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ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

THE USE OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS IN CODE-SWITCHING FROM APPALACHIAN ENGLISH DIALECT TO STANDARD ENGLISH DIALECT

This study examined the use of an intervention, Contrastive Analysis (CA), with fourth-graders’ writing in a Central Appalachian elementary school. The purpose was to improve the use of Standard English in students’ writing in Appalachia by decreasing the number of vernacular features typically used in the writing. The researcher collected data through Consent and Assent Forms, interviews with the fourth-grade teacher, classroom observations and an accompanying CA observation evaluation rubric, pre- and post-writing prompts, selected writings and Writer Self-Perception Scale (WSPS), as well as communication data. Data analysis was accomplished for both the prompts, writing pieces and the WSPS scores.

The primary results of the study indicated that the students’ use of vernacular features did in fact decrease after the implementation of CA. An approach that takes into account the vernacular or nonstandard dialect from the home speech of children, CA is utilized to help them perform better in writing in school. The CA approach has been used successfully with African American students primarily in large urban areas. The research results indicate that lessons from CA may be “customized” and used successfully with students who are speakers of Appalachian English. During the eleven-week study, the fourth-grade teacher implemented the intervention and a fifth-grade teacher also led a non-intervention group. A comparative analysis was done to determine whether membership in the fourth grade intervention group was a significant factor in lowering non-standard features in writing.

This was a descriptive case study. At the beginning and end of the study, teachers of the fourth- and fifth-grade groups administered pre- and post-tests to their respective groups in the form of writing prompts. The researcher and a second reader did vernacular counts of the writings of both groups. A comparative analysis of the frequency of vernacular features (VFs) in the writing of the fourth-grade group showed decreases greater than the fifth-grade group in three of four categories of vernacular features in writing. The categories were: regularization of past-tense verbs, multiple negation, subject/verb agreement, and pronominal difference. There was only a 1% greater decrease of VFs for the fifth grade in the fourth category. A scale of self-efficacy in writing, the Writer’s Self-Perception Scale (WSPS), was also administered by the teachers pre- and post-study to both groups of students. The difference between the fourth- and fifth-grade pre- and post-WSPS scores was not statistically significant.
The findings of the study are important because they show that the use of the CA approach, when used with students from the Appalachian subculture who are speakers of Appalachian English, does make a difference in their rate of usage of Standard English in writing.
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Chapter One: Introduction

When teaching English Language Arts (ELA) in public school several years ago, if someone had maintained that teachers could put the red pen for correction away—no longer circling verb phrases such as “We was” as an incorrect subject/verb agreement phrase on a student’s writing—the very nature of grammatical constructs in Standard English would have been questioned. After all, in teacher education programs for language arts, students were taught to circle with the red pen such “incorrect” grammatical constructs.

As cultural institutions, schools are not unchanging but, rather, dynamic. The intent of this study is to describe how one teacher in the Appalachian region of the southeastern United States viewed Standard English (SE) grammar from a different perspective in order to use Contrastive Analysis (CA) as an intervention with her fourth-grade students in English Language Arts. Teachers have their own ways of perceiving the world and their own consciousness, which may sometimes be in contrast to the dominant ideology that the school promotes; yet, through this consciousness they respond to the world (Eller, 1989; Freedman, Jackson & Boles, 1983; Keesing, 1974; McNeil, 1988). Heretofore in the fourth grade, vernacular features were often perceived as errors in writing, the “red pen” circled them, and they were assessed as such. However, when the fourth-grade teacher who (with the permission of her district and school) participated in the study agreed to step out of the traditional way of teaching grammar and to implement a new intervention to augment Standard English usage in writing, she was breaking the norm, thinking outside of the box, and allowing students to have a voice in their own learning. Similarly, a fifth-grade teacher who agreed to be in the study but did not use the
intervention was looking at “the big picture” in allowing herself and her classroom to be used for a greater cause—the increased use of Standard English in an Appalachian school. Note: All names of teachers, students, and places are pseudonyms used to protect the identity of the same.

Ms. Curry, the fourth-grade teacher, began instruction in CA by having students brainstorm examples of places and clothes that are formal and informal. Formal clothing examples given were: military uniform, suit and tie, ball gown, and graduation outfit. Informal clothing examples given were: tank top, football uniform, and jail jumpsuit. As to places, formal examples were church, wedding, class reunion, and funeral. Informal place examples were pool, family reunion, home, sports practice, Mr. Gatti’s Pizza, and KFC.

