



A publication of the
New York State Association
for Bilingual Education

Journal of Multilingual Education Research

Volume 7 *Rethinking Preschool Education through
Bilingual Universal Pre-Kindergarten: Opportunities
and Challenges (2016/2017)*

Article 4

2017

Talking about Language in Pre-school: The Use of Video-Stimulated Recall with Emergent Bilingual Children

P. Zitlali Morales

University of Illinois at Chicago, zitlali@uic.edu

Joseph C. Rumenapp

Judson University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://fordham.bepress.com/jmer>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), and the [Early Childhood Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Morales, P. Zitlali and Rumenapp, Joseph C. (2017) "Talking about Language in Pre-school: The Use of Video-Stimulated Recall with Emergent Bilingual Children," *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*: Vol. 7 , Article 4.

Available at: <http://fordham.bepress.com/jmer/vol7/iss1/4>

This Article on Theory and Research is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalResearch@Fordham. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Multilingual Education Research by an authorized editor of DigitalResearch@Fordham. For more information, please contact jwatson9@fordham.edu.



Talking about Language in Pre-school: The Use of Video-Stimulated Recall with Emergent Bilingual Children

Cover Page Footnote

P. Zitlali Morales, PhD, is Associate Professor of Curriculum & Instruction in the College of Education, and affiliated faculty of the Latin American and Latino Studies (LALS) program at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). Dr. Morales examines the language practices of Latinx youth and linguistic interactions of students and teachers in bilingual classrooms. She works in teacher education to prepare teachers to meet their multilingual students' needs by leveraging their linguistic skills and cultural knowledge. Dr. Morales is co-PI of a National Science Foundation funded project studying the digital literacy practices and transnational ties of immigrant youth.

Joseph C. Rumenapp, PhD, is an Assistant Professor of Literacy Education at Judson University where he teaches coursework on educational linguistics, ESL and bilingual education, and research methods. Having previously worked in school and youth contexts in Chicago, his research focuses on promoting more equitable learning opportunities through understanding language ideologies in urban education and how discourse analysis can be used as a tool for teacher professional development.

Notes:

Students who have previously been identified as limited English proficient (LEP) or English language learners (ELLs), are more recently being described as “emergent bilinguals” (García & Kleifgen, 2010) in order to place emphasis on the abilities they are developing, rather than their supposed deficiencies. In early childhood, another commonly used term is “dual language learners”, especially in the state of Illinois. In this article, we use the term emergent bilinguals and note where the label “English learners” is used in legislation or other sources.

Talking about Language in Preschool: The Use of Video-Stimulated Recall with Emergent Bilingual Children

P. Zitlali Morales

University of Illinois at Chicago

Joseph C. Rumenapp

Judson University

After first discussing the ideologies (standard and monolingual) implicit in language education in the United States, we argue for a necessary ideological shift in the way multiple languages and other forms of semiotic communication are understood, used, and supported in preschool for emergent bilinguals. We present examples from a preschool study in Illinois where emergent bilingual children in two classrooms used video-stimulated accounts to make sense of their actions. Students used multiple semiotic resources – including English, Spanish, and embodiment – to collaborate with others and represent their ideas. Our findings include evidence of language awareness and awareness of audience in choosing the language of interaction. We argue that very often, preschool teachers are not taught to support or encourage students' use of languages other than English, even in classrooms designated as bilingual. Implications are discussed for universal preschool with growing numbers of students with multilingual abilities.

Keywords: emergent bilinguals, preschool, video-stimulated recall, language ideologies, Cultural Historical Activity Theory.

The goals of most early childhood educational institutions in the United States rationally focus on preparing students for K-12 education. However, in the urgency get students ready for kindergarten, most of these settings do not currently take advantage of the full linguistic repertoires of preschool students or the knowledge base they bring from home. The *Preschool for All* initiative (U.S. Office of the Press Secretary, 2013) allows us to rethink the goals and approaches to preschool education generally, and it invites us to address more intentionally the goals and approaches in bilingual preschool programs. To rethink the onset of learning through early schooling, in this article we posit our support for bilingual education, while paying particular attention to how it is enacted.

While K-12 education in the United States has been mediated by institutionalized language ideologies, both in policy and practice (Schmidt, 2000; Spolsky, 2004), we argue that the language ideologies upon which bilingual programs are built must be made explicit and challenged. In our view, despite some recent policy shifts that support bilingual education (such as the state of Illinois requiring bilingual

preschool to be made available), underlying ideologies embedded in instruction may not support multilingualism, but rather support assimilation and language loss. The preschool context is an ideal forum to explore what is possible because at this educational level, students are developing language skills, and teachers encourage language production broadly. Additionally, early childhood educators learn to use play to mediate the learning context (Berk & Winsler, 1995), and thus, provide more expansive possibilities for language use. It is in the playing with, or manipulation of, language that students grow and are socialized into language use (Ochs, 2000; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1990, 2012).

In this article, we describe a study that took place in an urban preschool located in a predominantly Latino community, in the state of Illinois. As researchers, we used an instructional strategy called stimulated accounts (e.g., Theobald, 2012) to allow preschool children to talk about their language use. After we describe the methods used in the study, examples are provided of emergent bilingual¹ children engaged in early literacy activities. Through the discussion of findings, we call attention to the diverse ways these bilingual children use language and are aware of different ways language can be used to communicate meaning. Additionally, we examine the use of multiple resources, theorizing how we can positively utilize the tools that multilingual preschoolers already have at their disposal. These examples allowed us to see what children can and are doing with language in the preschool classroom. Often what they did far exceeded our expectations of what we thought they could do.

In the conclusions, we argue that pre-kindergarten education must be re-envisioned in ways that include expanded possibilities for linguistic and cultural diversity. Young children use language in novel and creative ways by drawing on multiple semiotic resources, such as oral language, body movement, and pointing to other signs and symbols, and they are aware of doing so. However, language ideologies found in the bilingual program observed do not necessarily allow for these possibilities to be sustained. Any discussion of current bilingual education practices and policies must analyze the language ideologies underlying policies, programs, and practice; otherwise, we continue to perpetuate standardized and monolingual language ideologies (Farr & Song, 2011).

Literature Review

Language Ideologies and Language Education in the US

Education policy in the United States has generally followed the monoglot standard (Silverstein, 1996) belief, that the nation is bound together through a standardized language policy, needed for mass communication and mass education. Language policy is comprised of both the explicit stances toward language encoded in written policy artifacts, and also in the unwritten beliefs about language held by people unofficially in a society (Spolsky, 2004). These beliefs about language have been theorized as language ideologies (Kroskrity, 2000, 2010; Pennycook, 2013; Razfar & Rumenapp, 2012; Schieffelin, Woolard, & Kroskrity, 1998; Siegal, 2006; Silverstein, 1979; Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994).

