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As states begin to highlight the system supports used to include English language learners with disabilities in standards-based assessments and accountability programs, implementation of those supports will be closely examined by school districts. This case study investigates the classroom culture in an early childhood preschool program for four-year-old children with disabilities. Classroom observations were used to determine how two young children with disabilities were acquiring English as a second language. Specific focus was given to activities that allowed for second language acquisition, native language development, the attainment of developmental skills, and alternative communication skills such as sign language and a communication board. An investigation took place into current theories to create a knowledge base for understanding how young children acquire linguistic skills in English and how classroom culture was created.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Early Interventions

Early intervention is available for young children birth through four-years-old who are identified as having a disabling condition or being at risk of developing other particular needs that may impact their future development according to the Texas Interagency Council of Early Childhood Interventions (2005). Early intervention consists of providing services to children and their families for the purpose of lessening the effects of specific debilitating conditions (Hagger & Winmueller, 2001). Early intervention can be corrective or precautionary depending on the nature and need of the child and family (McLean & Odom, 1996). The program can remediate existing developmental problems or prevent the predicted occurrence of developmental delays (August & Shanahan, 2006). There are three primary reasons for early intervention with young children (Richard-Amato & Snow, 2005). A specific program might enhance the child’s cognitive, social, emotional, and physical development. Second, the intervention possibly will provide support, education, and assistance to the family. Third, the instruction could strengthen the child’s and family’s benefit to society while preparing for future endeavors (Tabors & Snow, 1994). When young children are acquiring a second language and require early intervention assistance, issues are compounded. Teachers of these children need to be particularly aware of the skills that a child can demonstrate without the use of the English language (Tabors, 1997). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to observe the classroom culture and environment of two students enrolled in the preschool program for children with disabilities (PPCD) who were learning a second
language. Annotations were made of the non-English speakers, and observations were recorded through anecdotal records of the teacher and peer interactions as the focus children gained developmental skills and acquired a second language.

Background Information

Educators struggle to find ways to appropriately identify children in need of language support (Roskos, Tabors & Lanhart, 2004). Teachers must use caution when assessing an English language learner’s (ELL) overall social, emotional, cognitive, and physical abilities to ensure that the child had sufficient time to adjust to the classroom environment (August & Shanahan, 2006; Salend, 2001). Prudence is used to assure that the child has moved beyond language barriers and has adjusted socially before embarking on any type of assessment except the most informal (Tabors, 1997). The task of identifying disabilities for linguistically and culturally diverse young children is compounded when the native language skills are still developing as is the case for very young children (Anderson, 1994; Roskos, Tabors & Lanhart, 2004). A critical aspect appears to be the apparent failure of educators to recognize the vital relationship between the impact of learning a second language and cognitive development (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). Essential components in the level of language and cognitive growth achieved by English language learners is language competency, the development of phonemic knowledge base through their native language, and the acquisition of a second language (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Snow, 1983; Tabors, 1997). These three features are interconnected in a multifaceted process that supports high levels of performance for linguistically and culturally diverse children. In an
appropriate early childhood setting, educators attend to all three elements thereby promoting language acquisition, cognitive processing, social development, and literacy growth (Collier, 1995; Crain, 1992; Gonzalez, Brusca-Vega & Yawkey, 1997; Meadows, 1993; Snow, 1983; Tabors, 1997; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Young children from culturally diverse backgrounds are enrolling in schools today at very rapid rates (Banks, 2005; Miramontes, Nadeau & Commins, 1997). In the United States, children from families who do not speak English as their primary language may not receive equal opportunities for learning in today’s classrooms (Clayton, 2003). In 2004, approximately 21% of the 15,476,274 children ages one through 5 years old living in the United States spoke a language other than English at home according to the U. S. Bureau of Census (2006). Additionally, there are approximately 1,697,382 children ages zero through 5 years old residing in Texas. The total population of those persons living in Texas in 2004 was approximately 22,158,631 and 31.9% of them were speaking another language in the home. 27% of all children enrolled in kindergarten spoke a language at home that was not English, stated Steve Murdock, State Demographer (2006). Head Start reported in 2004 that 65% of its 905,000 students spoke English, 31% spoke Spanish, and 4% spoke one of 129 other languages (Head Start Bureau, 2005). Furthermore, Head Start reported that these figures are up from 22% in 2000 for Spanish speakers. In order to meet the needs of the students, educators must understand how culture influences language, the way children learn, and to what extent disability issues impact these young learners and their families (Clayton, 2003).
Early childhood programs operating in the 21st century must work to enhance a positive awareness of individual differences, learning styles, and literacy growth (Tabors, 1997). Preschool programs for children with disabilities will continue to face the challenge of providing meaningful education and services to growing numbers of ethnically, linguistically, and racially diverse children whose backgrounds and experiences diverge from the Caucasian teachers and administrators who might serve them (Gallimore & Goldberg, 2001). The Office of Special Education programs in 2005 reported that there were 598,396 preschool children ages three through 5 being served under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) during the 2003-2004 school year. Children enrolled included those from all fifty states, plus the District of Columbia. The breakdown by native language for these children receiving special education services in the area of preschool programs for children with disabilities was not reported from the Office of Special Education (2005).

Identification of Need

The focal point throughout a large majority of research on linguistically and culturally diverse children has been on kindergarten through grade 12 populations with the near exclusion of the preschool populations (August & Hakuta, 1997; Prince & Lawrence, 1992; Tabors, 1997). A longitudinal study that began in 1994 by the Committee Developing a Research Agenda on the Education of Limited English Proficient and Bilingual Students indicated that linguistically and culturally diverse preschool children were underrepresented in the second language acquisition and bilingual educational research literature and targeted this population as a high-priority
investigative area (August & Hakuta, 1997). English language learners with special needs represented another high priority area targeted by the committee. This combined research committee’s focus underscored that there were many unanswered questions regarding linguistically and culturally diverse preschool children diagnosed with developmental delays. The committee’s research agenda highlighted practitioners’ existing concerns over current practices related to the identification, placement, and instruction of preschool children with disabilities who were English language learners (August & Hakuta, 1997). Of equal concern to this committee was the establishment of active partnerships with linguistically and culturally diverse families in their child’s special education process. The lack of funding for research programs focusing on English language learners tended to exacerbate the issues (Valdes, 2001).

Additional areas which have received incomplete attention in the research literature were high disturbances of native language loss or attrition in very young children who had disabilities and how this paradigm changed educational endeavors (Peregoy & Boyle, 1993; Hinkel, 1999). Often children were not provided with access to early intervention programs because of a largely held myth by educators of the cognitive handicap attributed to bilinguals (Arzubiaga, Ceja & Artiles, 2000; Bartolome & Balderrama, 2001; Compton-Lilly, 2004; Dickinson & Tabor, 2001; Kozol, 1991). This myth of bilingual handicap holds that when linguistic minorities fail to develop it is because of their bilingualism (Artiles & Trent, 1994; Ortiz & Yates, 2001; Tabor, 1997; Thurlow, Albus, Shyyan, Liu & Barrera, 2005). While the educational goal then becomes to develop proficiency in the second language for students, the children’s use of their
native languages sometimes is discouraged and/or forbidden (Milian, 2002; Ortiz, 1997; Tabors, 1997; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Many educators believe children who are English language learners will learn English best through structured immersion, where they have English as a second language (ESL) classes and content-based instruction in English (Hakuta, 1986; Thomas & Collier, 1997). These programs provide more time on task in English than in bilingual classes (Asher, 1979; Cabezon & Lambert, 1998; Cazden, 1984). Research, however, specifies that this increased exposure to English does not necessarily accelerate the acquisition of English (Christian, Howard & Loeb, 2000; Richards & Lockhart, 1996). Over the course of the instruction, children in bilingual classes, with exposure to the native language and to English, acquire English language skills equivalent to those acquired by children who have been in English-only programs (Cummins, 1981; Davies, 1999; Soltero & Moya-Leang, 2002). This would not be expected if time on task were the most important factor in language learning (Cummins, 1996). Researchers also caution against withdrawing native language support too soon and suggest that although oral communication skills in a second language may be acquired within 2 or 3 years, it may take 4 to 6 years to acquire the level of proficiency needed for understanding academic language (Collier, 1995; Cummins, 1981; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Teachers should be aware that giving language minority children support in the native language is essential (Hakuta, 1986; Wilkins & Ortiz, 1986). The use of the native language in bilingual classrooms enables children to maintain grade-level school work, reinforces the bond between the home and the school, and allows them to participate
more effectively in school activities (Hakuta, 1986; Krashen, 1982; Ortiz & Yates, 1983). Furthermore, if the children acquire literacy skills in the native language, as adults they may be functionally bilingual, with an advantage in technical or professional careers (Richard-Amato, 1998; Hinkel, 1999).

Researchers indicate that a nonuse of native languages lead to feelings of embarrassment and shame of one’s own culture (Bunce & Watkins, 1995; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Garcia, 2001; Hakuta, 1986; Miramontes, Nadeau & Commins, 1997). These feelings in turn can lead to the use of the second-language and abandonment of the native language and ensuing academic difficulties (Genishi, Dyson & Fassler, 1994; Miramontes, Nadeau & Commins, 1997; Snow, 1983; Wong Fillmore, 1991). Furthermore, academic difficulties reinforce the myth and result in an advocacy for second-language instruction (Casey, 2006; Garcia & Malkin, 1993; Hickmann, 2001; Tabors, 1997; Zetlin, Padron & Wilson, 1996). Researchers argue that the school system instructional practices rather than bilingualism were responsible for the low achievement of some linguistically minority children and that schools needed to provide instruction that valued a student’s native language and encouraged its use (Cummins, 1984; Delpit, 1995; Garcia, 2001; Tabors, 1997).

English language learners do not show up to educational settings as blank slates. They enter classrooms armed with various degrees of oral proficiency and literacy development in their native language. There is clear evidence that tapping into native language literacy can grant access to skills in second language acquisition (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002; Bialystok & Cummins, 1991; Casey, 2006; Gonzalez, 1999; Ortiz & Yates, 1984). A few researchers have begun to address issues related to the
introduction of a second-language in formal school settings without first language support when the native language of linguistically and culturally diverse children was not fully developed due to a lack of native language support (Anderson, 1994; August & Hakuta, 1998; August & Shanahan, 2006; Delpit, 1995; Krashen, 1999; Tabors, 1997; Valdes, 2001). These studies seemed to indicate that under these conditions children experienced erosion of their native languages (Asher, 1979; Banks & Banks, 2003; Dickinson, 2002; Garcia, 2001; Krashen, 1999; Tabors, 1998). Most of the studies have focused on school-age children with kindergarten-age children comprising the youngest group studied (August & Hakuta, 1998). Many of these studies have been quasi-experimental in nature, blending both quantitative and qualitative work, and have been driven by trying a new or improved course of study or intervention (August & Hakuta, 1997; Banks & Banks, 2003; Cummins, 1989; Durgunoglu & Oney, 2000). Researchers have simply examined the discrete skills related to surface features of language to the exclusion of studying language use in context or realistic developmental stages of language (Anderson, 1994; August & Hakuta, 1997; Wilkinson & Ortiz, 1986). When preschoolers have special needs and they exhibit a native language other than English, there were very few studies, and these few were usually related to speech development (Heller, Holtzman & Messick, 1982; Mattes, & Omark, 1984; Odom & McConnell, 1992; Ortiz, 1997; Ortiz & Yates, 1983; Ortiz & Yates, 2001; Ortiz, Garcia, Holtzman, Polyzoi, Snell, Wilkinson & Willig, 1985; Ovando & McLaren, 2000). Consequently, studies are needed to determine the characteristics of effective schools, classrooms, and instructional practices for preschool English-language learners with disabilities, especially since there are many studies in each of the disciplines of either special
education or best practices for English language learners; however, these two disciplines rarely come together to share information (August & Hakuta, 1997; Ortiz, 1997; Ortiz & Yates, 2001).

Statement of Problem

Based on these identified areas of need, a case study which focused on the cultural makeup of a Preschool Program for Children with Disabilities (PPCD) where two linguistically and culturally diverse four-year-old preschool children were enrolled could help delve into unexplored areas. Furthermore, a research project such as this could identify program components that address major educational needs by identifying and describing how preschool English language learners with special needs acquired English while being supported in their native language. Specifically, such a study might help to explain how the classroom culture supports and impacts the lives of young children while they learn a second language and grow despite their developmental delays. Communication skills and cognitive acquisition were the focal points of the study. August and Shanahan (2006) point out in their recently released report from the national literacy panel that research on the acquisition of literacy in a second language remains scant at all age levels.

Interesting Topic

There are individuals who have a curiosity for learning about language development and cognitive growth of linguistically and culturally diverse preschool children when they are placed in language environments which differ from that of their
home at such an early age (Heller, Holtzman & Messick, 1982; Ortiz & Yates, 1984). Natural inquisitiveness emerges from informal classroom observations in PPCD classes. Some may need to understand how teachers and paraprofessionals create social environments for linguistically and culturally diverse preschool children in their care because there is a need to promote an optimal learning environment (Cazden, 1984; Heath, 1986). More specifically, some individuals have an interest in learning how linguistically and culturally diverse children try to make sense of their educational settings, and how these environments meet the needs of children as they learned to negotiate in social situations and attained cognitive skills (Asher, 1979; Owocki, 2001). It might be interesting to see the evolution of children’s native language and the achievement of second-language communication skills (Banks, 1988; Cabezon & Lambert, 1998).

Research Interest

This study’s primary concentration rested in the discovery of how 2 four-year-old children who speak languages other than English and have qualified for a PPCD classroom due to a disability such as mental retardation and autism acquire and use a second language and developed in an inclusionary preschool classroom. The classroom had English as the primary means of instruction. The nature of the learning environment and the classroom culture in which the two linguistically and culturally diverse preschool children were placed for a full day of instruction was the focus in this case study. Therefore, study emphasized the following features of the PPCD classroom:
The structured and unstructured activities – The structured activities include teacher directed events and the unstructured activities are those experiences that were child initiated.

The students’ use of language to meet various needs – This included but was not limited to a child’s desire or objection to completing a task, participating in an activity, or taking care of personnel needs.

The routines of the classroom – This included but was not limited to putting away materials, transitioning to new activities, or lining up to leave the classroom.

The focus children’s communicative interactions with their peers and adults – This included the use of the native language, second language, and alternative communication choices.

The instructional methods – This included each instructional event or period of time used by any person in an educational capacity.

Consequently, the study was designed to answer the following questions:

Research Questions

1. How was culture represented in a PPCD classroom?
   a. What was represented in the physical space, activities, and routines of the PPCD classroom?
   b. What were the communication choices of focus children with the inclusion children in the PPCD classroom?
   c. What were the communication choices between focus children and the English speaking teachers in the PPCD classroom?

2. How did the classroom culture support the developmental stages of growth for focus children in the PPCD classroom?
   a. Did support come through native language development?
   b. Was support noted during the acquisition of English?
   c. Was support demonstrated through the attainment of cognitive, physical, social, and emotional skills?
   d. How were the focus children supported through the development of communication skills?
Working Definitions

In reviewing the questions that were a catalyst for this study, it was important to state a definition of classroom culture. The work of Cummins (1981), Diaz (1992), Ortiz (1997), and Tabors (1998) was used to develop a definition for this research study. Classroom culture was perceived as encompassing the interactions of all the participants not only with each other, but also within the physical space using various materials around the daily routines of classroom life. This definition also included teachers’ beliefs and expectations about what the children could and could not do independently and with assistance. This was important because it appeared the teachers influenced the patterns of classroom communication and shaped the content of the experiences that were provided (Cabezon & Lambert, 1998; Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000).

Perhaps even defining the word culture is necessary to eliminate a source of contention. Tillman believed that “culture is a group’s individual and collective ways of thinking, believing, and knowing which includes their shared experiences, consciousness, skills, values, forms of expression, social institutions and behaviors” (2002, p. 4). Therefore, for the purposes of this study, classroom culture is defined as the interactions of all participants with each other and the environment while acknowledging the hidden rules, experiences, expectations, and value systems of each individual represented.

Linguistically and culturally diverse children for the purpose of this study were defined by Tabors (1997), Dickinson & Tabors (2001), Snow (1983), and Zehr (2001) as children from various language backgrounds who were simultaneously acquiring two
languages while occupying residency in various cultures. Residency was considered the
interaction of time periods that had a significant influence on the development of the
social and cognitive learning of the child (York, 2003). According to Kroeber and
Kluckhohn (1992) linguistically and culturally diverse children exhibit patterns of explicit
and implicit language, constituting the distinctive achievement of various human groups,
including their understanding of artifacts; the essential core consists of cultural traditions
and especially their attached values. Cultural systems may, on the one hand be
considered as products of actions, while on the other hand be viewed as conditioning
elements of further actions (York, 2003). Linguistical application of culture according to
Leung (1994) included the application of Kroeber and Kluckhohn’s definition of culture
and the embodiment of language diversity within individual persons. For this study,
reference to children who had varied cultural exposures and diverse language
backgrounds will be referred to as linguistically and culturally diverse. Additionally, these
children were acquiring two languages while spending time in various cultural venues.

For this study English language learners (ELL) will be considered children with
prior knowledge and experiences about learning language and they are in the process
of language acquisition in English (Bialystok, 1991; Brice & Roseberry-McKibbin, 2001;
Cummins, 1989). Previous to the use of the term ELL was the term limited English
refer to students who are acquiring English as LEP (Genesee, 2000; Dickinson &
Tabors, 2001; Thurlow, Albus, Shyyan, Liu & Barrera, 2005). No Child Left Behind
(NCLB) list the following definition in their literature. “An LEP (or ELL) student is an
individual age three through twenty one, who is enrolled in a U. S. elementary or
secondary school and meets these two requirements: Was not born in the United States or speaks a native language other than English and may be unable, because of difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understand the English language to score at the proficient level on state assessments of academic achievement” (Office of the Under Secretary, 2002). While many pieces of literature use the term interchangeably, for this study students who are acquiring a second language beyond their native language they will be referred to as English language learners (ELL).

L1 refers to the first language an individual might demonstrate an understanding about and L2 refers to the second language an individual is learning or speaking (Cummins, 1981; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Freeman & Freeman, 2001; Krashen, 1994). L1 is sometimes referred to as the first language or native language (Garcia, 2001; Houk, 2005; Krashen, 2003). The second language is the target language or the language learned after the first and may become the student’s dominant language if the acquisition is required in order to survive in a culture different from the individual’s native culture (Cummins, 1996; Garcia, 2000, Hinkel, 1999; Krashen, 1994; Tabors, 1997). Occasionally, the language a person regards as their native, home, and/or ancestral language is referred to as their heritage language (Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005). Additionally, the term mother tongue is associated with the language learned from the mother or the first language learned (Garcia, 2001). For clarification purpose in this study the term native language will be used. The term native language that will be used for this study as the language a person acquired first in life, or identifies with as a member of an ethnic group (Cummins, 1996; Houk, 2005; Isenberg & Jalongo, 2003; Krashen, 2003).
Preschool program for children with disabilities (PPCD) includes all three- and four-year-old children who have disabilities (Day, 2004; Diffily & Morrison, 1996; Noonan & McCormick, 2006; Ortiz & Yates, 1984). 5-year-olds with disabilities who aren't old enough for kindergarten on September first are also included (Calderon & Slavin, 2001; Christian, 1994). The needs of these children because of permanent or temporary disability in the areas of cognitive, communicative, social/ emotional and/or adaptive disabilities are unable to be met in a typical environment without special education and related services (Bredekamp & Rosegrant, 1992; Milian, 2002; Noonan & McCormick, 2006; Ortiz, 2001). This group includes preschool children who are delayed or whose development is atypical and those who have autism, hearing loss, health impairments, orthopedic impairments, speech-language impairments, visual impairments, or traumatic brain-injury (Anderson, 1994; Bredekamp & Copple, 1997; Dickinson, 2002). Preschool children with disabilities who meet these eligibility criteria may receive services upon reaching their third birthday and do not have to wait until the beginning of the next school year (Bredekamp & Rosegrant, 1992; Noonan & McCormick, 2006).

The practice of educating all or most children in the same classroom, including children with physical, mental, and developmental disabilities is referred to as inclusion (Dickinson, 2002; Noonan & McCormick, 2006; Thurlow, Albus, Shyyan, Liu & Barrera, 2005). Inclusion classes often require an educational assistant to the classroom teacher (Salend, 2001). The 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) made inclusion a controversial topic by requiring a free and appropriate education with related services for each child in the least restrictive environment possible, and an
Individualized Education Program (IEP) for each qualifying child (Culatta & Tompkins, 1999; Lewis & Doorlag, 1999; Noonan & McCormick, 2006). In 1991, the bill was renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the revision broadened the definition of disabilities and added related services (Couchenour & Chrisman, 2004; McCormick, Wong & Yogi, 2003; Noonan & McCormick, 2006). For the purposes of this study it is noted that the PPCD classroom that was observed is an inclusionary classroom. A small number of children in the class had a disability condition and most of the children in the classroom were developing typically.

The least restrictive environment (LRE) for this study will be defined as the educational setting where a child with disabilities can receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE) designed to meet his or her education needs while being educated with peers without disabilities in the regular educational environment to the maximum extent appropriate. The accepted definition of LRE in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is: "to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not disabled, and special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability of a child is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily." (IDEA, 1992, p. 44821). It is important to remember that special education is not a place, but rather a set of services (Artiles & Trent, 1994; Garcia & Malkin, 1993; Ortiz, 2001; Reynolds, 1984). Similarly, the LRE provision of the IDEA emphasizes services rather than the placement (Noonan & McCormick, 2006; Sharpe,
Learning in less restrictive environments benefits students with and without disabilities in so much as all children are more likely to improve their academic performance, and increase their communication and socialization skills (Culatta & Tompkins, 1999; Lewis & Doorlag, 1999; Salend, 2001).
American educational systems have generally focused on the needs of the mainstream students who are English speakers (August & Shanahan, 2006). According to current research literature, studies on linguistically and culturally diverse preschool children with disabilities are extremely limited (August & Hakuta, 1997; Baca, 1990; Grant & Gillette, 2005). The majority of studies relating to English-language learners involved kindergarten to grade 12 children in regular educational classrooms according to the Department of Education Advisory Committee on Research on English-language learners and the Office of Education Research and Improvement (August & Hakuta, 1997). The National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth just released recommendations regarding the attainment of literacy for English language learners (August & Shanahan, 2006). This report is significant in that it will contribute to an ongoing, national effort to more fully understand and address the educational needs of language minority children. This in turn will lead to informed, scientifically-based, decision making that will impact the educational experiences of English language learners (August & Shanahan, 2006). The draw back to this report is that again the overwhelming majority of research found within the report deals with children in kindergarten through grade 12. The small body of work on linguistically and culturally diverse children with disabilities focused on school-age children (August & Shanahan, 2006; Tabors, 1997; Articles & Ortiz, 2002). Of the research projects that have been written about linguistically and culturally diverse children, such as Zehr’s study in 2000...
and Roseberry-McKibbins’ case study in 1999, there was a spotlight on the use of appropriate curriculum and various instructional approaches in bilingual special education classrooms. Again these studies dealt with kindergarten through twelfth grade children (August & Hakuta, 1997; August & Shanahan, 2006; Brice & Roseberry-McKibbin, 2001; Zehr, 2001; Zehr, 2004). In Ortiz and Ramirez’s book addressing promising practices, information was covered on culturally diverse children, and the term exceptional students was linked to those with disabilities (1998). While school age children were the focus of study, there was a limited amount of information dealing with very young children. Additional studies on linguistically and culturally diverse children have addressed the use of standardized assessment instruments and the need for diagnosing disabilities in determining eligibility for special education programs (August & Hakuta, 1997; August & Shanahan, 2006; Baca, 1990; Banks & Banks, 2003; Bredekamp & Rosegrant, 1992; Layton & Lock, 2002). The majority of the focus in these studies was not on the identification of children but on the educational experiences they received after they were placed in a preschool classroom for children with disabilities.

Culture is central to all learning and plays a role not only in communicating and receiving information, but also on shaping the thinking processes of groups and individuals (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002; August & Hakuta, 1997; Banks, 2005; Bialystok & Cummins, 1991; Cabezon & Lambert, 1998). A pedagogy that acknowledges, responds to, and celebrates fundamental cultures offers full, equitable access to the educational system for all students from all cultures is culturally responsive teaching (Derman-Sparks & Phillips, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Obiakor, 2006; Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 2003). The primary goal for culturally responsive teaching is to encourage schools to
infuse the concept of culturally responsive pedagogy and utilize instructional methodology in all curriculum endeavors (Derman-Sparks, 1989; Schmidt & Ma, 2006; Obiakor, 2006). The following are the seven characteristics of culturally responsive teaching:

- Positive perspectives on parents and families
- Communication of high expectations
- Learning within the context of culture
- Student-centered instruction
- Culturally mediated instruction
- Reshaping the curriculum
- Teacher as facilitator

A starting point for the implementation of culturally responsive teaching is to have teachers engage in reflective self-analysis, to examine their attitudes toward different ethnic, racial, gender, and social class groups (Banks & Banks, 2003; Delpit, 1995; Obiakor, 2006).

Banks and Banks (2003) contend that multicultural awareness cannot be a one-time event and it can only be achieved through in-depth effort intensive labor. For both children and teachers, strategies such as writing their life stories, reflecting on their own life journeys, and looking at classroom interactions for biases, can help in developing a self-awareness that is critical to bringing about social change (Delpit, 1995; Schmidt & Ma, 2006). This multicultural curriculum advocated by many early childhood educators, then, is not merely tacos on Tuesday approach to diversity through the emphasizing of the differences between cultures by focusing on holidays, foods, and customs (Banks,
1989; Bredekamp & Rosegrant, 1992; Clayton, 2003; Cummins, 1996). Additionally, Derman-Sparks (1989) points out that such an approach tends to ignore the real-life everyday experiences and can lead to stereotyping. Instead, culturally responsive teaching views multicultural education as a perspective that is integrated into the daily activities of the classroom (Banks & Banks, 2003; Obiakor, 2006; Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 2006).

In searching for information on young children with disabilities who were learning a second language, there was a review of professional journals, books, and research studies in the field of early childhood and special education. The purpose of this review was to identify studies specifically relating to the unique needs of special education preschoolers. In the field of special education, it has been established that there is an increased awareness of the influence of ethnicity on the planning of curriculum for all children including those with disabilities (Harry & Kalyanpur, 1994; Layton & Lock, 2002; Ortiz, 2001; Zehr, 2004). The results of the review indicated that attention to preschool children with disabilities who speak a language other than English has been negligible. Following an escalation of school district requests for help from speech and language clinicians to deal with developmental issues for children who are also ELLs, additional researchers have looked at native-language attainment and second-language skills. Researchers warned of the problems with second-language acquisition when native languages are not fully developed (Cummins, 1981; Delpit, 1995; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Krashen, 2003; Odom, McConnell, McEvoy, Peterson, Ostrosky, Chandler, Spicuzza, Skellenger, Creighton & Favazza, 1999; Snow, Burns & Griffin, 1999). Despite a growing sensitivity and awareness to matters relating to language and...
culturally diverse differences, most articles appearing in the journals did not address the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse preschoolers specifically.

It appears that this shortage of research on linguistically and culturally diverse preschool children with developmental delays existed across professional journals and research studies. Therefore, attention was redirected to other components needing review in the developmental stages and delays found within preschool children enrolled in special education. The various research studies acknowledged a focus on the following areas and each are explored in this document:

- Culture and diversity in early childhood environments
- Self concept in multicultural classrooms
- Speech and language development
- Second-language acquisition and English-language learners
- Special education of preschool children

Culture and Diversity in Early Childhood Environments

Many obstacles exist in the education of children from other cultures (West, 2001). Eradicating stereotypes and a tourist approach to multiculturalism seems to be at the forefront as areas of concern (Clayton, 2003; Delpit, 1995; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Krashen, 1994; Krashen, 1999; West, 2001). In this millennium, it is important that educators begin to implement new teaching strategies, begin new discourses, and create paradigms and models of educational research that are not only inclusive of culturally sensitive research approaches for linguistically and culturally diverse children but also have the potential to significantly change their lives and their communities in
emancipatory ways (Tillman, 2002). In order to legitimize the contributions of all children, early childhood classrooms should include pictures, puppets, books, dolls, stories, poems, games and foods that represent diverse cultures (Banks & Banks, 2003; Derman-Sparks, 1989). Books which are written in diverse languages and from diverse cultural perspectives, rather than merely translations of English stories, are particularly relevant for children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (Bredekamp, & Rosegrant, 1992; Obiakor, 2006; Schmidt, & Ma, 2006). Thus a critical component in the educational arena is to foster each child’s healthy, positive self-identity and skills so that they may be active members of society while respecting a wide range of human diversity which is vital for human survival (Derman-Sparks, 1989; Derman-Sparks, & Phillips, 1997).