Next, Ms. Curry directed the students to write down phrases on 6-inch pieces of paper, and then to come up one by one and tape them to a T-Chart labeled Informal and Formal. It was a classic example when Brent taped his phrase, “Thanks for helping me” under Formal, but in the process he got in front of a small girl named Sara, to which she replied vehemently, “He ain’t takin’ turns!” as she taped her phrase, “What’s up?” to the Informal side of the chart. Ms. Curry did not miss the opportunity to ask Sara first, and then the class, where her comment would go on the chart. They correctly said in unison, “Informal!” When a student labeled her impromptu phrase as “incorrect English,” Ms. Curry simply stated, “Now in the right place it’s not really incorrect grammar, but how someone may talk at home. We have to think about time, place, and who we are speaking to, or our audience, to decide if these phrases are informal or formal.”
Rather than using Appalachian English (App E) vs. Standard English on charts and in explanations during the intervention, the categories Informal and Formal were used, since all student participants spoke the regional App E dialect. In the study, we did not wish to marginalize the home speech by emphasizing that it was not Standard English or school speech, appropriate for school. Wheeler and Swords (2006) gave a few examples of “customized” lessons for the Appalachian dialect, since their main focus in using CA was for students who spoke African American Vernacular English (AAVE). Subsequently, several customized lessons in App E were added to the study by the researcher, based on the categories of vernacular feature use that were found in student writing of the participants.

**Background**

In order to provide background information concerning concepts relevant to the study, a description of the Southern Appalachian dialect, marginalization of the same, and culturally relevant pedagogy follows.

The vernacular speech of Appalachian English (AppE) is indigenous to the region of the United States referred to as Appalachia. The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC), a federal-state government partnership designed to improve conditions in the Appalachian region, defines Appalachia as “the area around the Appalachian Mountains, which cover more than 1,500 miles from the Canadian province of Quebec to northern Alabama, making it the largest mountain system in eastern North America” (Pollard, 2005, p. 2). The region also covers 410 counties in thirteen states, including all of West Virginia as well as parts of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, Tennessee, Kentucky, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. Pollard contended
that “over the years, analysts have defined Appalachia along various typologies—most of them economic” (p. 2). One of Appalachia’s three major sub-regions, Central Appalachia, often known as the Core Region, includes West Virginia’s nine southernmost counties as well as eastern Kentucky, Virginia’s southwestern tip, and the northwestern portion of Tennessee’s Appalachia area (p. 4). The research in this study concentrates on the written vernacular, or AppE of fourth- and fifth-grade students from a public school in a county in eastern Kentucky, within the Core Region of Appalachia.

**Locating the Appalachian English Dialect Region**

The border between Southern and Northern speech has traditionally been the Ohio River. In general, Kentucky to the south of the river and Indiana to the north are placeholders of the southern and northern dialects respectively. According to the U.S. Census, the South, as the nation’s most populous region, is home to approximately 114.6 million people. The South and the West accounted for 84.4% of the increase of the United States population from 2000-2010. Specifically, Kentucky’s growth was 7.4% for the past decade (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Kentucky is among the East South Central states: Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee. The Southern dialectal region of the eastern United States was defined by Kurath (1949) on the basis of regional vocabulary items such as “light bread” for white bread or “low” for the sound made by a cow (Labov, Ash, & Boberg, 2006). The Appalachian mountains are the western boundary of the Southern region. Past the Appalachian foothills, the mountainous parts of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee and the regions further west are assigned to the Midland, not the South dialectal regions. Based on phonological and grammatical evidence, Labov et al. state that “the southern portion of Kurath’s Midland belongs to—
indeed is central to—the modern Southern dialect region … referred to as a ‘regional unification driven by the Southern Shift’” (Labov et al., p. 240).

While Southern-States English is the most widely recognized by the general public as a regional dialect, the South is seemingly an exception to the general observation that Americans pay little attention to regional dialects and have little ability in recognizing them. Case in point: Northerners imitate a Southern accent on occasion, and “stigmatize the dialect of people to the south of them as ‘Southern’” (p. 240).

