



International Reading Association

A membership organization of literacy professionals

Application Report

International Reading Association

Elva Knight Research Grant 2008

Application ID: **EK-08.127**

Current Status: **Approved**

Date Submitted: **1/13/2008**

Application Scores

Judge Name	Recommend Approval	Comments for Applicant	Comments for IRA Staff
1	Yes	This proposal addresses a very important and timely issue. It is justified well, and the plan is appropriate. It takes this field of inquiry to the next level. I look forward to learning its outcomes!	
2	Yes	I found this study to be well-designed and described. It is an essential area of investigation, and I hope that it will be conducted and its findings used to stimulate similar investigations amongst other populations with similar needs.	
3	Yes	This study will provide good information about an important literacy topic. The research questions can be answered using a formative experiment design. This type of research is excellent for the topic described in this proposal. The intervention is creative and atypical, but appropriate for the topic. I think you've designed a very good study that should be a real contribution to the field.	

Scoring Criteria [score range]	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3
Significance of research question [1-5 rating x 4] [4-20]	20	20	16
Rationale for the research [1-5 rating x 4] [4-20]	20	20	16
Adequacy of methods and data treatment [1-5 rating x 5] [5-25]	20	25	20
Significance of project impact [1-5 rating x 2] [2-10]	10	10	8
Clarity and specificity of the text [1-5 rating x 5] [5-25]	25	25	20
Total Score	95	100	80

Application Data

Short Title	African American Students' Linguistic Development
Short Summary	This formative experiment investigates an additive model of language instruction that supports culturally and linguistically diverse high school students as they develop an understanding of the power of their written and spoken language patterns as well as the appropriateness of using a particular register with a particular audience. Also studied will be their responses to developing their personal understandings that knowledge of a variety of registers provides them with opportunities to increase their power of communication across situations and audience. Findings hold promise for all who engage in conversations about teaching and learning practices of for linguistically diverse students.
Application Type	Individual
Requested Amount	\$10,000
Research Methods	Descriptive Research; Other
Grade Levels	High School
Referral Source	Web site

Application Team

Applicant

Name	Institution	E-Mail	Phone
Douglas Fisher	Health Sciences High	???	???

Co-Applciant

Name	Institution	E-Mail	Phone
Diane Lapp	San Diego State University	???	???

Project Description

You will be able to update and edit until you submit your application. Save changes as you work and return at any time to complete the application. Do not include the name(s) of the submitter(s) and institutional affiliation(s). APA style and format guidelines should be followed. Do not use underline, bold or italic text.

1. Full Project Title *

(150 characters maximum)

Expanding African American High School Students' Personal Ideologies and Linguistic Prowess

2. Abstract *

(700 characters maximum) Describe the purpose, method, and potential significance of the proposed research.

This formative experiment investigates an additive model of language instruction that supports culturally and linguistically diverse high school students as they develop an understanding of the power of their written and spoken language patterns as well as the appropriateness of using a particular register with a particular audience. Also studied will be their responses to developing their personal understandings that knowledge of a variety of registers provides them with opportunities to increase their power of communication across situations and audience. Findings hold promise for all who engage in conversations about teaching and learning practices of for linguistically diverse students.

3. Proposed Support Start Date *

(mm/dd/yyyy)

08/15/2008

4. Proposed Support End Date *

(mm/dd/yyyy)

10/31/2009

5. Research Description *

(10,000 characters maximum) The description of the proposed research should be as specific as possible and follow the type of outline used for typical dissertation or sponsored research proposals. The description should be limited to and include the following elements:

Research Question - Identify the research question, problem, or hypothesis being studied.

Rationale - Provide a rationale for the study. Relate the research question to the relevant, supporting research literature or to some existing database. Discuss how previous research findings or assumptions suggest that your study is significant.