Education both forms and is formed by language ideologies because language is used as a medium of instruction and a target of instruction. Two language ideologies particularly relevant to education in the United States are the standard language ideology, or the assumption of and bias toward a homogenous language structure (Lippi-Green, 1997; Milroy & Milroy, 1999; Silverstein, 1996); and the monolingual language ideology, or the idea that monolingualism is the norm (Blackledge, 2000; Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998; Woolard, 1998), when in actuality, bilinguals/multilinguals represent between half to two-thirds of the world's population (Baker, 2006). The English-only movement in the United States is one of the manifestations of these ideologies, but it can also be seen globally in the social value of "correctness" in relation to language varieties (Lippi-Green, 1997; Martínez, 2017; Siegal, 2006; Whittingham, Hoffman, & Rumenapp, 2016; Wiley & Lukes, 1996). Even without English-only policies, standard language ideologies and monolingual language ideologies are fundamental to many bilingual programs in the form of *parallel monolingualism* (Heller, 2006). Fitts (2006), for example, examined how a fifth grade dual language program generally allotted for either Spanish or English at particular times and in particular contexts. This created spaces that were *monolingual*, and although there was a goal of bilingualism and biliteracy, the dominant assumption was that languages were to remain separated.

Subtractive forms of bilingual education, in which a first language is used for the sole purpose of learning English, for example, are subtle purveyors of the two language ideologies. Though some may advocate for additive forms of bilingual education in which both languages are learned and maintained, thereby possibly contesting the language ideology of monolingualism, they take up the notion of bilingualism as a plurality of singular languages. That is, the understanding that bilingual education is oriented towards the learning of two separate language codes, a standard Spanish and a standard English, for example, thereby reifying the monolingual ideal (García & Torres-Guevara, 2010). This view of language is evidenced also in the idea that a bilingual person is the embodiment of two monolinguals (Grosjean, 1989; 1994).

As the field of bilingual education has moved into the 21st century, rather than talking about discrete linguistic codes, there has been a push toward the idea of *linguaging* as a way to consider speakers' discursive practices (García, 2009). This concept moves away from the idea of learning languages as one plus one, but rather developing language practices as part of discourse communities. Pedagogically, the way to support the development of a non-linear, dynamic bilingualism is through *translanguaging*, which are "multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds" (García, 2009, p. 45). We use this concept in the context of our study because it includes language interaction taking place on different planes, including multimodalities (e.g., visuals, sound, etc.; García & Wei, 2014; Makoni & Makoni, 2010; Schreiber, 2015).

In Illinois specifically, there has been legislation since the 1970s (Illinois State Board of Education, 2011) requiring bilingual education or linguistic accommodations (such as pull-out/push-in services or sheltered English instruction) for emergent bilinguals – who are called *English learners* in the legislation (Badillo, 2011). However, the particular bilingual program model mandated by the state is transitional bilingual

education. Thus, even though linguistic supports must be provided, the overwhelming majority of bilingual programs in the state are subtractive in nature; native language is used predominantly as a bridge to English.

While these language ideologies prevail in the organization of bilingual education (and also in monolingual education), there is a new context emerging with the *Preschool for All* initiative orchestrated by the Obama administration. In fact, Illinois is the first state to mandate bilingual education to three- and four-year-olds (Illinois State Board of Education, 2014). Passed in 2010, the state's *Preschool for All* program is mandated through regulations adopted by the Illinois State Board of Education (See Hadi-Tabassum & Gutiérrez in this volume.). However, a lack of resources, including qualified educators, has not allowed bilingual preschool to become a reality yet for most emergent bilinguals. Yet, we contend that is in early childhood that the metaphor of a speaker of two languages as *emergent bilingual* may have special application. Language socialization occurs without the presumption that the learner should yet be proficient in one or another *standard* language. Here we may find hope to challenge the ideologies of standardization because of the implicit assumption that in early childhood education, language learning is not focused on a standard English or Spanish or language in general, at least not yet. Rather, early childhood education focuses on the emergence of language use and language socialization.

Language as a Tool for Mediated Activity

Language learning involves much more than mastering a grammar and lexicon (García & Kleifgen, 2010). Language involves beliefs and values about language that govern its use, and, in particular, how it is learned. Language can be viewed, then, not as an abstract and autonomous structure to be learned, but rather as a tool used to mediate human activity (e.g., Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Roth & Lee, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1998). Cultural Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) is a perspective of human development that recognizes that learning always takes place through mediation, symbolic and material, and in activity defined by communities, rules, and divisions of labor (Engeström, 1999). From this perspective, language is taken to be a tool, used by humans to accomplish goals, and therefore language learning requires both the learning *of* language and learning *through* language (Halliday, 1985). Razfar and Rumenapp (2011) drew on CHAT to explain how tools such as language, language ideologies, and language policies mediate classroom activities. Though each may be analyzed separately, any conceptualization of education should consider how they play a role in organizing the learning context. Duff (2007) notes the compatibilities of wider sociocultural theories of language learning and language socialization theories, in which the use of language is emphasized over the acquisition of a language structure. González (2001), Martínez and Morales (2014), and Ochs (2000), for example, note language learning is best understood not as acquisition of language structures, but rather the socialization into communicative/interactional competence. Understanding the activity of language learning is helpful in conceptualizing expansive forms of bilingual education.

The ways in which young learners can articulate their thoughts about language can be important because it is part of the language socialization process (Aukrust,

2004). Pandey (2012, 2013) advocates that talk about language in the classroom can be useful at any age level to promote the appreciation and value of language. Research has demonstrated that young children use language differently based on the specific context, and these language choices are mediated by language ideologies (Volk & Angelova, 2007). Furthermore, talking about talk allows students to express their awareness of human interaction, demonstrating socialization as a communicative competence.

Reflection on and awareness of language has been a goal and an outcome of instruction in classrooms. Digital recording devices with playback features have been used for immediately revisiting classroom events since at least the late 1990s (Forman, 1999), allowing investigators to study student reflections. Technologies such as smart phones and tablets are more affordable and accessible and may allow for novel ways to develop and explore this awareness. For instance, the thoughtful and authentic integration of digital recording devices provides opportunities for expanding instructional approaches in the classroom (Lawless & Pelligrino, 2007; Oladunjoye, 2013). The use of video recording with immediate playback allows students and teachers to think about learning, allows time for reflection, expansion, and revision of thoughts and ideas, as well as allows for the verbalization of what is taking place (Pomerantz, 2005; Tanner & Jones, 2007). Specific to the practices of preschool read alouds, video can provide a record of how students interact and how they understand those interactions. This reflective process can give insight into why students make the decisions they do when using language, providing a deeper understanding of how emerging bilingualism can be an educational benefit.

We find this reflection about language useful, for it is in the talk about language that language is objectified and seen in its proper place as a way to do meaningful things with others. Therefore, in our view, a critical need in preschool bilingual education is not simply to learn grammatical structures and vocabulary in one language, the other, or both. Rather, the critical need is to understand how to use language and other semiotic resources that make up students' communicative repertoires to meaningfully interact with others (Lombardi, Mende, & Salgado, 2016; Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010; Rymes, 2014). If framed this way, then bilingual education would not be oriented solely toward learning two languages, but rather toward communicative competence more generally. The idea of expansive bilingual education allows us to break away from both the values of monolingual ideals and standardization, and instead promote multilingualism in preschool education through the use of authentic speech, or that speech which is used to accomplish everyday tasks.