**Linguistic Basis of the Stigmatized Dialect**

Given the linguistic basis for the stigmatization of the Midland dialect, of which the Appalachian regional dialect is a part, there is often a marginalization of the students within a school by teachers and other students (Hudley & Mallinson, 2011). Knowledge and use of Standard English gives students linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1991) and therefore power. Delpit (1995) stated: “Even while teachers provide access to the ‘codes of power’ represented by acquiring facility in ‘standard edited English,’ they must also value and make use in the classroom of the language and culture children bring from home” (p. xvii). Often, however, there is a mismatch between the school language and the home language, which creates confusion for the student in the basics of learning to read and write. Some educators and others assume students’ use of the vernacular counts as improper usage of English (Wheeler & Swords, 2006).

However, sociolinguists stress that “dialects are patterned, rule-governed, not haphazard” (Wolfram, Adger, & Christian, 1999, p. 170). Each language variety has its own set of rules, as does Standard English. Subsequently, dialects follow rules that state the predictable, regular patterns that the particular language variety dictates.
Vernacular usage refers to patterns in a student’s speech or writing, characteristic of the way the student talks with friends and family in the home community. Wolfram et al. (1999) maintained that among the various strategies used in learning Standard English equivalents, one that does not work is correcting vernacular features. Rather than using a corrective approach, Rickford (1998) was among the first to advocate the use of contrastive analysis, as this approach “draws students’ attention specifically to the differences between the vernacular and the standard language” (p. 17).

In the context of the “Resolution on the Students’ Right to Their Own Language,” historically, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) members and members of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) found cause to pass a resolution in 1974 taking the position that it is a basic human right to speak one’s own native language or dialect, or “the idiolect which expresses their unique personal identity” (NCTE, 1974). This important position statement has been maintained since the early 1970s as evidenced in the “Resolution on the Student’s Right to Incorporate Heritage and Home Languages in Writing” of 2011. The resolution states that the NCTE supports:

- policies and practices that affirm the student’s right to use his or her home language as well as the language of wider communication to enrich their classroom writing; and

- professional development initiatives that help teachers understand (a) how such practices promote students’ acquisition of academic discourses …; and (b) how monolingual teachers or teachers who do not speak or understand a student’s home language can embrace and support the use of home languages in the classroom.
This sensitivity to students’ home language is implied in the wording of the new Kentucky Core Academic Standards for English Language Arts. Language Standards 1-3 for grades 4 and 5 are the same. For instance:

- L.3 1f. Ensure subject-verb and pronoun-antecedent agreement. In speaking or writing some students may use vernacular-laden features such as “I seen” or “John and her,” which some teachers may read as improper grammar usage.

- In Language Standards K-5, grade 4 students #1: Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking.

- 1c: Use of modal auxiliaries (e.g., can, may, must) to convey various conditions. Some AppE students may use multiple auxiliaries, such as in the sentence, “He might could do that.”

Language variations of both formal and informal varieties are associated with middle-class and upper-class mainstream groups. However, since vernacular or nonstandard variations are associated with less socially favored groups, they are often not considered socially acceptable. Such an association reflects the underlying values of different social groups in our society, according to Delpit (1995). One of these “different groups” is the southern Appalachians. Their speech, Appalachian English, is associated with a rural, stigmatized vernacular related to people’s “native roots” (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998). Consequently, in many Appalachian communities, if members of the group move out of the area, they may face pressure to conform to old speech patterns upon return or be accused of “gettin’ above their raisin’.”
Rationale and Educational Implications

In the area of research called home and school continuity and discontinuity, African American, Latino, and Asian students have been the main focus (Powers, 1999). Another subculture minority, which has not been researched as thoroughly, called the “invisible minority,” is that of rural and urban Appalachians. Purcell-Gates (1995) wrote about Whites as minorities and also the objects of prejudice and injustice. She maintained that “the literacy attainment of poor Whites is significantly below that of middle-class Whites, reflecting the socioeconomic status that they share with the many minorities of color” (p. 180). Therefore, Appalachian students may face prejudice against their linguistic and cultural heritage when they leave their region for school or work (Hudley & Mallinson, 2011). Teachers must learn to “build upon the unique cultural understandings and literacy practices of those students in the classroom” (Heath, 1983). Since language variation cuts across ethnicities, social classes and regions, teachers and students realize that language variation should not be regarded as a problem, but rather a natural part of the realm of linguistics (Sweetland, 2006). She concedes, however, that children who use vernacular dialects are often the target of linguistic discrimination.