Knowledge regarding the history and development of the African American language has been advanced by numerous scholars who have moved others across disciplines to think beyond the study of the structure of speaking; beyond the study of phonology, morphology and syntax to an expanded view of how one uses language to learn and to share their thinking in the social contexts of their homes, communities, and the organizations in which they are active participants (Baugh, 1999; Bell, 2004; Cazden, John, & Hymes, 1972; Dillard, 1972; Flores, Teft, & Diaz, 1991; Heath, 1983; Lee, 2007; Lipski, 2005; Richardson, 2003; Smitherman, 1977; Stockman, 1996).

This expanded view of the utility of language supports conversations and investigations regarding the relationship between one's language and one's access to desired situational and personal mobility and opportunity (Edwards, 2007; Hymes, 1972; Smitherman, 1995). To more fully understand the relationships between language, its use at home, and its utility in the school community researchers have been moved to work directly with African American speakers of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) in their homes and community settings (Bell, 2001; Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005; Fisher, 2004; Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Scott & Marcus, 2001). What is clear from this work is that students who speak AAVE have a repertoire of language experiences that can be drawn from as a means to impact their academic and school successes.

As a result, innovative ideas related to improving instruction for African American students have been shared by many scholars (Ancess 2003; Ball, 1996, 1997; 2002; Edwards, 2004; Foster, 1991; Gutierrez & Rogoff, 2003; Sizemore 2007; Smitherman, 1992).

Unfortunately there still exists a need to attend to the issue introduced by Cazden, John and Hymes (1972) that instruction must support and grow from the power of the language varieties used by African American speakers while being cognizant of the racist implications of rejection of any language variety that is not Academic English.

Building from this work we ask the following two questions in an attempt to incorporate this sociolinguistic sensitivity to our instructional practice that will provide our students with in-school literacy experiences that emerge as an extension of their home literacy practices.

Research Questions

- Can we create an instructional intervention model for students who speak African American English vernacular that supports their understanding of academic English as an additive variation of their home language?
- Can sensitivity to academic English be developed through language experiences in which students study the written and spoken discourse patterns of historically prominent African American leaders from many arenas (e.g., historians, poets, musicians, educators) and then use these as a basis to analyze their and others personal written and spoken discourse patterns?

Rationale for the Research

As we engage in conversations with the high school students we teach, we are awed by the wide range of topics on which they are conversant. True the breadth is often more comprehensive than the depth; but indeed they have only lived sixteen or seventeen years. Hail to the Internet that allows any topic to be only a click or two away. We are also as equally disheartened when these students who speak AAVE as their home language receive failing grades on the state English test that is required for graduation because of their lack of use of the conventions of Academic English. While we know, appreciate and applaud the in-depth ideas these students use to create their spoken and written discourse, we also understand the discontinuity they experience between their home and school languages, and, like it or not, we also know the reality of this exam and the power it has over their future. We understand that this exam is situated in the American society where there exists a range of thinking and acceptance about language variation. As Hymes (1981) noted "it may sometimes seem that there are only two kinds of English in the United States, good English and bad English" (p. v). He further states, "the United States is a country rich in many things, but poor in knowledge of itself with regard to language" (p. v). There also exists a profile about those who do not speak what is believed to be the good English (Bernstein, 1970). This profile promulgates a deficit image of the speaker as well as the speaker's language which, when played out in schools and professional situations that require the "good" English, propels the profiled speaker in a downward spiral of failure. Our concern is that our students, who are speakers of Black English Vernacular (BEV), are lumped within this profile.

Like other teachers with this realization, we want our students to have the knowledge they need to succeed in any venture they attempt; and as their teachers we feel that one of our major tasks is to provide them with the supports they will need to move with linguistic ease among the experiential landscapes of their homes and school and into a world full of new possibilities awaiting their exploration.