Many studies support the notion that multicultural education approaches cultivate a school environment that celebrates diversity; supports mutual acceptance of, respect for, and understanding of human differences; and intrinsically provides a round-table in which diverse thoughts, feelings, and viewpoints can be brought forth (Derman-Sparks, & Phillips, 1997; McJilton de Marquez, 2002; Obiakor, 2006). Often educators support the notion that multicultural education prepares students to learn, work, live, communicate, and survive while achieving common goals in a culturally diverse world (Clayton, 2003; Morrison, 2000; Tabors, 1997). Multicultural education involves fostering an understanding and appreciation for a world and cultural that can at times be vastly different from previous experiences (August & Shanahan, 2006; Dodge, Colker, & Heroman, 2002; Eggers-Pierola, 2005; Owocki, 2001). This in turn might cultivate a respect for people of other ethnic, gender, socioeconomic, language and/or cultural
backgrounds (Ortiz, 2001; Tabors, 1997). Unfortunately, a traditional approach of multicultural education (or tourist approach as it is sometimes called) persists in our schools because of a lack of understanding about the acceptable methods of teaching cultural aspects (West, 2001). The tourist approach traditionally segregates the teaching of cultural beliefs and values into holiday times or isolated special events with token artifacts presented. In order to maintain high-quality multicultural programs, it appears that educators must strive to deliver an educational experience that establishes the unique characteristics found within each cultural group (Diaz, 1992; Genishi, Dyson & Fassler, 1994; Harry & Kalyanpur, 1994; McJilton de Marquez, 2002; Tabors, 1998; West, 2001).

Theories also expound upon developing an understanding of mixed culture or biracial children (McJilton de Marquez, 2002; West, 2001). This theory would include those children whose parents are from two distinctly different cultures and are reared in both cultures thereby creating a hybrid, or third combination culture within the child. Children thereby have to establish a sense of self that may be historically based outside of the culture in which they reside. Delpit (1995) agreed with Hatch’s (1987) findings that young children continually adjusted their personal interactions in order to maintain their own sense of self. Research has demonstrated that educators can no longer tell children in subtle but clear ways that they must adjust their true and vital selves to succeed, or even survive, in society (Delpit, 1995; Elswood, 1999; Hatch, 1987). Furthermore, only when teachers honestly feel that their programs are committed to valuing the many facets of diversity, and only when children observe positive and meaningful interactions between adults and children of diverse races, abilities, ages,
family structures and genders will society be successful in fostering non-exclusionary behavior among all children including those with disabilities (Delpit, 1995; Elswood, 1999; Hatch, 1987; Odom et al., 1999).

Self Concepts in Multicultural Classrooms

The roots of multicultural education go back to the foundational beginnings of the United States. Multicultural education was reconceptualized in various civil rights movements lead by Americans who felt oppressed in the 1960s (Ovando & McLaren, 2000). African Americans began to challenge discriminatory practices in public domains which included educational institutions (Wasley, Hampel, & Clark, 1997). In the 1960s educational institutions were among the most oppressive and hostile toward the rights of all citizens and many fought against racial equality (Banks, 1981; Banks, 1989; Banks, 2005; Goodlad, 2004). Many activists, community leaders and parents called for an end to bias curriculum and insisted on a reevaluation of hiring practices (Banks, 2005; Gollnick & Chinn, 2005). Many contended that the curriculum and the educators should reflect the same proportional percentages as the American population (Davidman & Davidman, 1997; Ovando & McLaren, 2000; Wasley, Hampel, & Clark, 1997). In the late 1960s and early 1970s the women’s rights movement joined in on the push for educational reform (Goodlad, 2004). The civil rights movement which had focused much of the attention on equal access and curriculum in schools turned to inequities in business, employment opportunities, wage earnings, and focused attention on sexism (Banks, 2005; Chistensen & Karps, 2003; Gollnick & Chinn, 2005). Feminist educators and other women activists insisted on curriculum that was more inclusive of
their histories, contributions, and experiences (Banks, 1989). The women’s rights movement took their complaints back to the schools and challenged the low numbers of female administrators relative to the percentage of female teachers (Banks & Banks, 2003; Davidman & Davidman, 1997).

Early in the 1970s there was slight progress made by African Americans and women in the fight for equal human rights, social justice, and educational change (Banks, 1989). The gay and lesbian groups, the elderly, and others with disabilities began to organize and become visible in an effort to gain political power as they sought to acquire equality for all (Banks, 2005; Goodlad, 2004; Wasley, Hampel, & Clark, 1997). As the educational venue scrambled to address concerns for all historically marginalized groups various programs, initiatives, and policies emerged in a shot gun approach to change traditional curriculum (Ovando & McLaren, 1999). These changes, although minimal in nature were the beginnings of the multicultural educational endeavors to bring about equality for all groups. In the 1980s a larger constituency of educational activist and researchers noticed that educational institutions had only begun to scratch the surface of equality by conducting special units on famous women or people of color (Goodlad, 2004). James Banks, a pioneer in multicultural education, researched the school systems curriculum delivery methods and the materials used to promote equality (1981). According to Banks, in order to protect a highly supportive multicultural school environment all aspects of the school had to be examined and then true reform measures put into place (2005). His investigations included district policies, teachers’ attitudes, instructional materials and the delivery of instructional materials, assessment methods, intervention strategies, and teaching styles (Banks, 1989).
Building upon Banks work, Carl Grant, Geneva Gay, Sonia Nieto, and Christine Sleeter began research and developed curriculum models that were intended to transform schools and convey social change as the avenue for educational reform (Chistensen & Karps, 2003; Davidman & Davidman, 1997; Ovando & McLaren, 1999). The researchers examined the structural foundations of schools and how policies contributed to educational inequalities (Grant & Sleeter, 2006; Grant & Gillette, 2005; Gay, 2000; Nieto, 2003). Targets included the tracking or grouping of children, culturally oppressive teaching approaches, standardized tests, school funding discrepancies, classroom climate, discriminatory hiring practices, and under qualified personnel working in predominately minority schools (Banks, 2005; Chistensen & Karps, 2003; Davidman & Davidman, 1997; Ovando & McLaren, 2000). At this same time the cultural composition of the United States continued to change as the populations became less Anglo Saxon Christian middle class and more culturally, racially, ethnically, and religiously diversified (Gay, 2000; Goodlad, 2004; Grant & Sleeter, 2006). The educational system at that time was not set up to meet the needs of the students as examined by researchers such as Shirley Brice Heath. She recorded some of her research in a text entitled Ways with Words in 1983 and dealt directly with the expectations of the educational systems and conflicts that arise when family expectations and values do not fit within the system. Educational reform was needed to develop expectations and knowledge to include creative and critical thinking skills, intercultural competence, and social and global awareness (Goodlad, 2004; Grant & Gillette, 2005; Heath, 1983; Nieto, 2003; Wasley, Hampel, & Clark, 1997). The education system was not only plagued by unequal treatment of traditionally oppressed
groups, but was also ill-equipped to prepare the most highly privileged students and the disabled students who were now moving into the least restrictive environments (Banks, 2005; Gollnick & Chinn, 2005; Grant & Sleeter; Ramsey, 1987). Throughout the 1980s and on into the 1990s multicultural scholars refocused their efforts on developing new approaches and models of education built upon a foundation of social justice, critical thinking, and equal opportunity (Banks, 2005; Goodlad, 2004; Ovando & McLaren, 2000; Williams, DeGaetano, Sutherland, & Harrington, 1985). Educators, researchers, and cultural theorist began to deconstruct traditional models in both K-12 education and higher education.

To this day work continues toward school transformation as noted in many of the actions taken in No Child Left Behind. Today, multicultural education endeavors to address the ills and shortcomings of the current education system and these must be addressed and eradicated (Banks, 1988; Chistensen & Karps, 2003; Gollnick & Chinn, 2005; Ramsey, 1987). Many researchers acknowledge negative experiences endured by young children occur due to their receiving of messages that they do not belong in the mainstream classroom (Banks, 1981; Delpit, 1995; Heath, 1983; Elswood, 1999; Marshall, 2001). It appears that educators must enlarge their consciousness, acknowledging that their thoughts, actions, and communications are drawn from their ideas of the cultures in which they are entrenched (Banks, 2005; Chistensen & Karps, 2003; Marshall, 2001). Children construct part of their views of self through participation and interactions with others (Elswood, 1999; Gollnick & Chinn, 2005; Kendall, 1983). Additionally, each culture or society respects different traits as worthy or treasured (Goodlad, 2004; Hunt, 1999). In Western cultures, parents strive to teach their children
to be independent, outgoing, and enthusiastic to explore new situations. These traits lead to admiration, thereby establishing positive self-concepts (Okagaki & Diamond, 2000; Retting, 1995). In contrast, Eastern cultures highlight maintaining harmonious, interdependent relationships. These interdependent traits are embodied in the characteristics of self-restraint, management of emotions, shyness, quietness, and calming behaviors. Children demonstrating such skills will receive the endorsement of adults thereby bolstering self-confidence (Okagaki & Diamond, 2000; Retting, 1995). Moreover, when children are given opportunities to develop self-confidence and are taught skills that enhance respect for citizens of other races, then social reform will be possible (Derman-Sparks & A.B.C. Task Force, 1989; Hunt, 1999).

Speech and Language Development

According to many researchers, native language development and cognition are closely associated as children begin at birth to learn from their experiences as they engage with others outside their world (Begley, 1996; Crain, 1992; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; McLean & Odom, 1996). Just the way in which parents and caregivers talk to their children, ask questions, or tell them stories while involving them in the families’ day-to-day activities develops the foundation from which language and cognitive development occurs (Delpit, 1995; Diaz, 1992; Heath, 1983; Tabors, 1997; Widdowson, 1989). Children must be allowed to explore, discover objects in relationship to other objects, and to problem-solve the nature of things in their environment (Hoggard, 1996; Morrison, 2000; Owocki, 2001; Vygotsky, 1986). These activities enable children to develop the neurological connections important to cognitive growth, skill acquisition, and
language development of both native and second languages (Barrera, 2000; Bialystok & Cummins, 1991; Meadows, 1993; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). Meadows (1993) concluded that Vygotsky, like Piaget, believed that children are active in the construction of knowledge when they use manipulatives to search for relationships between objects, themselves, and events in their lives. Moreover, Trawick-Smith (1997) and Meadows (1993) contended that Vygotsky asserted that language was critical to theoretical progress and learning and that Vygotsky accentuated the significant role of the family cultural in which the growth occurred. In other words, it is important to consider the influence of all stakeholders including the family and community members when planning for young children enrolled in educational programs.

The fundamental nature of native language development and cognition information found in literature continues to be that there is an interrelated facets of each that build upon the components found throughout initial expressive language development (Cummins, 1981; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Haager & Windmueller, 2001; Hickmann, 2001). Unfortunately some educators ignore the fact that the focus is on children whose native language is something other than English (Chapman, 1997; Cummins, 2001; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Krashen, 1994; Prince & Lawrence, 1992). There has been a tendency of policymakers to ignore a basic premise that the research is referring to native language development and promote English only instruction (Genesee, 2000; Krashen, 2003; Tabors, 1997). To add to the difficulty in promoting native language educational experiences, many researchers contend that special education practitioners often believe that it is better to teach linguistically and culturally diverse children who are experiencing problems in their native language only in English.
to avoid confusing them, thereby eliminating instruction in two languages (Carrasquillo & Baecher, 1990; Hakuta, 1986; Ortiz, 2001; Tabors, 1997). A consequence of maintaining such a perspective is that parents are asked to speak to their children in English at home as well (Ortiz, 2001; Prince & Lawrence, 1992). In this way, educators assume that bilingualism in students is contributing to or causing the cognitive developmental problems of young children (Tabors, 1998).

Additive bilingualism is a process by which individuals develop both fluency and proficiency in their second language while continuing to develop competencies in their native language (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002; Beck & Olah, 2001; Richard-Amato, 1988). This process of adding a second language allows for children to gain expertise in two languages and promotes cognitive development (Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005; Wilkinson, & Ortiz, 1986). Additive bilingualism is linked to high self-esteem, increased cognitive flexibility, and high levels of proficiency in the second language (Dickinson, 2002; Prince & Lawrence, 1992; Soto, 1997). What appears to be disregarded by many is the need to continue the development of the receptive and communicative skills of the native language in which the social-cultural context of the family environment exists (Dickinson, 2002; Gonzalez, 1999; Tabors, 1997). The significance of the research literature in this theory continues to be its emphasis on the critical connection between the development of a sound foundation in the native language and a young child’s essential understanding an acceptance of the culture found in their world (McLaughlin, 1995; Ortiz, 2001; Tabors, 1998). Cognitive and language development in the native language continues to be critical to later literacy growth and learning in school.
One of the fundamentals of bilingual education is that knowledge and skills learned in the native language may be transferred to the second language. Many researchers contend that this holds true for content knowledge and concepts as well as language skills and comprehension strategies (Cabezon & Lambert, 1998; Christian, Howard & Loeb, 2000; Cloud, Genesee & Hamayan, 2000; Cummins, 1981; Freeman & Freeman, 1996). The transfer skills from the native language shorten the developmental progression of the same skills in the second language (Elley, 1991; Fitzgerald, 1995; Garcia, 1994; Rossell, 1990; Rossell & Baker, 1996; Torres-Guzman, 2002; Wiggins & McTighe, 2000). Language skills that are not used in the native language may then be explicitly taught in a course featuring the second language acquisition but content area knowledge does not need to be explicitly retaught as long as the relevant second language vocabulary is known (Asher, 1979; Cazden, 1984; Holdaway, 1979; Soltero & Moya-Leang, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Second-language Acquisition and English-language Learners

Another element found most often in literature contains information about language development in relation to multicultural education. Language is one of the most noticeable sources of diversity in early childhood classrooms and to some theorists is the central source of a division among individuals (Dickinson, 2002; Lahey, 1988; Okagaki & Diamond, 2000). Unless research tools with accreditation practices are modified to record the kind of instruction that promotes language and growth while
addressing diversity, the current enthusiasm for early childhood programs as a means
to improve literacy may be undermined as preschool settings fail to achieve the desired
impact on early literacy achievement levels with children from diverse cultures
(Dickinson, 2002). Additionally, native language usage has a profound impact on
children’s adjustment in the classroom, and Tabors (1997) often warns of the
importance of the development of first languages. Tabors contends that children from
culturally diverse backgrounds often face isolation and social rejection due to language
barriers which in turn lead to cognitive delays (1998).

The early childhood field has been greatly influenced by the National Association
for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). In 1986, NAEYC issued a position
statement on developmentally appropriate practices (DAP) that was meant to influence
the teaching strategies used the educators of young children ages birth through eight.
The overall focus of DAP was that teachers would meet children where they were and
that they would help each child reach challenging and achievable goals (Bredekamp &
Rosegrant, 1992; Couchenour & Chrisman, 2004). There were also three fundamental
considerations that were meant to guide instruction and decision making for curriculum
planning (Bredekamp, 1987). The first basic premise was that planning should be
influenced by activities that were considered age appropriate based on what is known
about the development and learning stages of children within a particular age range.
The second critical principle indicated that teachers should consider what was
individually appropriate and make adjustments to accommodate for varying rates of
development for each child. The third decisive assertion made by NAEYC was that
educators must consider what is appropriate to the social and cultural context in which
children live (Bredekamp & Rosegrant, 1992; Copple & Bredekamp, 2006). Initially, a young child experiences the culture of a family home and builds relationships through family interactions (Aronson, 2002; Day, 2004). Later, young children have experiences outside of the family home and new relationships built are based on broader societal and cultural aspects that could be outside the confines of previous cultural familiarity (Bardige & Segal, 2005; Dragan, 2005; Eggers-Pierola, 2005). For those children whose languages or social and cultural backgrounds diverge significantly from the prevailing culture of the classroom, careful planning and implementation of curriculum is key to building a responsive and an appropriate environment (Freeman & Freeman, 1996; Garcia, 1994; Owocki, 2001; Rossell, 1990; Rossell & Baker, 1996; Torres-Guzman, 2002). Therefore, not only should caution be used in considering the age of children and the individual appropriateness of programs but educators must be vigilant while addressing social and cultural issues.

Research on children’s development has outpaced implementation in classrooms and homes on children’s emerging abilities, but sufficient information is known to support the research-based statement of literacy by the International Reading Association (IRA) and NAEYC (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006). This statement reveals that despite the beneficial effects of print-rich classrooms which are displaying books organized to support children’s engagement in literacy and language to communicate socially, children are not socializing because of a lack of language (Delpit, 1995; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Linquanti, 1999; McLaughlin, 1995; Osborn & Lehr, 1998). When educators change classrooms to be more accommodating by empowering a wider range of children and families with necessary language skills, language
deficiencies might be reconciled (Dickinson, 2002; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Stremmel, 1991). The underlying principle continues to be that there are language and cognitive competencies developed through native language that underlie the acquisition of other languages and cognitive learning in general (Tabors, 1997). These deep-seated competencies include the abstract language structures, linguistic universals, knowledge acquisitions, and cognitive developmental increases through the children’s life experiences (Cummins, 1989; Krashen, 1999; Ortiz, 2001). These indispensable structures or common proficiencies are developed within specific cultural and social context. Cultural organizations support second-language acquisition and learning in general because they provide a reference and resource for English-language learners (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Tabors, 1997).

A clear understanding of second language acquisition will seem to improve the classroom teachers’ abilities to serve linguistically and diverse mainstream children (Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005; Owocki, 2001). While Freeman & Freeman (2001) state that theories on second language acquisition are based on years of research throughout a wide variety of fields of study and are proven accurate, the professional development of classroom educators appears to lag behind according to Dragan (2005). Dragan contended that without a precise staff development plan, some key concepts about language acquisition are not perfectly understood much less applied in the classroom (2005). Furthermore, Howard declared that ethnographic studies of classrooms across America demonstrate that teachers consistently teach using English only curriculum without detailed vocabulary development in classrooms with English language learners (1999). Therefore, although many concepts are conceptually known
such as the concept supported by Cummins relating to a continuum of learning that is predictable for ELL, execution of theories fails to come to fruition (Eggers-Pierola, 2005). While many learners progress from a lack of knowledge of the new language to a level of competency that is nearly equitable to that of a native language speaker others flounder for years never moving beyond basic communication skills (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Krashen, 1994; Linquanti, 1999; McLaughlin, 1995; Osborn & Lehr, 1998).

Therefore, the development of a concrete foundation in a child’s native language and the recognition of a phonemic knowledge base are essential for the academic success of linguistically and culturally diverse children (Delpit, 1995; Garcia & McLaughlin, 1995; Hatch, 1987; McLaughlin, Blanchard & Osanai, 1995; Ortiz, 2001; Tabors, 1997). While virtually all young children acquire listening skills in their native language as part of the language acquisition process, even if their environment minimally supports their efforts, the attainment of second language skills are not as easily obtained (Ortiz, 2001; Wong-Fillmore, 1991). There are generally three major conditions that must be met before a person successfully masters second language acquisition (Consolo, 2000; Damhuis, 2000; Davies, 1999; Krashen, 1994; Ortiz & Ramirez, 1998; Widdowson, 1989). The first condition includes a deep seated desire on the part of the learner so therefore they are internally motivated to succeed. Researchers contend that the second essential condition is that those who already know the second language are skillful and cognizant of the need for the learner to be successful in their language acquisition therefore assistance is consistently offered and new knowledge is openly practiced. The third component reinforces a social setting
which brings the learner in frequent and sustained contact with other second language and native language speakers and makes the acquisition possible. Most of the time when a learner has difficulty acquiring a second language, the lack of success can be attributed to one or more of the factors listed above (Krashen, 1994; Wong-Fillmore, 1991). Listening is essential in two of the three conditions previously listed, and therefore listening is considered to be an essential component of second language development (Consolo, 2000; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Houk, 2005).

Researchers have discovered that while it is clear that input and listening play an indispensable role in second language acquisition, the amount and type of input that can be required of the learner for acquisition of a second language is not often described (Hoggard, 1996; Krashen, 1994; Linquanti, 1999; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Valdes, 1997). Building on research that showed the relationship between input and listening, Krashen maintains that comprehensible input is a necessary condition for second language learning (1999). In his input hypothesis, Krashen states that development for the learner’s current stage of language acquisition can only be elevated by the learner comprehending language and listening at a level slightly above the learner’s current knowledge level (2003). Krashen contended that comprehension was necessary in order for input to become internalized and used to promote further language development (Damhuis, 2000; Davies, 1999; Krashen, 1994; Ortiz & Ramirez, 1998).

Reinforcing this principle is the threshold hypothesis advanced by Cummins (1996) which states that language learners must reach high levels of competency in their first language to enable them to attain high levels of proficiency in another so that
they may be triumphant in meeting the challenges and expectations of the second language. A program which is instructional and combats the threshold hypothesis is the transitional bilingual education program (Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005; Ortiz, 2001; Torres-Guzman, 2002). In this program the subjects are taught through two languages. English language skills, grade promotion and graduation requirements are emphasized and the native language is used as a tool to learn specific content. The primary purpose of this type of program is to facilitate the English language learners’ transition to an all-English instructional environment while receiving academic subject instruction in the native language to the extent necessary (Howard, 1999; Ortiz, 2001; Wells & Chang-Wells, 1992). As proficiency in English increases, instruction through the native language often decreases. However, native language instruction is continued until the learner has obtained complete fluency in basic communication skills and in cognitive academic skills.

Affective filter is a term Stephen Krashen coined which refers to the negative emotional and motivational factors that may interfere with the reception and processing of comprehensible input (Genesee, 1995; Howard, 1999; Richard-Amato & Snow, 2005; Richards & Lockhart, 1996). These factors include anxiety, self-consciousness, boredom, annoyance, and alienation. Krashen argued that comprehensible input is necessary but is not enough to ensure language acquisition (Beck & Olah, 2001; Ortiz, 2001; Wells & Chang-Wells, 1992). English language learners also have to be receptive to that input (August & Shanahan, 2006; Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005). When learners are bored or angry they are not being receptive to the language input so they screen what is being presented (August & Hakuta, 1998; Bialystok & Cummins, 1991;
Cummins, 2001). This screen is referred to as the affective filter (Krashen, 1982; Linquanti, 1999). Activities promoted in the classroom need to be aimed at acquisition thus the activities must foster a lowering of the affective filter of the students (August & Hakuta, 1998). Activities must focus on topics which are interesting and relevant to the students and encourage them to express their ideas, opinions, desires, emotions, and feelings (Bialystok, 1991; Cummins, 2001; Damhuis, 2000; Davies, 1999; Krashen, 1994; Ortiz & Ramirez, 1998). A low affective environment reduces anxiety and creates a friendly atmosphere between the teacher, classmates, and the English language learner (Krashen, 1999; Leung, 1994).

Jim Cummins in 1981 proposed a theory in language proficiencies that include the terms BICS and CALP. BICS is the basic interpersonal communication skills that are necessary for survival (Cummins, 1989). They include basic language abilities that allow an individual to order lunch, find the bathroom, get directions, and communicate their wishes or desires. CALP stands for cognitive academic language proficiency and is the language ability required for academic achievement in a context-reduced environment (Cummins, 1989). Examples of context-reduced environments might include classroom lectures, textbook readings, and standards based assessments. Context-embedded language refers to communication occurring in a context that offers help to comprehension through visual clues, gestures, expressions, and specific instruction using hands on materials (Cummins, 1996). Context-reduced language does not allow for clues as to the meaning of the communication apart from the words themselves (Phillips, 1972). The language is likely to be abstract therefore reducing a second language learners chance for success (Cummins, 1996). While BICS takes anywhere
from 6 months to 3 years to learn, CALP talks much longer and usually takes about 5 to 7 years to develop (Soltero & Moya-Leang, 2002; Torres-Guzman, 2002). CALP is often referred to as school language, academic language of the language of decontextualized situations and is also the language of standards-based assessments (Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005; Ortiz, 2001; Torres-Guzman, 2002; Wells & Chang-Wells, 1992).

Special Education of Preschool Children

Researchers have noted that young children who have peer interaction difficulties and who fail to develop positive peer relationships, in contrast to those who are socially sophisticated, are at risk for behavioral, cognitive, emotional, and social maladjustments in later life (Linquanti, 1999; Mueller & Silverman, 1989; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). Young children who are second-language learners and are mentally and/or developmentally delayed often exhibit peer interaction difficulties (Odom, Parrish & Hikido, 2001; Tabors, 1997). Young children with a variety of developmental issues, including cognitive delays (Guralnick, Connor, Hammond, Gottman & Kinnish, 1996; Koop, Baker & Brown, 1994; Lieber, Schwartz, Sandall, Horn & Wolery, 1999), emotional problems (Byrnes, 1996; Odom et al., 1999), and histories of child neglect (Mueller & Silverman, 1989; Odom & Diamond, 1998), may be at risk for peer interaction difficulties and meager relationship development during early childhood. For example, in recent studies of young children with and without disabilities in inclusive preschools, investigators found a decrease in social interactions among children with disabilities (Brown, Odom, Li & Zercher, 1999; Ortiz, Garcia, Wheeler & Maldonado-
Colon, 1986) and that about 30% of the children with disabilities were publicly rejected (Odom, Hanson, Lieber, Marquart; Sandall, Wolery, Horn, Schwartz, Beckman, Hikido & Chambers, 2001; Ortiz & Ramirez, 1998).

Furthermore, studies of second-language learners reveal the same patterns of social dismissal in elementary school settings (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Florio-Ruane, 1989; Garcia & McLaughlin, 1995). In particular, young children who have significant behavioral problems with peers such as aggression, negative verbal interactions, and property destruction have been found to be at high risk for peer relationship tribulations as well as later social rejections (Odom & McConnell, 1985; Webster-Stratton, 1997). Since these children are more than likely in the same PPCD classroom as the second-language learners with cognitive delays, an understanding of the expectations and peer interactions of special education students is necessary.

The widely acknowledged importance of peer-related social competence has been based on two consistent findings:

- Positive peer interactions are significant for children’s enhanced development (Brown et al., 1999; Florio-Ruane, 1989; Koop, Baker & Brown, 1994).

- Peer interaction problems are a principal predictor of children’s future social difficulties (Brown et al., 1999; Guralnick, et al., 1996; Guralnick, 1999; McEvoy, Fox & Rosenberg, 1991; Minzenberg, Laughlin & Kaczmarek, 1999; Odom et al., 1999).

Due to the critical nature of young children’s peer-related social competence, many educators have advocated for the explicit integration of interaction interventions in PPCD programs, particularly when those programs include children who are at a greater risk for social competence problems as are many second-language learners (Brown et al., 1999; Guralnick et al., 1996; Guralnick, 1999; Odom & Diamond, 1998;
Odom, Parrish & Hikido, 2001; Rueda, Ruiz & Figueroa, 1995). In addition, memberships of professional organizations such as NAEYC (Bredekamp & Coople, 1997) and the Division of Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children (McEvoy et al., 1991; McLean & Cripe, 1997) have recommended the inclusion of social competence activities as a recommended practice in early childhood curricula.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) clearly states that it is the responsibility of each state to provide educational experiences for all children with disabilities (Koop, Baker & Brown, 1994). The opportunities afforded to such children must individually meet their unique needs in the least restrictive environment (National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities, NICHCY, 2006). Least restrictive environment according to IDEA (1992) states that school district shall ensure that, to the maximum extent possible, students with disabilities are educated with students who do not have disabilities, and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of students with special needs from the general education program occurs only if the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in general education classes with the use of paraprofessionals and other appropriate services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. IDEA (1992) also mandates that every effort should be made to educate children with disabilities in classroom settings that contain same age children who are typically developing. This statement is also associated with the least restrictive environment. In 1997, the IDEA reauthorization act stated that assessment data should be used not only to diagnose the disability of a child but also to align the child’s participation in preschool programs where appropriate with typically developing peers (NICHCY, 2006). The interpretation of this ruling clearly emphasizes
the significance of placement and integration practices for disabled children with typically developing peers in a least restrictive environment. The individual education plan (IEP) must identify all services that will facilitate a child's participation in the mainstream preschool program and provide assistance where needed to ensure success.

Given the acknowledged importance of young children's peer interactions for the development of social competence and the placement of children in least restrictive environments, researchers have investigated a number of strategies to improve communications of young children who are at risk for social problems, including second-language learners with developmental and/or physical delays (McEvoy et al., 1991; Odom, 2001; Odom et al., 2001). These strategies are applicable to second-language cognitively delayed children because eliminating social interaction problems is critical to building classroom relationships (Garcia, 2000). This information was crucial to this study in that social relations and language competency are components in how children create meaning from the environment and how classroom cultural can be created (Ortiz, 2001). A comprehensive review of peer interaction interventions included the systematic use of reinforcers, instructions, prompts, models, feedback, and some combinations of various procedures for improving young children's peer interactions (Bialystok & Cummins, 1991; Guralnick, 1999; Lieber, Schwartz, Sandall, Horn & Wolery, 1999).

Types of Programs

Once a child is eligible for services under the Special Education umbrella, several different types of programs can be made available. The following programs are
representative of the most common placement alternatives, should the parents elect to proceed with acquiring services:

- Parent participation preschool classes are operated by the adult education program provided at many local school districts such as Even Start programs (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997). These preschool classes allow parents and/or guardians to join with their child in experiencing developmentally appropriate activities. A variety of class schedules are offered throughout the week. Parent participation in the program decreases as children get older so the preschoolers increase their experience in larger groups.

- Head Start is a federally-funded preschool program that serves children from low income families. However, Head Start is required to have as a portion of its population children who have special needs. Some transportation may be provided for children. There is often no direct cost to parents for this program; however, parents are required to volunteer time in the classroom or serve on various advisory committees.