Within Appalachian English, there are Southern phonological or sound features in the speech of Appalachian students. The speakers tend to pronounce the vowels I and E the same way, as in the words pen and pin, Ben and bin, den and din, etc. According to Hudley and Mallinson (2011), this is called the “pen-pin” speech merger. Therefore, it is essential for the instructor to be able to distinguish between actual errors and language variations in student writing. When the student spells “wint” instead of went and “frind”
instead of friend, as indicated by context clues, most likely the spelling error is the result of Southern English’s pen-pin merger instead of a careless mistake.

By second and third grade, students have picked up on the difference between language patterns used at home versus those used at school. For instance, in Southern English as well as AppE, words are made plural the same way as in standardized English, simply by adding an S to the end of the noun: two chicks, three eggs, etc. However, words referring to weight and measure have an optional plural marker, especially when used with numbers (Hudley & Mallinson, 2011). Therefore, phrases such as “six ton,” “thirty mile,” and “twenty cent” are commonly used.

Another language variation pattern in AppE is the “regularization” of verb patterns. For instance, considering the standardized English phrase “I saw him,” in AppE, the pattern produced by speakers is “I seen him” or “I seed him” or even “I seened him,” according to Southern speech recorded by Hudley and Mallinson. The strategy for educators to use in this case is to remind the student that his/her subject (I) and verb (saw) must agree. An instructor should talk about how in “School English,” there is a different pattern for using saw and seen. It is very important to talk about different patterns instead of correct versus incorrect English. Culturally relevant pedagogy, formerly known as culturally responsive pedagogy, is essential to mainstreaming the vernacular in using contrastive analysis and code-switching.

**Culturally Relevant Pedagogy**

A culturally responsive perspective maintains that educators and teachers with diverse student populations examine the cultural context of their classrooms and learning situations. Thus, instruction is based upon the values of students’ respective cultures (Au,
Sweetland (2006) attributes culturally relevant pedagogy, as it has come to be known in research, as one characteristic of effective teachers, to an "informed perspective." Delpit (1995) maintains that language variations and vernacular resources such as situational code-switching, call-and-response and verbal play have been documented in other research to engage African American learners. One would suppose these effective methods could be useful by teachers of other language varieties, such as Appalachian English, and other minorities as well.

Rickford (1997) maintains that despite supporting theories and evidence that teaching methods that take students’ vernacular into account are more effective than those that devalue students’ home language, potential contributions of socio-linguistics to K-12 education are not fully realized yet. One area for improvement is in curriculum development, as there is a dearth of readily usable materials about dialect diversity. The other is research that demonstrates the effectiveness of linguistically informed teaching methods. The collaboration of the two is promising.

**Linguistically Informed Teaching Methods**

Sweetland (2006) highlights several linguistically informed teaching methods: 1) the use of dialect readers (Rickford & Rickford, 1995; Simpkins & Simpkins, 1981); 2) bidialectal approaches to teaching spoken and written Standard English; call-and-response, a vernacular-based classroom teaching technique (Bohn, 2003; Foster, 2001); and 3) the use of culturally based writing patterns and genres (Ball, 1995; Blackburn & Stern, 2000; Lee, 1997). The research in this area shows that the value of respecting and drawing on language variation in the classroom benefits AAVE-speaking students in
multiple ways (Sweetland, 2006). Therefore, if the research can benefit one minority group of students, there may be applications to other groups of linguistic minorities such as Latinos and Appalachian students.

Rather than take a correctionist stance regarding Southern English and other language varieties, it is important to model for students the attitude regarding standard features they are to learn and use (Labov, 1995). Students who are simply corrected without explanation may become discouraged, lose confidence in the learning process, their own abilities, their educators, and even in school.

For example, the language pattern in Southern English and other language varieties, including AppE, calls for making irregular verbs regular by adding “ed” to the present tense verb to form a “regular” past tense, as in bring-bringed; run-runned; know-knewed. The instructor needs to talk about the different patterns used in School English, rather than identifying “brought” as correct and “bringed” as incorrect. This differentiation is the basis for contrastive analysis.