Being mindful of the linguistic debates that foreground the belief that success is tied to being able to give voice to ones ideas in a standard English format as well as those who argue that expecting standard English usage of all students is promulgated racial discrimination (Baugh 2000; Lee, 1997; Richardson, 2003; Wolfram et al., 1999), we wonder how we can teach our students about language variation without disparaging their homes and communities. We continually study various instructional moves that will suggest to our students that there are different variations of English; that, for example, their home language of Black English vernacular (BEV) which is rule-governed at the syntactic and semantic levels has a long history of contributing to the artistic, literary and political accomplishments of African American people and that many prominent speakers of Black English also know and use an academic English variation when they decide it is situationally efficient. Through our instruction we strive to convey a model of different but not deficit (Gorski, 2006); a model that eradicates classism rather than one that attempts to repair economically poor children (Payne, 2005); a model that affords our students choices of the structures they select to use to communicate their ideas to various audiences.

Aware of those who will broker the power decisions about their future post-secondary school and work applications, interviews, positions and successes, we worry about students whose home language is not a close variation of standard English. While we believe that these power brokers should come to know the depth of thoughtfulness of ideas, arguments, and reasoning (Lee, 2005; 2006; 2007) presented in voices and grammars that may not sound like their own we heed the words of Delpit (1995) that "we all interpret behaviors, information, and situations through our own cultural lenses; these lenses operate involuntarily, below the level of conscious awareness, making it seem that our own view is simply 'the way it is'" (p. 151). These will be the lenses of the people making judgments that affect the futures of these students who are from cultures that have been historically disenfranchised and have consequently not experienced academic achievement. These are our students, those for whom classroom practice must be developed with the goal being to provide them with opportunities to develop a continuum of language that results in preparing them to successfully move, by choice, among speakers of the language varieties they will encounter at home, school, and their future worlds.

To this end we believe that we must provide avenues of learning that afford these students opportunities to expand their ways of knowing and expressing their ideas through authoritative voices that will not be at odds with those in seats of power. We believe that as a teachers we must provide our students with opportunities to expand their language registers by observing how many leaders from their home language culture switched language registers to share their ideas and arguments when they chose to do so. The key to this instruction is to arm students with linguistic knowledge that affords them the power of this same choice.

We believe that our work in this area is two pronged; to expand the knowledge platform of these power brokers through our public discourse while remaining mindful that Edwards (2007) implored all educators to ensure that all children have all of the language registers they need to succeed in situations outside of their homes. To this end this research will focus on the study of experiences that provide students with opportunities to use their indigenous home languages (Smitherman & vanDijk, 1988) to explore other structured language varieties (Labov, 1972) and their situational usage patterns. The primary goal being for students to have the language facility to reason and structure arguments in both their native vernacular and academic English. Their having this continuum of linguistic knowledge will ensure that their literacy "is not a single entity that occurs in different contexts, but a social practice that varies according to the particular use to which it is put in each context" (Ball & Farr, 2003, p. 435). It is our intent to design an instructional intervention that serves as a bridge rather than a barrier between the home literacy and school literacy practices of our students so that they will be able sustain and create successful language relationships within whatever domains become the social and professional realities of their futures.

Methodology

You will be able to update and edit until you submit your application. Do not include the name(s) of the submitter(s) and institutional affiliation(s). APA style and format guidelines should be followed.

6. Methodology *

(10,000 characters maximum) Describe the subjects or informants that will be used to answer the identified research questions. Where appropriate, describe the subjects, materials, and procedures. Consider the following:

- Sample Methods - procedures and description
- Data Collection

- Instrumentation
- Procedures – materials; and detailed timeline and work plan
- Data Analysis - framework and procedures

Given the clearly articulated pedagogical goal and a lack of information about effective interventions for facilitating the use of academic English among speakers of AAVE without compromising their rich language use at home, the most appropriate methodology for this study is a formative experiment (Newman, 1990; Reinking & Bradley, 2008). Formative experiments have been used to study engagement in reading of beginning English language learners (Ivey & Broaddus, 2007), the use of computers to affect reading and writing (Reinking & Pickle, 1993), vocabulary learning (Baumann, Ware, & Edwards, 2007), and the effectiveness of cognitive strategy instruction for Latina/o readers (Jiminez, 1997). Formative experiments allow for inquiry and investigation using both qualitative and quantitative traditions. Formative experiments focus on what it takes to achieve a pedagogical goal as well as the factors that inhibit or enhance the effectiveness of the intervention (Reinking & Bradley, 2004).

