-Manzanares, G. (1988). *Bilingual Education Act: Twenty years later*. Retrieved from www.ncela.gwu.edu
- Tabors, P. (2008). *One child, two languages: A guide for early childhood educators of children learning English as a second language*. (2nd Ed.). Baltimore, MD

- Tabors, P., & Snow, C. (1994). English as a second language in preschools. *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community*, 103-125.
- Tabors, P., & Terrill, D. (2011). *Helping your child learn two languages*. Washington, D.C.: Teaching Strategies.
- Teaching Strategies. (2011). *GOLD technical report*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement* (Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence). Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence. Retrieved from <http://www.usc.edu/dept/education/CMMR/CollierThomasComplete.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2001. *Head Start Program Performance Standards and Other Regulations*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services: Administration for Children, Youth and Families.
- Vitiello, V. (2013). *Dual language learners and the CLASS measure: Research and recommendations* [White paper]. Charlottesville, VA: Teachstone Training.
- Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(2), 159-180. http://dx.doi.org/1367-0050/06/02_159-22

Whitehurst, R. (2004). Dialogic reading: An effective way to read to preschoolers. Retrieved from *www.readingrockets.org*.

Zacarian, D. (2011). *Transforming schools for English language learners: A comprehensive framework for school leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Zepeda, M., Castro, D., & Cronin, S. (2011). Preparing early childhood teachers to work with young dual language learners. *Child Development Perspectives*, 10-14. Retrieved from *www.fpg.unc.edu*

Zurer Pearson, B., Burns, R. (2008, October). *Promoting language development from birth to 5 in one language or two: A short guide to program planning*. Paper presented at the Office of Head Start Dual Language Institute, Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX A

Consent for Classroom Research

Working with Preschool Dual Language Learners in Head Start Classrooms

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in a qualitative research study conducted as part of the requirements for a Doctorate in Educational Leadership, Administration and Policy in the Graduate School of Education and Psychology at Pepperdine University. For this project I will gather data from multiple classrooms and conduct multiple interviews in order to examine how teachers promote English language development for children who are dual language learners. The research will be supervised by Dr. Linda Purrington, Dissertation Committee Chair.

The purpose of this research project is to learn what teaching strategies in Head Start classrooms help promote receptive and expressive English language development for children who are dual language learners. The information generated and data collected may be used for academic research or publication. All information obtained will be treated confidentially.

For this project, I will interview teachers and conduct observations in each participants' classroom. During the one-on-one interviews, you will be asked to answer a series of interview questions. The entire interview should take between 45 minutes to 1 hour and will be conducted in person. I will tape record the interview for accuracy, but at any point, you may ask me to turn off the tape or refuse to answer a question. After the tape has been transcribed, the tape will be erased and your identity will remain anonymous. The classroom observation will take place a couple of weeks after the interview and will last approximately two hours. During the observation, I will be utilizing the Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition (CASEBA) instrument and also taking field notes. If additional clarification is needed, a second, less structured interview, may be requested. Through this data, I hope to learn more about the strategies Head Start preschool teachers are implementing to promote English language development for preschool aged children who are dual language learners.

Participation is voluntary and there is no compensation provided in exchange for your participation. You are free to withdraw your participation at any time should you decide to do so. There are no penalties nor loss of benefits should you decide not to participate. If you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]. I hope you will enjoy this opportunity. Thank you for your help. For questions about your rights, please contact Dr. Linda Purrington, Dissertation Chair, [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. You may also contact Dr. Thema Bryant-Davis, Chairperson of the Pepperdine University Graduate and Professional Schools IRB, [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] for additional questions about your rights as a participant.

Sincerely,

Dawn M. Terrill, Doctoral student

Signature of Researcher Date

Printed name of participant Signature of participant Date

Approved by Pepperdine University GPS IRB February 27, 2014-February 28, 2015

APPENDIX B

Informed Consent for Classroom Research: Assistant teachers
Working with Preschool Dual Language Learners in Head Start Classrooms

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in a qualitative research study conducted as part of the requirements for a Doctorate in Educational Leadership, Administration and Policy in the Graduate School of Education and Psychology at Pepperdine University. For this project I will gather data from multiple classrooms and conduct multiple interviews in order to examine how teachers promote English language development for children who are dual language learners. The research will be supervised by Dr. Linda Purrington, Dissertation Committee Chair.

The purpose of this research project is to learn what teaching strategies in Head Start classrooms help promote receptive and expressive English language development for children who are dual language learners. The information generated and data collected may be used for academic research or publication. All information obtained will be treated confidentially.