Sweetland (2006) utilizes sociolinguistics in order to improve instruction in the classroom, and proposes a model of writing instruction for use. The proposal is based on testing a model of writing instruction specifically adapted to the unique needs of children who speak a vernacular language variety. The research sought to find out whether teaching about dialect differences might improve the writing experiences and achievement of children who speak the vernacular.

The present research is framed by Sweetland’s study concerning three components: 1) a process writing curriculum, which is the most commonly used method of writing instruction adapted to use in the context of a diverse classroom where
vernacular is used by the students; 2) dialect awareness discussions—some following the showing of select sections of “Do You Speak American?” (MacNeil & Cran, 2005)—“Down South” and “Up North”; and 3) lessons using one-on-one contrastive analysis, which point out specific grammatical differences between the vernacular AppE and Standard English (SE).

Integrating these elements—writing process instruction, dialect awareness, and contrastive analysis—creates effective teaching and culturally relevant pedagogy, according to Rickford (1995) for speakers of African American Vernacular English (AAVE). Therefore, one can hypothesize a transference of results to another diverse group, the Appalachian subculture, when such instruction, based on their language variety, is used with them.

In Sweetland’s (2006) study of African American students and the achievement gap between Black and White students, she maintained that African American failure can be made less severe by making different choices, such as using the vernacular as a basis for instructional decisions.

From the lens of a descriptive perspective on language, dialect awareness programs seem to be the best way to counter the destructive social, educational, and political effects of “misguided notions” about language variation (Wolfram et al., 1999).

The 2002 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) revealed that only 14% of African American fourth graders were proficient writers, compared to 34% of White fourth graders. The disparity grows greater by eighth grade (Persky, Daane, & Jin, 2003). The NAEP, often referred to as “The Nation’s Report Card,” showed that there was no difference in scores for fourth graders between 1992 and 2003; however, the
writing performance of fourth and eighth graders actually improved between 1998 and 2002 (Adger, Wolfram & Christian, 2009, p. 89). According to Adger et al., on the 2003 NAEP, the writing performance of Asian/Pacific Islanders and European Americans in grades 4, 8, and 12 exceeded that of African Americans and Hispanics. These statistics show the need for culturally relevant pedagogy, as writing and literacy per se are very complex. Therefore, this need would be implicit to language variation populations such as AppE students. The writing assessment of the NAEP is given every 2-4 years. It was last given to fourth graders in 2003. Only eighth and twelfth graders participated in the 2007, 2009, and 2011 tests. The 2011 NAEP was the first computer-based writing assessment (http://youtube.com/watch?v=BzwoRppveto, retrieved Dec. 9, 2013).

Labov’s (1995) words in _Language in the Inner City_ were prophetic of these statistics: “The major causes of reading failure are political and cultural conflicts in the classroom, and dialect differences are important because they are symbols of this conflict” (p. xiv). It is prudent, then, for educators to understand how the various vernacular cultures use language as well as how verbal skills develop within a particular culture. No connection was found in this particular research between reading success and linguistic skill in the nonstandard or vernacular culture (Labov, 1995).

Case in point, however, as reading and writing are inextricably linked as facets of literacy, Labov’s words resound from reading to writing. One premise of this study is that dialect variation transfers from speech to writing through the lens of the vernacular speaker. Also, as in the use of dialect readers (Rickford & Rickford, 1995), dialect variation is represented in writing and, conversely, writing represents dialect. The phonetic system of reading is represented in the grapho-phonemic system of writing.
One of the states of the Central Core of Appalachia, the setting for the research population of the study is also part of the South. Dillon (2009) discusses how results from NAEP mathematical assessments given to fourth and eighth graders exhibited large gaps in scores of racial and ethnic groups as well as by state. For instance, in Math, 57% of fourth graders scored at or above “proficient” on the assessment, but only 16% of students in Mississippi did so (National Center of Educational Statistics, 2009). Such statistics indicate a great disparity between overall educational achievement in the South as opposed to the rest of the nation.

The proposed research will show that the critical roles language differences and sociolinguistic awareness play in the education of vernacular speakers, which Wolfram maintains in the foreword to Hudley and Mallinson (2011), are “important aspects of complex and multi-faceted socio-cultural and educational challenges” (p. 144).