Our study will borrow from Reinking and Watkins (1998)'s procedures (numbered below) to develop, refine, and confirm an intervention approach for facilitating standard English with a group of 16-18-year-old African American students.

It is important to note that we have secured a location for the study. We have access to a group of high school teachers and students in southern California. We collaboratively teach and study instructional practice with the teachers whose teaching experiences span from one to thirty years. 90% of these teachers have completed a MA degree. The school has a formal partnership with us to conduct this experiment. Our target student population will be 91 African-American students who speak BVE and are in the 10th or 11th grades. 100% of these students live in poverty.

1. Identify and justify a valued pedagogical goal.

We have identified the pedagogical goal of increasing African American students' use of academic English while maintaining their rich home language. The justification for this goal was outlined in the opening of this paper and is well-documented in the research literature. Our goal is complex as we want to ensure that students understand that their home language is a valuable one and that they can converse outside of home in other ways that are equally valuable.

2. Specify an instructional intervention and provide a rationale for why it might potentially be effective.

In their 10th or 11th grade English class, a group of African American students will receive instruction focused on language registers, techniques writers and speakers use in persuasion, and professional conversation. Consistent with inquiry approaches, students will develop criteria for evaluating speeches and written documents and then will apply these criteria to evaluate the written and oral structures of persuasion used by many African American speakers and writers in business, government, journalism, literature, entertainment, medicine, religion, science and technology, the military who have shared their ideas with various audiences through written and spoken academic English. These will include but not limited to notables such as E.B. DuBois, Arthur Ashe, Carol Moseley Braun, Oprah Winfrey, Kayne West, Joan E. Higginbotham, Toni Morrison, Colin Powell, Rita Dove, Condoleezza Rice and Barak Obama, as well as locally known personalities such as newscasters, sports figures, educators, and politicians. Doing so will expose them to the importance of selecting language, syntax and diction that conveys the intended message to the intended message (Flower, 1994).

Through observation and discussion students will come to realize the power of knowing one's audience. The task gains authenticity because these students will then be asked to create persuasive oral and written discourse to be shared with readers of *The New York Times*, *Ebony Magazine* and members of their family. This will encourage them to understand that language is additive and that all of their registers are powerful and appropriate depending on the audience. Other intervention experiences that will be studied with this same intent include:

- inviting students to rewrite and record in BVE the academic statements of African American and Anglo speakers from speakers and writers in business, government, journalism, literature, entertainment, medicine, religion, science and technology, the military. This will add some levity to the instructional process as well as provide them with and opportunity to discuss the mismatch between the audience and the selected language vernacular.
- creating personal video journals of themselves speaking in both BVE and academic English. This will provide them the opportunity to view themselves as public speakers and to consider the audience to whom they are speaking.
- using a Language Experience Approach to develop an understanding of the relationship between spoken and written forms of language and an understanding of the different registers commonly used with each.

3. Collect data to determine which factors in the educational environment enhance or inhibit the specified intervention's effectiveness.

Formative experiments require regular collection and analysis of data to determine next steps for intervention. We will collect daily teaching plans, weekly observational field notes, weekly video recordings of students in class, bi-weekly interviews with students, monthly interviews with their content teachers regarding the transfer of their language knowledge to new academic situations, all student work products assigned by the teachers, monthly common formative assessment scores, and our own daily journal entries.

As noted by Reinking and Bradley (2008), "unlike other dominant research methodologies in education research, conceptualizing and conducting formative and design experiments are not driven mainly by a particular method of collecting and analyzing data" (p. 21). Our plan for data collection includes a number of qualitative tools as well as formal measures of achievement. We will meet weekly, on Friday afternoons, to review the data collected for the week and to reevaluate the factors that have accelerated or hindered the intervention. We understand that this will require several hours every Friday as we will use a constant comparative method to identify emerging hypotheses and to identify the specific components of the intervention should be continued and which should be modified.