For this project, I will interview teachers and conduct observations in each participants' classroom. The classroom observation will take place a couple of weeks after the interview and will last approximately two hours. The focus of the classroom observations are the lead teachers, not the assistants nor the children. During the approximately two hour observation, I will be utilizing the Classroom Assessment of Supports for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition (CASEBA) instrument and also taking field notes. Through this data, I hope to learn more about the strategies Head Start preschool teachers are implementing to promote English language development for preschool aged children who are dual language learners.

Participation is voluntary and there is no compensation provided in exchange for your participation. As an assistant teacher, your only participation will be in the classroom when I am observing for approximately two hours. However, you are free to withdraw your participation at any time should you decide to do so and not be part of the study. There are no penalties nor loss of benefits should you decide not to participate. If you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]. I hope you will enjoy this opportunity. Thank you for your help. For questions about your rights, please contact Dr. Linda Purrington, Dissertation Chair, [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. You may also contact Dr. Thema Bryant-Davis, Chairperson of the Pepperdine University Graduate and Professional Schools IRB, at [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] for additional questions about your rights as a participant.

Sincerely,

Dawn M. Terrill, Doctoral student

Signature of Researcher

Date

Printed name of participant

Signature of participant

Date

Approved by Pepperdine University GPS IRB February 27, 2014-February 28, 2015

APPENDIX C

Informed Consent for Classroom Research: Children

Dear Family Members,

My name is Dawn Terrill and I am a doctoral student at Pepperdine University in the Educational Administration and Policy Program. I am doing a study for school about strategies teachers use to help children learn English. As part of the study, I am going to spend a couple of hours in your child's Head Start classroom on just one day. I will be watching the teacher to see how he/she teaches and talks with the children. My focus will be on the teacher, not the children. I will observe typical lessons that the teacher would teach on any given day and children's participation will be as it would be on any given day. No teacher's names or student names will be identified in the lesson observation data collected.

Participation is voluntary and there is no compensation provided in exchange for your child's participation. Children whose parents choose for them not to participate in observed lessons will be provided a related non-observed activity. You are free to withdraw your participation at any time should you decide to do so. If you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]. For questions about your rights, you may also contact Dr. Linda Purrington, Dissertation Chair, at [REDACTED], [REDACTED] or Dr. Thema Bryant-Davis, Chairperson of the Pepperdine University Graduate and Professional Schools IRB, at [REDACTED] or [REDACTED].

Please indicate whether or not you give permission for your child to be involved in the classroom activities while I am observing.

Teacher's Name: _____

Child's Name: _____

_____ Yes, I give my permission for my child to be involved in the classroom activities while you are observing.

_____ No, I do not want my child involved in observed classroom activities.

Parent's/Guardian's Signature: _____

If you have questions, please contact me at [REDACTED]

Thank you for your help!

Sincerely,

Dawn Terrill

Pepperdine University Doctoral Student

Signature of researcher

Date

Approved by Pepperdine University GPS IRB February 27, 2014-February 28, 2015

APPENDIX D

Forma de autorización para los niños

Queridas Familias,

Me llamo Dawn Terrill y soy una estudiante a la Universidad de Pepperdine en el programa de Administración y Polizas en Educación. Estudio las estrategias que los maestros en Head Start usan para ayudarles a los niños aprenden ingles. Como parte de este estudio, pasare dos o tres horas en el salón de clase de su niño en un dia. Observare el maestro para saber como les enseña y les habla con los niños. El enfoque sera en el maestro, no en los niños. Observare actividades típicas que los maestros hacen cada día. No hablare con los niños. No voy a incluir los nombres de los niños ni de los maestros en mi estudio.

La participación es voluntaria. Si Ud. prefiere que su niño no participe en las actividades de la clase durante la observación, no le observare. Otra actividad en la clase sera disponible para el/ella.

Favor de indicar abajo si de permiso a que su niño participe en actividades regulares durante la observación.

El nombre del maestro: _____

El nombre del niño: _____

_____ Si, doy permiso que mi niño participe en las actividades de la clase durante la observación.

_____ No, no doy permiso que mi niño participe en las actividades de la clase durante la observación.

La firma del miembro de la familia: _____

Si tengan preguntas, favor de contactarme a [REDACTED]. Si tengan preguntas sobre sus derechos, favor de contactar Dr. Linda Purrington, Dissertation Chair, a su correo electronico [REDACTED] o [REDACTED].

Gracias por su apoyo.

Sinceramente,

Dawn Terrill
Estudiante de La Universidad de Pepperdine

APPENDIX E

Interview Protocol

Pseudonym of interviewee: _____

Location of interview: _____

Date of interview: _____ **Time of interview:** _____

Review the intent of the study and thank the participants for their time.
Remind the participants that you will be recording the interview with an audio recording device in addition to taking notes. Let them know that they can request to stop the audio taping at any time.

- 1) How do you support home language development for children who are dual language learners?

- 2) How do you promote children's receptive English language development?