**Research Problem**

Do contrastive analysis teaching methods generate demonstrable effects on student writing between Standard and vernacular usage with students in two classes—one intervention group of fourth-grade AppE students and another fifth-grade, non-intervention group of AppE students who receive only conventional instruction in ELA with no reference to the vernacular—when implemented in an Appalachian community school? Contrastive analysis is an approach that takes into account the vernacular or nonstandard dialect from the homes of children in efforts to help them do better in school. The contrastive analysis approach has been used successfully with African American students. In this particular study, this strategy is being used with students from the Appalachian subculture who are speakers of the Appalachian English regional dialect.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this descriptive research study is to determine the effectiveness of one method of reducing the number of vernacular features in the Standard English writing of Appalachian-dialect students. Descriptive research is defined by Kamil, Langer, and Shanahan (1985) as research that describes “characteristics, properties, or relationships of groups, events, or phenomena” (p. 66). Another important purpose of the study is to investigate effective methods of writing instruction for upper elementary-age writers in vernacular contexts (Sweetland, 2006). Therefore, descriptive research was an appropriate method of research for this study.

Research Questions

1. How will the intervention of contrastive analysis enable AppE fourth-grade students to write Standard English with fewer vernacular features as compared to a non-intervention fifth-grade group without the use of contrastive analysis?

2. In what ways does instruction in contrastive analysis impact students’ views of themselves as writers?

3. In what ways does the contrastive analysis approach have a similar effect on AppE students’ writing as it does for other language varieties?

Research Design

This is a descriptive case study with an intervention and a non-intervention group, and a pre-test/post-test design. The groups are already established and intact. The researcher will administer a pre-test to both groups, administer an intervention to one group, and give a post-test to both groups (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006).
Intervention Resources

As few public school teachers have a linguistic background, the documentary *Do You Speak American?* (MacNeil & Cran, 2005) is useful to familiarize teachers with the topic. The researcher used Parts “1” and “2,” “Up North” and “Down South,” respectively, to augment the socio-linguistic background of the fourth-grade intervention teacher. There was also a Web site (www.pbs.org/speak) that was used as a resource to address issues related to dialect diversity, different regional and ethnic varieties, and language standards. Five topical units of curriculum materials are available at www.pbs.org/speak/education (Adger et al., 2009). Linguists have also developed a dialect awareness unit that has been successfully tested in several locations in North Carolina (e.g. Reaser, 2006). The activities were developed to help students compare the Standard English speakers in regions such as the rural South, New England, and the urban North, according to Adger et al. (2009). Other resources including “state-centered documentaries such as *Voices of North Carolina* work well, too, but some of the vignettes are too localized for widespread use” (p. 157). The documentary is often used to stress the nature of dialects and the accompanying attitudes associated with them.

Contrastive Analysis

Taylor (1989) used contrastive analysis effectively in two freshman English classrooms to show improvement in Standard English mastery with AAVE speakers. Her eleven-week study showed that students taught by traditional methods used 8.5% more vernacular features in writing, while the class that used contrastive analysis used 59.3% fewer African American vernacular features (as cited in Sweetland, 2006). She noted that it is crucial that contrastive analysis exercises be used in context. For her study, this often
meant simply engaging students in dialogue about their experiences. This shows the effectiveness of grammar instruction informed by research on language variation. Sweetland maintains that “this contrastive approach to grammar is contextualized by discussions of dialect diversity so that Standard English is taught as a second dialect, not the only dialect” (p. 27).

**Significance of the Study**

Many students in the Southern Appalachian area are at a disadvantage in formal schooling, especially in test-taking situations and later in the job market, because they speak and write a nonstandard or vernacular dialect (Adger, Wolfram, & Christian, 2009; Hudley & Mallinson, 2011). Specifically, the purpose of developmentally appropriate speech and language testing in early elementary school is to see whether language acquisition of children is occurring at a normal rate of development. During many initial speech and language development screenings before entering school for the first time, children who exhibit a language variety may be classified as “language disordered” and recommended for more extensive diagnosis (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998). The “normal” development definition is based on the norms of the Standard English-speaking population, which are based on middle-class samples of children. If middle-class standardized norms are used as the basis for language development testing, there is much room for dialect discrimination in the testing outcomes, according to Wolfram and Schilling-Estes. As students advance in age, the distinction between formal and informal standard becomes more important in tests such as the Scholastic Aptitude Test. Case in point, the SAT is often geared toward recognition of Standard English forms. Wolfram and Schilling-Estes maintain that rather than measuring achievement, the tests are
measuring “inner language knowledge of the standard dialect … . The underlying problem, then, is the comparison of standard and vernacular speakers as if both groups started from the same linguistic baseline” (p. 269). In other words, the effects of measuring vernacular speakers by standard norms can have quite severe outcomes.