- State-funded preschool programs are operated in some local school districts as required by law. These programs can be half-day or full-day and have income, housing, or language requirements. However, children with disabilities do not have to meet these other criteria. These programs provide developmentally appropriate instruction for children in an inclusive or independent setting. Parent and family involvement is encouraged.

- Private school options for young children are also available such as those associated with a private school, a church, or other religious association at the parents’ expense. Parents should visit the site and talk to the administrator in order to determine if they believe their child’s disability needs will be served in an appropriate manner.

- Many families find it attractive to use a combination of programs for their child. This might include having the child attend a for-profit preschool program and receive related walk in services from the local school district. Some children may attend a special education preschool program from one to 5 days weekly and, in addition, attend a community-based program after school. Some families could choose to use other community resources such as recreation or gymnastic classes, religious schools, or informal social groups to provide for their child’s social and emotional development. Because no two children or their families are alike, developing an imaginative combination program can be a way to individualize services for a young child with special needs.
Special education preschools are preschool classrooms for children with identified disabilities who meet eligibility criteria set by the state department of education. Preschool children with special needs may attend a local program, depending on needs, from one to 5 days per week. Classrooms are often staffed by one certified teacher and one or more paraprofessionals and referrals often come from early childhood intervention (ECI) programs. Activities in the classroom are designed to help children reach the goals specified on their individual educational plan (IEP) as well as to provide a stimulating, developmentally appropriate preschool program.

Summary

Research indicates that in order to serve children whose native language is other than English, educators need to be aware of a number of factors which will influence whether young children are successful in their early school experiences. These factors include:

- Attending to the development of a solid native language relative to the culture of the child’s family (Mattes & Omark, 1984; Tabors, 1997).
- Promoting second-language acquisition while supporting the native language development (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001).
- Creating classroom environments that enable all students to construct knowledge (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997).
- Listening to families to determine how to most individually meet the needs of their children (Ortiz, 2001).
- Encouraging children to become socially competent in an inclusive environment (Garcia & McLaughlin, 1995).

Additionally, the literature indicates that these critical factors should be embodied within inclusive and language-rich environments identified as providing optimal learning opportunities for preschool children in language, social, emotional, cognitive, and physical skills (Brown, Odom & Conroy, 2001; Mattes & Omark, 1984; McLaughlin, Blanchard & Osanai, 1995). Children with developmental delays or physical disabilities should have opportunities for engaging in activities surrounded by typically developing
peers (Ortiz, Garcia, Wheeler & Maldonado-Colon, 1986; Osborn & Lehr, 1998; Tabors, 1998). Moreover, inclusive and language-rich classrooms promote social and verbal interactions while challenging all children’s thinking, expanding their range of communication skills and enabling them to expand promising social relationships with peers (McLaughlin, 1995; Odom & McConnell, 1992; Ortiz, 2001). In fact, these environments can accommodate, when necessary, more structured supports to individualize and boost a child cognitive and linguistical growth. Therefore, the purpose for conducting this study was to observe the culture of the classroom of preschool children who have disabilities and are linguistically and culturally diverse second language learners. How the structures and practices found within the classroom aligned with those concepts presented in the literature review to promote continued growth of the child was ascertained. The findings will help further understanding of critical development issues of children with special needs who are linguistically and culturally diverse.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Qualitative

The selection of a qualitative method as the way to proceed with this research study was not accidental. The study involved very young children. Their language abilities and behaviors should be examined from the perspective of the educators who work most closely with them in the classroom (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Hatch, 1995; Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). Additionally, comprehending the behaviors of young children most often comes from observing their activities over time and in venues familiar to them (Glesne, 1999; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Merriam, 1998). Therefore, a case study approach was selected as the most appropriate way to gain an in-depth understanding of the daily events encountered by young preschool children with disabilities who happen to be second-language learners in an inclusion class setting (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Hatch, 1995; Leedy & Ormrod, 2001; Patton, 2002). The case study was a suitable choice because it allowed the collection of a great deal of information about an inadequately researched area of concern (Glesne, 1999; Leedy & Ormrod, 2001; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). A child’s placement in a program where their native language was not the daily language of instruction requires an understanding of the features of classroom culture that mediate first-language development, second-language acquisition, and cognitive acquisition with peer interactions (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002; Mattes & Omark, 1984; McLaughlin, Blanchard & Osanai, 1995). In order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the 2 focus children, their lifestyles, and behaviors, an understanding of what happens in the social context of
the classroom and how the focus children respond to events within the environment of a PPCD classroom must occur (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Patton, 2002).

Extensive data on each focus child was collected through observations of physical and social structures in the PPCD classroom in an effort to understand the nature of the classroom culture and how the classroom supported English-language learners who were disabled. The observations included written detailed accounts of the observations (Glesne, 1999; Hatch, 1995; Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). By clearly focusing on the features of the PPCD classroom, the discovery of the framework within which the every day activities occurred was expected (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). By observing the interactions and communication experiences of the focus children, the ability to infer and analyze the educator’s approaches to language acquisition, cognitive learning, and social skill development was expected (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 1995; Hatch, 1995). By identifying the focus children’s native and second language use, the ability to discover how they used language to engage with peers and adults and how they made sense of the activities in their classroom was anticipated (Mattes & Omark, 1984; McLaughlin, Blanchard & Osanai, 1995; Tabors, 1997).

The purpose of looking at classroom culture was not to find the “good” and “bad” in a particular classroom, but rather to identify and examine social and organizational features and examine how linguistically and culturally diverse preschool children reacted and responded to them (Bialystok & Cummins, 1991; Guralnick, 1999; Leung, 1994; Marshall, 2001). The aim was to describe and identify the specific characteristics of the classroom culture in the PPCD setting so that new perspectives might emerge.
regarding the relationship between linguistically and culturally diverse children and
existing social and instructional patterns in a disabilities classroom. Therefore, the ability
to gain insight into the nature of special education environments and how they support
or do not support the linguistically and culturally diverse preschool children with
disabilities would be established.

Site Selection

In selecting a location for this study, the following criteria in order of importance
was considered. First, the school needed to have an inclusionary preschool program for
four-year-old children with disabilities. Second, at least 3 children enrolled needed to be
children whose native language was something other than English. Third, the site
needed to be accessible based on the administrator’s and district’s responsiveness to
the proposed study and the key educators’ agreement to participate in the study. Being
accessible was also considered to mean that the school would support me in identifying,
contacting, and meeting with the families of the students enrolled in the class. All the
information for the Institutional Review Board (IRB) had already been filed and the
superintendent of the district’s consent form also had to be filed before meeting with the
teachers or parents.

Arrangements were made to attend a preschool special education team meeting
in February in order to meet the staff, explain the purpose of the study, explain the data
collection process, obtain consent, and address any questions from the staff. Then a
time was scheduled to meet with the parents of the students in the classroom. Three
different interpreters, Spanish, French, and Asian, were scheduled for language
translations to ensure the parents had an accurate description of the study. This meeting provided an excellent opportunity to meet the families, introduce the study, address concerns, and obtain their consent for their child to be videotaped and participate in the study. It was made clear that any reference to their child in the study would be made using an alias. Parents were given the option of taking the consent form home to discuss the matter further before signing and returning it. For the 2 parents who did not attend the meeting, the teacher was asked to send home the notice of consent and a copy of the information on the study. In the letter, many contact numbers were included in case they had any questions about the study.

The principal, teachers, and parents were assured that strict confidentiality in regard to their child’s identity as well as the identity of the site would be maintained. Only faculty advisors and the IRB had access to the specific information of where the study occurred. Additionally, only faculty advisors had access to the raw data obtained from the study. Necessary safeguards were maintained, security of materials ensured, and the study was conducted in an ethical manner.

Teacher and Paraprofessional Consent

At a special education team meeting, the objectives of the study, the research questions, and the steps to be taken in addressing the questions were outlined. This information was delivered in greater detail than for the parents. Recommendations for children who met the qualifications for the study were sought. Information on how willing the parents of the recommended children would be in allowing their child to participate in the research study was requested. At this meeting the educators were informed that
even if they agreed to participate in the study, they could withdraw at any time. An agreement to share the results of the study with the educators, administrators, and parents was reached. The teachers were provided a consent form with the names and telephone numbers of individuals that they could contact should they have any questions or concerns.

Student Selection

The plan was to select the children after the principal and preschool special education team agreed to participate in the study. After authorization for the study, a meeting between the principal, the cooperating teacher, and the researcher was set to select the focus children from the list of children who were enrolled in the class and met the criteria. In order to be found eligible for the Preschool Program for Children with Disabilities (PPCD), the child must have been functioning with delays that were 15 standard deviation points below their intellectual level. At the preschool age level, most children are labeled other health impaired – early childhood non-categorical. Initially there was no plan to review the records of these children in regards to their placement in the program. It was expected that the children met the criteria for developmental delays because they were enrolled in the program. A plan to obtain consent to examine the children’s records was in place, but only to allow a better understanding of what was observed during classroom observations of the children. This did not happen however, due to the policy of the school district and the special education director. The teacher however confirmed that children were not placed in this program when only speech disabilities were noted. Quite often, children with cognitive delays exhibit speech delays
as well. However, if speech disabilities were the only deficit noted, the children received walk-in speech therapy. Therefore, all 4 children in the PPCD classroom had issues of developmental delays beyond the issue of just speech difficulties.

Information was gained that determined a classroom was accessible that had students enrolled who met the criteria of being both LEP and special education. The classroom had 12 children enrolled. Of the 12 students 4 of the children were special education students. Of the 4 who were special education students, 2 of the children were LEP. Therefore, these 2 students were selected to be focus children upon consent of the parents. Due to the nature of the study, all of the children’s parents were asked to come to a meeting. The information about the meeting is covered below.

Parental Consent

As part of the approval process, the 12 children’s parents in the classroom were informed of the study in a letter of introduction signed by the principal and myself written in English, Spanish, and French. In addition, written consent from all the families regarding the use of a video camera during observational sessions was sought. Parents were given the option of viewing all videotapes of the sessions before the information was used. A total of 6 out of 12 parents and 1 out of 3 paraprofessionals did not consent to the use of videotaping. Therefore, that method of observation had to be dropped from the study. The reasons varied for the lack of support for videotaping. One person had a religious objection, 3 feared that others would make fun of their children; 1 did not give a reason but simply refused. One said that they had an abusive ex-spouse and feared the
A time was scheduled to meet with the parents of the 2 focus children and they were given a choice of a home visit or of coming to school at a specific time. Each focus child’s parent chose to come to the school rather than allow a home visit. The teacher was asked to attend this meeting with the children’s parents. During this meeting, it was explained that 2 children for whom English was their second language would be observed. Initially, I hoped that a classroom containing at least 3 children who met the language criteria would be located in case some of the families did not agree with the study or anyone was lost to attrition. This was not the case and the decision was made to use a classroom that had 2 children who met the language criteria. Information was gained from the teacher of record as to the home languages spoken by each of the families. A French interpreter and a Spanish interpreter were in attendance in order to facilitate language understanding and to gain proper informed consent from the parents. The children were under the age whereby assent was necessary so after the parents agreed additional consent forms were not needed. In the meeting the study was introduced, information was given about the celebration that would be provided at the conclusion of the study, and any parental concerns were addressed. All discussions with the parents of the focus children and all correspondence were translated into their native language of either French or Spanish. Assurances regarding confidentiality and risk due to participation were provided by explaining that the study had successfully undergone approval of a university committee and had also received school district approval. Parents were provided with telephone numbers they could use if they had any
additional questions or concerns. Parents were informed that their child’s participation was voluntary and could be withdrawn at any time.

Data Collection

In qualitative research, data collection and analysis often occur simultaneously as the study is being conducted (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Glesne, 1999; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002). In other words, the observations and the detailed transcriptions are being analyzed as the compilation of data continues to be collected (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Hatch, 1995). It was planned to use 2 doctoral students to aid in the coding of data from the videotaped sessions to validate findings from the classroom. They were to be trained in coding of this particular data to aid in Interrater reliability (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). A problem arose when 6 parents of the participants including the parent of 1 of the focus children refused to allow their children to be videotaped so it was decided not to include any videotaped data. In the following sections, the variety of components in the data collection process will be discussed separately to make it easier to follow the procedures implemented in this study.

Observational Data

Observations of the participants were the key method of data collection. Bogdan and Biklen (2003) described this method as the chief data gathering technique for an observational case study. There was no plan in place whereby the researcher would actively participate in the activities taking place in the classroom. Questions asked by the children of the researcher received a response but there was no active engagement
in leading or participating in instructional practices. Assistance was provided to the children only at their request and interactions with them were limited by directing them to the teacher or paraprofessional to reduce disruptions or change in the classroom culture or routines. The initial plan was to observe the children 3 times a week for 3 hours each session for 6 weeks in their PPCD classroom. It was anticipated that the majority of the children would take these visits in stride since these types of classrooms have many visitors throughout the day. A detailed account of the observations has been recorded in the data section of this document.

The classroom observations were to be conducted in the spring semester of the school year. The plan was to visit on non-consecutive days throughout the 6 week period. Two initial visits prior to recording information about the children were planned to allow a feel for the activities in the classroom setting to develop. This would allow the children to become accustomed to the researcher’s presence and would allow the researcher to get acquainted with the children and adults. Additionally, this period of non-note-taking observations would help with becoming familiar with the classroom activities and routines. All of the information collected during classroom visits is reported in the data section of this document.

Note-taking observations provided an eyewitness view of the components of the classroom culture and the interrelationship of the participants in a social setting. Included throughout the observations were patterns of interactions and language use between the adults, the focus children and their peers (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Glesne, 1999; Patton, 2002). By systematically focusing attention on the daily routines in the PPCD classroom, it was possible to establish the purpose of instruction, how the focus
children attempted to understand the activities, and how they engaged with peers and adults (Graue & Walsh, 1998). Observational data collection, therefore, made it possible to study how the adults prepared both the physical and social learning environments for the focus children. It was possible to explore how the teachers used and promoted language, social skills, and accelerated the cognitive learning for the focus preschool children with disabilities whose native language was other than English.

Videotaping

It was planned to videotape a one hour session per day to add additional information to the field note descriptions. Additionally, the videotapes would help in the diagnostic interpretations of the data because 2 outside raters would be coding the information from the video tapes. The plan was to place multiple cameras throughout the room. Just as plans were being finalized for camera use, the information session with the parents of the 12 children in the classroom was held. Several parents agreed to allow videotaping of their students. However, there were 5 of the ten non-focus children’s parents plus a focus child’s parents and 1 of the paraprofessionals who did not want any type of video recordings. Due to this, a decision was made not to videotape any of the sessions and to use only methodical systematic note taking.

Review of Records

It was planned to read the 2 focus children’s school records after the observations had been completed to gain insight into the educational plans experts recommended (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). In addition, the reading of official documents at
the end of the observation period might re-establish the impartiality of the observer about the focus children’s behaviors observed during data collection.

In addition, it was planned to evaluate the 2 focus children’s IEP’s, diagnostic reports, and other assessment information. This, however, also proved to be problematic. Even though the parents had not objected to the viewing of the students’ records, the district would not allow the researcher to independently view the individual records. If the parents scheduled a time to go to the administration building and share the records with the researcher, then the records would be made accessible. Only 1 parent agreed to pursue this aspect of the study, and that parent was not a focus child’s guardian. Therefore, a decision was made to rely on the parents’ description of their child’s disability and not the official findings recorded in the school reports.

Data Treatment

At the conclusion of the data collection, the transcribed field notes, analytic memos, and notes on informal talks with teachers, parents and specialist filled well over 2000 pages. All of these records needed to be coded to answer the research questions previously proposed. The information also had to be protected in order to ensure the anonymity of the site and the participants. All paper records were kept in a locked trunk and a locked file cabinet. Data were stored on a flash drive and on several compact discs. These were also kept in the locked file cabinet located in a secure area.
Field Notes

Seventy-page spiral notebooks were used to record all field notes to ensure that individual records were not misplaced. Pages were divided down the middle and observation notes were entered in the right hand column only and the left hand column was used to record categories, concepts, events, and reminders of additional information that must be gathered. The notations of the left-hand column helped to focus on future needs and to refine each scheduled observation.

To prepare the data for analysis, the raw observation field notes were transcribed into a complete data record. The transcriptions began at the end of each day’s observations. The field notes were typed only on the right-hand side of a page, just as the field notes were, leaving a 2 inch margin on the left-hand side for inserting category labels. After analysis in NUD*IST® (N6) a computer package designed to aid researchers in handling non-numerical and unstructured data created by Qualitative Solutions & Research Pty., Ltd. Corporation Australia labels were attached. The process of transcribing the notes was difficult as only those actions and events actually observed with no interpretations were recorded. Reflections and personal ideas were placed in bold on the left hand side to set them off from the text of the transcribed observation notes so as not to confuse them with classroom descriptions. A total of 16 notebooks containing 70 pages each were used just for raw data material. The transcribed notes are contained on 17 compact disks at this time.
Videotaped Observations

For easy retrieval and analysis, a videotape of each one-hour session was planned for a separate tape. The tapes were to have represented various segments of classroom interactions that took place during data gathering. The tapes were meant to insure a more accurate picture of what was occurring in the classroom. Two doctoral students were to do the initial coding of the tapes. A diary of events as each tape was recorded was to be developed and tapes would be placed in chorological order in a plastic bin. However, none of this occurred due to the objections raised by the parents of the focus and non-focus children. Although it was carefully explained that the tapes would be destroyed and that only the parents or doctoral students would be able to view the tapes, numerous objections were made so the videotape option was not viable.

Record Review Notes

Transcribed copies of the handwritten notes from the selected children’s school records were to be prepared. Handwritten notes were to be part of the raw data information in a spiral notebook just like the field notes. The completed school record review notes were to be organized chronologically with the field notes. As was early noted, objections from district personnel and the lack of parental involvement in obtaining a viewing of individual records prohibited the collection of these notes. The parents were informed that they had to go to the administration office between the hours of 8:00 am and 4:00 pm, and they had to fill out a form to view their child’s records. Viewing the records in the presence of the parent in order to gain access to the student’s records was a requirement of the district. The restrictions placed on the
viewing of the records made the activity prohibitive, and therefore, the planned activity
did not take place.

Developing Categories

Merriam (1998) recognized that category construction was a form of content
analysis and how labels were conceptualized reflected the study’s focus and strength.
To begin the diagnostic procedure, a comparative method was applied to the detailed
transcripts. A set of very broad categories prompted by the research questions and the
definition of classroom culture provided early on were used. The broad categories
initially included the division of time and physical space, the activities of adults with the
focus children, the activities of the focus children, the interactions of the peers with the
focus children, and patterns of language used in the classroom. These broad categories
served as a framework for examining the data and a clear starting point in the
investigative method. It was anticipated that as the data was interpreted, many of the
categories would be too broad and that there would be some overlapping of data into
many categories. This would result in the emergences of new categories and
subcategories.

Data Analysis

Data analysis during the study occurred continually from the first day of data
collection. As recommended in Merriam (1998), analysis began with a review of the
emerging data record and continued as transcriptions were prepared into finished data
sets during the first phase of analysis. Phase one analysis consisted of a search for
recurrent behaviors, the labeling of patterns into categories, and reflecting on the meaning of information gained and used to focus future observations. Also included in the analysis was a table of the categories which changed often during the first few weeks until list of categories was stabilized. N6 sorted the data that was acquired in the transcripts from the observations. The computer program offered tools to assist with interpretation, coding, indexing, searching text or patterns of coding, and theorizing about what had been seen and understood as the patterns became clearer. The raw data was unstructured and took shape only as the data accumulated so the flexibility and ongoing analysis available with N6 was suitable for this type of project. N6 allowed the creation of nodes to hold the data in categories and identified topics of significance for analysis. This process also allowed for automatic descriptive coding of the documents and storing of text searches. Text searches within the document were used to find occurrences of words or specific people to help establish relationships among the pieces of information. Data were sorted by the adults each focus child interacted with in order to gain a clear picture of classroom culture. Patterns of interactions among the peers and the focus children were also found. Looking into the structured and unstructured activities gave clear insight into the patterns of events that formed the classroom culture.

In the second phase a variety of graphic displays on poster boards were used to finalize categories, identify their component parts, and visually defined relationships among them (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The poster boards allowed the physical movement of pieces of information from one place to another. Analysis of phase two began after gathering data was completed and transcribing all the collected data and
the inputting of data in N6 was finalized. At this point, the finished data records included all the expanded field notes. Also, the categories were stabilized and the finished data record was coded after making some minor adjustments in coding the patterns of various observed behaviors. At this stage, an attempt was made to understand and explain the why of what I had been seen and heard based on written reflections and the research and literature review for ideas and evidence to support the developing theories about why events in the setting occurred as they did. In addition, findings were related to existing theory regarding English language learners with disabilities to make inferences regarding preschool children with developmental delays whose native language was other than English. All of this information has been recorded in the data discussion section located in later sections of this document.

Expectations

The work of case study research entailed identifying and understanding the cultural ingredients of a setting through examining the perspectives and behaviors of every participant (Glesne, 1999). The nature of culture in the preschool classroom and how this setting promoted language, social interactions, emotional growth, physical development and cognitive learning for the focus children selected for observations was the focus of the study. The belief that the features of the classrooms’ culture that included not only the physical aspects, but more importantly, the social traits expressed in the interactions and relationships among the participants was assumed. Identifying the relationships between the adults and peers with the focus children was also felt to be important. Understanding how the focus children communicated and interacted with
each other in the various activities within the school day setting was also needed. In addition, identifying patterns in the features and components of the classroom culture and discovering how these related, influenced, or hindered developmental growth had to occur. Finally, the information about the classroom culture had to be related to theoretical findings which were based in scientific research. All of this information has also been recorded in the discussion section found later in this document.

Strengths of Case Study

The case study approach was a qualitative method of scientifically-based research (Patton, 2002). Researchers are somewhat freer to discover and address issues that arise and look in depth at the site (Hatch, 1995). The looser research format of case studies also allows beginning with a broad question and narrowing the focus as observations progress (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). By seeking to understand as much as possible about a single subject, deep data and thick description gives life to the information obtained in the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). This emphasis allows researchers to bridge the gap between theory, concrete practices, and real world applications (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001).

Weaknesses of Case Study

The case study approach relies on personal interpretation of all data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The results lack generalizability, are difficult to test for validity, and rarely offer a problem-solving prescription to others (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). Simply put, relying on a few subjects as a basis for cognitive extrapolations runs the risk of inferring
too much from what might be circumstance. Case studies also can involve obtaining more information about the subjects being observed than most researchers need to know or have the time to gather (Hatch, 1995; Patton, 2002). Therefore, the cost and time efforts contribute to the weaknesses of case studies (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Conducting case studies requires careful consideration of ethical and relationship issues (Glesne, 1999; Hatch, 1995; Merriam, 1998). Efforts must be made to ensure that personal integrity, sensitivity, and possible prejudices and/or biases of the investigator are not articulated while gathering data (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001; Patton, 2002).

**How to Improve Validity and Reliability**

To help insure accuracy of the findings, a prolonged time must be spent in the field gathering data (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003; Glesne, 1999; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002). In this study it was important that normal developmental advances did not alter or add another dimension to the outcome. Therefore, a decision was made to spend a 6-week period in the field. The process of triangulation can be employed in data collection to aid in the accuracy of findings (Hatch, 1995; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). A variety of data sources should be relied on in the assemblage efforts to increase reliability (Glesne, 1999; Merriam, 1998). Extensive collections of referential materials as a base for theoretical conclusions will add to the validity of the findings (Bodgan & Biklen, 2003). Continuous consultations with committee members will aid in increasing theoretical interpretations thereby enhancing reliability and validity. As far as this type of study is concerned, Merriam (1998) suggested that qualitative research should be
judged as credible and confirmable as opposed to deeming it valid, reliable, or
generalizable. Case study methods were never intended to function in the same manner
as a quantitative study, therefore it should not be asked to do something it was never
designed to do (Glesne, 1999; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Patton, 2002).
CHAPTER 4

GATHERING DATA

Description of Site

A site located close to home would allow easy access, convenience and feasibility, as it related to being given permission to conduct this research study. To this end, a small school district in North Texas close to some larger school districts and one urban school district was selected. This particular location featured a school with approximately 700 students on a title one campus. The campus has a majority of 49.7% Hispanic students. The school has 74% of its students eligible for free or reduced lunch and participates in a district provision two feeding program through the United States Department of Education. The superintendent of the district and the principal of the school both agreed to allow the school to be part of this study.

The school houses a prekindergarten three-year-old program and a prekindergarten four-year-old program. Each has full-time inclusion PPCD classrooms. The school also houses the districts individual life skills (ILS) classrooms for elementary grades, and they work with inclusion on an individual basis for each student. The school offers classes in prekindergarten three through fifth grade. Classes begin at 7:45 am and continue until 3:15 pm. The prekindergarten four-year-old program have a modified schedule beginning each day at 8:15 am and dismissing each day at 2:45 pm. The parents are required to drop off and pick up their children at the door. Special education students have the option of having transportation provided for them. The teachers in each of the PPCD classrooms hold general certifications in early childhood education and special education certifications. The first visit with the special education teachers
occurred in February to begin the process of identifying students who met the criteria to participate in the research study. Each teacher and paraprofessional signed a consent form before a meeting with the parents was set. The teachers working with the focus students in the classroom each had less than 5 years teaching experience.

Classroom Selection

The classroom had a total of 12 students enrolled. There were 8 boys and 4 girls. There were 10 children classified as Limited English Proficient (LEP), and there were 4 children eligible for special education services. Of the 4 PPCD students, 2 of them were both special education and LEP. The parents of both students agreed to allow their children to participate in the study. The classroom had 1 English speaking teacher and 1 English/Spanish bilingual full-time paraprofessional. There were other students who had varying degrees of disabilities, so there were 2 other English speaking paraprofessionals who came in and out of the room at different times. There was also a speech therapist, a sign language/communication specialist, an occupational therapist, and a physical therapist who routinely worked with children from the classroom. All of the specialists were English speakers.

Focus Children

The first student was a boy who was 4 years and 7 months at the beginning of the study. The student participated in the four-year-old program at the school. The student’s native language was French, but the family also spoke Swahili. The parents both read French, and the forms were translated for them into French. The child had 4
much older siblings, and both parents resided in the home. The child was non-verbal upon entering the program last year and had a disability classification of autism. The child used both sign language and communication boards to help the teachers understand his needs or desires. He had begun to verbalize in short phrases by November of the school year. The study began in February 2006, and he was using approximately 20 words with consistency. He had no physical limitations. This student will be called Sam. Sam worked 90 minutes with the speech therapist and 135 minutes with the sign language/communication specialist.

The second student was a boy who was 5 years and 3 months at the beginning of the study. The student did not participate in any program prior to joining the class in January. The student's native language was Spanish, and he was the only child in the home. He resided with a Spanish-speaking mom who appeared to demonstrate limited cognitive abilities and a Spanish-speaking grandmother. He rarely spoke and only used Spanish when speaking to his mom. He did use one-word English phrases when speaking with teachers but used Spanish with the other children in the classroom. His classification was level A Non-English Speaker, and, he was mentally retarded according to the grandmother. She stated that he was functioning at the level of most 12 month olds. He also had a left hand and arm that were not properly formed and received physical therapy and occupational therapy to aid in the use of the limb. This student will be called Eric. Eric had 20 minutes a week with the occupational therapist, 30 minutes a week with the physical therapist, and 90 minutes a week with the speech therapist. He also had a paraprofessional who works with him 30 minutes a day to meet movement goals on his IEP. The time spent with the paraprofessional included such
activities as putting objects in and out of a bowl, rolling a ball and catching it, and scooping up sand and rice with various tools and then pouring the material into a container.

Classmates

The 10 other children in the class ranged in age from 3 years 11 months at the beginning of school to 5 years 7 months. 9 of the children had been in the classroom since August 2005, but 1 of the students had only arrived in the United States in December 2005. 2 of the children in the classroom, both boys, exhibited a variety of disabling conditions. 1 of the boys was Caucasian and the other was African-American. The remaining 8 children exhibited speech delays and language acquisition issues and were not classified as PPCD students. The 4 girls were all LEP students and native Spanish speakers. 3 were just beginning to exit the silent stage with 1 child being very fluent in both Spanish and English. The other 4 boys who were also LEP students were exhibiting various levels of language acquisition. 2 of the boys were Spanish speakers, 1 was an Asian speaker, and 1 student was from the Middle East and used a dialect of Arabic. Each of these 4 boys was very active and loved to play Power Rangers. There was no evidence of attendance issues in this classroom as it was rare to find a child absent.