- 3) How do you introduce and reinforce new vocabulary?

- 4) How do you encourage children to use their emerging expressive English skills?

- 5) Which teaching strategies have you tried previously that you did not feel were effective?

- 6) What professional development resources and opportunities have been most beneficial to you in working with children who are dual language learners?

- 7) What opportunities have you had to share your challenges, successes and brainstorm ideas?

- 8) What training or coursework have you had on working with children who are dual language learners?

Ask the participants what additional information, if any, they would like to share.

Thank them for their time and participation. Remind them that you will be conducting a classroom observation the following month.

APPENDIX F

Interview questions categorized by themes

Interview Question	Categorized theme
1) How do you support home language development for children who are dual language learners?	Teaching strategies
2) How do you promote children's receptive English language development?	
3) How do you introduce and reinforce new vocabulary?	
4) How do you encourage children to use their emerging expressive English skills?	
5) Which strategies have you tried previously that you did not feel were effective?	
6) What professional development resources and opportunities have been most beneficial to you in working with children who are dual language learners?	Professional development
7) What opportunities have you had to share your challenges, successes and brainstorm ideas?	
8) What training or coursework have you had on working with children who are dual language learners?	

APPENDIX G

Interview questions aligned with research questions

Research question	Interview Question	Literature Sources
<p>RQ1: What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote receptive English language development of dual language learners who are demonstrating progress of three or more levels, as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?</p>	<p>How do you support home language development for children who are dual language learners?</p>	<p>Chang et al., 2007; Cummins, 1994; Durgunoglu et al., 2002; Espinosa, 2010a; Espinosa, 2010b; Frede et al., 2007; Freedson, 2005; Krashen, 1985; Goldenberg, 2006; Lopez & Greenfield, 2004; H.R. Res. P.L. 105-285, 7643; National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008; Office of Head Start, 2009; Pearson, 2008; Tabors, 2008; Tabors & Terrill, 2011</p>
	<p>How do you promote children's receptive English language development?</p>	<p>Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, 2010; Byrnes & Wasik, 2009; Cummins, 1994; Espinosa, 2010b; Jalongo & Sobolak, 2010; Office of Head Start, 2010; Tabors, 2008</p>
	<p>How do you introduce and reinforce new vocabulary?</p>	<p>August et al., 2008; Brydon, 2010; Castro et al., 2006; Collins, 2010; Espinosa, 2010b; Facella et al., 2010; Freedson, 2005; Goldenberg, 2006; Magruder et al., 2013; Matera, 2013; National Early Literacy Panel, 2008; Nemeth, 2009; Tabors, 2008; Tabors & Terrill, 2011</p>

(Continued)

<p>RQ2: What strategies are utilized by Head Start preschool teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon to promote expressive English language development of dual language learners who are demonstrating progress of three or more levels, as determined by their assessment ratings on Teaching Strategies GOLD Assessment System?</p>	<p>How do you encourage children to use their emerging expressive English skills?</p>	<p>Hart & Risley, 1995; Hernandez et al., 2010; Jalongo & Sobolak, 2010; Office of Head Start, 2010</p>
	<p>What specific teaching strategies have you found to be most successful overall in promoting children's English development?</p>	<p>Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, 2010; Downer et al., 2011; Espinosa, 2010a; Espinosa, 2010b; Facella et al., 2010; Head Start National Center on Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness, 2013; Knapp-Philo & Stechuk, 2013; Lopez & Greenfield, 2004; Matera, 2013; Magruder, et al., 2013; National Early Literacy Panel, 2008</p>
<p>RQ3: What, professional development strategies and resources, if any, have Head Start teachers in a metropolitan area in Oregon found to be beneficial in promoting children's receptive and expressive English language development?</p>	<p>What challenges, if any, have you had in working with children who are dual language learners?</p>	<p>Espinosa, 2010b; Freedson, 2010; Goodwin, 2002; McCarty, et al., 2001; National Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Resource, Pal-tech, 2008; Nieto, 2010; Zacarian, 2011</p>
	<p>Which strategies have you tried previously that you did not feel were effective?</p>	<p>Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, 2010; Downer et al., 2011; Espinosa, 2010a; Espinosa, 2010b; Facella et al., 2010; Head Start National Center on Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness, 2013; Knapp-Philo & Stechuk, 2013; Lopez & Greenfield, 2004;</p>

(Continued)

		Magruder, et al., 2013; Matera, 2013; National Early Literacy Panel, 2008
	What professional development resources and opportunities have been most beneficial to you in working with children who are dual language learners?	Buyse, et al., 2010; Castro, et al., 2006; Freedson, et al., 2011; Goode et al., 2000; Lindsey et al., 2009; Matera, 2013; Sanchez, 2011; Zepeda, et al., 2011
	What opportunities have you had to share your challenges, successes and brainstorm ideas?	Castro et al., 2006; Nieto, 2010; Zepeda, et al., 2011
	What training or coursework have you had on working with children who are dual language learners?	Castro, et al., 2006; Espinosa, 2010b; Freedson, 2010; Karoly et al., 2008; National Center for Cultural and Linguistic Diversity, 2012; Maxwell, et al, 2006; Nieto, 2010; Sanchez, 2011; Zepeda et al., 2011