Method

School Site and Participants

The study discussed in this article analyzed the speech of early learners in an early childhood context in which students were encouraged to talk about language. We conducted a qualitative study in an urban, Catholic preschool in Illinois during the summer of 2014. The school served about 400 students from Pre-K to 8th grade, with 98% of the student population identified as Hispanic. The school was chosen because of previous connections with the teachers through a university program and because of its stated mission to serve the community. The philosophical approach taken by the school in their mission statement sought to serve the immigrant community through building strong family and community connections. However, there is only one reference to multicultural education in its mission and philosophy statements and no references to bilingual education. The community is predominantly Spanish-speaking and nearly 80% of the community are immigrants from Mexico or children of immigrants from Mexico.

The two preschool classrooms consisted of three to five-year-old children. While nearly all of the preschool students used Spanish in the home, many of the families also spoke English in the home and around the community. Classroom A consisted of 19 students and Classroom B had 18 students. While most students participated in the research study, only eight (four from each classroom) are featured in this article. The teachers for each of the classrooms were white females, and the teacher in Classroom B was proficient in Spanish. Both teachers had backgrounds in special education and were pursuing their ESL endorsements. Both classroom teachers predominantly used English for instruction. Each classroom had one bilingual instructional aide, who played a supportive role in classroom activities but rarely led instruction. The aide in Classroom A was a certified teacher. While there was an inclusion of Spanish as a medium of instruction in the preschool, it was predominantly restricted to Thursdays, for activities such as the weekly Spanish read aloud. Thus, primary language instruction was not enacted for emergent bilinguals, which will be further considered in the discussion below.

The university Institutional Review Board approved the research and special considerations were made for young, emergent bilingual students. Parent permission forms were sent out with a recruitment letter in Spanish and English and students were given assent forms in Spanish and/or English. The assent procedures were read orally each time and students were asked throughout the activities if they wanted to continue participation. On occasion, a student indicated that he or she did not want to participate and went back to the whole class activity. In addition, the principal of the school and the teacher were informed of the precise procedures and given the opportunity to withdraw students from the research.

Data Collection and Analysis

The study incorporated the use of video-stimulated recall (e.g., Theobald, 2012) during classroom read aloud activities. Video-stimulated recall is a tool used to record participants, ask them to watch the video recording, and allow them to engage in

analysis. Forman (1999) and Hong and Broderick (2003) refer to a similar approach as *instant video revisiting*, which serves as a tool to expand the mind of students and extend the learning of three to five-year-old children, for example with reflecting on parts of a story. Students are videotaped in the events of their everyday classrooms, and after a particular event are asked to revisit the video and talk about what was happening and what they were thinking. In this way, the video with the analysis of the video are instructional tools, but also include students' analysis of classroom events. Additionally, emphasis on creating dialogue among students has led to the development of instructional and research methodologies like video-stimulated reflective discourse (Tanner & Jones, 2007), which emphasizes the use of these tools for instruction of children while privileging the participatory methodology of including students in the analysis of naturalistic events.

The research team consisted of two white female former early-childhood teachers who were doctoral students at a local university, a white male university instructor and postdoctoral researcher (Rumenapp), and a bilingual Latina researcher sponsoring the research (Morales). Following a series of classroom observations, the research team scheduled classroom visits twice a week during daily read aloud time for three weeks. Field notes were collected during whole-class instruction, teacher-directed read aloud and subsequent follow-up literacy activities such as ordering events, categorization activities, and other response activities. A small group of four assenting children then recreated the follow-up activity at the direction of a member of the research team, who recorded the reenactment on a tablet. The tablet recordings of follow-up activities were approximately 10 minutes in length. We collected a total of 12 tablet recordings, six from each classroom. The activities that were recorded were conducted in the style that was typical of the classroom, in which English was dominant. Students used Spanish among themselves, and the teacher and researchers also used Spanish for clarification of instructions or to summarize stories with the students.

Immediately following the video recording, students collectively viewed the tablet video of their engagement in the literacy activity. Students were prompted with questions such as "What were you thinking when you said that?" or "How did you know that?" When possible, the researchers asked them about their language choices. This process was video recorded (resulting in a *reflection video*) to document student interaction and reflections on the previously collected tablet recording. This process documented 10-40 minutes of student reflection per group session. Field notes were taken throughout. Additionally, the two main classroom teachers participated in pre-post interviews to inform our understanding of classroom contexts and teachers' perceptions of this process. These interviews consisted of questions about general classroom setup and curriculum. Additionally, teachers were asked to reflect on students' language usage, and specifically, on how students talked about language. In the post interview, the teachers were also asked to discuss what they observed regarding the stimulated accounts activities.

Preliminary findings from this study have been reported elsewhere (Rumenapp, Whittingham, & Hoffman, 2015) with a focus on the reading practices of students. These researchers found that students used the recordings on tablets to recall events, to expand on their thinking about the read-alouds, and to reflect on their own reading

practices. For this article, the data were analyzed by the authors with a focus on the metalinguistic awareness of the students, the bilingual practices, and application from this video-stimulated accounts activity, particularly in light of the fact that they were all able to draw from multiple languages in their linguistic repertoires. All videos were cataloged and instances in which students used Spanish were selected for further investigation to see if students' reflection of their activities on the video included explicit reflection on their language choices. The examples were analyzed using a form of discourse analysis (Gee, 2011) that attends to the wider social and cultural implications of language in use. In the examples below, one of the members of the research team, Liz (pseudonym) facilitated these activities.

Results

We present three examples from this study of language in use to showcase how early education students use multiple languages for different purposes and are aware of doing so, as well as how they actually talk about these choices. The first example shows how language is used by students to assert their own ideas in a disagreement, with an explicit focus on how Spanish was used as an additional resource to vie for power in an English dominant group. The second example includes students reflecting on multiple languages used, as they articulate their choices of using Spanish and English with their peers. Finally, we present an example of a student who uses a variety of semiotic resources to explain events that had transpired earlier in the activity.

Examples

“No Catarina, como así”: Using language(s) to assert ideas, disagree, and collaborate. In this first example, we show how language, along with multiple modes of representation, is used in student collaboration and conflict. In the example below, four students from Classroom A are working together to put felt figures in the order in which they occurred in Eric Carle's (1969) classic book *The Very Hungry Caterpillar*. This was videotaped on an iPad so that students could view it directly after the activity. Initially the researcher, Liz, asked the students to put the felt cutouts in linear order. Each student had one of the following: an egg on a leaf, a caterpillar, a cocoon, or a butterfly (Figure 1). The students include three girls: Susan, Catarina, and Flora, and one boy, Diego. Catarina primarily spoke Spanish in her classroom, although she also speaks English for academic purposes, as seen below. Diego, Susan, and Flora speak both English and Spanish in the classroom and among the group, although they spoke primarily English in whole group activities.