Professional Educators

For the purpose of this study the following names will be used:

- "Mrs. Clark" – Teacher of record for the PPCD classroom
“Mrs. Smith” – Teacher of record for the ILS classroom that participated with the PPCD classroom

“Ms. Brown” – the paraprofessional assigned to the PPCD classroom

“Mr. Larson” – the paraprofessional who worked with individual students in the PPCD classroom

“Mr. Miller” – the paraprofessional who worked with some of the handicapped students in the PPCD classroom

“Mrs. Bold” – the speech therapist who worked weekly with the focus children

“Mrs. Parker” – the communication/sign language specialist who worked weekly with one of the students in the PPCD classroom

“Mrs. Roland” – the occupational therapist who worked with some of the students in the PPCD classroom

“Mrs. Black” – the physical therapist who worked with some of the students in the PPCD classroom

All of the teachers in this educational setting met the definition of highly qualified according to the standards set forth by NCLB. Each teacher had a bachelor’s degree from a university and each was certified by the state of Texas in the area in which they were assigned. All of the paraprofessionals working with these students also met the definition of highly qualified. One was a degreed individual, one had at least forty eight hours college, and the other had passed a rigorous test that met the definition of highly qualified. Since this was a school district that met the standard of title one at all campuses, all paraprofessionals working directly with students had to meet the highly qualified standard by May 2006. The speech therapist had been with the district for 8 years, while all other professionals had 5 years or less in the district. All of the teachers who came in contact with the children were Caucasian, and 2 of the paraprofessionals were Caucasian. 1 of the paraprofessionals was Hispanic. The teacher of record had
some exposure to Spanish and to sign language. All of the professionals who worked with the students had training on the use of a communication board. The communication board has been described in detail later in the data reporting section.

Physical Space

The room was located on the bottom floor of a 2 story elementary school. The classroom was suitably supplied with developmentally appropriate materials. There were various sections throughout the room that enabled the students to make choices about areas where they would most like to interact. Such areas included the home center, the block center, fine motor development, sand/water table accessories, puppet center, art center, writing center, dramatic play center and a reading station. The centers were built on an open concept to allow easy access for various types of equipment that might be needed for the disabled students. The room was not rearranged during observations, but the teacher reported that many changes took place during the fall semester to accommodate the needs of the students. The 2 rectangle table areas, 1 circle table, and 1 kidney-shaped table were set up as structured centers during various times of the day and also served as a breakfast table in the morning and the snack table. Mrs. Clark, the classroom teacher, stated that socialization was a key component of the curriculum and every opportunity was used to promote social skills. There was a carpet area for whole group that had 20 squares of various colors on it. The children were assigned a particular color to go to during group time. There was a space at the back of the carpet for a child who participated from a wheel chair. The children sat on the carpet during story time, and during music time they brought a chair
with them and formed a circle on the carpet. Since the class size was small there were plenty of toys and materials to accommodate all of the children. Many of the smaller piece toys were kept in a closet where the teacher was the only one with access. Some of the children had lower developmental ages and according to the teacher they had put pieces in their mouths which created hazardous conditions.

**Data Collection**

Data collection began on February 19, 2006. The first two days, February 19 and February 21, were observation days without note taking. These observations lasted 3 hours on the first day and 4.5 hours on the second day. The teachers were observed to become familiar with the students’ names. During observations for data collection the students were accompanied to recess, to lunch, and to therapy sessions. The therapy sessions were one-on-one with a specialist, so notes about 1 child could be recorded during these sessions. Because of the differences in each of the focus children only data collection on 1 child at each observational session was possible in order to obtain valid information about their interactions. At this time it was decided to use color-coded notebooks for recording information about the children. Eric’s color became red and Sam’s became blue. During these first 2 sessions familiarity with the class schedules was also established. The routines in the classroom seemed to help the students to anticipate what would happen next.
Daily Schedule

8:15 – Arrival and breakfast in the classroom. Since this is a provision two feeding district, each child receives a free breakfast and a free lunch. The children were given a breakfast sack upon arrival each day. The sack contained a breakfast item, juice, and milk.

8:35 – The students cleaned up their space at the table and removed all items to the trash.

8:45 – They went to their carpet square for whole-group time. This consisted of calendar activities, weather reports, daily academic focus information, special events postings, daily message board, and a story time.

9:00 – On Monday’s and Wednesday’s Sam went to speech therapy. On Tuesday’s and Thursday’s Eric went to speech therapy. Sam was in a group by himself, but Eric had 2 other LEP students in his group. On the days that Sam and Eric did not have speech, they were participating in center time activities geared to address number concepts and letter-recognition activities.

9:45 – Morning recess time – All four-year-old prekindergarten classrooms had recess together. The bilingual class and the 2 regular education classes met the PPCD classroom outside.

10:00 – Restroom time and snack time – The PPCD classroom had a routine to ensure that those who were potty trained went to the restroom and those in diapers were changed. They had a group snack time where the children worked on table manners and socialization skills. The students had to raise their hand, be acknowledged, and
then ask appropriately for the snack that they desired. If the children had a beverage choice as well it was made in the same manner.

10:20 – This time was set aside to work on IEP’s for individual students. Mrs. Roland, the occupational therapist, and Mrs. Black, the physical therapist, were scheduled 2 or 3 times a week depending on the needs of the student. The other paraprofessionals, Mr. Miller and Mr. Larson, not officially assigned to this classroom came in and worked with the four PPCD children. Mrs. Clark, the classroom teacher was generally working on language acquisition skill lessons with the LEP students. Eric and Sam sometimes worked one-on-one with Mrs. Brown, a paraprofessional, and sometimes participated in the language lessons. Eric’s time period with Mrs. Roland, the occupational therapist, and Mrs. Black, the physical therapist, were during this block of time.

11:00 – Music time – All of the students brought a chair to the carpet area and Mrs. Clark, the teacher, had them form a circle. Sometimes the children were sitting, but often they had activities that involved movement or following directions so that they had to get up and push their chairs back.

11:30 – Restroom Time – This was the time they used to prepare for lunch. 2 of the students had adaptive materials for eating, and all had toilet needs prior to lunch.

12:00 – Lunch – Sam was able to carry his own tray, but Eric required some assistance to get his left arm up under the tray. He could manage if the tray was very light-weight. He had some problems if the meal contained something like a stew or a soup. Lunch was a time with a great deal of language and socialization. The teacher and 2 paraprofessionals spaced themselves between the children to assist the children with any needs they encountered in the lunch room. Sam had some difficulties settling down
with all the noise. There are many times when he looked around and held his ears and
did not eat. The noise level on the playground did not seem to impact his ability to
participate as much as the noise level in the cafeteria.
12:30 – This period of time was used as a rest or down time. On Tuesdays, Thursdays,
and Fridays Sam’s sign language/communication board specialist came and worked
with him. The other children read books while lying on a blanket, played with small toys
on their blanket, and many of them fell asleep. Sam did not respond well to the therapist
and often created a very noisy environment. On 6 of the 8 days that Sam was observed
with Mrs. Parker, the sign language/communication specialist, they had to leave the
room to go and work on his goals in an area without so many distractions. Since the
paraprofessionals were all at lunch, there was no one else to send with Mrs. Parker to
help reassure Sam. Detailed information on these sessions will follow in this data
section.
1:15 – 2 of the children left at this time to have integration with a kindergarten class.
They were assigned to the PPCD four-year-old room because the ILS room had many
older children and they did not function well in that setting. 3 children who were first and
second graders in the ILS room came into the PPCD room. Mrs. Smith, the ILS teacher,
accompanied them, and the children had unstructured center time. The 3 children from
ILS are all English speakers and all were functioning on a three- or four-year-old level.
The integration with Mrs. Clark’s PPCD class was meant to provide peer interaction and
language modeling for the LEP students and Sam and Eric. The centers were set up
with easy access, and the only requirement was that, when they chose a center, they
had to stay in the center for twenty minutes. Mrs. Clark, the classroom teacher, created
that rule when she noticed that the children were just going from place to place every 2 to 3 minutes, and there was little to no meaningful play or interaction by the children with the centers. During this time period Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Smith, Ms. Brown, and Mr. Larson were in the room. The adults moved around at the various centers engaging in conversation with the children. If the children were talking and playing well, the adult often left the center to go and work with other students. There was not a limit on the number of children that could be in the center. However, since there were only 13 children in the room and there were 8 centers which the children could choose to visit, there were never more than 4 children seeking a center at one time. After 18 minutes of play the teacher would announce that if the children wanted to change centers they must clean up the center they were currently using. Often times they chose to stay at their current selection. Eric would never leave the block center if he had the choice to stay there. During observations, Mrs. Clark would allow him to stay in the block center 2 times a couple of days each week but then would make him chose somewhere else to play. The teachers, Mrs. Clark and Mrs. Smith stated that the system was working well in the second semester, but there were many obstacles that they had overcome. The LEP students were not allowed to speak in their native language during this time. The teachers, Mrs. Clark and Mrs. Brown stated that the LEP students needed to learn English, and so they would have to speak English while at school.

2:15 – This time period was used as clean-up time with a last restroom break before getting ready to go home. The PPCD children all had transportation provided for them. The LEP student’s parent would pick them up at the door. According to school district policy all prekindergarten students had to have someone pick them up at the door, and
the children were not allowed to walk in by themselves in the morning for safety reasons.

2:30 – The PPCD children were walked to the bus by Mrs. Clark, Mr. Larson and Mr. Miller. Mrs. Brown remained in the room with the eight LEP students.

2:45 – The prekindergarten teachers met at least one day a week to discuss various issues. According to Mrs. Clark the teachers planned units, activities, and events during their grade level meetings.

3:15 - After the ILS children were dismissed, Mrs. Brown and Mrs. Smith met almost daily to discuss events of the day or things they were going to do in the future.

Time in Field

The following was a record of the time periods spent in the field to gain information about the culture of the classroom and yet not have a maturation issue influence the activities observed. Therefore, it was decided that the schedule of observations would occur over a six-week time period. This did vary a little in that spring break for the district was held March 12-16. Originally, there was a plan not to do observations 2 days in a row. Because only 1 child at a time could be the focus of an observation, visitations were scheduled on consecutive days but not for the same child 2 days in a row. Additionally, observations were scheduled to occur on a 3 hour time period. The planned observational period of 3 hours however often ended in the middle of an activity so observations tended to be an average of four hours.
Table 1

*Time in Field for Collections*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Number of Hours in field</th>
<th>Focus Child Observed</th>
<th>Special Features of the Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/23/06</td>
<td>9:00 – 1:00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Sam worked with Mrs. Parker (communication/sign language) from 12:30 until 1:00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27/06</td>
<td>9:00 – 1:30</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Eric had speech with Mrs. Bold from 9:04 until 9:40. Eric had PT from 10:20 until 10:50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/06</td>
<td>8:15-11:30</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Eric had speech with Mrs. Bold for 9:00 until 9:35. Eric had OT with Mrs. Roland from 10:30 until 10:50. Eric worked with two other children and Mrs. Roland from 10:10 until 10:30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/06</td>
<td>9:00 – 1:30</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Sam worked with Mrs. Parker (communication/sign language) from 12:30 until 1:15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Number of Hours in field</th>
<th>Focus Child Observed</th>
<th>Special Features of the Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/7/06</td>
<td>8:45 - 1:30</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Sam worked with Mrs. Bold (speech) from 9:00 until 9:40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8/06</td>
<td>9:00 – 12:30</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Eric worked with Mrs. Bold (speech) from 9:10 until 9:55.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/06</td>
<td>8:15 - 11:15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Sam worked with Mrs. Parker (communication/sign language) from 11:00 until 11:45. Mrs. Parker came early to work with Sam. Only the first fifteen minutes was observed due to a conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/06</td>
<td>9:20 - 12:20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Eric worked with Mrs. Roland (OT) from 10:30 until 11:00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/06</td>
<td>8:00 – 1:15</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Sam had difficulty getting off the bus. Sam worked with Mrs. Parker from 12:30 until 1:15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Number of Hours in field</th>
<th>Focus Child Observed</th>
<th>Special Features of the Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/21/06</td>
<td>9:00 – 1:00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Eric did not receive any outside special services today. He did work with a paraprofessional Ms. Brown on IEP goals from 10:45 until 11:00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23/06</td>
<td>8:30 – 1:30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Sam worked with Mrs. Parker (communication/sign language) from 12:35 until 1:10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27/06</td>
<td>8:15 – 1:15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Eric worked with Mrs. Bold (speech) from 9:00 until 9:35. Eric worked with Mrs. Roland (OT) from 10:40 until 11:00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/28/06</td>
<td>9:30 – 2:45</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Sam arrived back in the classroom at 9:43 from his speech lesson with Mrs. Parker. Observations of Sam began at 9:45 as he began morning recess.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 1 (*continued*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Number of Hours in field</th>
<th>Focus Child Observed</th>
<th>Special Features of the Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/3/06</td>
<td>9:00 – 1:15</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Sam worked with Mrs. Bold (speech) from 9:05 until 9:45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4/06</td>
<td>10:00 – 2:45</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Eric returned from speech early. He worked with Mrs. Roland (OT) from 10:40 until 11:05. He arrived after music started and had a difficult time transitioning due to a change in normal routines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/6/06</td>
<td>8:15 – 12:15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Sam was in the classroom during the observation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/06</td>
<td>9:30 – 1:30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Eric had no special outside services on this day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10/06</td>
<td>8:15-2:45</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>The initial forty hours with Sam had been recorded. This observation was inclusive of Sam’s entire day. Sam had speech with Mrs. Bold from 9:00 until 9:40 on this day. This was the last day with Sam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*table continues*)
Table 1 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Number of Hours in field</th>
<th>Focus Child Observed</th>
<th>Special Features of the Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/13/06</td>
<td>8:15-2:45</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>The initial forty hours with Eric had been recorded. This observation was inclusive of Eric's entire day. Eric had speech with Mrs. Bold from 9:10 until 9:45. Eric had group OT time with Mrs. Roland from 10:25 until 11:00. This was the last day with Eric and the last time data was collected for this study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collection occurred 46.50 hours with each child totaling 93 hours plus the initial 7.5 hours of observation that was not formally recorded. This time occurred during a total of 7 weeks in the classroom which provided the opportunity to see each child interact with several adults at various times. The data observation began on February 19. The data collection began on February 23.
Table 2

*Time Spent with Specialist*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ms. Roland (OT)</th>
<th>Mrs. Parker (C/Sign L)</th>
<th>Mrs. Bold (Speech)</th>
<th>Mrs. Black (PT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>150 minutes in six observations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>185 minutes in 5 observations</td>
<td>90 minutes in three observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>165 minutes in 5 observations</td>
<td>120 minutes in three observations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developing Categories

According to the work of Merriam (1998) the category construction should begin with a spotlight on the research questions being asked and focus on the area of study. Therefore, data analysis began with the following categories:

- Structured activities – including teacher directed events
- Unstructured activities – including experiences that were child initiated
- Sam’s use of language with peers – all forms of communication used by Sam with other children
- Eric’s use of language with peers – all forms of communication used by Eric with other children
- Sam’s use of language with adults – all forms of communication used by Sam with adults
- Eric’s use of language with adults – all forms of communication used by Eric with adults
Established routines of the classroom – this included but was not limited to putting away materials, transitioning to new activities, or lining up for an event

Instructional methods used with Sam – methods used by adults in the delivery of curriculum

Instructional methods used with Eric – methods used by adults in the delivery of curriculum

Cultural aspects of the physical space – the interactions of all participants within the environment of the physical space in instructional areas

Cultural aspects of the structured activities – the interactions of all participants within the environment in the time period of the structured activities

Cultural aspects of the unstructured activities – the interactions of all participants within the environment in the time period of the unstructured activities

Cultural aspects of the classroom routines – the interactions of all participants within the environment in the time period of the classroom routines

Native language development for Sam – development of French and Swahili expressive and receptive language skills

Native language development for Eric – development of Spanish expressive and receptive language skills

Acquisition of English language for Sam – development of English expressive and receptive language skills

Acquisition of English language for Eric – development of English expressive and receptive language skills

Attainment of developmental skills by Sam – skills gained in the domains of cognitive, physical, social and emotional

Attainment of developmental skills by Eric – skills gained in the domains of cognitive, physical, social and emotional

Development of alternative communication skills by Sam – communication skills developed that are non-verbal
After learning the NUD*IST® (N6) program which is a computer package designed to aid researchers in handling non-numerical and unstructured data created by Qualitative Solutions & Research Pty., Ltd. Corporation Australia over many hours of practice, inputting information and developing emerging categories began. Initially a word document was created by inputting the information and experimenting with the categories to learn to use the N6 program. Commonalities between observations and created nodes for handling the various pieces of information were sought. This became an interesting and complicated process due to lack of experience with the program. To help with learning and understanding, the documents were printed and copied, and then posters representing the various categories were made with specific information cut from the data records pasted onto the boards. Although, this created an additional step in the analysis process, it helped establish the patterns that were being observed. This process also allowed a visual representation of the data, and a focus on missing pieces of information. Early on it became apparent that there was little to no instruction or speech used in either Eric’s or Sam’s native language. Because of the research on second language acquisition for young children, there was an intense awareness of native language usage. Further discussion of this particular aspect of the data will follow in this document. Also information about Sam and Eric’s use of language with adults was included but there was not a specific category about the adults’ use of language with the children. Once various types of language used by the adults were identified, the following additional categories emerged.
Adult talk for teaching academics – types of speech used by adults during academic instruction

Adult talk for teaching social skills – types of speech used by adults during the social skill development activities

Adult talk to promote communication in first language – types of speech used by adults during the promotion of French and Swahili for Sam and Spanish for Eric

Adult talk to promote communication in second language acquisition – types of speech used by adults during activities used to promote the acquisition of English

Adult talk to promote communication through alternative methods of communication – types of speech used by adults during activities used to promote communication skills that were non-verbal

Adult talk to manage behaviors – types of speech used by adults to manage the two focus children’s’ behaviors

Adult talk to maintain routines such as restroom activities, eating activities, and transitions – types of speech used by adults throughout established classroom routines

Adult talk for critical responses such as someone is about to be hurt or routine fire drills – types of speech used by adults during emergency activities

Coding Guide

Since it was possible for field notes to be coded into several different categories, the establishment of categories enabled visual conceptualization of the connections between various components of the study. The following section contains documentation of the information gained in each of the above categories. In the discussion portion of this report, information obtained through research analysis is applied to the data gathered in this study. This allowed the implications of this study to be outlined and used to answer the research questions.
While gathering data a coding system was used to indicate what type of activity was being observed. This coding system listed every type of activity that was presented on a reference sheet. After about 10 observations the coding system has been internalized and became very natural and quick. The activities were listed in the order in which they generally occurred during the day to produce an easy reference guide. The guide that was used is as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unloading of bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Walking to classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Putting away materials and backpack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eating breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cleaning up from breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Going to carpet and sitting down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Math activity to include counting, one to one, odd and even, and patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Story time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Whole group activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dismissal to academic structured centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Letter games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Number activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Science experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Reading activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Speech (with Mrs. Bold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Recess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>IEP focus skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Language acquisition games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>OT (with Mrs. Roland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PT (with Mrs. Black)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Music time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Active movement games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rest time with mat activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sign language/communication board (with Mrs. Parker) * see explanation below coding system chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Free choice blocks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. Free choice puppets
33. Free choice sand/water table
34. Free choice dramatic play
35. Free choice home center
36. Free choice book station
37. Free choice fine motor
38. Free choice art center
39. Free choice writing center
40. Prepare for dismissal
41. Walking to the bus
42. Loading the bus

* Sam used a notebook that had hook and loop tape down both the right and left hand sides of the front. On the left hand side was a pictorial schedule of the events that Sam would be participating in each day. Initially the right hand side of the hook and loop tape was empty. Upon completion of each and every activity, Sam was to move the one inch by one inch picture from the left hand side of the board to the right hand side of the board. When the teacher said and signed finished, Sam was instructed to say and sign finished after the teacher and move the piece to the right. Sam had difficulty transitioning from one activity to another activity. With this visual representation, Sam’s ability to change activities improved. There were small pieces of hook and loop tape located at every place that Sam visited. For example, if he was supposed to go to the computer station he would put his picture of the computer on the piece of hook and loop tape. When he left the center, he put the picture on the right hand side of the notebook. Contained within the notebook were approximately 300 pictures according to his teacher. When they had something new planned that they have never done and did not have a preprinted picture for, they created a picture. Mrs. Clark stated that Sam really had made dramatic improvements since he began using the communication board in September.
Structured Activities

There were 23 visits to the site during the time in the field. While 2 of the visits did not involve note taking, and information was not formally collected from those visits, all 23 visits did have evidence of structured activity. The activities students engaged in did cross over into other categories, so the specifics of the activities will be covered in other sections of this document. Below is a table that outlines the number and types of structured events that took place during the time frames of the classroom visits. When a student actively participated in the activity documentation was collected and categorized as engagement in activity. When the student failed to attend to the activity or lesson and demonstrated non-compliance type behaviors documentation was noted and categorized as non-engagement. The numbers under the activities relate directly back to the coding sheet used in the classroom that was previously recorded in this document.

Table 3

*Structured Activities in which Focus Children Engaged*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and name</th>
<th>Activity engaged in</th>
<th>Activity not engaged in</th>
<th>Examples of non-engagement in activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/23 Sam</td>
<td>12, 13, 16, 21, 22, 26, 28</td>
<td>25, 30</td>
<td>25 – Music – Sam did not get his chair nor sit in the chair after being assisted by Ms. Brown. 30 – Sam only attended to the teacher and her activities 4 minutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and name</th>
<th>Activity engaged in</th>
<th>Activity not engaged in</th>
<th>Examples of non-engagement in activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/27 Eric</td>
<td>12, 14, 15, 18, 24, 28, 29</td>
<td>25, 26</td>
<td>25, 26 – Eric became very tired after working with his physical therapist. While waiting for only 5 minutes in his chair for music Eric fell asleep and remained asleep until he was woken up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/01 Eric</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 18, 23, 25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23 –. Mrs. Roland (OT) had worked with Eric and 2 other children for 20 minutes, and Eric simply rolled on the ground and would not practice taking his shoes and socks off as asked by the teacher. Mrs. Roland took Eric into the hallway and worked with him independently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/02 Sam</td>
<td>12, 13, 16, 21, 22, 26, 28, 29</td>
<td>25, 30</td>
<td>25 – Sam did not sit in his chair. He kept going up to the chart where the song was and pushing the buttons on the CD player. 30 - Sam appeared to not want to go with Mrs. Parker to the room where they worked on his sign language/communication board applications. Sam ran down the hall into another classroom. Mrs. Parker sought assistance from another adult.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and name</th>
<th>Activity engaged in</th>
<th>Activity not engaged in</th>
<th>Examples of non-engagement in activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/05 Eric</td>
<td>4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 24, 26, 28</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
<td>Eric had no problems participating today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/07 Sam</td>
<td>7, 8, 12, 18, 21, 22, 25, 26</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
<td>10 - Sam kept taking the pieces off the storyboard and running away with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/08 Eric</td>
<td>18, 25, 26, 28</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
<td>21, 22 - Eric did not to participate in the IEP focus skills or the language game due to the apparent level of difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/09 Sam</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 21, 30, 17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22 – Eric did not want to do the language acquisition game because he usually had computer time before language, and he missed his computer time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and name</th>
<th>Activity engaged in</th>
<th>Activity not engaged in</th>
<th>Examples of non-engagement in activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/19 Eric</td>
<td>13, 17, 23, 25, 26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28 – Eric did not like the choice at lunch and he refused to carry his tray.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20 Sam</td>
<td>10, 12, 13, 17, 21, 22, 28</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 30</td>
<td>Sam wanted to sit in another seat on the bus and the driver had Sam maintain his assigned seat. Sam was having difficulties throughout the bus ride. Sam got off the bus, threw his backpack, and took off running.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21 Eric</td>
<td>14, 16, 21, 22, 25, 26, 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eric had a great day today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23 Sam</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 12, 17, 21, 22, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30</td>
<td>7, 8, 9</td>
<td>7- 8 - 9 – Sam came off the bus and into the classroom but, after going to the carpet, he got up and would not return to listen or participate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and name</th>
<th>Activity engaged in</th>
<th>Activity not engaged in</th>
<th>Examples of non-engagement in activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/27 Eric</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 18, 21, 23, 25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26 – Eric did not want to stand up and he simply pushed his chair back and sat down on the floor. After a minute he laid down on the floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/28 Sam</td>
<td>21, 22, 25, 26, 28, 40, 41, 42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Many of the activities were unstructured, and Sam did great all day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30 Eric</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 24, 25, 26</td>
<td>3, 28</td>
<td>3 - Eric needed remove his diapers from his backpack and put them into his tub before he sat down for breakfast. All he wanted to do was eat. He continued to go back to the table and it appeared that the teacher could not influence him. 28 – Eric does not verbalize very well and he got mad when a child that picks on him sat next to him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (*continued*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity engaged in</th>
<th>Activity not engaged in</th>
<th>Examples of non-engagement in activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/03</td>
<td>Sam 18, 17, 26, 28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21 - Sam missed his computer time on speech day, and he really liked the computer. He would do nothing the Mr. Larson (paraprofessional) asked until he was allowed computer time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/04</td>
<td>Eric 28, 40, 41, 42</td>
<td>25, 26</td>
<td>25- 26 – Another child was sitting in Eric’s spot. Eric had a very difficult time adjusting to sitting somewhere else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06</td>
<td>Sam 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sam had a great day. He was not pulled out of class at all. Sam did better when he was not required to go anywhere special.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/07</td>
<td>Eric 21, 22, 25, 26, 28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13 - Eric had trouble recognizing the difference in letters. He got mad and began throwing the letters on the floor. The paraprofessional tried to help Eric with the game. Eric wanted to leave the area and the paraprofessional was holding on to Eric’s arm. Eric pulled away and crawled under the table and would not come out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table continues*
Table 3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and name</th>
<th>Activity engaged in</th>
<th>Activity not engaged in</th>
<th>Examples of non-engagement in activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/10 Sam</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 18, 17, 22, 25, 26, 28, 40</td>
<td>41, 42</td>
<td>41 - 42 – Sam had problems staying in line to walk to the bus. Today, Sam did not like waiting in the sun while they were having trouble with the wheelchair lift button.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13 Eric</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 18, 21, 23, 28, 40, 41, 42</td>
<td>25, 26</td>
<td>25 - 26 – Eric came in from working with Mrs. Roland (OT) just as music started. He sat down in his chair and fell asleep almost instantly. Mr. Miller (paraprofessional) woke him up in time to go to lunch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Structured Activities

The majority of the day in Mrs. Clark’s PPCD classroom was spent in structured activities such as whole group activities, academic instructional time periods, and language acquisition instruction. During many of the events such as science experiences or language acquisition games the children were asked close-ended questions that required only a “yes” or “no” response. Often the information was
expected to be answered from a leading question such as “What color is the ball?” Mrs. Clark and the paraprofessionals who worked in the classroom did not often talk to the children other than to deliver information, expectations, or to give directions. A verbal response was not expected nor required in these instances. The teachers provided a clear focus and agenda during structured activities and off-task behaviors were dealt with immediately.

Unstructured Activities

The unstructured activities took place throughout the day as did the structured activities. Unstructured activities included recess, restroom, rest time, and free choice centers from 1:15 until 2:15. To understand how the culture of the class was created, every single event witnessed was classified as either structured or unstructured. After completing this task, the events were broken down into the type of event that it represented. When a student actively participated in the activity documentation was collected and categorized as engagement in activity. When the student failed to attend to the activity or lesson and demonstrated non-compliance type behaviors documentation was noted and categorized as non-engagement. While many more activities took place in structured settings, less behavioral issues occurred during unstructured time periods. The schedule was not altered throughout the 6 week observational time period.
### Table 4

*Unstructured Activities in which Focus Children Engaged*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and name</th>
<th>Activity engaged in</th>
<th>Activity not engaged in</th>
<th>Examples of non-engagement in activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/23 Sam</td>
<td>19, 20, 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with unstructured events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/27 Eric</td>
<td>19, 20, 27, 29, 31</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with unstructured events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/01 Eric</td>
<td>19, 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with unstructured events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/02 Sam</td>
<td>20, 27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19 – The class arrived outside for recess and found the ground to be too muddy. Sam refused to line up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/05 Eric</td>
<td>19, 20, 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with unstructured events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/07 Sam</td>
<td>20, 27, 29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19 – Sam hid in the tunnel outside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/08 Eric</td>
<td>19, 20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27 - Eric had a dirty diaper and appeared to not want it on. Eric pulled his shorts down. He had trouble because his shoes were on so he took them off as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 4 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and name</th>
<th>Activity engaged in</th>
<th>Activity not engaged in</th>
<th>Examples of non-engagement in activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/09 Sam</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19 – Sam would not come down off the rock wall to go inside. Another student tried to urge Sam to come down to no avail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19 Eric</td>
<td>19, 20, 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with unstructured events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20 Sam</td>
<td>20, 27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19 - Sam did not like to come in from recess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21 Eric</td>
<td>19, 20, 27, 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with unstructured events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23 Sam</td>
<td>19, 27, 37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 - Sam did not have to go to the bathroom and the para was trying to make him go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/27 Eric</td>
<td>19, 20, 27, 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with unstructured events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/28 Sam</td>
<td>19, 20, 27, 29, 36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33 - Sam knocked a great deal of sand onto the floor. When it was time to clean up he did not want to participate in helping clean up the floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30 Eric</td>
<td>19, 20, 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with unstructured events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 4 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and name</th>
<th>Activity engaged in</th>
<th>Activity not engaged in</th>
<th>Examples of non-engagement in activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/03 Sam</td>
<td>19, 20, 27, 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with unstructured events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/04 Eric</td>
<td>19, 20, 27, 34, 38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31 - Eric continually had to be told not to get out the wood blocks. The smaller building blocks appear to be hard for Eric to work with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/06 Sam</td>
<td>19, 20, 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with unstructured events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/07 Eric</td>
<td>19, 20, 27, 31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29 - At rest time Eric kept singing very loudly and disturbing other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10 Sam</td>
<td>19, 20, 27, 29, 32, 35, 39</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with unstructured events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/13 Eric</td>
<td>19, 20, 27, 29, 31, 38</td>
<td></td>
<td>No issues with unstructured events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Unstructured Activities

The unstructured activities existed on a much smaller time frame in Mrs. Clark’s PPCD classroom. Classroom restroom breaks which could almost be classified as structured based on the rules and directions that were given happened three times a
day. Other unstructured activities included outside morning recess, rest time after lunch, and play center time from 1:15 – 2:15. Due to the schedule restrictions, there were not as many opportunities to observe the unstructured play center times as there were opportunities for structured events. During the seven week observation period Sam and Eric had many days where they were actively engaged in all unstructured time periods. Sam’s behavioral issues with unstructured activities dealt with ending recess after a very short period of time and changing schedules when he did not get his time at the computer. In both of these situations, Sam seemed not to have the vocabulary to express his disappointment or desires. Eric also seemed to lack the vocabulary to deal with the situations he encountered during unstructured time periods. Unstructured time periods were the only activities where the children could freely talk with other children. Eric was often reminded to “Use your words” by several of the staff members. This feedback happened when he was speaking Spanish to his friends. Due to the consistency of the use of this phrase an understanding was gained so that the phrase “Use your words” had the hidden denotation. The meaning was that Eric was supposed to use his English to communicate. Sam was content not to interact with anyone. There were many times during unstructured activities that another child tried to engage Sam in play activities, but he was content to use solitary play throughout the time period. The teachers only engaged students in conversation or interacted with them when it was time to clean up a center, when there were controversies, or when it was transition time to another center. The teachers clearly used more of this time period to prepare for the next day’s events than to interact informally with the students.
Use of Language

Patterns of communication used with peers and adults were evident in all events throughout the child’s day. Through tracking communication efforts it became obvious that they fell into the two categories of non-verbal and verbal communication. Each focus child had numerous examples of each. Verbal communication was used to indicate that the focus child used some form of expressive language that could be heard by others. Non-verbal communication was used to indicate that the focus child used a visual or gesture to communicate and that the listener used sight to gather information.