4. Use data to modify the intervention to achieve the pedagogical goal more efficiently and effectively.

The intervention we have designed to start the study is based on the thinking of some of the best scholars in the field. However, these recommendations have not been put into practice as an intervention with a group of students. As with all formative experiments, we expect to modify the intervention to achieve the pedagogical goal along the way. As we do so, we will document each change, the reasons for the change, and the impact the change had on student engagement, behavior, learning, and achievement.

5. Consider what positive or negative effects the intervention is producing beyond those associated with the pedagogical goal.

As we conduct this formative experiment, we will regularly analyze our notes and other sources of data for unanticipated results. We expect that the systematic nature of formative experiments will allow us to collect a great deal of information about students and their responses to schooling.

6. Consider the extent to which the educational environment has changed as a result of the intervention.

As outlined in #3, we will routinely collect information about the educational environment and how it is changing. One important aspect of teaching students to use standard English as needed is changing the perspectives of people around them such that other language registers and structures are recognized as appropriate based on the audience and context. In addition, we expect to identify a number of

changes that occur in the educational environment as we shine our research light on this particular pedagogical goal.

Procedures

As we have noted, we will be working with a group of teachers and approximately 91 African American students. In this University/School collaborative we have the roles of teacher mentor as well as teaching colleagues since we also teach these students. During the course of one academic school year, we will implement and evaluate the intervention using a formative experiment through the ever-developing pedagogy we have identified earlier. Our timeline includes:

August

- Obtaining the speeches and written discourse of the identified leaders.
- Obtaining class schedules and parent consent.

September

- Collecting initial writing samples from the students that discuss the value of owning multiple language registers. This will allow us to obtain both writing and attitude samples related to the topic of study.
- Collecting attitude samples from the teachers regarding their beliefs about academic English and language variations. This will provide insights about how teachers view BVE.
- Beginning conversations with students regarding language usage

October –June

- Implementing, evaluating, and revising the instructional intervention plan through weekly reviews of the data collection
- Collecting and studying the intervention process through analysis of teachers' daily teaching plans, weekly observational field notes collected by research assistant, weekly video recordings of students in class, bi-weekly interviews with students, monthly interviews with their content teachers regarding the transfer of their language knowledge to new academic situations, all student work products assigned by the teachers, monthly common formative assessment scores, and our own daily journal entries.

July-August

- Summarizing findings for conference presentations and journal articles

Research Significance

You will be able to update and edit until you submit your application. Do not include the name(s) of the submitter(s) and institutional affiliation(s). APA style and format guidelines should be followed.

7. What populations will benefit, in what ways? *

(10,000 characters maximum) Discuss the potential impact of your work on research and practice in literacy.

Importantly, as Ivey and Broaddus (2007) note, "Formative experiments leave open the possibility for creating interventions that are actually responsive to a particular group of students in a particular context" (p. 515). This is true of the research we have proposed since the focus of this research is an investigation of an instructional intervention, which is designed to enhance the oral and written language patterns of African American students. The significance of these findings will have far reaching implications.

Our intent is to garner a better understanding of classroom practice that supports culturally and linguistically diverse students as they develop an understanding of the power of their written and spoken language patterns as well as the appropriateness of using a particular register, which is characterized by different tones and language markers, with a particular audience. We will further examine student responses to developing their personal understandings that knowledge of a variety of registers provides them with opportunities to increase their power of communication across situations and audience. The feasibility of accomplishing these goals as an additive model of sociolinguistic language development will be the first area of significance resulting from this study. These findings will have wide generalizability to similar populations of students.