Figure 1: Students place cut-outs in linear order

After reading *The Very Hungry Caterpillar*, the four students sat on the floor with their figures. Liz gave Catarina the cocoon, and Catarina said in English, “The ladybug goes to the cocoon.” When asked to repeat what she said, Catarina replied, “The ladybug goes to the cocoon and changes to the butterfly.” We can see through this that Catarina has a working knowledge of the order of events from the story. While she referred to the figure as a “ladybug” rather than “caterpillar,” she did orally recount the order of events. The students then begin to discuss the order and place the figures. The transcripts below include several conventions that are useful in analysis to indicate pauses in speech (.), elongated vowels (:), interruptions (/ -), self corrections (\), and whispering (° ... °). Additionally, parentheses are used for observational comments and brackets for overlapping speech. Susan begins:

- 01 SU: Diego’s first and an’ I’m the last one
 02 FL: That was an egg
 03 DI: And then it’s for Flora
 04 FL: Ah, it’s upside down
 05 SU: Flora was in
 06 CA: you have to go in [the cocoon]
 07 DI: [That should go on the top]
 08 SU: Catarina’s turn
 09 CA: It go here the cocoon
 10 DI: They have to go at the top

At this point, we see each of the students participating verbally and in action. Flora placed the caterpillar under the egg, and Catarina put the cocoon next to the caterpillar and moved it to touch the head (Figure 1). This represents the ordering that the caterpillar moves into the cocoon. Diego reiterates twice (lines 7 and 10) that the caterpillar and cocoon should go next to the egg in linear order. This begins an initial disagreement over how to represent the order of events. Diego is following Liz’s instructions in an abstract, more school-like way of discrete events in linear order. Catarina, recognizing that the caterpillar goes into the cocoon, finds a way to represent this by placing the cocoon next to the caterpillar and moves it so that it is partially covering the caterpillar, as if the caterpillar is moving into the cocoon.

In this next section, Spanish is introduced by Diego in the interaction and used by Susan, as well:

- 11 FL: Yai (inaudible 3 syllables) the top
- 12 DI: Catarina, *dos están arriba*
- 13 FL: It's all dirty again
- 14 DI: No Catarina, *como así*
- 15 CA: It have to go to the cocoon it have to go to the cocoon
- 16 SU: Hey! (Diego put the cocoon then the caterpillar)
- 17 DI: Oh wait. (moving the objects around to the correct order)
- 18 SU: Catarina °*así* . Catarina *así*°
- 19 DI: And then Susan then it's you

Here we begin to see how language plays a role in collaboration and vying for whose representation is correct. First, we see Diego, once again, directing others to put the caterpillar and cocoon in line with the egg. However, there is some ambiguity with what he is saying. When Diego tells Catarina, "*dos están arriba*," he could be pointing out that two go at the top, or that one is on top of the other (and that this is incorrect). The word *arriba* in Spanish can translate to "at the top" or "on top of," as in making a pile – just as the felt cutouts were being placed on top of each other. In fact, when Flora remarks, "It's all dirty again," she could be referring to the messiness of the felt cutouts, as opposed to the order Diego was attempting to demonstrate.

Diego then takes control and demonstrates to Catarina what he means, showing her "*como así*." He accidentally reorders the cutouts incorrectly, and in line 16, Susan jumps in to correct him as Diego recognizes his error and puts them back in order. Susan seemingly follows Diego's lead in speaking Spanish to Catarina and whispers to her "*así*" twice (line 18) as she points. Up until now Catarina has spoken in English (lines 6 and 9) and has demonstrated that she understands the correct order of events (at least the ordering of the caterpillar and cocoon). This activity has shifted from a question of ordering events from the story to how to represent order, and Diego uses Spanish, in addition to English, to direct and clarify how he thinks things should be done.

In the rest of this activity, we see that the struggle over representation continues. Whereas in lines 12, 14, and 18 above, we see both Diego and Susan directing Catarina about how to put the events in order, now we see Diego and Susan disagree on representation.

- 20 SU: My turn.
- 21 CA: And then they change to butterfly
- 22 FL: Beautiful butterfly
- 23 SU: And then this comes out and then it's the butterfly
- 24 (Interchanges butterfly and caterpillar)
- 25 DI: No. The butterfly goes last.
- 26 FL: Oh wha/. No this is the last part see
- 27 FL: uhhh the way (inaudible 3 syllables) that
- 28 DI: First . wait . First is the egg then is the um caterpillar
- 29 then its the cocoon
- 30 SU: ooo oh so . So the caterpillar/-
- 31 DI: It's right there it's after the egg.
- 32 SU: (puts caterpillar down)
- 33 DI: No, it's like this.

34 (Interchange the cocoon and butterfly and caterpillar)
 35 FL: °Quiet, they are taking a nap° (other students in the room)
 36 DI: °like like that. You put the butterfly right here. you put
 37 the butterfly°

The three girls all move the butterfly to exchange the caterpillar. They also attempt to put the cocoon on top of the caterpillar and the butterfly on top of the cocoon. These are more embodied forms of representation, for, indeed, if the caterpillar did change, we should not see it represented anymore. This struggle over representation climaxes in lines 25 and 26 in which Diego says that the butterfly goes last, and Susan says, “this is the last part, see.” Here we see the conflict over representation, not over the recall of events. All agree on the order; the question is representational. Diego ultimately moves the figures into the linear order, ending with whispering his directives.

After this, Liz asked if they could tell her what happened. Diego states the order from the egg to the butterfly, “First he was an egg, and then he was a caterpillar, and then he was in his cocoon, and then he is a butterfly.” Interestingly, he personalizes the caterpillar with the pronoun “he” and also switches tenses from past to present tense. This is significant because what Diego represents linguistically is in line with what the girls were attempting to represent via the movement of the cutouts; that this single being is changing, and therefore there should not be four discrete representations next to one another, all present at once.

In this example, we see that language plays a vital role in collaboration, building understanding, and in the struggle for whose representation is correct. We see that the activity was mediated by conflicting notions of representation, but are explained through verbal language. The use of Spanish in this episode is quite significant because we see that Catarina is making sense of the activity in English, correctly ordering events, but due to the conflict in representation, Diego attempts to clarify with the use of Spanish. Susan picks up on this and follows suit. Ultimately, we see that the conflict is not in Catarina’s sense-making of the activity, but rather in two different ways to represent the order. Diego’s use of Spanish becomes one more tool to use in the struggle over meaning and in the collaboration of completing the activity.

“Dos están arriba”: Articulation of language choice based on interlocutor.

In the second example, we shift to the video response activity. Liz shows the students a video of themselves taken during the above activity. She guides their attention to the moment that Diego speaks to Catarina in Spanish (Figure 2) and asks Diego about what he said (VD refers to “Video Diego”, or the video recorded image of Diego on the tablet).



Figure 2. Liz shows students the video of them placing cutouts in linear order.