Table 5

*Verbal and Non-verbal Communication with Peers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Communication</th>
<th>Type of Communication</th>
<th>Which Focus child used this type of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Pointed to objects</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Handed various objects to others</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Took objects away from peers</td>
<td>Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Made noises to get attention</td>
<td>Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Imitated peers actions or gestures</td>
<td>Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Signed while saying words</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Clapped hands, banged objects, stomped feet</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 5 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Communication</th>
<th>Type of Communication</th>
<th>Which Focus child used this type of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Hummed</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Raised hand</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Pointed to pictures</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Used one or two word phrases</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Used Spanish words</td>
<td>Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Used private speech or self-talk</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Mimicked words or phrases</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Used English words</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Asked questions</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Responded verbally to questions</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

*Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication with Adults*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Communication</th>
<th>Type of Communication</th>
<th>Which Focus child used this type of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Pointed to objects with hands and with gestures</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 6 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Communication</th>
<th>Type of Communication</th>
<th>Which Focus child used this type of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Handed various objects to others</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Tapped adult on hand</td>
<td>Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Made noises to get attention</td>
<td>Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Imitated adults' actions or gestures</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Signed while saying words</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Clapped hands, banged objects, stomped feet</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Hummed</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Raised hand</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td>Pointed to pictures</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Used one or two word phrases</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Responded verbally to questions but only after prompting</td>
<td>Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Used private speech or self-talk</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Mimicked words or phrases</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues)
Table 6 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Communication</th>
<th>Type of Communication</th>
<th>Which Focus child used this type of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Used English words</td>
<td>Sam and Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Asked questions</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Responded verbally to questions</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the field experiences the focus children used either verbal or non-verbal patterns of communication for various reasons. In charting the functions of language the following reasons were used most often. The focus children chose to communicate:

- To ask questions
- To get information
- To participate in an activity
- To protest doing a particular activity
- To get an adult’s attention
- To get something they wanted
- To report something

Summary of Communication Efforts

Communication for both Eric and Sam appeared to be non-existent in their native language during the observations. The focus of all interaction in the classroom seemed to be to learn English. Due to Sam’s disabling condition, sign-language and a communication notebook were both acceptable forms of communication. Although all children were on the circle carpet and at the tables during structured activities, they were only allowed to communicate one at a time and only if the teacher believed there
was a need to communicate. Most of the instructional strategies used during structured
events were teacher-center, direct instruction with group responses. Only during music
and movement time were all children expected to demonstrate receptive and expressive
language skills simultaneously. All music presented in the classroom and all language
activities were conducted in the English language. Mrs. Clark, the classroom teacher,
stated that both Sam and Eric were in the silent/receptive period of language
acquisition. A discussion of information gleaned in this analysis in relation to theory on
language acquisition skills will be documented in chapter 5.

Established Routines of the Classroom

There were clearly established routines. Often inappropriate behaviors occurred
simply because something in the routine changed. After looking at the various pieces of
information gained from the field observations, the following list was created. These are
the recognized routines that occurred on a daily basis which impacted the focus
children:

- Unloading of the bus
- Walking to the classroom
- Putting away materials
- The manner by which the children obtained their breakfast
- Clean up after breakfast
- Going to carpet time
- Calendar was done first in circle
- Dismissal instructions from group
- Instructions for lining up
- Instructions for bringing their chairs to the carpet area
- The manner by which the children obtained their lunch
- Walking to the bus
- Loading the bus
Summary of Established Routines of the Classroom

Routines enable students to gain confidence and respond appropriately in a world that is unfamiliar to them (Denham, 1998). For young children learning a second language, classroom routines give them confidence to be able to anticipate what will happen next and to participate in daily activities (Day, 2004). Mrs. Clark, the classroom teacher, had many routines and was guided by the sequences of events. During an observation, she stated that because she had children on various language and abilities levels and due to the high number of special education students in her classroom, she must keep to a schedule of events and plan every minute of the day. While gathering data, she stated students need time to explore and she felt she did a great job of working into the schedule free time at the end of the day. At the initial staff meeting Mrs. Clark announced that she was very pleased with the schedule she had come up with this year.

Instructional Methods Used in the Classroom

Lasley, Matczynski, and Rowley (2002) outline the following models for curriculum presentation in their book entitled Instructional Models: Strategies for Teaching in a Diverse Society:

- Concept Attainment
- Inquiry
- Concept formation
- Synectics
- Mnemonics
- Direct Instruction
- Cooperative learning
- Oral Discussion
A curriculum pattern based on cooperative learning was anticipated since this was a preschool classroom. The following chart illustrates the types of instruction found to occur in this classroom.

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

**Figure 1.** Types of instruction used with focus children.

These strategies correlate to the Direct Instruction Model. Every morning at either circle time or during structured center time, Mrs. Clark, the classroom teacher would reteach a skill from the day before to a particular student or group of students. The student groups remained stagnant during the seven week observation period. An investigation was not made to determine how Mrs. Clark determined what skills needed reteaching. For Sam this occurred fourteen times during the period of observations. For Eric this occurred ninety one times. Then either Mrs. Clark, the classroom teacher, or Ms. Brown, the paraprofessional, would work with a student to present a new concept. The children would be sent to a station to practice the information independently, and they would be corrected by either the teacher or the paraprofessional as they performed a task. Sometimes this would be done with manipulatives, but often it was presented as a paper and pencil project. They would continue to have times to practice the isolated skills independently, but most often would not be given a review time of the new skill.
The same cycle of events occurred daily with very little deviation. Mrs. Clark, the teacher explained that the four PPCD children had many IEP goals and this was the best way to work on their skills. During an observation session, Mrs. Clark also stated that the LEP students had to work on the prekindergarten checklist and report cards so she planned the lessons in the same sequence in which they were presented on the report card. Mrs. Clark contended that she always knew what she had covered because she did things in the correct order.

Instructional time throughout the day had little variation in the ways concepts or skills were presented. The children were not to respond or talk at any time during the day except during the unstructured activities unless the teacher gave them permission to talk. During most periods children were given directives or teachers used indirect directives such as, “We are in the hallway.” This was to remind the children that they were to be in a straight line with a space between each other, their hands behind their back, and their bubbles in (no talking). More often than not, a series of directives were used and the only response needed from the students was to comply and follow through with the action required by the directives. For example, Mrs. Clark would say – “Put away your things, get your chair, put your chair on the carpet, and sit on your chair without talking.” All directions and communication with the students would be presented in English. Occasionally, Mrs. Clark would use a visual or gesture and point to indicate what she wanted the students to do. Mrs. Brown, a paraprofessionals Spanish speaker; however, she used her Spanish to communicate only with the parents. With the students, she only used Spanish on two occasions during the observation period, and
these communications were not with the focus children so specific communication was not noted.

Summary of Instructional Methods Used in the Classroom

Direct and explicit instruction was the method chosen by the teacher of this PPCD classroom. In planning a curriculum and instructional model for linguistically and culturally diverse second language learners, the teacher must select objectives, select and organize curriculum, choose the appropriate learning experiences, determine the most appropriate sequence for the activities, and determine how to assess both children’s growth and language acquisition. In an average size classroom of twenty children, the teacher deals with all developmental levels and all language acquisition levels. In a classroom of English speaking four-year-old children there are still many different developmental levels and various language acquisition levels. Mrs. Clark has been away from a higher education setting for less than 5 years and has been teaching for four of those years. The focus of early childhood education in her higher education institution was probably not direct instruction for four-year-olds. Her beliefs stated during this research project was that the only way she could address all of the issues involving her various student populations was to deliver instruction by the current method she was using. At no time did she ever refer to her instructional style as relating to the direct instruction model. Additional comments and discussion on this will occur in chapter 5 of this document.
Instructional Methods used by the Specialist

Mrs. Parker was the sign language/communication specialist for Sam. Sam went with Mrs. Parker on average three times per week for forty 5 minutes. She used part of the time to work with Sam on learning new signs and used the remainder of the sessions to work on recognizing and practicing using his communication notebook. During the sign language portion of the session she would say a word, often provide a visual or an artifact and then provide the sign. They would repeat this same pattern for approximately ten words per session. Sam would mimic what the teacher did and said and then practice each sign independently. At the end of the session the teacher would say the word, and Sam was supposed to show her the sign. He would be successful about 40% of the time. The signs usually were presented in themes such as fruits, sports, school items, people, and so forth. There was no relationship between what Sam was studying in class and what signs Mrs. Parker was presenting.

When working on the communication notebook, Mrs. Parker would show Sam a picture. She would say the word and sign it. She would put it on the left hand side of his notebook. She would go on to another picture and follow the same sequence. When she had an entire line of pictures, she would pretend that they were going through the sequence of events. The picture might be of the breakfast foods. She would gesture to pick up a sack, open the sack, take out the food, eat the food, throw away the sack, and clean up the table. Then she would say, “Finished,” and sign the correct visual. She would pick up the picture piece from the left side and move it to the right side of the notebook. Every session they would practice through pretense at least two of the pictures and then move the piece to the right hand side. Occasionally she would have
Sam practice moving the piece off the notebook onto a piece of Hook and loop tape by the door or by a computer station. Then he would move the piece back to the right hand side of the notebook. Sam’s behavior during these sessions was often one of rebellion and non-compliance. His classroom teacher believed that the non-compliance was because he wanted to be resting and reading books on his mat in the classroom which apparently was something that he enjoyed doing.

Mrs. Bold was the speech pathologist for Eric and Sam. Sam and Eric both attended speech for approximately 45 minutes 2 days a week. According to Mrs. Bold, Sam was in a group by himself because of his autism. Eric was in a group of four students, one from another four-year-old prekindergarten classroom and 2 from a three-year-old prekindergarten classroom.

When Mrs. Bold (speech therapist) picked up Sam, she would hold his hand, and they would walk together to the speech room. She would talk to Sam, ask him questions, wait for response, acknowledge his response or help him come up with a response by giving him choices of viable options. When they got to the speech room, they would play games, work with manipulatives, or use art materials to create something. There was only one occasion where Sam had any difficulties during the three observations made. It was not a behavior problem, but he clearly did not understand the concept or ideas behind a game they were playing. He was looking at other things and non-attentive. Mrs. Bold put away the game and went back to something Sam was familiar with. His attention returned, and he was receptive and verbally responsive. Sam verbalized with greater fluency and accuracy in Mrs. Bold’s
room than in any other setting throughout his day. Sam often used 4 word phrases such as “It is mine now” and “I want the ball” while in Mrs. Bold’s room.

Eric attended class with 4 other boys and 1 girl. All 4 children were second language learners and all were identified at a level A with a status of non-English speaker. Eric was the only child in the group who also had a physical disability and the only 1 enrolled in a PPCD program. Mrs. Bold used real objects during each observational visit to her classroom. On the first observation the children and the teacher all sat on the floor with a basket of balls. There were 13 different balls of various sizes and styles. She allowed the children to play with the balls, and she talked about the various balls. She did not initially ask for any type of verbal response. She talked about the color of a ball and then rolled it to a child. She talked about the size of a ball and rolled it to a child. She talked about the material the ball was made out of and rolled it to the child. She talked about the shape of the ball and then tossed it to a child. She then encouraged the children to say one thing about a ball. She assisted the child before asking for a response by holding up her ball and saying, “My ball is blue.” Then she went around the circle and called on each child. One child responded with “My ball red” and the others all responded with just a color word. Eric responded by saying the color word azul in Spanish, and the teacher asked “Is your ball blue?” Eric’s ball was in fact orange, and another child said “Orange.” Mrs. Bold said “Eric your ball is orange. Here is a blue ball,” and she handed him a blue ball. Eric repeated the word blue. Eric interacted well with the teacher and also with the other children. Eric was compliant with the teacher’s request and participated in every lesson. The only difficulty he had was in the lesson about fruits and vegetables. He consistently kept biting the food samples
when handed one to examine. After 3 such instances, Mrs. Bold held on to the item while Eric examined its characteristics.

Mrs. Roland was the occupational therapist for Eric. Eric went with Mrs. Roland one day a week. Mrs. Roland also worked with Eric and 2 other children in a small group inside the classroom. Mrs. Roland helped Eric learn to brush his teeth, wash his hands, put on his socks and shoes, snap his pants, and close the hook and loop tape on his shoes. She worked with Eric using his right arm to guide most of his movements. She also worked on strengthening his left hand and arm. She helped Eric learn how to carry his lunch tray as long as there were minimal items on the tray. According to Mrs. Roland, many practice attempts at carrying his tray occurred before they practiced it in the lunch line. She stated that he needed to achieve success before putting his efforts into public practice. There were 6 opportunities to observe Eric’s sessions. Mrs. Roland was very soft spoken, and Eric responded well to her instruction with his actions. All of the instruction was in English. Eric’s native language is Spanish. Eric only verbally responded 1 time to Mrs. Roland. She talked often to him and waited for verbal responses but he only gestured or pointed. Mrs. Roland would respond with a verbal answer to his gestures or pointing. On 1 occasion she asked him if he was tired and he said, “Yes.”

Mrs. Black was the physical therapist for Eric. Eric went with Mrs. Black one day a week. There were only 3 opportunities to observe these sessions. Mrs. Black worked with Eric in a one-on-one situation. Eric worked on climbing stairs on each occasion. Eric’s left arm and hand have malformations and he heavily depends on his right arm and hand. He does have balance issues while running and hopping, and these areas
were an additional focus during therapy. Mrs. Black helped Eric with learning how to catch a ball using both hands. First, Mrs. Black rolled the ball to Eric while they were sitting down. Eric was instructed to pick up the ball with both hands. This was very challenging for Eric. During the third observation session they were now standing up, and Eric had to bend down to catch the rolling ball. Eric had great difficulty not falling over while reaching with both hands. Eric only mastered one physical IEP goal during the school year, but Mrs. Black was very encouraged by his progress in many areas. Eric was able to get up the stairs of the bus without assistance but still struggled to get down the stairs of the bus without adult assistance. Eric worked very hard with his physical therapist. Mrs. Black only used English instructions with Eric. Eric was not asked to verbally respond to Mrs. Black during the 3 observed sessions.

Summary of Instructional Methods used by the Specialist

Each specialist had a different way of dealing with the students. Mrs. Parker appeared to be results driven and relied on Sam’s IEP to dictate what activities she did with Sam. She expressed concern that his behavior was so inappropriate that he might be a candidate for institutionalization when he was older. She acknowledged that she had little training or experience with autistic children and that she generally only worked with deaf children.

According to the criterion stated by Mrs. Clark, both Mrs. Roland and Mrs. Black seemed to get the job done with Eric and met his IEP needs. In fact, Eric appeared to have made a great deal of progress towards independence during the school year. He did not master many of the skills such as independently dressing himself and carrying...
his belongings without assistance but demonstrated progress in various areas.

Additional information about the sessions will be provided in chapter 5.

Mrs. Bold appeared to make connections with each student and really addressed the needs of each individual. She took the time to interact and seemed to make learning relevant to each child in her group. With Sam she encouraged him to communicate, and he demonstrated second language acquisition skills at an emergence stage. She worked through the disability issues surrounding his autistic diagnosis and talked to Sam. The conversations seemed to flow, and she allowed time for the expressive language to be produced. She aided and assisted when Sam had difficulty but did not push her ideas, words, or thoughts onto Sam. With Eric she provided basic language instruction. Eric was just moving into the early production stage of second language development. Eric was able to produce one and two word phrases independently and demonstrated comprehension of new concepts in her classroom. Eric tried new speech with encouragement and participated in the activities. Mrs. Bold seemed to take the time to meet the individual students’ needs and varied instruction while scaffolding when necessary. She listened intently to the speech production and gave appropriate wait time. She appeared to be extremely supportive of each individual student.

Cultural Aspects of the Physical Space

In chapter 1 a definition of classroom culture for the purpose of this study was given. The definition was derived from a review of research literature. The definition of classroom culture was the interactions of all participants with each other and with the environment while acknowledging the hidden rules, experiences, expectations, and
values systems of each individual represented. Below the physical materials available to
the children for use in building an understanding of their environment and for promoting
an educational experience will be described. Materials found on the walls and the
placement of the furniture in the room will be included.

The PPCD classroom which was located on the lower level of the elementary
school building was entered through a door that was on the right hand side of the room.
Immediately to the left was a restroom equipped with supplies that met the needs of the
students with handicapping conditions. The restroom measured 5 feet by 8 feet and
included a changing table and special toilet facilities. Exiting the restroom, there was a 7
foot space between the door and the wall. Turning to the left to continue entering the
room there was a rectangular table measuring 2 feet wide by 4 feet long to the right
along the wall. The table was 31 inches above the ground and was higher than the rest
of the tables in the room. It was made to accommodate the wheelchair of a student
enrolled in this class. Continuing into the room toward the left, the outside wall of the
bathroom extended 8 feet into a counter area along the left-hand side wall. The counter
area extended the entire length of the wall and measured 14 feet long. A cabinet and
drawers were to the right at the end of this cabinet area. There was a sink to the left-
hand side of the cabinet area that was made for young children. There was also a sink
at counter level that is made for adult use. The counter top measured 36 inches from
the floor to top. Above the counter area there was a cabinet that extended 10 feet down
the wall and met the 4 foot by 4 foot cabinet. The color scheme in the room was teal
green with maroon accents. The right-hand side of the wall past the rectangular table
contained a dry-erase/bulletin board combination. The total board area began 24 inches
from the ground and was 4 feet tall and 12 feet long. Adjacent to the board on the floor was a carpet containing twenty squares of various colors. The carpet was arranged with 5 squares in a column and 4 squares in each row. There was a big book stand on the far end of the carpet and a rocking chair next to the stand. On the other side of the big book stand on the remaining portion of the right hand side wall was a computer station with two computers at a young child’s level. The room, not including the little hall space by the restroom measured 14 feet long by 26 feet wide. Along the back wall of the room there were 2 windows on either side that measured 12 inches wide by 6 feet high. These were covered with mini blinds. There was a library station, a home center area, block center, a sand/water table, a book case containing manipulatives, a dramatic play area, and writing center along the 26 foot wall. In the center of the room was a rectangular table measuring 28 inches by 60 inches, a 4 foot round table and a kidney shaped table designated as the teacher table. The following list contains information as to the materials that were available in each of the stations:

- **Library stations** – Contained one book shelf with approximately 30 board books and 60 paperback books.

- **Home center** – Housed in the home center was a play sink, stove and refrigerator, small round table, 2 chairs, pans, play American food, high chair, doll bed, 3 Caucasian baby dolls with various clothes, 1 Asian baby with various clothes, 1 Hispanic baby with various clothes, dinnerware, tablecloth, and blankets.

- **Block center** – There was a 2 foot by 3 foot book case containing various wooden blocks. There was a 4 foot by 4 foot carpet square that was next to the book case. On the other side of the book case was a 24 inch square tub of Lego blocks.

- **Sand/Water table** – 2 feet by 4 feet with 2 separate compartments and lids, 1 side was filled with water and seven small water-type toys, the other side was filled with rice and 6 digging-type toys. The staff made the decision about which side the children would use.
Fine motor skills – There was a book case that was 3 feet long by 4 feet tall. It contained 12 bins that had manipulatives in them. The bins contained such items as lacing cards, lacing beads, small connecting toys, counting bears, sorting transportation items, sorting dinosaurs, nesting blocks, and other such items. On top of the case were box games such as letter and number bingo, sound games, matching games, and other types of literacy games.

Dramatic play – There was a case that stood about 4 feet tall and had a mirror on one end. There were hooks that ran underneath the top shelf. On the top shelf there were various hats that represented many community helpers. On the hooks were costumes that matched the hats of the community helpers. There were no other types of dress up clothes other than community helpers. Hanging next to the dramatic play case was a mesh hanging container of puppets. There were some animal puppets and children puppets in the container. The children puppets represent a boy and girl from different countries. There were a total of 12 children puppets and 17 animal puppets.

Writing center – There was a bookcase that contained paper, pencils, rubber stamps, ink pads, stickers, crayons, and markers.

There was a small table with 2 child-size chairs next to the bookcase. There was an alphabet strip and a number strip on the table. The walls within the room had many traditional posters. An alphabet line featuring various animals was directly above the dry erase board. On the back wall were number, shape, and color posters of various sizes located above the centers. Located on the outside of the restroom wall was a birthday chart containing the names of all the children in the classroom. Many items were labeled in the room using large index cards however; they were labeled in English only. There was a poster above the children's sink about hand washing. The pledge of allegiance and the Texas state pledge were displayed on posters above the flags. A poster about the parts of a computer and one about the proper use of a mouse were displayed above the computer station. There was a map of the United States and a map of Texas above the wheelchair accessible table. There were some nursery rhyme charts next to the bathroom door. There was a rule chart, calendar chart, an academic center
chart, weather chart, and a helper chart on the bulletin board next to the dry erase

board.

Summary of Cultural Aspects of the Physical Space

While there were many appropriate things available to children in this classroom, there were some things missing that promote the culture of an early childhood environment. The missing items include belongings which create a sense of ownership and promote a special feeling of this being “my class.” As a general rule in early childhood classrooms children’s art work is featured and evidence of photographs exist that allow children to claim the room as theirs. Additionally, ethnic and diversity materials were present only in limited numbers. A discussion of the cultural aspects of the physical space will be provided in chapter 5.

Cultural Aspects of the Structured Activities

Data collection began in February 2006 and continued through April 2006. The only significant holiday in the data-collection period was Easter. Probably because of the religious nature of the holiday, Easter was never referenced in any discussion although Mrs. Clark shared several books about Easter-egg hunts, and the children completed several cut-and-paste Easter pictures. Occasionally during circle time, a book focused on a child that was of an ethnic origin other than Caucasian. As with any other book selected for story time, there was simply a one-time reading of the story. Sometimes the teacher would ask what they thought the book was going to be about, and sometimes the teacher would ask if they liked the story. The story had very little to
do with anything else they did that day or any other day. There was very little said to the children about their home life. The teacher would infrequently relate an activity to the real world, but it was from the teacher’s experience rather than from the children’s. She often made statements like, “When I was a child…. “

Summary of Cultural Aspects of the Structured Activities

Little to no information about any culture other than middle class America was ever portrayed during the classroom observations. Neither Sam’s nor Eric’s heritage, nor their interests were ever spoken of or referenced during any activity. Near the end of the observational visits, the teacher mentioned getting the Spanish ladies to do something for Cinco de Mayo. This class appeared to have been designed for middle-class American children in an earlier time-frame such as the 1970s. Cultural diversity has changed the make-up of this school district’s student population dramatically in the last ten years. A discussion of the need for change in the classroom will be included in chapter 5.

Cultural Aspects of Unstructured Activities

Unstructured activities during the instructional framework really only occurred during the free-choice centers in the afternoon. Some ethnic materials could have been incorporated into these centers to add cultural relevance to the classroom. Unfortunately, this aspect of cultural integration was not present. Only the puppet center had any real diversity objects, and there was no adult interaction to guide play during free centers other than to give directions or correct behavior so the puppets had little
impact in the lives of the children. Eric was only familiar with the poverty side of a
Hispanic lifestyle. He might have benefited from interactions with adults in how to play
with the American toys and equipment found in his classroom. Sam had been raised in
the American environment but had a non-English speaking father and much older
siblings. He too could perhaps have benefited from talking through various aspects of
play with an adult. The children were often reminded to “use your words” while at play.
This was a reminder to speak English to their friends. Therefore, the only real cultural
aspect of unstructured play was discouraged during the activity centers.

Summary of Cultural Aspects of Unstructured Activities

The lack of culture and diversity in the classroom was not necessarily evident to
those not trained to look for it. To the casual observer just stepping into the classroom
there were a majority of Hispanic students, some disabled students, an Asian student, a
Swahili/French speaking student, an African-American, and a child from the Middle
East. There was only 1 Caucasian student. All the staff members were Caucasian
except 1 paraprofessional who was Hispanic. This classroom appeared to be full of
diversity and had many aspects of various cultures due to the adults and children
represented. Looking beneath the surface will be the focal point of the discussion in
chapter 5.

Cultural Aspects of the Classroom Routines

The routines in the classroom existed in order to maintain a consistent schedule
according to Mrs. Clark, the classroom teacher. Some teachers chose to make these
routines the entire learning experience for the children and to simplify their day. A purpose for a schedule can be to provide routine and structure for children so that they know what to expect each day. The routines established in this classroom clearly were in place to aid the staff in staying on schedule and to plan for implementation of IEP goals and Prekindergarten guidelines rather than for any other reason. Ruby Payne (1996) contends that young children like to know what will happen and when. They benefit from a schedule that is familiar and predictable, however not rigid (Bredekamp & Copple, 1987). The schedule should have both balance and variety and in each classroom the sequence of daily activities will be slightly different, but will follow a predictable pattern. Throughout the observational period there was simply no connection between the routines established and any cultural aspects other than maintaining order and balance in the day. The culture of this classroom was one of regulation and sequenced events.

Summary of Cultural Aspects of the Classroom Routines

In order to establish a culture of the classroom an educator must plan to celebrate, acknowledge and participate in promoting the diversity of the classroom. Teachers should plan for experiences and activities that reflect and are representative of the diversity of society and especially of the students represented in the classroom. A routine activity in this classroom was the labeling of objects. How simple to add the Spanish word and then include other languages that were representative of the student populations as additional labels. Another daily routine in the classroom was the calendar and weather reports. The paraprofessional was a Spanish speaker. After the
teacher presented the weather and calendar in English, the paraprofessional could have
done it in Spanish. The only culture represented in the routines of this classroom was
the culture of middle-class America. Unfortunately, this occurrence was not a relevant
cultural experience for the student population in this identified provision-two school
district that had 74% of the population on free and reduced lunch.

Native Language Development for Sam

Sam’s native language was French, but the older members of the family also
spoke Swahili. The parents both read French, and the forms were translated into French
for them. The mother spoke English and was able to hold a conversation about Sam
and his needs. The father spoke very broken English and had great difficulty with
receptive and expressive language skills. There was no one in the school who spoke
French, and the district hired a Catholic charity organization when translations were
needed. Sam’s second language was receptive and one word expressive Swahili. A
third language was sign language with receptive and one sign expressive skills, and his
fourth was English with receptive and emerging expressive skills. Sam’s diagnosis of
autism made signing the most comfortable language at this time. His sign language was
supported by staff to a limited degree.

Native Language Development for Eric

Eric’s native language was Spanish. Both his mother and grandmother were
Spanish speakers; however, his grandmother was the only 1 who could read Spanish
according to Eric’s mother. Eric’s mental abilities had limited his language acquisition in
his first language. By not supporting the native language, Eric’s disabling condition was enhanced. Development of the first language for Eric was critical for many future endeavors. Ms. Brown, the paraprofessional, could have aided in the development of first language skills for Eric’s as she was a Spanish speaker. The choice for an all-English environment was in total opposition of current research beliefs. Preventing school failure starts with creating educational climates that foster academic success (Cummins, 1989). Prevention of failure among English language learners involves 2 critical elements. The formation of educational environments conducive to academic success and the application of instructional strategies that promote first language development prior to second language acquisition (Ortiz, 1997; Rhondes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005).