Because we believe the teacher is vital to a student's successful school experience, we will be studying the development of this instructional intervention model with the classroom teachers of these students. These teachers are very willing associates because they realize that the significance of one's language and linguistic knowledge are resources that ensure success in one's home, school, and future world communities. As we develop and study this curriculum together we will all come to more fully realize our roles in "allowing bidialectal students' voices to be heard, legitimized, and leveraged within their classrooms" (Ball, 2005, p. 283). These understandings will also have wide generalizability for teachers regarding how their attitudes as well as their practice profoundly affect the language knowledge and use across situations for culturally and linguistically diverse populations of students. We also plan to share this information with our teacher educator colleagues across the country who design and implement teacher education programs. The model of language instruction that we are investigating is grounded in the belief that a child's success in school can be ensured if instruction builds upon and with home literacy practices and language. This mindset replaces a unidirectional approach to a bidirectional approach to home-school interaction and appreciation as the basis for instruction. The unidirectional approach has a rich history of causing dissonance for those students whose home environment and language are very different from that of their school because the home and the school convey different, often conflicting, messages about academic expectations, language, and educational and social values to the child (Comer, 1980). A bidirectional approach, which support a relationship where families and educators co-construct school ideologies, offers a clearly articulated unified message of literacy expectations and possibilities. In the process of this co-construction educators come to know, understand and respect the home ideologies of families within the school community. They begin to understand their student's home literacy practices as well as how they can draw from these to support the student's continued language and literacy development. This co-construction eliminates a one-way view because the families also are invited to share and develop the school ideologies. The result of this synchronization will hopefully be a fuller understanding and acceptance about language, culture, learning, and differences shared by all members within each student's world as well as a unified voice about literacy expectations and possibilities. Because of this information becoming a part of the preparation of teachers it will also reach the parents of the students they teach.

In addition to strengthening the school curriculum and preparation of these teachers and other educators to whom this information can be generalized we plan to reach administrators and policymakers through the oral and written publication of our findings. The impact this information can have on administrators and policymaking is also far reaching and crucial if change based on the advancements that continue to occur in our understanding of language instruction as a result of findings from sociolinguistically based research is to become educational policy that is supported by funding. Once this happens we can hope to see mandated changes in assessments, teaching materials and teacher preparation programs. These changes will indicate that the dominant view that there are cognitive and social limitations to the use of language registers that are not related to academic or standard English usage are being expanded to suggest that there are multiple ways of knowing and sharing information. This view is supported by "overwhelming evidence that children, and

indeed all neurologically normal speakers, have a repertoire of linguistic resources upon which to draw for social meanings" (Health, 2001, p. xvii-xviii).

Our procedural plan is to begin this conversation with the policymakers within our own state. This is very possible since one of us is the Co-Director of the Center for the Advancement of Reading, a statewide organization with significant involvement in state-level policy in reading language arts. This position allows direct communication with state legislators, state board members, state language arts framework authors, state department of education staff members, and teacher credentialing officials.

In conclusion the significance of the dissemination of these findings will impact our students and many other students who have traditionally been devalued because their home language is an unfamiliar discourse to their teachers. Our goal is that they become full members of the learning community with an expanded knowledge about their language and its relationship to a wide range of audiences. This information will ensure them the power to decide how they will to share their messages.

As these findings reach teacher educators, principals, and legislators plans for ensuring that schools and homes work to establish a bidirectional message about language and learning will become a reality that is obvious through curriculum, assessments, materials, and instruction. This same sensitivity and mutual respect will become obvious as teachers implement as additive model of language instruction that supports literacy learning for all of their students.

These findings hold great promise for all constituents who engage in conversations about appropriate teaching and learning practices for linguistically and culturally diverse students.

Bibliography

You will be able to update and edit until you submit your application. Use a reference consistent with English bibliographic format such as American Psychological Association (APA) style. To accommodate the blind review process, if the submitter's own publications are cited in such a way as to give away his/her identity, then the submitter should substitute the word "Author" in the citations (e.g., Author, 2003). Do not use underline, bold or italic text.

8. Bibliography *

(10,000 characters maximum) Provide complete bibliographic information for all sources cited in the research proposal.