01 LI: Ok, let's keep listening. I want to see how you guys work
 02 together and what you say to each other to get this job done
 03 so well.
 04 VD: Catarina. *Dos están arriba*
 05 LI: What did you just say?
 06 DI: I um. I told Catarina that, um, in the in the in the . um .
 07 the caterpillar and the stuff go on top.
 08 LI: Ok . and do you remember what words you used to say that?
 09 DI: uh huh
 10 LI: What did you say?
 11 DI: Catarina. *están arriba*
 12 LI: And what does that mean?
 13 DI: Catarina, that caterpillar stuff is up, it's right there
 14 where everybody put it.

When Video Diego makes a declaration in Spanish in line 4, Liz asks Diego in the current moment about what he said. Diego responds by translating his words into English in line 7. Liz prompts him to recall his exact words in line 8. Diego responds that he does remember and reproduces his initial phrase, “*están arriba*.” Liz asks him what that means. Diego translates and explains the placement of the felt cutouts, referring to them as the “caterpillar stuff.” Liz then continues to prompt Diego to explain why he used Spanish words instead of English words.

15 LI: ‘There it is,’ right? So why did you use Spanish words
 16 instead of English words.
 17 DI: Because she speaks in Spanish.
 18 FL: And you would, and you go to Mexico
 19 LI: Yeah (looking at Flora who is raising her hand) go ahead.
 20 FL: (inaudible)

When Liz asked Diego to explain why he used Spanish words instead of English words, Diego tells Liz that the reason is because Catarina speaks in Spanish. This is not to say that Catarina *only* speaks Spanish. On the contrary, Catarina had spoken in English throughout this interaction. However, it is possible that Diego associated Catarina with the Spanish language and seems to understand that Catarina has a better understanding and command of Spanish. At this point, Flora mentions going to Mexico in line 18. It is not clear whether Flora is addressing Catarina and has knowledge of

Catarina's travels, or if she is making a statement, associating speaking Spanish with Mexico, as one could say, 'one goes to Mexico.' After this, Liz asks Catarina a metacognitive question about what she was thinking when spoken to in Spanish.

- 21 LI: Catarina, what were you thinking about when he was talking to
 22 you in Spanish?
 23 CA: I think uh (inaudible utterance)
 24 LI: He said *arriba*
 25 CA: uh huh
 26 LI: And you heard him say that.
 27 CA: uh huh
 28 LI: What did that make you think? . . . What did, what did that
 29 make you think about when he said that to you?
 30 CA: He said (inaudible 2 words; gestures hand up, like
 31 indicating the top)
 32 LI: That's what he was saying, right? Did you hear a difference
 33 in his words? Did you think about those are English words or
 34 those are Spanish words? . . . Did you think about those words
 35 being in English or in Spanish?
 36 CA: um
 37 LI: Or did you not think about it?
 38 CA: I think about
 39 LI: You did think about it? So did you do what he was asking when
 40 he spoke to you in Spanish?
 41 CA: uh huh

Liz asks different questions to Catarina, mostly asking for acknowledgment or a yes/no response. Catarina responds to most of the questioning simply with "uh huh." However, we do see in line 30 that she responds by recounting what Diego had said with gestures. This seems to indicate that she understands Liz's question and is answering as best she can. Catarina may understand more English than she can express.

Liz then asks Catarina if she had thought about Diego speaking to her in Spanish while speaking in English the rest of the time. Catarina responds that she did think of it, although as she is agreeing to each of the questions from Liz, it is difficult to know whether she had been thinking about Diego's language choice or whether she had been thinking about the activity more generally. She seems to have been hesitating to form an answer in line 36, but did not have enough wait time to develop her response before Liz rearticulated the four questions in lines 32-35 into the negative form (line 37). This is something typical in young, emergent bilinguals. Their receptive capabilities of L2 develop before L2 production.

Liz started the video again and heard Video Diego saying, *como así*. Liz follows up to ask Diego about his language choice again.

- 42 LI: *Como así*. Who were you talking to?
 43 DI: Catarina
 44 LI: You were talking to Catarina. If you were saying the same
 45 thing . to Susan would you have used the same words?
 46 DI: What's that
 47 LI: You would have said "What's that?" if you were talking to
 48 Susan? Why is that?
 49 DI: Um. I don't know what/wha you are talking about.
 50 LI: You don't know what I am talking about? I'm asking you why

51 you would have said to Susan and why you said different words
 52 to Catarina.
 53 DI: Because Catarina speaks in Spanish and Susan speaks in
 54 English.
 55 LI: Oh so you kind of made a decision because of who you are
 56 talking to.

Similar to the above statement, Diego explains his use of multiple languages (line 52). As Liz asks him about why he said *como así*, she digs deeper into whether he could imagine other contexts, and if he could articulate which language he would choose in an assumed situation. He acknowledges that he would speak in English to Susan, and he articulates why he would do so. This example demonstrates that preschool students can and do articulate their decisions about language use.

“Caterpillar walking”: Omar’s use of multiple semiotic resources. In this final example, four students from Classroom B conduct a similar sequencing activity.ⁱⁱ The students include two girls and two boys: Lucila, Karina, Jimmy, and Omar. All four students spoke primarily in English in the classroom, although as seen below, Omar used both English and Spanish to explain events from the story. Liz was facilitating the small group activity that had been determined by the teacher. The read aloud had been conducted in Spanish, as was typical for Thursday read alouds, but the teacher’s follow-up activity was primarily conducted in English, with Spanish translations for objects from the story. Like the other class, students were asked to put the following in order from *The Very Hungry Caterpillar*: egg, caterpillar, chrysalis, and butterfly. However, in this classroom, the visuals were accompanied by both English and Spanish words. While the book and classroom discussion had used the word *cocoon*, these figures used *chrysalis* to index the more accurate term. *Chrysalis* was not referred to during the read aloud, as the students were ordering the pictures and not the words specifically. In addition to this ordering activity, the children also had a glass jar with a live caterpillar inside. Students turned around frequently to look at it and also spent time watching and describing it. Below, Omar’s hand gestures seem to mimic the walking of this live caterpillar.

The conversation below occurred while this group was looking at themselves as recorded earlier on the iPad. Jimmy had already shared his version of the events in the video. Liz had just pointed out Karina in the video and then asked her about the actions she had taken with the egg. She next asked Karina if she had anything more to add, and while Karina did not, Omar was eager to share something. In the transcript below, words preceded by an asterisk are phonetic spellings.

01 LI: Do you have anything you want to tell us about that? (to
 Karina)
 02 (Karina shakes her head no)
 03 OM: Me yeah.
 04 LI: Do you have something you want to say?
 05 OM: (nods head)
 06 LI: Ok
 07 OM: um Jimmy say the caterpillar en the cocoo y en la
 08 caterpillar (moving fists in a circle) y an da an da
 09 butterfly .. (pointing to the video) y cocoo son y es
 10 jumpin’ akwas y *katana en the cocoon.
 11 LI: Ok, you’re using some Spanish words and some English words

12 to tell me about that
 13 OM: (nods head)

From the outset, Omar is enthusiastic in his communication. He seems excited to share his recollection of Jimmy's version of the events in the video. When Karina shakes her head no to signify that she does not have anything else to add, Omar jumps in with the phrase, "Me yeah." While we can understand this phrase as an approximation of "I do" in English, it is actually closer to a word-for-word translation of the phrase, "Yo sí," in Spanish, which also means "I do." Not only does Omar use both Spanish and English in his recounting of what he heard Jimmy (sitting next to him) say about what is happening in the video, but Omar is also using his hands and body to retell what Jimmy just shared. Although it is difficult to understand everything Omar is saying, he is clearly using the vocabulary from the story (caterpillar, cocoon, butterfly) and signaling the movement of the caterpillar, with his fists rotating in a circular motion, towards the picture representation of the cocoon and eventually the butterfly. He is largely accurate in his representation of the order of events. Liz comments on his use of both Spanish and English words in his narrative. Next, Liz directs him to tell his narrative again but more slowly this time.