Wolfram and Schilling Estes contend that for the standard speaker, achievement tests measure this inner language knowledge that the student brings to school from home. However, for the vernacular dialect student, it only measures the ability to recognize the Standard English forms. It assumes that the student has been introduced to such forms in the classroom. This study proposes to bridge the gap in testing as well as other school knowledge for the vernacular dialect student. It will do this by increasing the student’s ability to utilize the standard dialect in the context of school—for example to recognize standard verb forms and syntax. In such ways it will improve the student’s writing ability and add to our knowledge base as teachers and students.

**Definition of Terms**

Several terms used in this thesis require definition in order to differentiate one from another.

1. **Appalachian English (AppE):** One of the surviving nonstandard or vernacular regional dialects of English still spoken in the United States and associated with natives of the southern Appalachian Mountains (Richards, 2001).

2. **Code-switching:** The use of several languages or dialects within the same conversation or sentence of bilingual people. (Gardner-Chloros, 2009). Note: code-switching also refers to the use of a nonstandard dialect within the conversation or sentence of monolingual people within their standard dialect.

3. **Contrastive analysis (CA):** Originally from second-language acquisition studies by Lado (1957), CA is a second-dialect teaching tool. Through a comparison of the vernacular or nonstandard English and Standard English, usually on charts, students are helped to discover the detailed
contrasts between the grammar of the two. It is used as a tool for learning Standard English in the school setting (Wheeler & Swords, 2006).

4. Dialect: Synonymous with language variation, dialect is a label used to refer to any variety of a language shared by a group of speakers living in the same place or in close proximity to each other, or belonging to the same socioeconomic or social group (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998).

5. Ebonics: The language system, coined by Black scholars, with roots in West Africa (not a substandard form of English). It may also be referred to as Black dialect or African American language system. In the literature, African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and African American English (AAE) are used synonymously (Perry & Delpit, 1997).

6. Register: A pragmatic skill involving speakers who change the way they talk in a given context. Hudley and Mallinson (2011) defined the concept as different communication situations calling for different uses of language.

7. Register shift: How speakers use variation in linguistic forms to fit different functions in cultural situations (Boult, 2007). This refers to the shift between formal and informal usage—teacher and peer speech, for instance.

8. Standard English: Referred to by Hudley and Mallinson (2011) as School English, it is a standardized form of English used by students and educators in educational settings. It is also referred to as the language of business, government, schools, and colleges (Odell et al., 2001). “Standard English is a collection of the socially preferred dialects from various parts of the United States and other English-speaking countries” (Adger et al., 2009, p. 15).

9. Standard Mainstream American English (SAME): The language of school instruction (Boult, 2007). AAVE and AppE, both nonstandard dialects, therefore, are considered non-mainstream dialects.

10. Stigmatized Dialect: A term sometimes used interchangeably with vernacular dialect to refer to varieties of English often devalued in schools and other public institutions.

11. Vernacular Dialect: Used synonymously with nonstandard or non-mainstream dialect, vernacular dialect refers to the speech of people who do not speak a standard variety. It is the preferred term by some linguists.
and educators because a) it “highlights the dimension of the indigenous communities associated with language varieties that differ from the standard” (Adger et al., 2009, p. 15); and b) it has a more neutral nuance than the term nonstandard and is less confusing than non-mainstream, which is commonly used to refer to groups outside of mainstream society for various reasons.
Chapter Two: Review of Literature

Language Variation, Multicultural Education, and Sociolinguistics

The literature to support the design and implementation of this study was reviewed through a multicultural education lens with an eye for sociolinguistics. Language diversity is essential to the multicultural education mission in that language is an integral part of culture and identity (Hudley & Mallinson, 2011). Multicultural education espouses the concept that every student is unique, which is central to the academic and social development of each student.