- Ancess, J. (2003). *Beating the odds: High schools as communities of commitment*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ball, A. (1996). Expository writing patterns of African-American students. *English Journal*, 85(1), 27-36.
- Ball, A. (1997). Expanding the dialogue on culture as a critical component when assessing writing. *Assessing Writing*, 4(2), 169-202.
- Ball, A. (2002). Three decades of research on classroom life: Illuminating the classroom communicative lives of America's at-risk students. In W. Secada (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education* (Vol.26, pp. 71-112). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Ball, A., & Farr, M. (2003). Language variations, culture and teaching the English language arts. In J. Flood, D. Lapp, J. Squire & J. Jensen (2003), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (2nd ed., pp. 435-445). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Baugh, J. (1999). *Out of the mouths of slaves: African American language and educational malpractice*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Baugh, J. (2000). *Beyond ebonics: Linguistic pride and racial prejudice*. US: Oxford University Press.
- Baumann, J. F., Ware, D., & Edwards, E. C. (2007). "Bumping into spicy, tasty words that catch your tongue": A formative experiment on vocabulary instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 61, 108-122.
- Bell, C. (2004). *The sanity of survival: reflections on community mental health*. Chicago: Third World Press.
- Bernstein, B. (1970). Social class, language, and socialization. In P. P. Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and social context: Selected Readings* (pp. 157-178). London: Penguin.
- Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, M. B., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A microethnographic perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cazden, C., John, V. P., & Hymes, D. (1972) *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Dillard, J. L. (1972). *Black English: Its history and usage in the United States*. New York: Random House.
- Edwards, P. A. (2007). *The education of African American students: Voicing the debates, controversies and solutions*. Presidential address to the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.
- Edwards, P. A. (2004). *Children's literacy development: Making it happen through home, school, and community connections*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Fisher, M. T. (2004). "The song is unfinished": The new literate and the literary institutions. *Written Communication*, 21(3), 290-312.
- Flores, B., Teft, P., & Diaz, E. (1991). Transforming deficit myths about learning, language and culture. *Language Arts*, 68, 369-378
- Foster, M. (1991). Constancy, connectedness, and constraints in the lives of African American women teachers. *National Association of Women's Studies Journal*, 3, 70-97.
- Gonzales, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practice in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gorski, P. (2006). *Savage unrealities. Rethinking schools*. 21, 2. http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/21_02/sava212.shtml
- Gutierrez, K., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 19-25.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Heath, S. B. (2001). Foreword. In J.L. Harris, A. G. Kamhi, & K. E. Pollock (Eds.), *Literacy in African American Communities* (pp. xv-xx). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hymes, D. (1981). Foreword. In C. Ferguson & S. B. Heath (Eds.), *Language in the USA* (pp. v-ix). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2007). A formative experiment investigating literacy engagement among adolescent Latina/o students just beginning to read, write, and speak English. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42, 512-545.
- Jimenez, R. T. (1997). The strategic reading abilities and potential of five low-literacy Latina/o readers in middle school. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 32, 224-243.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in Black English vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lee, C. D. (1997). Bridging home and school literacies: A model of culturally responsive teaching. In J. Flood, S. B. Heath & D. Lapp (Eds.), *A handbook for literacy educators: Research on teaching the communicative and visual arts* (pp. 330-341). New York: Macmillan.
- Lee, C. D. (2005). Double-voiced discourse: African American Vernacular English as resource in cultural modeling classrooms. In A. Ball & S.W. Freedman (Eds.), *New literacies for new times: Bakhtinian perspectives on language, literacy, and learning for the 21st century* (pp.

129-147). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, C. D. (2006). Every good-bye ain't gone: Analyzing the cultural underpinnings of classroom talk. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(3), 305-327.

Lee, C. D. (2007). *Culture, literacy and learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Newman, D. (1990). Opportunities for research on the organization impact of school computers. *Educational Researcher*, 19(3), 8-13.

Lipski, J. (2005). *A history of Afro-Hispanic language: Five centuries, five continents*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moss, B. J. (2001). From the pews to the classroom: Influences of the African American church on Academic literacy. In Harris, J. L., Kamhi, A.G., & Pollock, K.E. (Eds.), *Literacy in African American Communities* (pp. 195-212). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Payne, R. K. (2005). *A framework for understanding poverty* (4th ed). Highlands, TX: aha! Process, Inc.