14 LI: I want you to slow down and tell me again because that was
 15 very important and I want to hear all of it. Ok. You were
 16 telling me something about what Jimmy was talking about,
 17 right?
 18 OM: (nods head)
 19 LI: (to a girl in the group) Let's wait a second so we can hear
 20 everything he says, ok? Tell us one more time.
 21 OM: Ok. Um. Da cocoon es the first and the *kaus y the butterfly
 22 say no son no *kaus and the butter/ and the caterpillar
 23 walking walking (making walking gestures) y and the
 24 caterpillar es moving moving and the butterfly estep (slams
 fist into hand)
 25 like that.
 26 LI: The butterfly stops like that?
 27 OM: Yeah (nods head)
 28 LI: So the caterpillar is moving
 29 OM: y y moving y (one unknown word accompanied by hand
 30 gestures) like that it's moving (looks behind
 31 at the real caterpillar)
 32 LI: The caterpillar is moving, right and you're telling me the
 33 butterfly is staying still.
 34 OM: yeah.

Upon Liz's encouragement, Omar agrees to tell his version of events again, with an "ok" at the beginning of line 21. On his second retelling, Omar gets a little bit confused with the order of events, stating that the cocoon comes first. He says "no" a few times, which may be a way he is negating what he just said, or changing his mind about the order. Because after those few "no's", Omar begins to say butterfly, but stops midway through the word and goes back to talking about the caterpillar. He again describes the movement of the caterpillar ("walking, walking"), putting his hands together, palms touching, and swerving his connected hands back and forth, as if a long caterpillar was moving along. Omar abruptly changes his hands to making a fist with his right hand and opening his left hand, palm up, to signify a butterfly landing on a leaf

(line 24). Liz repeats what she believes Omar has just said, contrasting the moving caterpillar with the butterfly staying still. Omar emphasizes the word “moving” one more time, looking behind him at the real caterpillar in the jar to confirm that the caterpillar is indeed still moving.

Post-Interviews Regarding Language Use in the Classroom

Post-interviews were conducted with both teachers; they were asked to reflect on their own and their students’ language use in the classroom. Teacher A generally viewed her role as supporting what she perceived as the parents’ goals, noting that “the parents want their children to speak English; overall they want them to have a better life and to have better opportunities and better jobs than they themselves had.” Other than the teacher aide reading a Spanish book to the students once a week or translating for students, there was little use of Spanish in classroom instruction.

Both teachers expressed that there was often resistance to speaking English in the classroom at the very onset of the year, but that students soon shifted to becoming resistant to speaking Spanish at home, which has been documented in the literature elsewhere (Martínez-Roldán & Malavé, 2004). However, Teacher B noticed a slight difference in her students this year:

Um, they tend to be more English. They're like, typically once you start learning English in the classroom, that they'll fight it, they'll fight using Spanish as a home language, like they'll go home and they'll just want to speak English all the time. Um, but I haven't really had that this year.

In fact, instances emerged organically where students expressed an interest in bilingualism. For example, one student in Classroom A told the researchers that she wanted to learn Spanish during a reflection activity. Teacher A, in her post-interview, noted that:

[This student] is very, very eager to learn Spanish, I think because she [the teacher aide] will read the book once a week in Spanish and will sing songs or occasionally speak in Spanish, and she realizes that she doesn't fully understand, so she is the most eager one in the class to learn Spanish.

This student’s interests in language development included Spanish, in a classroom, which exposed her to authentic language practices, such as songs and a fluent Spanish speaking adult (the classroom aide).

Teacher A also heard comments about language use from her preschool students frequently in the course of the school day. She noted that some students expressed very clear home/school delineation, such as, “when I’m here I speak English, when I’m at home I speak Spanish.” She also allowed language to be a topic of conversation in the classroom and acknowledged the concept of language varieties with students:

When I came back from London I had a bit of an accent because I had to learn phonetics and teach it. And I still do one or two times I catch it. And one of my kids she goes, “Do you celebrate St. Patrick's day?” And she goes, “No? But I know you're Irish because you sometimes say 'scof' instead of 'scarf'.”

Teacher A noted that her preschool students noticed varieties even within the English language.

The teacher in Classroom B explained that the majority of her students spoke Spanish at home, but that in the classroom they used English most of the time. In response to how she integrated Spanish into the classroom, she described an attempt to foster Spanish and English by conducting a read aloud once a week in both languages:

So we do repeated readings of the read alouds. We try to find books that are in English and in Spanish so that once a week the kids who are stronger in Spanish are exposed to the same book and can learn the vocab words that the teacher aide reads.

In this classroom, an attempt was made to include a limited selection of texts that could be found in both Spanish and English. Emphasis was placed on vocabulary development and learning from the teacher aide. The teacher continued to explain the attempts to incorporate Spanish in the classroom and make connections between the two languages:

I'm really cognizant of trying to get them to bridge between the languages. So, um, I can look it up on the computer, I can look it up in the Spanish dictionary. Turn it into English and then like yesterday like I had, after we reread the book, I said oh *chapalear* and oh! I can look it up on the computer or in the Spanish dictionary and then turn it into English, so, like they're going to *chapalear* like they're going to splash. But doing it more as like a bridge into English, like I'm going to teach a new word in Spanish.

The teacher here mentions being able to use technology to translate words, or learn new words in either language. She also seems familiar with the Spanish language, enough to know a word like “chapalear” or “to splash.” However, these examples were fairly minimal uses of Spanish, less than what is found in most bilingual classrooms, where it is typical to see primary language instruction at the early grades. It is also not taking advantage of what students know in Spanish, which we elaborate below.

Discussion

The study yielded a rich set of data to investigate children's use of multiple semiotic resources, including English and Spanish, and their reflection of that use. This allowed us to demonstrate that children use language in diverse ways, although we do not always value the way they use and think about language. The children in this preschool classroom were able to recall the story the teacher read, put events in order and talk about it, and interact with each other and the researcher using various semiotic means. These emergent bilinguals engaged in translanguaging as they co-constructed meaning with each other by using both Spanish and English, embodiment, pointing at the tablet screen, and moving the felt figures. They demonstrated language awareness by giving a reason for addressing interlocutors using a particular language. As a tool, the video-stimulated recall helped make explicit the students' ability to make sense of and articulate what they did in the immediate past. The examples of researcher and student discussions point to the full linguistic resources at these students' disposal, as well as evidence the value students gave to their burgeoning languages, even while the

school program did not always leverage these resources, as shown by an absence of a specific policy that supports multilingualism and a lack of instructional attention given to Spanish.