APPENDIX H

Observation notes instrument

Research Area:		
Researcher:		
Location:		
Pseudonym of Teacher:		
Date:	Start:	End:
Observation		Observer Notes

APPENDIX J

*Classroom Assessment of Support for Emergent Bilingual Acquisition (CASEBA)**Preschool Classroom Observation Rating statistics*

Item	Min	Max	Mo	Mdn	M
1	6	7	6	6.5	6.2
2	6	7	6	6.5	6.2
3	1	4	1,4	2.5	2.5
4	2	5	3,5	3.7	3.5
5	2	6	4,5	4.5	4.3
6	4	4	4	4	4
7	3	7	6	6	5.3
8	5	7	6	6	6.2
9	2	7	2,5	3.5	4
10	1	1	1	1	1
11	3	7	7	6	6
12	1	5	4	4	3.3
13	2	4	3	3	2.8
14	1	5	2	2	2.2
15	5	7	7	6.5	6.3
16	5	7	6	6	6.2
17	7	7	7	7	7
18	7	7	7	7	7
19	4	6	4,5,6	5	5

(Continued)

20	6	7	7	7	6.8
21	4	7	6	6	5.8
22	4	7	6,7	6	5.8
23	2	6	4	4	4
24	6	7	7	7	6.7
25	4	7	7	6.5	6
26	4	6	6	6	5.3
27	7	7	7	7	7

Note: Rating statistics are reflected for CASEBA 27 observation items. 1= No Evidence; 3=

Minimal Evidence; 5= Good Evidence; 7= Strong Evidence

APPENDIX K

IRB approval

February 27, 2014

Dawn Terrill



Protocol #: E1013D02

Project Title: Dual language learners in Head Start: Examining teaching strategies that promote English language development

Dear Ms. Terrill:

Thank you for submitting your application, *Dual language learners in Head Start: Examining teaching strategies that promote English language development* for expedited review to Pepperdine University's Graduate and Professional Schools Institutional Review Board (GPS IRB). The IRB appreciates the work you and your advisor, Dr. Purrington, completed on the proposal. The IRB has reviewed your submitted IRB application and all ancillary materials. As the nature of the research met the requirements for expedited review under provision Title 45 CFR 46.110 (Research Category 7) of the federal Protection of Human Subjects Act, the IRB conducted a formal, but expedited, review of your application materials.

I am pleased to inform you that your application for your study was granted **Full Approval**. The IRB approval begins today, **February 27, 2014**, and terminates on **February 27, 2015**.

Your final consent form has been stamped by the IRB to indicate the expiration date of study approval. One copy of the consent form is enclosed with this letter and one copy will be retained for our records. **You can only use copies of the consent that have been stamped with the GPS IRB expiration date to obtain consent from your participants.**

Please note that your research must be conducted according to the proposal that was submitted to the GPS IRB. If changes to the approved protocol occur, a revised protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB before implementation. For *any* proposed changes in your research protocol, please submit a Request for Modification form to the GPS IRB. Please be aware that changes to your protocol may prevent the research from qualifying for expedited review and require submission of a new IRB application or other materials to the GPS IRB. If contact with subjects will extend beyond February 27, 2015, a **Continuation or Completion of Review Form** must be submitted at least one month prior to the expiration date of study approval to avoid a lapse in approval.

A goal of the IRB is to prevent negative occurrences during any research study. However, despite our best intent, unforeseen circumstances or events may arise during the research. If an unexpected situation or adverse event happens during your investigation, please notify the GPS IRB as soon as possible. We will ask for a complete explanation of the event and your response. Other actions also may be required depending on the nature of the event. Details regarding the timeframe in which adverse events must be reported to the GPS IRB and the appropriate form to be used to report this information can be found in the *Pepperdine University Protection of*

Human Participants in Research: Policies and Procedures Manual (see link to “policy material” at <http://www.pepperdine.edu/irb/graduate/>).

Please refer to the protocol number denoted above in all further communication or correspondence related to this approval. Should you have additional questions, please contact me. On behalf of the GPS IRB, I wish you success in this scholarly pursuit.

Sincerely,

Thema Bryant-Davis, Ph.D.

Chair, Graduate and Professional Schools IRB

Pepperdine University

cc: Dr. Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives

Mr. Brett Leach, Compliance Attorney

Dr. Linda Purrington, Faculty Advisor