Summary of Native Language Development for Sam and Eric

While establishing instruction for Sam in his native language would have been difficult for the school, it was imperative to the development of Sam’s additional language acquisitions (Dickinson & Sprague, 2001). Modifying instruction for Eric was easy in that several bilingual certified teachers were available district wide. An understanding of second language acquisition processes can improve the ability of classroom teachers to serve the linguistically and culturally diverse students (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield & Quiroz, 2001). Current theories of second language acquisition are based on years of research in a wide variety of fields, including linguistics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and neurolinguistics (Freeman & Freeman, 2001; Garcia, 2001; Gonzalez, Vega & Yawkey, 1997; Hinkel, 1999; Krashen,
2003; Richard-Amato & Snow, 2005). One concept endorsed by most current theorists contends that there is a continuum of learning that is predictable and transferable from one language to another (August & Hakuta, 1998; Baca, 1990; Beck & Olah, 2001; Cabezón & Lambert, 1998; Christian, 1994; Cummins, 1981; Diaz, 1992; Freeman & Freeman, 1996; Garcia, 2000; Hakuta, 1986; Tabors, 1997). Sequential stages of language development, in which the learners progress from no knowledge of the new language to a level of competency closely resembling that of a native speaker, follow the same patterns of skill development established in their initial native language (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002; Cummins, 1987; Davies, 1999; Diaz, 1992; Dickinson & Sprague, 2001; Genesee, 1995). Understanding that students are going through a predictable and sequential series of developmental stages helps teachers predict, plan, and accept a student’s current stage of development and modify classroom instruction in order to encourage growth in language acquisition.

Acquisition of English Language for Sam

Various forms of instruction were used in order for Sam to acquire English. Within the presentation of circle time there was explicit instruction in how to say the days of the week and the months of the year. Stories were read to the children, and the teacher would sometimes ask the children to point to something. The skills presented easily promoted receptive language. Sam easily followed 1 and 2 step directions and clearly indicated the correct objects, colors, numbers, or shapes when asked to point to something. The classroom teacher, Mrs. Clark, plainly articulated the words being identified but the students were not asked to expressively repeat the words except on a
few occasions. The chart below is a visual of occasions Sam was asked to point to something, asked to say the word associated with the object or picture, asked close-ended questions, and asked open-ended questions while in the classroom. The activities that lead to language acquisition for Sam included photo cards, language games, realia, art activities, gross motor skill games, books, stories, puppets, and music.
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**Figure 2.** Types of communication used by Mrs. Clark when working with Sam.

The next bar graph is a chart that contains the same indicators as the above chart but lists the language acquisition activities Sam experienced while working with Mrs. Bold the speech teacher and Mrs. Parker the communication specialist. As previously indicated there was great disparity between the types of activities and communication styles Mrs. Bold and Mrs. Parker used while working with Sam. Sam responded to each teaching method differently as noted in the discussion chapter.
Acquisition of English Language for Eric

Eric was given only a few opportunities to say words and was rarely asked open-ended questions. Mrs. Clark, the classroom teacher, stated that Eric lacked the mental capabilities to participate in a conversation. Eric received the majority of his instruction in the classroom through one-on-one instruction with either the teacher or the paraprofessionals. Eric was very compliant when asked to point to an object or to say a word. When asked close-ended questions Eric usually gestured rather than verbally replied. Eric babbled and hummed while working but used clearly articulated one to two word Spanish phrases with his friends while waiting in line at the restroom or playing in unstructured centers. Eric spoke one and two word Spanish phrases to his mother and grandmother when they picked him up. Occasionally, I would see him try to ask the teacher for something in Spanish, and she would simply turn away. Eric would put his head down and walk away without any additional attempts. The activities for Eric that lead to language acquisition included the use of realia, photo cards, books, stories, music, and puppets. Mrs. Clark indicated that all of the language games were too
difficult for Eric. Many of the activities used for language acquisition with Eric were recycled each week with little variation.

![Graph showing communication types used by Mrs. Clark when working with Eric.](image)

**Figure 4.** Types of communication used by Mrs. Clark when working with Eric.

Just as with Sam, the interactions Eric had with Mrs. Bold, Mrs. Black, and Mrs. Roland were documented and classified. The same indicators from inside the classroom were used to chart what happened with the specialists. Eric's use of language varied greatly though, depending on the setting and with whom he was working.

![Graph showing communication types used by Mrs. Bold, Mrs. Roland, and Mrs. Black when working with Eric.](image)

**Figure 5.** Communication used by Mrs. Bold, Mrs. Roland, and Mrs. Black when working with Eric.
Summary of Acquisition of English Language for Sam and Eric

Every child can learn. That continues to be a statement over-used and under-believed by teachers across this nation. Now the new phrase is “No Child Left Behind.” When the hidden biases and belief systems filter into the classroom practices, what actually happened mattered more than what was written in the lesson plans or articulated in the Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) committee. Because most of the biases are hidden, even from the teachers, it is difficult for them to really see clearly what happens in their classroom. Therefore, these hidden biases hinder the multifaceted process of language acquisition that was already confusing and challenging for students of all ages.

Language acquisition is a very complex and difficult process, and for young children we have to look carefully at developmental rates and maturation issues. When speakers of other languages start to learn their new language, they will develop at different rates (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002; Bialystok, 1991; Cummins, 1981). Many teachers clearly understand the silent period and they understand that it often lasts for six months or more (August & Shanahan, 2006; Bardige & Segal, 2005; Bialystok & Cummins, 1991). In this stage students have a receptive language of about 5 hundred words but may not use any of them in an expressive manner. The second stage children enter into is the early production stage (Cummins, 1981; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Garcia, 2000; Garcia & Malkin, 1993; Genesee, 1995). Students will begin speaking in one or two word phrases, and they can comprehend new pieces of information with assistance from a more capable peer or adult. After stage two, students will enter the speech emergence stage (Cummins, 1981; Hakuta, 1986; Lahey, 1988; McLaughlin, Blanchard
This period often lasts a year or more. Students begin to develop a vocabulary of around six thousand words, and they function in a BICS environment. BICS according to Cummins (1981) refers to Basic interpersonal communication skills. It is the language that is needed in order to communicate with friends about the baseball game, to order lunch at the cafeteria, and to maneuver through the hallways at school. After this is the intermediate language proficiency stage. At this stage many teachers will believe that the student no longer requires any assistance and that they are a fluent language speaker. While they may be fluent in many ways, they may not fully have all the skills necessary for mastery in CALP. Again according to Cummins (1981) this refers to Cognitive academic language proficiency level that is vital to understanding the academic language of school. Upon completion of stage four, students move into the final stage of language acquisition which is entitled advanced language proficiency stage (Cummins, 1981; Ortiz & Yates, 2001; Peregoy & Boyle, 1993; Tabors, 1997). Gaining advanced proficiency in a second language can typically take from 5 to seven years. By this stage students have developed some specialized content-area vocabulary and can participate fully in grade-appropriate discussions and activities. The student’s second language skills are now said to be nearly comparable to that of a native language speaker (Cummins, 1991; Tabors & Snow, 1994).

A concept endorsed by most scholars familiar with second language acquisition comes from Stephen Krashen’s comprehensible input hypothesis (Krashen, 2003). The theory argues that learners acquire language by taking in and understanding language that is a little beyond their present level of competence (Anderson, 1994; Artiles & Ortiz, 2002; August & Hakuta, 1998; August & Shanahan, 2006). This relates right back to
Vygotsky’s idea of the zone of proximal development which asserts that with the assistance of a more capable peer or adult, children can move to a new level of understanding beyond their current level of operation (August & Hakuta, 1997).

In the case of language acquisition for Sam and Eric, many of the staff members who worked with them have placed barriers to their achievement, in effect creating a glass ceiling based on the teachers’ own low expectations. Both students demonstrated skills while working with certain individuals that were significantly more advanced than the skills demonstrated in the mainstream classroom. The lower expectations of the classroom teachers, whether intentional or not, limited expressive second language development. Additional discussion of the implications of this information will be addressed in chapter 5.

Attainment of Developmental Skills

Theories abound about various types of child growth and development. Each theorist has supporters necessary to prove their theory through research. A scheme that continues to be consistent across all theories involves the general categories addressed by the theorists concerning developmental issues. Each of the following four domains of development is indicated for each focus child.

- Physical development
- Social development
- Emotional development
- Cognitive development
Table 7

Levels of Development by Sam and Eric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sam</th>
<th>Eric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Can ride a tricycle</td>
<td>Sits and crawls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walks up/down stairs</td>
<td>Walks but still stumbles often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Runs fast</td>
<td>Uses a fork but not spoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jumps with both feet</td>
<td>Climbs on equipment less than 12 inches tall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climbs on equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catches a ball</td>
<td>Can take off socks, shoes and shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Throws a ball</td>
<td>Can attach the Hook and loop tape on his shoes and jacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walks Backward</td>
<td>Can unsnap his shorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hand-eye coordination</td>
<td>Uses fist grasp when coloring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copies shapes</td>
<td>Catch and roll a ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifies 8 shapes</td>
<td>Wash his hands/face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuts on lines</td>
<td>Attempts to clean table surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prints all letters</td>
<td>Can carry his lunch tray when one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laces objects</td>
<td>or two items are on the tray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stacks objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can do chin ups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holds crayons and pencils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tends to bathroom needs on his own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can sharpen pencil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
Table 7 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sam</th>
<th>Eric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Does not share</td>
<td>Responds to adults and peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will parallel play</td>
<td>Enjoys the company of everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not initiate conversation</td>
<td>Has many friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solitary play preferred</td>
<td>Shares toys easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wants to be first</td>
<td>Cooperative play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is possessive</td>
<td>Hard time with separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not have friends in the class</td>
<td>Eager to please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relies on self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not ask for assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Cries easily</td>
<td>Cries easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Throws things</td>
<td>Does not question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Runs away</td>
<td>Needs routines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs routines for security</td>
<td>Compassionate towards others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not exercise self-control</td>
<td>Fears being alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fears strangers</td>
<td>Fears being in the dark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not like new things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avoids conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trying new task appears to be difficult which brings on a emotional outburst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object permanence</td>
<td>Has receptive skills in four languages</td>
<td>Speaks using one -two Spanish words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressive skills in three languages</td>
<td>One word phrases in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows 12 colors</td>
<td>Can accurately write his name</td>
<td>Has object permanence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify numbers to 50</td>
<td>Can identify letters/sounds randomly</td>
<td>Knows 5 colors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can rote count numbers to 100</td>
<td>Classifies objects</td>
<td>Knows two shapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify letters/sounds randomly</td>
<td>Can attend for long periods of time</td>
<td>Can write the letter E in his name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classifies objects</td>
<td>Can seriate objects</td>
<td>but does not identify it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can attend for long periods of time</td>
<td>Uses complex patterns</td>
<td>Can extend patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can seriate objects</td>
<td>Can group objects by shape, color, and size</td>
<td>Sorts by color 90% of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses complex patterns</td>
<td>Differentiates between real and make believe</td>
<td>Can identify eight animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can group objects by shape, color, and size</td>
<td>Is beginning to conserve numbers</td>
<td>Can color on paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiates between real and make believe</td>
<td>Can sound out some three letter words</td>
<td>Can point to pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is beginning to conserve numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can put objects into a shape box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can sound out some three letter words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eric wanted to please the adults and he enjoyed the praise he received. He also chose to avoid the punishment that came in the form of verbal corrections and directions when a task was not completed. He very much acted like a child that was
conforming to the behaviorist viewpoints. Eric had some disability issues when it came to the physical side of development. He walked without assistive equipment but often stumbled. He could not manage the two flights of stairs in the building so he used the elevator when it was necessary for him to go upstairs. He was a people pleaser and smiled almost continually. He worked hard to accomplish tasks whether working in the classroom or with specialists. He enjoyed the company of others. Many of the skills that he demonstrated still fell in a birth to three-year-old range. His grandmother stated that the doctor said that Eric had cognitive skills in the twelve-month to eighteen-month range.

Sam used internal motivation and is very active in his own development. Many of his actions followed the constructivist viewpoint. Piaget believed that children created knowledge and Vygotsky acknowledged a zone of proximal development as previously discussed (Ashiabi, 2001; Barnett, 2001; Berk, 2002; Copple & Bredekamp, 2006; Crain, 1992; Morrison, 2000). Sam continually tried to create meaning out of his environment. Sam surpassed the mastery levels on the prekindergarten checklist provided as his school report card. He also mastered all skills on his IEP except the socialization skills. When examining the characteristics of autism, one of the most noticeable concerns for children with autism is that they have significant communication and social delays (Noonan & McCormick, 2006; O’Brien & Daggett, 2006). Sometimes autistic children appear to be isolated and unaware of people and the events that transpire in their environment (Lewis & Doorlag, 1999). While Eric was aware of my presence on numerous occasions, I do not believe that Sam ever noticed me. Many children with autism like the sameness of things and the routines of the
classroom (O'Brien & Daggett, 2006). When things change children with autism frequently experience behavioral challenges such as hiding under the table or acting aggressively and running away. O'Brien and Daggett (2006) discovered that children with autism learn relatively quickly with systematic instruction, and this did come to fruition for Sam. Sam will be entering a kindergarten classroom in the next school year with skills that are clearly above many of his classmates.

Summary of Attainment of Developmental Skills by Eric and Sam

Physical development is orderly and systematic not random. Physical development most often proceeds from the head downward and from the middle of the body outward. While Sam did not exhibit any delays in physical development, Eric’s abilities were limited in this way. Eric did have an IEP in place that addressed the issues involving physical development, and his goals were being updated annually.

Social development is often enhanced through relationships. By the time that they are three years old, children have established relationships with their families and with many individuals outside of the family. Most children have worked on developing strategies for obtaining things that they want and have some idea of how to achieve their desires. Children with autism have developmental issues surrounding the area of social relationships. Sam had IEP goals that addressed social development issues. Eric functioned well in the area of social skills; however, his mental disabilities were making it difficult to move into role playing and organized game characteristics that are common for four- to six-year-olds. He also did not have the ability to take turns which is a developmental social skill.
Emotional development, like physical and social development, often follows fairly predictable lines of growth. Emotional growth can be encouraged through typical classroom experiences if the teacher is aware of the child’s level of development and what can be done to encourage additional development. Role playing, the use of puppets, acknowledgment of feelings, children’s literature, and listening to children all promote emotional growth. Both Eric and Sam had issues with emotional development; however, both had made significant progress during the school year according to Mrs. Clark and other school personnel. Additionally, both Eric and Sam were functioning within acceptable degrees of emotional development when their disabilities were taken into account.

Cognitive development refers to the child’s ability to think and reason. Gardner (1983) defined cognitive acquisition as the capacity to express and understand the meaning of ideas in a structure of symbols. The symbols included words, pictures, numbers, shapes, and gestures. These symbols are associated with the given cultural setting and the children require the ability to apply knowledge gained through the use of symbols. Planning for cognitive growth must take into account where the child is currently functioning (Isenberg & Jalongo, 2003). Piaget and Vygotsky both contended that teachers must recognize the development of individual children, provide activities and experiences that will enhance children’s thinking, and remember that all learning takes place in a social context (Berk & Winsler, 1995). Gardner (1995) believed that intellectual capacity did not develop as a whole but as different intelligences. What was most significant about Gardner’s theories to the field of early childhood education was the support for offering a variety of experiences and activities as the focal point to
planning so that all children could learn. This key thought and a current assessment of individual students could help promote additional cognitive growth. Children need chances to learn in ways that are active and that provide opportunities that suit their individual techniques for organizing and remembering information. Katz (1996) warned that teachers must avoid the “learned stupidity” that embodies many children. Many children are given tasks that they cannot do and, through failure at those tasks, learn to believe that they are stupid and then quit trying.

Vygotsky also supported the notion that children from different cultures learn different things at various times (Meadows, 1993). Educators must recognize that children will use language and cognitive skills in ways that are appropriate for their own culture and perform tasks that are appropriate in that culture (Berk & Winsler, 1995). Middle class American culture was the basis for the learning experiences conveyed to Sam and Eric even though neither child was a middle class American student.

Development of Alternative Communication Skills

Developmental stages of growth for the children occur through a variety of opportunities. Current research stimulated a desire to know more about first language development for young second language learners. Important to this study was also the acquisition of English because central to the enrollment in their class was the fact that these children were identified as second language learners. Developmental stages such as those proposed by Piaget (Piaget & Inhelder, 1969) centered on the attainment of developmental skills. Piaget’s stages of development that apply to children in primary levels of education include:
Sensorimotor period (birth to age two) – Characterized by interactions with the environment and centered primarily with receptive input and output. The task of this period is to develop the concept of object permanence.

Preoperational period (two to seven) – Characterized by emergence of the ability to represent objects and knowledge through replication, symbolic play, drawing, mental images, and spoken language. The preoperational child tends to give thought to one element of a problem at a time and cannot organize information from multiple sources.

Concrete operational period (seven to eleven) – The operational thinker is one that employs identity and reversibility in solving problems and can receive input from a variety of sources. They are not egocentric in their thinking. They will also examine their own conclusions knowing that their beliefs can differ from another child’s understandings.

Finally, communication comes in various forms and all communication is not verbal. By selecting children with disabilities for this case study, the possibility existed that augmentative and alternative communication sources would need to be considered. Augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) includes any symbol system that supports or supplements speech (Ortiz, 2001). It uses sign language, communication boards, photos, pictographs, computer images, or print (Odom & Diamond, 1998). Because they use visual language systems to represent concepts, words, or sentences, AAC techniques take advantage of the visual processing talents and needs of children with autism (Odom, et al., 1999). Low-technology AAC tools, such as the picture system that Sam used are simple to develop and inexpensive to produce. The picture system was meant to focus on a social and communication exchange (Ortiz, 1997). Proceeding through the day and communicating needs or desires through symbols enabled Sam to communicate effectively. Sam could tell someone that he was finished at the computer, that he needed to go to the bathroom, or that he was hungry. This communication device helped to create a sense of self-reliance and independence and allowed Sam to...
function in a classroom with other children. Sam learned to make some requests by the end of the observational field experience, and his IEP goals continued to provide support in the future for this learning process.

Eric had no AAC tools available to him, and it appeared that this was not a necessary intervention strategy for his success in the classroom.

Summary of the Development of Alternative Communication Skills

Augmentative communication included gestures, pictures, or symbols documented to aid communication of needs or desires for some students (Ortiz, et al., 1985). AAC tools are alternative communication systems for children who are unlikely to ever use speech; for others, the systems supplement and enhance oral communication and are not meant to ever replace speech (O’Brien & Daggett, 2006). Sam used AAC materials not as a substitute for speech but to increase communication skills and support speech efforts, just as his sign language was meant to amplify his efforts to communicate. Decisions concerning the selection and use of an AAC system were not one-time decisions made by the ARD committee. As Sam develops and circumstances change, needs and the appropriateness of the system must be continually evaluated and adjusted. Sam needed these tools at this time, and they effectively allowed him to participate and grow developmentally.

Adult Talk

The adults had many interactions with the focus children on a daily basis. The adults involved included the classroom teacher of record, the paraprofessionals, the
classroom teacher present for integrated curriculum, and the specialists made available through the IEP process. Each adult played a unique role in defining the culture of the PPCD classroom. Below are charts showing the communication methods used by the adults during various time periods of the day. Data records were transcribed to make a tally count of various types of verbal interactions. Those types of interactions are listed below. Each section of adult talk was then broken out by the adults present and the period of the time spent with the focus children. The types of interactions included:

- Teacher giving directions
- Teacher responding to child question
- Teacher asking child a question
- Teacher extending child’s conversation
- Teacher relating information to real life experiences

![Figure 6. Adult talk for teaching academics.]

Adults included in this graph are Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Smith, Ms. Brown, Mr. Larson, Mr. Miller, Mrs. Bold, Mrs. Parker, Mrs. Roland, and Mrs. Black
Figure 7. Adult talk for teaching social skills.

Adults included in this graph are Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Smith, Ms. Brown, Mr. Larson, and Mr. Miller.

Figure 8. Adult talk to promote communication in native language.

Adults included in this graph are Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Smith, Ms. Brown, Mr. Larson, and Mr. Miller. All conversation related to first language dealt with reminders to speak in English except in one instance when a paraprofessional responded to a question from another student.
**Figure 9.** Adult talk to promote communication in second language acquisition.
Adults included in this graph are Mrs. Clark, Ms. Brown, Mr. Larson, Mrs. Bold and Mr. Miller.

**Figure 10.** Adult talk to promote communication through alternative methods.
Adults included in this graph are Mrs. Clark, Ms. Brown, Mr. Larson, and Mrs. Parker.
Figure 11. Adult talk to manage behaviors.

Adults included in this graph are Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Smith, Ms. Brown, Mr. Larson, Mr. Miller, Mrs. Bold, Mrs. Parker, Mrs. Roland, and Mrs. Black.

Figure 12. Adult talk to maintain routines such as restroom activities, eating activities, and transitions.

Adults included in this graph are Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Smith, Ms. Brown, Mr. Larson, Mr. Miller, Mrs. Bold, Mrs. Parker, Mrs. Roland, and Mrs. Black.
Summary of Adult Talk

Adult talk with children is a critical component in the development of classroom culture (Beck & Olah, 2001). In this classroom it was evident that giving directions and asking children questions was the dominant means of dialogue. The missing factor in the data was the wait time given children to respond to the questions or to react to the directions given. There were many instances where questions or directions were fired off one right after the other and the students had little to no time to respond. An effective classroom context for English language learners continues to be one that presents a direct challenge to the system that continues to operate by the motto “That is the way we have always done it.” Many researchers contend that educational systems have traditionally been known to silence English language learners and inhibited their
success in the classroom (August & Shanahan, 2006; Banks, 1981; Delpit, 1995; Heath, 1983; Elswood, 1999; Marshall, 2001). It has rarely been enough to simply care about and love the children with whom you work (August & Hakuta, 1997). We must realize that whether we like it or not, there are varied and powerful forces that impact the lives of our children (August & Hakuta, 1998). The forces are the cultures that present themselves in classrooms across America. In order to effectively educate English language learners, we must create a classroom context that actively and purposely counters the influences that limit our children (Adcock & Patton, 2002; Arzubiaga, Ceja & Artiles, 2000; August & Hakuta, 1998; Banks, 1988; Bialystok & Cummins, 1991; Delpit, 1995).

Summary of Data Collection

Multiple sources of evidence must be collected and stored comprehensively and systematically in various formats so that converging lines of investigations and patterns of events can be discovered (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Leedy & Ormrod, 2001; Patton, 2002). The individuals and or objects of the case study must be carefully observed to identify factors associated with the observed phenomenon and to then be able interpret the information to answer various research questions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Merriam, 1998). Then raw data is examined by using many interpretations in order to find connections between the research subjects and current research theories (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Hatch, 1995; Patton, 2002). Exemplary case studies will deliberately sort the data in many different ways to expose or create new insights and will deliberately look for conflicting data to refute a given analysis (Glesne, 146
The data can be categorized, tabulated, and recombined to address the initial questions and purpose of the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Hatch, 1995). After three years of looking at current research, seven weeks of data collection, and eight months of data sorting and tabulating, the final recording of data collection took place.

Additionally, the N6 program was used to have a separate database to store the codes and to note their place and the relationship to the overall structure of the research document. Since the information is not done automatically and proper training was lacking, the process of data analysis was overwhelming and burdensome. The indexing system worked well, but looking at all the different pieces and seeing the emerging whole picture was difficult. After placing information into the indexing system, a hand analysis was necessary to aid seeing the whole picture. With additional training the N6 program would probably have been more beneficial and reduced frustration. Once the software analysis was supplemented by the hand analysis, details made sense and relationships emerged. In addition, missing categories became apparent and were established. All of the information from the collected data was sorted into these categories and tallied. The culminating results now comprise all of the information contained in chapter four. An analysis of that data and implications for additional research follows in the subsequent chapter.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION OF DATA

Data

This research was designed to gain knowledge of how classroom culture impacted the lives of young children who happened to be disabled and were also learning a second language. Many second language students have entered the school districts across this nation in the last ten years (August & Hakuta, 1997; August & Shanahan, 2006; Dragan, 2005). Additionally, researchers have begun to look into the second language needs of young children (Diaz, 1992; Krashen, 2003). Alba Ortiz, of the University of Texas, has even looked closely at English language learners with special education needs. However, the needs of young children who are also second language learners with special education identification have been researched by only a few individuals or groups. The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) issued a position statement in 1986 on developmentally appropriate practice that is now the cornerstone of preschool programs across the nation and perhaps around the world. Had developmental appropriate practice guidelines extended into the special education arena and what impact had the guidelines had on meeting the developmental needs of these identified students? Rules and regulations delineating the rights of special education students have been outlined in IDEA. Those regulations were meant to ensure that all students had equal access to a free and appropriate educational experience in the least restrictive environment. The laws set forth in special education do not mention the aspects of early childhood education that make the classroom an appropriate and meaningful educational venue. Therefore, a look into the
world of special education for second language learners and investigate the classroom culture for a very small population of young students is warranted. This case study was meant to provide a starting point for future investigations. The research questions were meant to begin opening windows into a world that has not been closely examined to date.

The greatest challenge of the investigation was the realization that as a non-participant observer, it was impossible to question what was happening, suggest changes, or discuss areas of concern. To do so would have changed the classroom culture and rather than observe the culture simply report the occurrences. Resisting recording feelings, opinions, or biases was difficult at times yet a conscious effort was made to record only what occurred. Writing throughout a 4 or 5 hour data gathering session was time consuming and physically, emotionally, and mentally exhausting. The intention of this project was never to condemn what the staff members were doing nor to assign blame but to simply report what occurred. Perhaps the negative behaviors and classroom practices observed and reported will help other see their program more clearly and how that program is or is not working for the benefit of all children. Maybe this research will help individual teachers examine their belief systems and focus on the spirit behind the words in No Child Left Behind. Maybe children like Sam and Eric will encounter a teacher who has made a decision to monitor closely and reflect on what happens in their classroom because of their awareness of what happened in one classroom during a sever week period of time. This report provides insight and guidance into one program and because of it programs providing services to young children with disabilities whose native language is not English can be examined and possibly refined.
Discussion of Findings

The study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. How was culture represented in a PPCD classroom?
   a. What was represented in the physical space, activities, and routines of the PPCD classroom?
   b. What were the communication choices of focus children with the classroom children?
   c. What were the communication choices between focus children and the English speaking teachers?

2. How did classroom culture support the developmental stages of growth for the focus children in the PPCD classroom?
   a. Did support come through native language development?
   b. Was support noted during the acquisition of English?
   c. Was support demonstrated through the attainment of cognitive, physical, social and emotional skills?
   d. How were the focus children supported through the development of communication skills?

Classroom culture was defined as the interactions of all participants with each other and the environment while acknowledging the hidden rules, experiences, expectations and value systems of each individual represented. For this study, children who have varied cultural exposures and diverse language backgrounds were referred to as linguistically and culturally diverse. These definitions serve to anchor the discussion of the data that follows.
What was Represented in the Physical Space, Activities, and Routines of the Classroom?

The physical space was arranged as are most early childhood classrooms with accommodations made for children requiring specialized equipment. Furniture was child sized; centers were open and contained materials appropriate for young children. The room had the special facilities for toileting and a lower sink for children to wash their hands. For the number of children in the classroom, the size was very comfortable. The space did accommodate multiple uses. The centers had enough space for each activity and the spaces could easily house more than one type of activity. The sand and water table was in an area that was easy to access and clean. The quiet areas of the room, computer station and library, were near each other and away from the sand table. The blocks, home center, and dramatic play centers were grouped on the other side of the back wall. The centers all could have been improved by having additional items representing the various ethnic cultures of the school added. With the exception of the puppets and a few dolls, no ethnic culture was represented other than Caucasian. Foods from other countries and costumes of various ethnic groups should be added to the home and dramatic play center. Common items found in other countries could be added as manipulatives.

The activities of the classroom were comprised of academic and socialization components. This in and of itself was a viable option for curriculum in an early childhood classroom. However, the activities of this classroom, both academic and social, were conducted almost exclusively under the direct instruction curriculum model which is inappropriate for young children (Adcock & Patton, 2002; Anderson, 1994; Barrera, 2000). In circle time there was daily review and sometimes the presentation of new
materials. In the academic structured centers the students practiced, received feedback and corrections, and did independent practice activities. The free choice centers were there because, as the teacher stated, “All children need time to play.” The free choice centers were not meant for socialization or for first/second language development. The children were reminded not to use Spanish, and the teachers did not encourage conversations within the confines of the center play. The staff members used free choice centers as a means to gain release time to allow them to prepare lessons for the next day. The classroom culture was defined by blocks of time in which the educators focused on prekindergarten guidelines and meeting IEP goals. In this classroom, the teacher selected and directed all activities making certain that proper behaviors were maintained and events were sequenced in a specific order. Across activities the teachers continually used a prompt and say method for language instruction. Social activities were promoted in the classroom only during free center time. During free centers the children were often reminded to “Use your words” which had the hidden meaning of “English only” in this context and teachers often encouraged specific children to play with a particular child.