Teacher Language Ideologies in Tension with Program Goals

Teachers in preschool classrooms navigate complex linguistic spaces. Not only is early childhood a rich and complex space for learning language, but also multiple semiotic resources are used to make meaning. The language practices of students vary from child to child, and classrooms become spaces in which different language practices (and language ideologies) collide. Preschool teachers may not always know how to support the use of these diverse linguistic resources.

For example, in the interview conducted with the bilingual classroom teacher after the conclusion of data collection in the classroom, the teacher discusses exposing children to the same books in Spanish and English about once a week. Here we see that the teacher was valuing Spanish only in as much as it structurally performed the same task as English in the classroom. That is, Spanish was only helpful so far as it reinforced vocabulary in English and stories that were already told (most likely written and created) in English. This can further be seen in her effort to bridge the two languages. Rather than incorporating more authentic literature in Spanish or use storytelling to support the development of oral language for instance, the impulse when a Spanish word is spoken is to turn it into English. This act implicitly devalues the languages students speak in the classroom other than English. She did not explicitly reflect on the space she was providing for different languages to be used in her classroom, or how she was helping to construct the linguistic space necessary for students to feel comfortable using their first languages. The teacher's own language ideologies were affecting the way languages were being used for instructional purposes, and in this case, minimally using one of the primary languages of many of the students in the classroom.

When the student in Classroom A expressed that she desired to learn Spanish, she displayed an authentic interest in broadening her own linguistic repertoire. Thus, students are aware of bilingualism in the wider context of a classroom or community, even though they may not need to use multiple languages to complete the goals of an instructional activity. This lends credence to the notion that bilingual identities can be fostered in early childhood classrooms, an approach much different from restrictive and utilitarian notions of multilingualism.

Pedagogical and Teacher Education Implications

The findings discussed prompted the question of what possibilities may be fostered in early childhood classrooms when students are aware of and can articulate use of their multiple tools. We point to a need for a theoretically updated bilingual education (Nevárez-La Torre, 2013), informed by studies of the way real people speak and analysis of actual talk (Palmer & Martínez, 2013). Instruction in early childhood bilingual programs should enact not a strict separation or development of two separate codes, but the development of ideas about the tool of language itself, in all its complex, hybrid forms. One way of moving toward this ideal is incorporating more metalinguistic talk in the classroom – talking about talk, and why one language or the other is used in a particular context. As Pandey (2013) noted, talk about language, and

multiple languages, in the classroom can support appreciation for language diversity and, when home languages are valued and celebrated, students will grow. These discussions should be strategic and explicit, building student consciousness of their own practices and language forms. While the researchers were explicitly asking students questions about why they chose to use a particular language at certain moments in the recorded interactions, there were conversations that at least one of the teachers was already having with her students that could be further built upon.

In the example of the accented English when the teacher said the word *scarf*, the same teacher interviewed who did not integrate authentic use of the primary language into classroom instruction, was able to recognize her students' metalinguistic awareness. While the student was not able to differentiate between an English and Irish accent, this example demonstrates the level of attention paid to language differences, as well as the overlay of identity to language when the student assumes the teacher must celebrate St. Patrick's Day based on the way she speaks. As demonstrated in the study itself, students talk about language and reflect on their language choices, when these were facilitated by the researcher. These metalinguistic acts can be leveraged in the classroom to promote expanded forms of learning. By facilitating these dialogues, language is not viewed as a monolithic construct with a standardized ideal. Rather, language is a topic to discuss and a tool to use.

Some implications of this shift in the way language is understood and leveraged in the classroom include changes to teacher education that begin with having teacher candidates listen to how students actually talk, rather than promoting an *ideal* of language. By engaging in the process of discourse analysis in the classroom, pre-service teachers may discover the language practices of particular communities, uncovering for themselves how much language hybridity actually exists. Instruction should reflect more expansive views about language and a value for understanding *linguaging* rather than attempting to move towards demonstrating proficiency of a code, particularly at early levels of schooling.

Conclusion

The potential opportunities that may open up because of *Preschool for All* initiative allow educational researchers, policymakers, and practitioners to reflect on what it would take to truly make preschool accessible for all students. Specifically of interest are programs such as Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK) in which policies are in place to allow for expansive forms of bilingual education, but the policies must align with language ideological stances and classroom instructional practices. One way to rethink bilingual preschool education is to revisit the role language plays. The code, that is the lexicon and grammar of language, is not the primary tool used in making meaning. A wider set of semiotic resources is available for students to make meaning and communicate. Awareness of these multiple resources, and how they work to accomplish goals, is a more nuanced way to understand preschool learning activities.

References

- Aukrust, V. G. (2004). Talk about talk with young children: Pragmatic socialization in two communities in Norway and the US. *Journal of Child Language*, 31(1), 177–201.
- Badillo, D. A. (2011). Litigating bilingual education: A history of the *Gomez* decision in Illinois. In R. O. Martínez (Ed.), *Latinos in the Midwest* (pp. 207-226). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Berk, L. E., & Winsler, A. (1995). *Scaffolding children's learning: Vygotsky and early childhood education* (Vol. 7). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Blackledge, A. (2000). Monolingual ideologies in multilingual states: Language, hegemony and social justice in Western liberal democracies. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 1(2), 25–45.
- Blommaert, J., & Verschueren, J. (1998). The role of language in European nationalist ideologies. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 189–210). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Carle, E. (1969). *The very hungry caterpillar*. New York, NY: Philomel.
- Duff, P. A. (2007). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching*, 40(4), 309–319.
- Engeström, Y. (1999). Activity theory and individual social transformation. In Y. Engeström, R. Miettinen, & R. Punamaki (Eds.), *Perspectives on activity theory* (pp. 19-38). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Farr, M., & Song, J. (2011). Language ideologies and policies: Multilingualism and education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 5(9), 650–665.
- Fitts, S. (2006). Reconstructing the status quo: Linguistic interaction in a dual-language school. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(2), 337-365.
- Forman, G. (1999). Instant video revisiting: The video camera as a “tool of the mind” for young children. *Early Childhood Research and Practice*, 1(2), 1-7. Available from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED435499.pdf>
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, O., & Torres-Guevara, R. (2010). Monoglossic ideologies and language policies in the education of Latinas/os. In E. Murillo, S. Villenas, R. T. Galván, J. S. Muñoz, C. Martínez, & M. Machado-Casas (Eds.), *Handbook of Latinos and education: Research, theory and practice* (pp. 182–194). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- González, N. (2001). *I am my language: Discourses of women and children in the borderlands*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

- Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36, 3–15.
- Grosjean, F. (1994). Individual bilingualism. In *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (pp. 1656–1660). Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Victoria, AU: Deakin University.
- Heller, M. (2006). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography* (2nd ed.). London, UK: A & C Black.
- Hong, S. B., & Broderick, J. T. (2003). Instant video revisiting for reflection: Extending the learning of children and teachers. *Early Childhood Research and Practice*, 5(1), 1-15.
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2011). *Title 23 Illinois Administrative Code Part 228*. Available from <https://www.isbe.net/Documents/228ark.pdf>
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2014). *Title 23 Illinois Administrative Code Part 228*. Available from https://www.isbe.net/Documents/preschool_faq.pdf
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2000). Regimenting languages: Language ideological perspectives. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, policies, and identities* (pp. 1–34). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2010). Language ideologies: Evolving perspectives. In J. Östman, J. Verschueren & J. Jaspers (Eds.), *Society and language use* (pp. 192-211). Herndon, VA: John Benjamins.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lawless, K. A., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2007). Professional development in integrating technology into teaching and learning: Knowns, unknowns, and ways to pursue better questions and answers. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(4), 575–614.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lombardi, R. S., Mendes, M. C., & Salgado, A. C. P. (2016). Developing the bilinguality of learners through the expansion of their communicative repertoire within the science class. *Electronic Journal of Science Education*, 20(3), 112–125.
- Makoni, S., & Makoni, B. (2010) Multilingual discourses on wheels and public English in Africa: A case for 'vague linguistique'. In J. Maybin & J. Swann (Eds.). *The Routledge companion to English language Studies* (pp. 258-270). London, UK: Routledge.
- Martínez, D. C. (2017). Emerging critical meta-awareness among Black and Latina/o youth during corrective feedback practices in urban English language arts classrooms. *Urban Education*, 52(5), 637–666. doi: 10.1177/0042085915623345
- Martínez, R. A., & Morales, P. Z. (2014). ¿Puras groserías?: Rethinking the role of profanity and graphic humor in Latin@ students' bilingual wordplay. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 45(4), 337-354.
- Martínez-Roldán, C. M., & Malavé, G. (2004). Language ideologies mediating literacy and identity in bilingual contexts. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 4(2), 155-180.

- Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (1999). *Authority in language: Investigating standard English* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
- Nevárez-La Torre, A. A. (2013). Editorial: Necessary paradigm shifts in bilingual education: Rethinking language. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 4, 5-8.
- Ochs, E. (2000). Language socialization. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9(1-2), 230-233.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1990). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion* (pp. 276-320). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2012). The theory of language socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 1-21). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Oladunjoye, O. K. (2013). *iPad and computer devices in preschool: A tool for literacy development among teachers and children in preschool*. [Thesis] Stockholm, SE: Stockholm's University. Available from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:640202/COVER01.pdf>
- Otsuji, E. & Pennycook, A. (2010). Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7(1), 240-254.
- Palmer, D. K., & Martínez, R. A. (2013). Teacher agency in bilingual spaces: A fresh look at preparing teachers to educate Latina/o bilingual children. *Review of Research in Education*, 37(1), 269-297.
- Pandey, A. (2012). *Language building blocks: Essential linguistics for early childhood practitioners*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Pandey, A. (2013). Say Sí, Oui, Ee, Yee, 'A-ha, Da, Jee/Ji, Haa(n), Ja, Jeje, Ye(s), Yo!: 6,000 voices alive and strong! *Perspectives*, 35(1), 5-10.
- Pennycook, A. (2013). Language policies, language ideologies, and local language practices. In L. Wee, R. B. H. Goh, & L. Lim (Eds.), *The politics of English: South Asia, Southeast Asia, and the Asia Pacific* (pp. 1-19). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Pomerantz, A. (2005). Using participants' video stimulated comments to complement analysis of interactional practices. In H. te Molder & J. Potter (Eds.), *Conversation and cognition* (pp. 93-113). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Razfar, A., & Rumenapp, J. C. (2011). Developmental context(s): Mediating learning through language ideologies. *Human Development*, 54(4), 241-269.
- Razfar, A., & Rumenapp, J. C. (2012). Language ideologies in English learner classrooms: Critical reflections and the role of explicit awareness. *Language Awareness*, 21(4), 347-368.
- Roth, W. M., & Lee, Y. J. (2007). "Vygotsky's neglected legacy": Cultural-historical activity theory. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(2), 186-232.
- Rumenapp, J. C., Whittingham, C. E., & Hoffman, E. B. (2015). "What were you thinking?" Bilingual preschool students talk about reading practices through video reflection. In E. Ortlieb, L. Shanahan, & M. McVee (Eds.), *Video research in disciplinary literacies* (pp. 117-140). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Rymes, B. (2014). Communicative repertoire. In C. Leung & B. V. C Street. (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to English studies* (pp. 287-301). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A., & Kroskrity, P. V. (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. (Oxford studies in anthropological linguistics vol. 16). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, R. (2000). *Language policy and identity politics in the United States*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Schreiber, B. R. (2015). "I am what I am": Multilingual identity and digital translanguaging. *Language Learning & Technology*, 19(3), 69–87.
- Siegal, J. (2006). Language ideologies and the education of speakers of marginalized language varieties: Adopting a critical awareness approach. *Linguistics and Education*, 17(1), 157–174.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In R. Cline, W. Hanks, & C. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The elements: A parasection on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193–247). Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Silverstein, M. (1996). Monoglot 'standard'; in America: Standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony. In D. Brenneis & R. Macaulay (Eds.), *The matrix of language: Contemporary linguistic anthropology*. (pp. 284–306). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tanner, H., & Jones, S. (2007). Using video-stimulated reflective dialogue to learn from children about their learning with and without ICT. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 16(3), 321–335.
- Theobald, M. (2012). Video-stimulated accounts: Young children accounting for interactional matters in front of peers. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 10(1), 32–50.
- U.S. Office of the Press Secretary (Producer). (2013, February 13). Fact Sheet President Obama's plan for early education for all Americans. Retrieved September 29, 2014, from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/02/13/fact-sheet-president-obama-s-plan-early-education-all-americans>
- Volk, D., & Angelova, M. (2007). Language ideology and the mediation of language choice in peer interactions in a dual-language first grade. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 6(3), 177–199.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Whittingham, C. E., Hoffman, E. B., & Rumenapp, J. C. (2016). "It aint 'nah its 'no": Preparing preschoolers for the language of school. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*. doi: 10.1177/1468798416674254
- Wiley, T. G., & Lukes, M. (1996). English-only and standard English ideologies in the US *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 511–535.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3–50). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23(1), 55–82.

End Notes

ⁱ Students who have previously been identified as limited English proficient (LEP) or English language learners (ELLs), are more recently being described as “emergent bilinguals” (García & Kleifgen, 2010) in order to place emphasis on the abilities they are developing, rather than their supposed deficiencies. In early childhood, another commonly used term is “dual language learners”, especially in the state of Illinois. In this article, we use the term emergent bilinguals and note where the label “English learners” is used in legislation or other sources.

ⁱⁱ This example was, in part, discussed in Rumenapp, Whittingham, and Hoffman (2015). Please refer to this source for further information.