Richardson, E. (2003). *African American literacies*. New York: Routledge.

Reinking, D., & Bradley, B. A. (2004, December). Formative experiments as mixed methodology research in literacy. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX.

Reinking, D., & Bradley, B. A. (2007). *On formative and design experiments: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Reinking, D., & Pickle, J. M. (1993). Using a formative experiment to study how computers affect reading and writing in classrooms. *National Reading Conference Yearbook*, 42, 263-270.

Reinking, D., & Watkins, J. (1998). Balancing change and understanding in literacy research through formative experiments. *National Reading Conference Yearbook*, 47, 461-471.

Scott, J. C., Marcus, C. D. (2001). Emergent Literacy: Home-School Connections. In J. L. Harris, A. G. Kamhi, & K. E. Pollock (Eds.), *Literacy in African American communities* (pp. 77-98). Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Sizemore, B. (2007). *Walking in circles: The black struggle for school reform*. Chicago: Third World Press.

Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Smitherman, G. (1992). Black English, diverging or converging? The view from the National Assessment of Educational Progress. *Language and Education*, 61(1), 47-61.

Smitherman, G. (1995). Students' right to their own language. A retrospective. *English Journal*, 84(1), 21-27.

Smitherman, G., & van Dijk, T.A. (Eds.). (1988). *Discourse and discrimination*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University.

Stockman, I. (1996). Phonological development and disorders in African American children. In A. G. Kamhi, K. E. Pollock & J. L. Harris (Eds.), *Communication development and disorders in African American children: research, assessment and intervention* (pp. 117-154). Baltimore: Brookes.

Wolfram, W., Adger, C. T., & Christian, D. (1999). *Dialects in schools and communities*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Budget

Describe and explain the rationale for each budget line item. Enter "0" in amount and "none" in descriptor if necessary. For more information please review budget guideline.

9. Personnel Amount

\$5,000

10. Personnel description and rationale

(200 characters maximum)

\$3000 for a research assistant who will maintain research files and enter data into databases and \$2000 for an observer who can record observational notes for inclusion on our data analysis.

11. Materials Amount

\$0

12. Materials description and rationale

(200 characters maximum)

None

13. Travel Amount

\$1,000

14. Travel description and rationale

(200 characters maximum)

Support for travel and registration for an educational conference to present findings

15. Computer Amount

\$0

16. Computer description and rationale

(200 characters maximum)

None

17. Office Expenses Amount

\$600

18. Office description and rationale

(200 characters maximum)

These funds will be used for photocopying and office supplies

19. Clerical Support Amount

\$3,000

20. Clerical description and rationale

(200 characters maximum)

These funds will support a clerical assistant who will be available for transcribing interviews, typing of materials, compiling reports, copying research instruments, etc.

21. Other Amount

\$400

22. Other description and rationale

(200 characters maximum)

This will be used to reimburse mileage to and from research site

23. Amount of outside funding

\$3,600

24. Sources of outside project-related funding (if none, enter "none")

(200 characters maximum)

The school has offered to match the photocopying bill (up to \$600) and the clerical support (up to \$300)

25. Total Project Budget *

\$10,000

Advisor Contact Information

Provide contact information for the major advisor, dean or department head who will sponsor your application.

26. Advisor First Name *

???

27. Advsior Last Name *

???

28. Advisor Title *

???

29. Institution Name *

???

30. Department *

???

31. Address1 *

???

32. Address2

33. City *

San Diego

34. State/Province *

CA

35. Zip/Postal code *

92123

36. Country *

USA

37. Advisor E-mail *

???

School Official Contact Information

If this is a teacher-initiated research project, enter contact information for the school official who can verify employment status and permission to conduct research.

38. Is this a teacher-initiated research project?

(If yes, enter contact information for school official.)

Yes

39. School Official First Name

???

40. School Official Last Name

???

41. School Official Title

???

42. Institution Name

Health Sciences High

43. Department

???

44. School Official E-mail

???

45. School Official Phone

???