Routines were established and maintained to the fullest extent possible. From the opening routine of unloading the bus to the closing routine of getting back on the bus each routine was followed precisely as it was designed. The schedule routines, according to Mrs. Clark, were put in place for structure and accountability. The children had to have a structured day that was both predictable and easy to follow. The teacher stated that the routines allowed her to check off all areas on the prekindergarten checklist and on the student’s IEP’s because she knew that she had completed all the
work. Obviously the daily events were about what the teacher could get through, not what the children learned or internalized. Making meaning applicable to the lives of children was nonexistent. The focus of the teachers was to get through all the requirements of the curriculum. The staff portrayed the attitude that if the children got the information that was great and if they did not get the information then they were not capable and it was part of their handicapping condition.

What were the Communication Choices of Focus Children with the Classroom Children?

Sam chose not to communicate with other children. If a child initiated the conversation, then Sam might or might not acknowledge the child. Sam’s preference was to work independently so that he could finish his work and get to the computer. He never once used his sign language or his communication notebook with another student. At times, he would forget his notebook and a child would bring it to him. Sam would grab the notebook and not acknowledge the other child. Sam often looked up or to the left while walking in a line to get from one place to the other. While being the helper for circle time, he kept his back to the other children. The closest to communicating with another student that Sam exhibited during the observations copying what another student was doing in the form of parallel play at the writing center.

Eric loved to communicate with other children. Eric would easily point, gesture, and use his Spanish while playing with others. Eric initiated play with others and joined when children were already in the center. Eric was fearful of being alone. Eric sought out children on the playground and when they went off and did something Eric could not participate in such as climbing to the top of the jungle gym, he found someone else with
whom he could play. Eric copied other children while they were in the centers together. He would mimic actions, words, and phrases. The English that Eric learned was in the form of survival English and was generally one-word phrases. He would talk or gesture with any and every person with whom he came into contact with. Eric loved to give hugs. When a friend was being nice to him, Eric would reach out and pat the child on the arm or simply give them a hug. Eric did not have a particular best friend; everyone was Eric's best friend. Eric did not seem to understand when another child was being mean to him. Eric would simply walk away and find someone else. Eric smiled all the time and simply wanted to be in the middle of all the action.

What were the Communication Choices between Focus Children and the English Speaking Teachers?

Sam sometimes used English in short sentences or phrases when communicating with staff members but this usually occurred when he was prompted or questioned. He used sign language to indicate desires in well established routines such as breakfast time or for bathroom needs. Sam used his communication notebook to report a desire such as going to the computer, then he would show the notebook to staff members and indicate that he was finished with a project. Sam pointed to objects on rare occasions unless he was prompted to do so by a teacher. He exhibited competency in all task that he undertook, and pre-academic skills were no longer challenging. He would protest doing tasks that he had already mastered, and Mrs. Clark reported that the staff had a hard time keeping up with new projects and games for him to do. The staff members often created file folder games, and after they explained the game once, Sam would complete even the most challenging and difficult game. On
numerous occasions, Sam would put a bucket of letters in ABC order in less than ninety
seconds. In less than two minutes Sam put the number cards zero through fifty in order.
Mrs. Clark never gave him numbers higher than fifty. Sam would create three letter
words and sound them out. If he created what he believed was a nonsense word, he
would sound it out and then throw the letters back into the bucket. The only word he
ever created during the observations that he thought was a nonsense word and was not
was sky. Just as Sam chose not to communicate with his peers, he chose not to
communicate with his teachers unless he was prompted to do so. There were very few
instances where Sam made the first move to communicate.

Eric communicated most effectively with the staff members by patting their arm
or leg and pointing. Eric’s pronunciation of English words made it very difficult for him to
be understood. Eric could clearly use one- and two-word phrases in Spanish, but he
was highly discouraged to do so. The teachers did not consider providing instructional
support for Eric’s native language as an option, nor did they use it for social purpose or
for giving instructions. Eric would answer every question or direction by first nodding his
head and then when the teacher reminded Eric to use his words, he would say
something. The words most often sounded like a baby babbling. The teacher would
acknowledge Eric as complying with the request and would, then, use the gesture Eric
originally provided to complete the answer to the question. Eric was always seeking the
teachers’ attention or approval and therefore responded to every request made by the
teacher.

In this classroom, the development and maintenance of the native language for
either student was never addressed. The teachers’ attitudes about first language use
and perhaps their misunderstanding of the research supporting first language
development meant that it was never used for either Sam or Eric. Additionally, the IEP
goals set forth for Eric and Sam never mentioned the development of their first
language and did not address them as needing language support from the ESL
coordinator according to the teacher. The sporadic use of language-rich input and
opportunities to extend or engage in conversations weakened the support for Sam and
Eric in their emerging English language (Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005). By not
taking advantage of the teachable moments, not providing support in the child’s native
language, not scaffolding the acquisition of English by making connections to real life
applications, and not accounting for the varied cultures Sam and Eric were raised in, the
learning opportunities for Sam and Eric were reduced in number and meaning
throughout the majority of their daily experiences. While the teachers attested to the use
of multicultural materials and cooperative learning philosophies there was no evidence
that either of these critical components existed in the classroom during this seven week
observation period.

Therefore, in answering the question, how was the culture represented in a
PPCD classroom, the culture of this classroom was that of middle class English
speaking America. The instruction was an outdated, inappropriate direct instruction
model based on the behaviorist viewpoint. The physical environment was created for
the children by placing the appropriate learning materials at the appropriate levels.
However, NAEYC changed the mission and vision of preschool programs by adopting
the term developmentally appropriate practice (DAP) almost two decades ago (1987).
Appropriate educational experiences consist of more than just the assemblage of
materials that are designed for young children. The intent behind developmentally appropriate practice continues to be that the teachers plan a curriculum that acknowledges the individual talents and the interests of the child (Brown et al., 2001). DAP requires that teachers think about children’s basic needs for play and rest and that they focus on children’s development in all areas. Furthermore, teachers plan and engage in an inclusive program that honors the cultural differences each child brings to school. Additionally, they must work with the families and support parents in the educational experiences of every child (Dickinson & Sprague, 2001). When looking at the growth in all areas the focus must be on physical, emotional, social, and cognitive development.

Developmentally appropriate practices are fluid and dynamic, not static and rigid. The planning and curriculum must never be a one-size-fits-all course of study. In early childhood education there are many theorists who provide an explanation as to how children learn and grow. These theoretical positions include behaviorism, maturationism, and constructivism. The behaviorist theory suggests that performance can be shaped by the response that follows an action and was propagated by Skinner and Thorndike (Berk, 2002). The maturationist point of view is that children will unfold and develop over time if they are in the right environment and has been circulated by believers of Rousseau’s work (Byrnes, 1996). The constructivist or developmentalist view was founded by Piaget and Vygotsky and proclaimed that children create knowledge through interactions with the environment (Berk & Winsler, 1995). Children are not passive receivers of knowledge; rather they actively work at organizing their experiences or adventures into mental structures.
While DAP is not and was never intended to be a curriculum, it is a way of developing the curriculum based on knowledge provided by current theorists (Graue & Walsh, 1998). Supporting the viewpoints of a particular theorist and exhibiting a curriculum aligned only with that theorist is not required in order to be a good teacher. Development can be described in different terms, depending on one's philosophical point of view. Development is an orderly process of moving from one stage to the next stage. Physical development is rapid throughout early childhood periods and continues to be refined during primary years and on into adolescents. Furthermore, social development progresses throughout the school years as children become capable of having successful independent interactions with others and confidence emerges. Additionally, emotional development is often observed as children evolve from expressing undifferentiated responses to emotions to being able to verbalize their desires or ideas in socially acceptable ways in various venues. Finally, cognitive development describes the changes that take place in children’s thinking and reasoning. Very young children learn best from manipulating objects; preschoolers need to maneuver various items and reflect on the changes created; and elementary children need to use concrete materials to describe abstract ideas (Isenberg & Jalongo, 2003). Therefore, all of these things are wrapped up into the different stages of child development and should be considered while planning for curriculum in an early childhood classroom. Teachers need to think about each child’s physical abilities and the cognitive requirements of each distinctive task when they select learning experiences (McEvoy, Fox & Rosenberg, 1991). They also need to plan various activities that will help children develop social skills (Linquanti, 1999). They must talk
with children, listen to them, honor and explore their cultural backgrounds, acknowledge, develop, and promote the child’s native language, while connecting their experiences to new ideas (McLean & Cripe, 1997). Simply planning curriculum based on a checklist system of getting everything done is not creating a developmentally appropriate curriculum which continues to be a decisive component in the education of young children (Minzenberg, Laughlin & Kaczmarek, 1999).

The second research question addressed the support of developmental stages of growth that occurred in many different areas. The number of areas researched was limited and the focus was on those that often have an impact on the culture of a classroom since culture was the main focus of the study. When referring to the definition of classroom culture, a global picture of the interactions of all participants was sought. Field notes were placed into categories that were independent of each other and how they were interrelated was investigated. All of the field notes from each observation were separated by topic and then pieced them back together to form one picture. The picture was meant to answer each of the research questions and to enhance the knowledge base for those who work with young children who have special needs and are second language learners. The examinations of the questions revolving around developmental stages of growth are as follows.

**Did Support come through Native Language Development?**

The only way to describe the development of growth for Sam and Eric in their native languages is that it was totally lacking. For Sam it was as if he had no native language. His teacher initially reported an incorrect language when ask about Sam’s
native language. Notes to Sam’s parents were sent home in English. The teacher reported that the school had provided ARD information in the native language, and an interpreter was provided for the ARD. The parents were surprised when permission slips to participate in the study were presented in their native language. They had brought an older sibling with them to the parent meeting to translate into French as they were not expecting an interpreter. The expression of gratitude on the face of the father indicated their acknowledgment of the effort made to accommodate for their native language.

Sam was given instruction in adaptive communication devices in the form of sign language and communication boards. He was given in-class instruction for the acquisition of English in the classroom at minimal levels. He was encouraged to use English, sign language, and his communication notebook.

For Eric there were four teachers that were bilingual certified assigned to the campus. In Eric’s room there was a Spanish speaking paraprofessional. All of the notes sent home to his mom were in Spanish. The paraprofessional made all of the phone calls so that the mother and grandmother could understand the conversation. There was a Spanish-speaking secretary to aid parents in obtaining meaning from the school environment. However, the teachers did not consider instructional support in Spanish for Eric. Mrs. Clark stated that not all the children were Spanish speakers in the classroom; therefore, in all fairness to the other children, she did not allow Spanish to be spoken. She stated that it was a policy of the school that they did not converse with the children in Spanish. On many visits to the school other teachers were speaking to children in Spanish, and there was a bilingual four-year-old class right down the hall so
her answer did not make sense. This was not addressed with her to avoid influencing the classroom culture. Furthermore, Mrs. Clark indicated that English as a second language teachers and strategies were not appropriate for use with her students because the PPCD classroom focus was on language skills and the development of appropriate communication skills, and some of the students did have disability conditions.

**Was Support Noted during the Acquisition of English?**

Every language is made up of a set of integrate systems: phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics (Cazden, 1998). Phonology is referred to as the system of sounds that make up the language; it includes sounds that are used to make words, the rules for combining each sound, and the stress and intonation patterns that help to communicate meaning. Morphology deals with the specific meaning of sounds. A morpheme is the smallest unit of sound that carries expressed meaning. The syntax of a language contains the rules for combining words into phrases and sentences and for the transformation of sentences into paragraphs. Semantics refers to the acquisition of vocabulary and meanings associated with words. Pragmatics is the use of language to express meaning and to get things done.

Without careful planning for language development, the different systems of language can be overlooked. Mrs. Clark’s class focused on the sounds letters made in isolation. This would be considered phonological instruction. The only other instruction students received dealt with semantics as the students looked at photos, identified the names of objects, and handled realia while saying the word associated with it. Sam was
also taught to identify the beginning sound that words make and to associate the symbol that went with the sound. Mrs. Clark confirmed that her job was to help the children become fluent English speakers. The isolated skills method that permeated the classroom culture was unlikely to promote the type of language acquisition necessary for fluent English speaking (Miramontes, Nadeau & Commins, 1997).

Conversations and interactions are required for language development. Extended discourse about relevant events will always be a necessary form of language development (Cazden, 1998). Constructing meaning from instruction allows the child to internalize the information and to create meaning associated with the language they are learning (Osborn & Lehr, 1998). While learning language from birth, an infant will focus naturally on receptive language and being able to understand what is said and follow directions (Snow, Burns & Griffin, 1997). Soon the toddler will begin expressive language which often begins with single words or two word phrases (Soto, Smrekar & Nekcovei, 1999). The preschooler will then develop longer utterance and learn to produce negatives and questions as language growth continues (Freeman & Freeman, 2001). By then, the child’s language consists of some mature forms and some immature forms of spoken language. By the time the child is seven their native language is mature if not interrupted, and the child’s comprehension has developed rapidly (Rhondes, Ochoa & Ortiz, 2005).

The same process takes place for second language acquisition. The children go through the stages of language acquisition already outlined in this document, and they acquire BICS first and then develop CALP. According to Cummins (1981) BICS includes basic interpersonal communication skills. These are the skills necessary for everyday
communication. After developing BICS children began to develop CALP. CALP refers to cognitive academic language proficiency. This includes learning the academic terms of various subjects in order to gain cognitive growth across curriculum areas. The language learners move from non-English speaking status to limited English status and then to fluent status. A mistake that teachers often make occurs when they assume that a child who is fluent can function without assistance in English (Soto, 1997). Many second language tests only assess basic communication skills and they do not identify cognitive academic language, which is the level needed later to pass state-assessments (Valdes, 2001).

Understanding the role of language in fostering children’s later literacy skills has important implications for all children, but it is of special significance for those who work with families from low income areas who are second language learners and have documented disabilities (Soto, 1997; Barnett, 2001). Children growing up in these families are more likely to have difficulties with learning to read than children from middle-class families, and these gaps in performance begin to appear very early (Dickinson & Sprague, 2001). These early disadvantages can have serious long-term effects because children who experience reading difficulties and cognitive delays are more likely to drop out of school (Barnett, 2001). The importance of early childhood experiences with rich language input and appropriate exposure to the uses and functions of print was emphasized by a series of national organizations in the late 1990s. The International Reading Association (IRA) and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) together issued a position statement in 1998 highlighting the appropriateness of providing rich language experiences in preschool
classrooms (Houk, 2005). There is a consensus that classrooms with young children should be language-rich, with lots of words used during interesting conversations that are world connected and enriched by stories and explanations that are culturally relevant.

Clearly the focus of the curriculum in Sam and Eric's classroom failed to meet the criteria set forth by NAEYC and IRA. Giving directions, correcting behavior, and soliciting answers to questions did not successfully meet the standards associated with initial or second language acquisition (August & Hakuta, 1997). The staff members who served the needs of Sam and Eric were operating under a false assumption that if they eliminated the first language and spoke only in English that the children would successfully obtain a second language (Gonzalez, 1999; Tabors, 1997). Language continues to be best learned when it is used for a real purpose; thus, contrived activities to practice isolated language skills are rarely effective (Garcia, 2001). The teacher should accept and respect the first language of all children in a developmentally appropriate classroom. The best environment for learning language includes critical elements such as choice, active involvement, age and individually appropriate expectations, and connections to real life applications (McLaughlin, 1995).

Was Support Demonstrated through the Attainment of Cognitive, Physical, Social, and Emotional Skills?

Whether addressing the various categories of developmental skills such as physical, social, emotional, and cognitive or simply addressing stages of development such as Piaget's stages of development or Erikson's stages of psychological development, growth should be measured overtime and in increments (Osborn & Lehr,
This study was meant to describe the classroom culture and how it supported the attainment of developmental skills. The culture of this classroom was driven by documenting efforts that all curriculum areas and IEP goals had been taught. Every skill was introduced in a sequential order although in many cases as an insolated event. Many educators concur that child development issues, while complex and fluid, are foundational and interdisciplinary (Berk, 2002; Katz, 1996). Some contend that children who grow up with their basic physical and material needs met are likely to trust themselves and their community, possess an enthusiasm for life, and build on internal resourcefulness to participate in society, regardless of the obstacles they face (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Denham, 2001; Erikson, 1963). Additionally, numerous professionals agreed that there are new and complex problems facing young children in their efforts to negotiate meaning from the environment (Denham, 1998; Golbeck, 2001; Graue & Walsh, 1998). These problems included, but are not limited to poverty, inadequate health care, safety issues and violence, prenatal exposure to drugs and alcohol, and substandard child care (Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005; Gullo, 2006; Payne, 1996; Tomlinson & McTighe, 2006). Positive influences on child development included significant relationships that are consistent and predictable, unwavering expectations, strong emotional family ties, acceptance and affirmations, and a variety of stimulating materials in family and school settings (Knitzer & Cauthen, 2000).

It is critical for early childhood educators to concede the implications of the conditions impacting a child’s development. In order to create an environment that promotes the attainment of developmental skills the program should:

- Teach coping skills to children - Developing nurturing relationships and focusing on children’s strengths rather than labeling, blaming, and criticizing children’s
performance fosters beliefs in their abilities and rests on the core principles and traditions of early childhood education (Berk, 2002; Denham, 1998; Katz, 1996).

- Institute reform measures in schools and programs - Proponents of school reform have taken the position that all children can learn and that cognitive growth for all children is more alike than different (Golbeck, 2001; Gullo, 2006). Yet, just as in the past, many schools continue to label many economically disadvantaged children as special learners who need direct instruction and this reinforces the myth that poor children cannot be expected to learn very much (Ashiabi, 2000; Weissbourd, 1996). Instead, early childhood professionals must teach to all children’s strengths.

- Provide teachers and caregivers with access to resources that protect children’s health and safety - Teachers must be open to actively participate in cadres to develop better methods and strategies for identification of children’s special needs while advocating for proper healthcare and childcare (Carnegie Corporation, 1994; Children’s Defense Fund, 2001).

- Prepare future and practicing teachers to work effectively with children abused by violence and poverty - Early childhood educators can help children deal with the impact of violence and poverty in their lives through the development of strong programs and curricula, research-based teacher preparation, ongoing professional development, and strong partnerships with parents (Hyson, M. C. & Molinaro, J., 2001; Payne, 1996). Successful teachers tend to be nonjudgmental in their interactions with all children while taking a problem-solving approach to children’s life events. Teachers must believe in their ability to influence children’s development rather than fantasizing about rescuing children from their hostile environments and must to try to understand the views of all stakeholders in children’s lives (Gullo, 2006; Isenberg, 2000). Teacher preparation and staff development programs must revisit the components that are used to train successful teachers and align coursework, experiences, and training toward the development of these character traits (Early & Winton, 2001).

- Develop teachers and administrators who can meet children’s developmental needs while addressing academic standards - Teachers and administrators need support in developing teaching methods that simultaneously address mandated curriculum standards and the identified developmental needs of all young children (Osborn & Lehr, 1998; Trawick-Smith, 1997). They also need to demonstrate an expanded repertoire of ways to teach academic content to all young children in a developmentally appropriate manner (Adcock & Patton, 2002).

Mrs. Clark was teaching all components of the educational curriculum as isolated pieces of information. A fluid, connected, language-rich, interactive, child-initiated,
culturally relevant and responsive curriculum was needed in this classroom (Tabors, 1998). The students came to school not only with a variety of languages but also with a variety of skills in their first languages (Valdes, 2001). The impact of this range of language skills was compounded by the special education components found in the inclusionary classroom Sam and Eric attended. There will never be a one-size-fits-all curriculum to meet the needs of every child in any type of classroom. Researchers state that people learn language because they are in real situations communicating about important and interesting things (August & Shanahan, 2006; Katz, 1996; Tabors, 1997). An initial look at the school environments in which young children develop their language skills reveals a great deal of linguistic variety, yet virtually all children effortlessly and naturally learn language through interactions and involvement (Golbeck, 2001). Children’s language development before they come to school takes place largely through interactions in conversations with members of their family (Katz, 1996). Recent research validates the notion that children learn language by actively constructing principles for the patterns that they hear in the speech of others as they interact on a regular basis (Adcock & Patton, 2002; Golbeck, 2001). A language-rich and interactive setting with culturally relevant materials was the component needed for Sam and Eric to be successful in their attainment of skills in all developmental domains. Unfortunately, this case study revealed that the teachers were not fully prepared to serve the linguistically and culturally diverse children with developmental delays. Their classroom setting was not conducive to meaningfully supporting their language, physical, social, emotional, or cognitive needs.
How were the Focus Children Supported through the Development of Communication Skills?

Data was gathered that documented Sam and Eric’s use of language with peers and with adults. Data was also gathered that indicated the types of speech adults used with the focus children and the various domains in which they used the language. Data was reported about first and second language use and about alternative communication skills used by Sam. All of the data gathered was indicative of the same type of instruction being used to promote communication skills. The instruction used was a prompt-and-say model whereby the teachers pointed to a picture, a word, or object and said the word, and then had the child repeat the word. Sometimes this was done through individual instruction and sometimes a group response was expected.

Research shows that children learn language, language functions, and how to use language in social interactions all at the same time (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). Parents do not set out to teach language to their children by limiting their children’s learning to one piece of the complex system of language. Parents help their children learn language by conversing with them in meaningful contexts and in social situations (Wong-Fillmore, 1991). Parents present language as a whole, within a context, and within a social milieu of the family (Katz, 1996). The same is true for the effective development of communication skills in school. Teachers of young children can also protect the holistic nature of communication by not breaking it into bits and pieces for study in school (Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005). Words in isolation – or worse, sounds in isolation - have no meaning that can be constructed for young children (Katz, 1996). Children do not need to practice isolated elements of language to learn to communicate whether in their first or second language (Dickinson & Tabor, 2001).
Children need to use language in a variety of situations and with a variety of speakers to master communication skills (Garcia & McLaughlin, 1995). Young children need to talk about topics of interest to them and learn to adjust their language to meet the requirements of a particular communication venue (Freeman & Freeman, 2001). Real talk provides young children a chance to practice their developing communication skills in a supportive environment where they can take risk (Bialystok & Cummins, 1991).

How does classroom culture support the developmental stages of growth for the children in the PPCD classroom? In this setting the only culture promoted was the middle class English American. Native language support was non-existent. The acquisition of English was improperly promoted with expectations that a prompt-and-say method would enable children to progress through the stages of language acquisition (Brice & Roseberry-McKibbin, 2001). The foundation for promoting developmental skills was also void and lacked the framework necessary for young children to succeed. The disconnected presentations of materials that promoted the development of communication skills did not allow the children to construct meaning out of the complex language system (Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005). The classroom culture failed to support the ethnicity of the children enrolled in the program. An overall feeling of being an outsider existed for the children and taking ownership of the class and curriculum was as foreign as the materials with which the children are ask to work (Delpit, 1995).

Limitations

The limitations of the study include the limited number of students observed. In order to gain a clear understanding of the cultural environment encountered by the
focus children, an intensive examination of their experiences was needed. Therefore, only two students were observed to gain information on the classroom culture that supported their native language growth while the students acquired a second language. Additionally, only one classroom was assessed. The intensity and depth of the study limited the number of classrooms that could be examined in a seven week period. Hatch contends that “researchers interested in studying childhood as a cultural invention are logically bound to the use of qualitative methods designed to reveal how children and other participants in children’s worlds are experiencing and constructing their realities” (1995, p. 122). Extensive periods of time were devoted to each individual child. In order to observe different classrooms with different focus children an expanded observational period would have been necessary.

Another limitation of the study was that personal interviews with the staff members were not planned in advance. Upon completion of data collection, there was a realization that while instruction was delivered using a particular method, the educators view of the delivery system of the instruction differed from the examination of the literature on second language acquisition and developmentally appropriate practice. Informally information was given by the staff members that indicated they believed that the children were socializing to gain language and developmental skills. When asked about the classroom schedule the teacher explained that most of the day was built around the needs of the children to explore their world and communicate with their peers. A carefully constructed interview with each adult playing the role of educator in the life of the focus children prior to the beginning of the study, might have revealed information that lacked alignment with knowledge based on current best practices.
Videotaping and photography was eliminated from the study due to objections from parents of not only classroom participants but also of a focus child. Initial plans for this case study included analysis by two doctoral students of the videotapes to aid in triangulation during data analysis. Due to a lack of observational taping, coding of the data was limited to only the observational records.

A review of the focus students’ records was planned to aid in an understanding of the disability that facilitated placement in a special educational setting. Policies in place at the school district prohibited the viewing of such records. Knowledge of the handicapping condition of each focus child was gleaned from the information provided by the parent or educator of the child. This information did not reveal specific testing instruments used or specific information about strengths and weaknesses of each student. The examination of the IEP and the diagnostic testing of the student were intended to identify whether or not instructional methods used were based on the identified accommodations for the individual student.

Very early observations of during this case study revealed a need to observe each focus child independently. Each focus child’s educational needs were facilitated by various educators. There is an understanding based on developmentally appropriate practices established through NAEYC that all young children need materials and instruction that is age appropriate, individually appropriate, and socially and culturally relevant. Beyond this general understanding however, there is an IEP for students in special educational settings. The nature of the focus children’s handicapping condition revealed diametrically opposed educational plans. Therefore, observations of the experience for each child had to be examined independently. An implication for future
research would be to examine whether or not students exhibiting the same
handicapping condition receive similar educational plans and how the implementation of
those plans influences attainment of native language skills, second language
knowledge, and the acquisition of developmental skills.

While a great deal of data was gathered revealing information about adult talk
and communication throughout this case study, the wait time allowed students to
respond to any type of questioning strategy was missing. Questions are the building
blocks of language development (Bredekamp & Rosegrant, 1992; Bunce & Watkins,
1995; Dickinson & Sprague, 2001). A teacher should ask questions that stimulate
conversations, thinking, and interacting between the child and teacher and among peers
(Garcia, 1994; Gay, 2000; Golbeck, 2001). Questions will not aid in language
development and comprehension if they address low-level, factual knowledge based
information (Katz, 1996; McLean & Odom, 1996; Osborn & Lehr, 1998). While
information was documented that the majority of the questions were close-ended
allowing for specific correct answers to be given, the amount of wait time given to the
second language learners was not documented although hindsight indicates this
documentation might have been helpful in providing more insights into student-teacher
and teacher-student interactions which were a part of the classroom culture.

Implications of the Findings

All of the data and research lead to the conclusion that in this particular location
the teachers did not understand how native language development, home cultures,
second language acquisition processes, special education issues, and developmental
delays were interrelated. While the teachers and paraprofessional were doing the very best that they knew to do under the circumstances presented to them, the teachers lacked the ability to empower the students to reach goals that were beyond what an IEP committee suggested. The IEP committee failed to envision or understand that these two students needed special language support as second language learners and therefore the omission of these goals was blatantly obvious. However, what is not apparent is whether or not those on the ARD committee had the knowledge base to understand the importance of native language development for all students including those exhibiting handicapping conditions. Curriculum and instructional practices fell within archaic direct instruction practices that are not considered appropriate for young children (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Obiakor, 1999). Therefore, there was a total disregard for the focus children’s native language and ethnic background and the needs associate with English language learners. This lack of knowledge reveals that steps to provide professional development activities should be taken to include not only the educational staff members but the special education evaluation team, bilingual education personnel, the campus administration team, paraprofessionals and specialists trained in the delivery of instruction for students receiving special education services.

The classroom culture did not support Sam and Eric’s needs as English language learners with developmental delays (Genesee, 2000; Obiakor, 2001). The neglect of the teachers to promote first language development could lead to the loss of an ability to speak their native language and a total failure to fully develop their native language skills, and this has social consequences for the children (Genishi, Dyson &
Fassler, 1994). If a child cannot communicate effectively with their families in meaningful ways, they will not be able to participate actively with their families which share their culture and beliefs (Bialystok, 1991, Ortiz, 2001, Tabors, 1997). The weakening of a child’s native language conceptual base through early exposure to an English-only system suggests that their deficits can be attributed to bilingualism (Ortiz, 2003; Tabors, 1998).

The inclusion classroom was meant to serve the students with peers who are developing typically (Noonan & McCormick, 2006). However, the peers in this classroom were also second language learners and although they were typically developing physically, socially, emotionally, and cognitively their language development was also not supported (Tabors, 1998). Therefore, none of the students received the academic services to which they were entitled.

Numerous studies have identified instructional practices in bilingual classrooms, self-contained classroom, and English only special education classrooms that resulted in appropriate academic gains and social interactions (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002; Houk, 2005; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Isenberg & Jalongo, 2003; Obiaker, 2006). All second language children including Sam and Eric benefit from language rich and inclusive environments that are built around their cultural experiences and equally value and promote their native language development alongside their acquisition of English (Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005; Noonan & McCormick, 2006). Inclusive settings that incorporate children’s culture and language also meet the multicultural criteria for recommended practices that facilitate positive interactions with diverse families while
promoting cultural competence of professionals in early intervention classrooms (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002; Banks & Banks, 2003; Dickinson & Tabors, 2001; Gay, 2000).

Recommended practice for early childhood classrooms also require appropriate scheduling and pacing of activities to allow for the exploration of materials provided in the environment (Berk & Winsler, 1995). The schedule presented by the teacher limited the interaction during opening group time and additional time could have been dedicated to physical development activities during recess. Curriculum based on children’s interest could be integrated so that content is not arranged as isolated activities designed to meet report card objectives.

When a child’s experiences become the focus of an in-depth understanding of an ethnolinguistic course of study, families have the ability to transmit knowledge, skills and values to the professional educator (Freeman, Freeman & Mercuri, 2005). This parental understanding, in turn, creates a bond between the school and community and a commitment to promote an excellent educational experience for their child. The optimal learning environment for second language learners with or without disabilities survives only when a connection to families is made (Articles & Ortiz, 2002). Early educational settings that incorporate the first language and cultural experiences of preschool children help to maintain important connections to the home while addressing children’s individual learning styles and developmental needs (Katz, 1996).

Professional Development Implications

The views and practices of the staff members in Sam and Eric’s classroom differ significantly from current research literature in the field of early education with special
needs students. Additionally, the practices of the staff do not convey an understanding of research implications for second-language students. These compounding variables indicate a need for intensive, on-going staff development with a monitoring system to ensure proper implementation of skills. Staff development cannot be effective if presented as a one-time encounter. In order to build the capacity of staff members, a rigorous system must be in place. Recommendations based on this study would be to begin with instruction for all staff members in creating a knowledge base of current research on how children acquire a second language. The second-language student population has grown tremendously in the last several years, and the understanding of language acquisition has also exploded. Krashen and Cummins’ information has been around for several years but Ortiz, Dickinson, Snow, Freeman & Freeman, and Tabors have many ideas and suggestions that have added to the body of knowledge. Delpit, while controversial, has given middle class American teachers something to think about by publishing Other People’s Children. One Child, Two Languages by Patton Tabors explores the world of young children learning to cope in a world that looks differently, speaks differently, and acts differently. Finally, Carl Glickman has recently edited a book called Letters to the Next President. In this book parents, teachers, and, more importantly, children have written letters about their educational experience and have articulated the good and the bad with suggestions on how to make things better. Researchers, policy makers, and administrators have an obligation to continue to explore ways to improve our educational system. Teachers have an obligation to implement the very best teaching practices, yet if they are not provided information on
how research connects to educational practices, research cannot be expected to impact individual classrooms.

Discussion of Methodology

Due to the nature of case study research, generalizability is often not applicable (Patton, 2002). One cannot take case study findings and apply the knowledge to a large group of children (Hatch, 1995; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Case study research is meant to give a detailed examination of one setting, focusing on a small number of subjects, or particular events (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Glesne, 1999). There is inevitable diversity among various types of case studies just as there is in the various types of venues one might study. Due to the personal nature of looking at young children, a great deal of difference in the two subjects who participated in this case study was found. The study was designed to look at students who were enrolled in a Preschool Program for Children with Disabilities and spoke a native language other than English. The type of disability the student had to have to be considered for the study was not predetermined. Therefore, the disparity among the children made the study very interesting as one child had an ability level between twelve and eighteen months with mental retardation and the other child was a high functioning autistic student.

This case study was also intended to be naturalistic by nature. The events witnessed took place day in and day out, and the setting was not contrived to be anything other than an elementary school classroom. The people participating in the study engaged in normal behaviors as they conducted their day. Classroom culture was examined knowing that it was a small piece of the whole educational system and an
even smaller portion, the PPCD classroom, was intently examined to gain information. That information, while representative of only two students working in one classroom, can be used to examine other classrooms with other teachers and students. Eric and Sam were both in special education, but on opposite ends of the spectrum. Would the pieces of the puzzle they provided be so diametrically opposed that no specific useful information from this study be possible? Could the research questions be answered? As the pieces of the puzzle were examined, various components began to fall into place and answers to questions began to appear in the emerging patterns.

At the onset of this study a case study seemed the appropriate approach because of the age and nature of the students and the results indicate this decision was valid. Witnessing the interaction of the students with various classroom participants to see how those interactions influenced the behaviors of the focus children was vital. Seeing how Eric and Sam made sense out of their world and how the aspects of the classroom influenced their learning on all levels was also necessary even though the method of collection was time consuming. The method of analysis was crucial to answering the questions initially stated. Even though the analysis of so much information was daunting, the end results were confirming.

All qualitative studies lack the validity and reliability of quantitative research (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Generalizability to other populations is also difficult in that the initial investigation has a very small sample size (Hatch, 1995; Patton, 2002). However, as avowed by Merriam (1998), qualitative research was never intended to do the same things as quantitative research. Qualitative research should be considered credible and confirmable not valid, reliable, and
generalizable as is quantitative research (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). Additional research now should look into practices found in other classrooms who service young children with special needs who are non-English speakers. The impact of information gained throughout the country can inform organizations like NAEYC and promote a change in recommendations for services received by the future leaders of this nation.

Future Research Implications

For those who are interested in the language development of English language learners, the natural instinct for future research studies lie in understanding the application of language acquisition theory for the promotion of best practices. The potential to impact large populations is here upon the educational system and bringing information of rich theory to educators is key to systematic change. Research on second language learners who are young children and have handicapping conditions can be explored from coast to coast and in many developmental areas. Future investigations could include an inquiry into the attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs of those that work with young English language learners. Research might focus on the level of understanding educators have toward acquisition learning theory and how language is internalized for those are young learners with disability conditions. Community preschools could seek to build additive bilingual curriculum allowing students to develop both fluency and proficiency in their native and second language. Studies could be used to examine the affective filter in an experimental situation. There are many programs which measure the anxiety level of children and these could be explored. Krashen (2003) contended that student anxiety impedes language acquisition
and sought to focus on lowering the filter to allow for optimal learning experiences. Dual language programs are at the infancy stage of implementation and studies involving young English language learners could help to explore content acquisition in this type of program. Although educational systems have improved in professional development activities that include the important information about BICS and CALP, many educators, paraprofessional, and administrators are still uncertain as to how to accelerate the acquisition of cognitive language. Developmentally appropriate practice influences programs due to the internalization of information by the teachers who serve these populations. Looking in depth at early childhood programs who serve special education children who are English language learners to obtain information as to the level of developmentally appropriate curriculum could improve the level of service for this focus population.

The research on second language acquisition should impact the practices of all classrooms where teachers are providing instruction to second language learners. Most general and special education teachers do not have extensive coursework or training related to the education of learners from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds. Fewer still have been trained to understand the specific needs of English language learners. Whether a child receives special education services or is simply acquiring second language communication skills, the strategies that best meet the needs of the students are well documented. Taking this information from a knowledge level to an application level will require diligent work on the part of policy makers, administrators, trainers, practitioners, and classroom teachers. Therefore, professional development activities must ensure that teachers share common instructional strategies.
and best practices, language acquisition information, and a knowledge base concerning the education of learners from diverse cultures and backgrounds.

It will require that public schools, private schools, as well as public and private day-cares implement systematic changes for their changing client base. Given the growing diversity of the student population, all teachers, regardless of teaching assignment, should have training in second language acquisition and the relationship of the native language to the development of English proficiency. This study can have the impact of a pebble in a crystal clear lake. The study can immediately impact the practices of this school district and then provide a continuous ripple effect to all agencies that provide services to young children with special needs who are acquiring a second language.
APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR TEACHERS
Before agreeing to your participation in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose and benefits of the study and how it will be conducted.

**The Title of the study:** An investigation into the classroom culture for second language acquisition of four-year-olds in a preschool program for children with disabilities.

Principal Investigator is Susan Casey, University of North Texas, Department of Education.

**Purpose of the Study:** You are being asked to participate in a research study which involves looking at how children gain a new language in a PreKindergarten program.

**Study Procedures:** You will be asked to do nothing that you normally do not do in the classroom. You will be in charge of the classroom and the researcher will only be recording what is happening in the classroom. The researcher will listen carefully to the children and record information about what activities help the child learn a new language. The researcher will use video recording materials to carefully look at all areas of language usage. The researcher will write down all utterances, gestures, and any other communication methods used by the children. The researcher will then analyze and report the findings to the classroom teacher and the parents of the students. The research will spend approximately 84 hours in the classroom. The researcher will meet with the teacher approximately 6 additional hours to go over information about the study.

**Foreseeable Risks:** The potential risks involved in this study are nothing more than the risk of coming to school everyday. I will seek to provide absolute confidentiality with protection of the names of the individual students and teachers involved in the study. The students, school, and teachers will not be identified in any part of the study with their real names. The school will be identified as an elementary school from a small school district in Northeast Texas.

**Benefits to the subjects or others:** The benefits to your students are that you as the teacher will gain valuable information as to the type of activities that allow your students to gain a second language. The study will also contribute to a greater understanding of how young children gain language skills in a PreKindergarten classroom. This will be of a greater impact to other students who have similar backgrounds upon entering the public school setting in the future.

**Compensation for Participants:** Your class will be participating in a picnic toward the end of school as compensation for their participation in this study. You as the teacher will also be invited to attend. All expenses of this picnic will be taken care of. You as the teacher will also be invited to attend a meal prior to the end of school with the focus children and their families. We will have a celebration for the completion of this project. I will share information with you and the focus children’s families as to the knowledge gained in this research study.
Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records: The research records, signed consent forms, and all video tapes will be kept in a locked cabinet in my home. The tapes will be in a number sequence only without any other identifiable information. The notes will be kept in a spiral notebook which will contain no identifiable information other than my name and phone number. The tapes and records will be kept separate from the coding name sheet. I plan to assign pseudonyms to each participant in the study. I plan to maintain the records until after my defense of my research. At this time the coding sheets and all tapes will be destroyed. I will maintain confidentiality of your child’s individual information in any publication or presentation regarding the findings of this study.

Review for the Protection of Participants:
This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Research Participants’ Rights:
Your signature below indicates that you have read or have had read to you all of the above and that you confirm all of the following:

- You have been told the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to agree to take part in this study, and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw from the study will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.
- You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
- You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent participate in this study.
- You have been told you will receive a copy of this form.

____________________________
Printed Name of Teacher

____________________________  _______________________
Signature of teacher             Date

For the Principal Investigator or Designee:
I certify that I have reviewed the contents of this form with the teacher signing above. I have explained the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study. It is my opinion that the teacher understood the explanation.

____________________________
Signature of Principal Investigator

_______________________  _______________________
Date
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR CLASSROOM PARTICIPANTS
Before agreeing to your child’s participation in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose and benefits of the study and how it will be conducted.

**The Title of the study:** An investigation into the classroom culture for second language acquisition of four-year-olds in a preschool program for children with disabilities.

**Purpose of the Study:** You are being asked to allow your child to participate in a research study which involves looking at how children gain a new language in a PreKindergarten program.

**Study Procedures:** Your child will be asked to do nothing that they normally do not do in the classroom. The teacher will be in charge of the classroom and the researcher will only be recording what is happening in the classroom. The researcher will listen carefully to the children and record information about what activities help the child learn a new language. The researcher will use video recording materials to carefully look at all areas of language usage. The researcher will write down all utterances, gestures, and any other communication methods used by the children. The researcher will then analyze and report the findings to the classroom teacher and the parents of the students. The researcher will spend approximately 84 hours in the classroom gathering data.

**Foreseeable Risks:** The potential risks involved in this study are nothing more than the risk of coming to school everyday. I will seek to provide absolute confidentiality with protection of the names of the individual students involved in the study. The students, school, and teachers will not be identified in any part of the study with their real names. The school will be identified as an elementary school from a small school district in Northeast Texas.

**Benefits to the subjects or others:** The benefits are that the teachers will gain valuable information as to the type of activities that allow second language students to gain English. The study will also contribute to a greater understanding of how young children gain language skills in a PreKindergarten classroom. This will be of a greater impact to other students who have similar backgrounds upon entering the public school setting.

**Compensation for Participants:** Your child’s class will be participating in a picnic toward the end of school as compensation for his/her participation in this study. Your child’s teacher will also be invited to attend. All expenses of this picnic will be taken care of.

**Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records:** The research records, signed consent forms, and all video tapes will be kept in a locked cabinet in my home. The tapes will be in a number sequence only without any other identifiable information. The notes will be kept in a spiral notebook which will contain no identifiable information other than my name and phone number. The tapes and records will be kept separate from the coding name sheet. I plan to assign pseudonyms to each participate in the study. I plan to maintain the records until after my defense of my research. At this time the coding sheets and all tapes will be destroyed. I will maintain confidentiality of
your child’s individual information in any publication or presentation regarding the findings of this study.

**Review for the Protection of Participants:**
This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB).

**Research Participants’ Rights:**
Your signature below indicates that you have read or have had read to you all of the above and that you confirm all of the following:

- You have been told the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to allow your child to take part in this study, and your refusal to allow your child to participate or your decision to withdraw him/her from the study will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your child’s participation at any time.
- You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
- You understand your rights as the parent/guardian of a research participant and you voluntarily consent to your child’s participation in this study.
- You have been told you will receive a copy of this form.

____________________________
Printed Name of Parent or Guardian

____________________________
Signature of Parent or Guardian           Date

**For the Principal Investigator or Designee:**
I certify that I have reviewed the contents of this form with the parent or guardian signing above. I have explained the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study. It is my opinion that the parent or guardian understood the explanation.

____________________________
Signature of Principal Investigator           Date
APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR FOCUS CHILDREN
Before agreeing to your child’s participation in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose and benefits of the study and how it will be conducted.

**The Title of the study**: An investigation into the classroom culture for second language acquisition of four-year-olds in a preschool program for children with disabilities.

**Purpose of the Study**: You are being asked to allow your child to participate in a research study which involves looking at how children gain a new language in a PreKindergarten program.

**Study Procedures**: Your child will be asked to do nothing that they do not do in the classroom during a regular school day. The teacher will be in charge of the classroom and the researcher will only be recording what is happening in the classroom. The researcher will listen carefully to your child and the teacher. The researcher will be writing down information about your child’s communication skills and the activities they are involved in. The researcher will use video recording materials to carefully look at all areas of language usage. The researcher will write down all utterances, gestures, and any other communication methods used by the children. The researcher will then analyze and report the findings to the classroom teacher and the parents of the students. I will observe your child’s activities for approximately 42 hours. I will visit the classroom 14 days for 3 hours a day.

**Foreseeable Risks**: The potential risks involved in this study are nothing more than the risk of coming to school everyday. I will seek to provide absolute confidentiality with protection of the names of the individual students involved in the study. The students, school, and teachers will not be identified in any part of the study with their real names. The school will be identified as an elementary school from a small school district in Northeast Texas.

**Benefits to the subjects or others**: The benefits to your students are that the teachers will gain valuable information as to the type of activities that allow your children to gain a second language. The children will then receive the best educational experience possible. The study will also contribute to a greater understanding of how young children gain language skills in a PreKindergarten classroom. This will be of a greater impact to other students who have similar backgrounds upon entering the public school setting.

**Compensation for Participants**: Your child and their family will be asked to join me before the end of school to celebrate the completion of the research project. Should you wish to have a translator present; accommodations will be made for this to take place as well. All expenses of this meal will be taken care of.

**Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records**: The research records, signed consent forms, and all video tapes will be kept in a locked cabinet in my home. The tapes will be in a number sequence only without any other identifiable information. The notes will be kept in a spiral notebook which will contain no identifiable information other than my name and phone number. The tapes and records will be kept separate from the coding name sheet. I plan to assign pseudonyms to each participate.
in the study. I plan to maintain the records until after my defense of my research. At this
time the coding sheets and all tapes will be destroyed. I will maintain confidentiality of
your child’s individual information in any publication or presentation regarding the
findings of this study.

**Review for the Protection of Participants:** This research study has been reviewed
and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB).

**Research Participants’ Rights:**
Your signature below indicates that you have read or have had read to you all of the
above and that you confirm all of the following:

- You have been told the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or
discomforts of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to allow your child to take part in this study,
and your refusal to allow your child to participate or your decision to withdraw
him/her from the study will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The
study personnel may choose to stop your child’s participation at any time.
- You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
- You understand your rights as the parent/guardian of a research participant and
you voluntarily consent to your child’s participation in this study.
- You have been told you will receive a copy of this form.

____________________________
Printed Name of Parent or Guardian

_______________________________
Signature of parent or guardian           Date

**For the Principal Investigator or Designee:**

I certify that I have reviewed the contents of this form with the parent or guardian
signing above. I have explained the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or
discomforts of the study. It is my opinion that the parent or guardian understood the
explanation.

____________________________
Signature of Principal Investigator        Date
APPENDIX D

FORMULARIO DE CONSENTIMIENTO
Antes de dar su consentimiento, es importante que usted lea este documento para que usted entienda el propósito y los beneficios de este estudio.

**Titulo:** Una investigación acerca de la cultura de niños de cuatro años con impedimentos que están aprendiendo un segundo idioma.

**Propósito:** A usted se le pide que le de permiso a su hijo(a) para participe en un estudio que explora la manera en que niños de cuatro años aprenden un segundo idioma.

**Procedimiento:** A su hijo(a) no se le pedirá que haga nada que el/ella no hace en la escuela con regularidad. La maestra está encargada de los estudiantes y la investigadora solo estará tomando notas de lo que está pasando. La investigadora estará escuchando con detenimiento a la maestra y a los estudiantes. La investigadora estará tomando notas acerca de las actividades de la clase y las destrezas de comunicación de su hijo(a). La investigadora filmará la clase para poder observar con su hijo(a) usa su lenguaje. La investigadora tomará notas de las palabras, gestos, y otros medios de comunicación usados durante la clase. Después, la investigadora analizará la data y le informara a la maestra los resultados. La investigadora hará sus observaciones por aproximadamente 42 horas. Ella visitara la clase por 3 horas diarias por 14 días.

**Riesgos:** Los riesgos asociados con esta investigación no van más allá de los riesgos comunes asociados con asistir a clases. Yo asegurare la confidencialidad de los participantes. Los estudiantes, la maestra, o la escuela no serán identificados por nombre en el informe final. La escuela será descrita como una escuela primaria de un distrito escolar pequeño del noreste de Tejas.

**Beneficios para los participantes y otros:** Su hijo(a) se beneficiará de este estudio porque su maestra recibirá información acerca de las actividades más efectivas para el aprendizaje de un segundo idioma. Con esta información ella le podrá dar mejor clases a su hijo(a). Este estudio también le proveerá al público información con respecto al aprendizaje de un segundo idioma. Esta información también le servirá a otros estudiantes como su hijo.

**Incentivos o Pagos a los Participantes:** Su hijo(a) y su familia serán invitados a una comida a final del semestre para celebrar el final de la investigación. Dejeme saber si necesita un traductor para la cena. La investigadora correrá con todo los gastos.

**La Confidencialidad de los Archivos de este Estudio:** Los archivos, formularios firmados, y los videos de este estudio serán almacenados bajo llave en mi casa. Los videos serán numerados en secuencia sin ningún otro rotulo. Yo tomaremos notas en un cuaderno con mi nombre y número de telefonos sin ninguna otra información que identifique este cuaderno con los participantes. Los videos y las notas se almacenaran separadamente. Yo le asignare seudonimos a los participantes. Yo mantendré todos estos documentos en mi posesion hasta la defensa de esta investigación. Después, todos estos materiales serán destruidos. El nombre y/o identidad de su hijo(a) no aparecerá en ninguna publicación relacionada con esta investigación.
La Proteccion de los Participantes: Este estudio ha sido revisado y aprobado por el Consejo de Revisiones Institucionales (Institutional Review Board) de la Universidad del Norte de Tejas (University of North Texas).

Los Derechos del Participante:
Su firma asegura que usted ha leido o se le ha leido lo escrito en este documento. En adicion usted asegura que:

- Ella le explico los beneficios y los riesgos posibles de este estudio.
- Usted entiende que usted no tiene que permitirle su hijo(a) que participe de este estudio y si usted decide removerlo a ustedes no se les penalizara ni se les eliminara ninguno de sus derechos o beneficios. La investigadora puede remover a su hijo(a) del estudio en cualquier momento.
- Usted entiende el porque de este estudio y todos sus procedimientos.
- Usted entiende sus derechos como padre o encargado del participante y usted cosiente de su participacion voluntariamente.
- A usted se le dijo que usted iba a recibir una copia de este documento.

Nombre del Padre o Encargado

Firma del Padre o Encargado __________________________ Fecha __________________________

Para el Investigador o la Persona Designada
Yo certifico que he discutido el contenido de este documento con la persona que lo firma. Yo le explique los beneficios y los riesgos posibles de este estudio. Yo opino que esta persona entendio mi explicacion.

Firma __________________________ Fecha __________________________
APPENDIX E

FORMULARIO DE CONSENTIMEIENTO PARA EL PARTICIPANTE
Antes de dar su consentimiento, es importante que usted lea este documento para que usted entienda el propósito y los beneficios de este estudio.

**Título:** Una investigación acerca de la cultura de niños de cuatro años con impedimentos que están aprendiendo un segundo idioma.

**Propósito:** A usted se le pide que le de permiso a su hijo(a) para participe en un estudio que explora la manera en que niños de cuatro años aprenden un segundo idioma.

**Procedimiento:** A su hijo(a) no se le pedirá que haga nada que el/ella no hace en la escuela con regularidad. La maestra está encargada de los estudiantes y la investigadora solo estará tomando notas de lo que está pasando. La investigadora estará escuchando con detenimiento a la maestra y a los estudiantes. La investigadora estará tomando notas acerca de las actividades de la clase y las destrezas de comunicación de los estudiantes. La investigadora filmará la clase para poder observar cómo su hijo(a) usa su lenguaje. La investigadora tomará notas de las palabras, gestos, y otros medios de comunicación usados durante la clase. Después, la investigadora analizará la data y le informará a la maestra los resultados. La investigadora hará sus observaciones por aproximadamente 84 horas.

**Riesgos:** Los riesgos asociados con esta investigación no van más allá de los riesgos comunes asociados con asistir a clases. Yo aseguraré la confidencialidad de los participantes. Los estudiantes, la maestra, o la escuela no serán identificados por nombre en el informe final. La escuela será descrita como una escuela primaria de un distrito escolar pequeño del noreste de Tejas.

**Beneficios para los participantes y otros:** Su hijo(a) se beneficiará de este estudio porque su maestra recibirá información acerca de las actividades más efectivas para el aprendizaje de un segundo idioma. Con esta información ella le podrá dar mejores clases a su hijo(a). Este estudio también le proveerá al público información con respecto al aprendizaje de un segundo idioma. Esta información también le servirá a otros estudiantes como su hijo.

**Incentivos o Pagos a los Participantes:** Su hijo(a) y su familia serán invitados a una comida a la final del semestre para celebrar el final de la investigación. Dejéme saber si necesita un traductor para la cena. La investigadora correrá con todo los gastos.

**La Confidencialidad de los Archivos de este Estudio:** Los archivos, formularios firmados, y los videos de este estudio serán almacenados bajo llave en mi casa. Los videos serán numerados en secuencia sin ningún otro rotulo. Yo tomaré notas en un cuaderno con mi nombre y número de teléfono sin ninguna otra información que identifique este cuaderno con los participantes. Los videos y las notas se almacenarán separadamente. Yo le asignaré seudónimos a los participantes. Yo mantendré todos estos documentos en mi posesión hasta la defensa de esta investigación. Después, todos estos materiales serán destruidos. El nombre y/o identidad de su hijo(a) no aparecerá en ninguna publicación relacionada con esta investigación.

**La Protección de los Participantes:** Este estudio ha sido revisado y aprobado por el Consejo de Revisiones Institucionales (Institutional Review Board) de la Universidad del Norte de Tejas (University of North Texas).
Los Derechos del Participante:
Su firma asegura que usted ha leído o se le ha leído lo escrito en este documento. En adición usted asegura que:
- Ella le explicó los beneficios y los riesgos posibles de este estudio.
- Usted entiende que usted no tiene que permitirle su hijo(a) que participe de este estudio y si usted decide removerlo a ustedes no se le penalizará ni se les eliminará ninguno de sus derechos o beneficios. La investigadora puede remover a su hijo(a) del estudio en cualquier momento.
- Usted entiende el porque de este estudio y todos sus procedimientos.
- Usted entiende sus derechos como padre o encargado del participante y usted cosiente de su participación voluntariamente.
- A usted se le dijo que usted iba a recibir una copia de este documento.

_______________________________  __________________
Nombre del Padre o Encargado      Fecha

Firma del Padre o Encargado  Fecha

Para el Investigador o la Persona Designada
Yo certifico que he discutido el contenido de este documento con la persona que lo firma. Yo le expliqué los beneficios y los riesgos posibles de este estudio. Yo opino que esta persona entendió mi explicación.

_______________________________  __________________
Firma                           Fecha
APPENDIX F

CONSENTEMENT POUR FOCUS CHILDREN
Consentement pour < Focus Children University of North Texas>

Avant d'accorder la participation de votre enfant `a cette e'tude de recherches, il est important que vous lisiez et compreniez l'explication suivante du but et des avantage de l'e'tude et comment elle sera conduite.

**Le titre de l'e'tude:** Une recherché sur la culture de sale de classe pour les enfants handicapes de quantre ans d'apprendre une deuxie'me languae, dans un programme pre'scolaire.

**But de l'etude:** Nous vous demandons de faire participer `a votre enfant `a une e'tude de recherché ce qui nous montra comment les enfants apprennent une nouvelle langue dans un programme de PreKindergarten.

**Proce'dures D'Etude:** Votre enfant fera ce qu'il fait d'habitude dans la sale de classe. Le professeur sera responsable de la sale de classe et le chercheur fera l'enregistrement de ce qui se produit dans la sale de classe. Le chercheur s'coutera sognement votre enfant et le professeur. Le chercheur notera des informations sur les qualifications de la communication devoir enfant et les activite's gu'ils sont implique's dedans. Le chercheur emploiera des materiaux d'enregistrement visual afin de ragarder soigneusement tous les domains d'utilisation de langue. Le chercheur notera toutes les expressions, getes, et toutes les autre methods de communication employe'es par les enfants. Ensuite, le chercheur analysera et fera un compte rendu des resultants au professeur et aux parents. J'observerai les activite's de votre enfant pendant approximativement 42 heures. Je visterai la sale de classe pendant 14 jours, 3 heures par jour.

**Riwques Previsibles:** Cette etude ne porte pas de risques. Je garderai la confidentialite' et la protection des noms des diffe'rents e'tudiants implique's dans l'etude. Les e'tudiants, l'ecole, et les professeurs ne seront pas identifies dans cette etude. L'ecole sera identifie'e comme ecole primaire d'une petite zone au nord-est du Texas.

**Avatages aux participants et aux autres:** Les avantages `a vos e'tudiants sont que les professeurs obtiendront l'informatio nimportante quant au type d'activities qui permettent `a vos enfants d'apprendre une deuxieme langue. Donc, les enfants recevront la meilleure experience e'ducative possible. Nous allons mieux comprendre comment les enfants de PreKindergarten apprennent une nouvelle langue. Ce sera d'un plus grand impact `a d'autres e'tudiants qui ont un historique similaire.

**Compensation pour des participants:** Votre enfant et leur famille seront invites `a me joindre pour un barbeque `a Spring Creek avant la fin de l'annee scolaire afin de feter la fin du projet de recherché. Sit vous souhaitez avoir un interprete, il/elle sera present (e); Le repas sera gratuit.

**Proce'dures afin de maintenir la confidentialite' des dossiers:** Les dossiers de recherches, les formularies de consentement, et toutes les cassettes vide'o seront maintenus dans un coffret verrouille' chez mo9i. Les bandes seront nume'rote sans autre information identifiable. Les notes seront maintenues dans un carnet qui ne contiendra aucune information identifiable autre que mon nom et numero de telephone,. Les bandes et les dossiers seront garde's se'pare de la feuille de nom de codage. J'assignerai des psudonymes `a chacum participant. Je conte maintenir les
disques jusqu’après ma defense de ma recherché. En ce moment là, les feuilles de programmation et toutes les gandes seront détruites. Je maintiendrai la confidentialité d’information individuelle de votre enfant en n’importe quelles publication ou de présentation concernant les résultats de cette étude.

**Revue pour la protection des participants:** Cette étude de recherches a été passée en revue et approuvée par le comité d’examen institutionnel d’UNT(IRB).

**Les Droits Des Participants De Recherches:** Votre signature ci-dessous indique que vous avez lu et que vous comprenez la suivante:

- On vous a informé des avantages et les risques potentiels et/ou les désavantages de l'étude.
- Vous comprenez que vous n’êtes pas obligé de faire participer votre enfant à cette étude, et qu’il n’y a pas de pénalité pour ceci. L’administration d’étude peut choisir d’arrêter les participation de votre enfant à tout moment.
- Vous comprenez pourquoi l’étude existe et comment elle sera exécutée.
- Vous comprenez vos droits autant que parent/guardian d’un participant et vous êtes d’accord de la participation de votre enfant à cette étude.
- Vous étiez informé que vous recevrez une copie de cette forme.

___________________________________
Nom du Parent ou de Gardien

___________________________________
Signature du Parent ou Gardien

___________________________________
Date

Je Certifie que j’ai lu le contenu de cette forme avec le parent ou le gardien signant en haut. J’ai été informé de tous les avantages possibles et les risques potentiels et/ou les désavantages de l’étude.

Il est mon avis que le parent ou le gardien a compris l’explication.

___________________________________
Signature de l’Investigateur Principal

___________________________________
Date
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