Many people have strong beliefs about Southern English, although no single language variety is inherently superior to any other, according to Hudley and Mallinson. This theory is borne out in a study by Preston (1998), who extensively researched attitudes about language in the United States. Preston found that even when respondents were Southerners themselves, when asked to rate the degree of “correctness” of spoken English in regions of the country, the South was continually given the lowest ratings. Although there is a tendency for people to associate Southern English with low intelligence, quaintness, and incompetence, pleasantness and friendliness is also associated with it (Lippi-Green, 1997).

The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the International Reading Association (IRA) (1996) have endorsed adopting linguistically informed ways of teaching standardized English. Accordingly, students’ ability to learn to communicate effectively in the “language of wider communication,” or standardized English, is supported by these organizations (Hudley & Mallinson, p. 20). In this bent, teachers must understand when and how standardized English is best used as well as how the structure
and use of standardized English compare to the structure and use of non-standardized or vernacular varieties of English that students might bring from home.

Institutional responses to students’ language differences, rather than the initial language variety students bring with them from home, may ultimately lead to the academic failure of lower- and middle-class preschoolers through first graders, according to Craig and Washington (2002, 2004). In a study in the Detroit area of non-standardized English-speaking students’ academic failure, Craig and Washington found that upon entry to school, African American boys and low-income African American students generally used African American English features more often than African American girls and African American students from middle-income homes. The research shows that for most African American English-speaking students, there was a shift that occurred between kindergarten and third grade (Craig & Washington, 2004, 2006). During this time, most of the African American English features used by students were reduced by more than half. Consequently, the students who reflected this decrease in their use of African American English features between kindergarten and fifth grade had higher reading achievement scores. However, students who did not “become well versed in standardized English forms by fourth or fifth grade typically ended up one or more grade levels behind” (as cited in Hudley & Mallinson, p. 106). These findings demonstrate the effects on students’ early school success from learning or not learning to use standardized English forms.

Labov states in the foreword to Hudley and Mallinson’s book: “Southern English and African American English are both subject to caricature and misrepresentation in the public arena” (p. xiv). He maintains that the traditional view of the speakers of these
language varieties is that these forms of English “are the result of the personal
deficiencies of the speakers; that they are the products of laziness, carelessness, and
ignorance.” Labov supports Hudley and Mallinson as they counter this deficit view of
language varieties as “the product of a different set of rules with their own logic and
internal consistency” (p. xiv). Finally, Labov restates what so many in the field agree is
the goal: to lead students to a mastery of reading and writing of standardized English
(Hudley & Mallinson, 2011; Adger, Wolfram, & Christian, 2009; Wheeler & Swords,
2006).

The field of sociolinguistics values research in the public interest (Rickford,
1997). Modern sociolinguistics, in fact, emerged during the social justice movements of
the 1960s (Sweetland, 2006). The context of research on literacy attainment for groups
whose needs were not being met by the school systems was a cause for many of the
methods and questions first developed in the field. Thus we have the Ann Arbor Decision
of 1979, also referred to as the Black English Trial, where parents filed suit against the
Ann Arbor School District in Michigan for failing to provide adequate education for their
children. The ruling was influenced by testimony of Labov and Smitherman (1981). The
ruling determined that the deficiency in education was due to “teachers’ ignorance and
insensitivity regarding AAVE,” which created a negative impact on the teaching and
learning of reading for Black children in the district (Joiner, 1979). Later the Oakland,
California, school board attempted to formally recognize the role of vernacular speech in
the classroom and created a national crisis into which linguists were drawn. Thus, as well
as being drawn into crises, there is also a tradition of “consciousness raising” in the field
of sociolinguistics (Rickford, 1999).
Pursuant to these crises, an outgrowth of concern caused some sociolinguists through their research to create dialect awareness programs for the communities, such as Appalachia, in which they work such as Appalachia and for college-level courses for pre-service teachers (Wolfram, 1999; Wolfram, Shilling-Estes, & Hazen, 2000). These efforts have been perceived as effective means of changing negative attitudes toward AAVE and other language varieties, including AppE (Ball & Muhammad, 2003; Smitherman & Villanueva, 2000).

**Significance of Code-switching**

One way vernacular speakers learn to cope with the dichotomy of functioning with a non-standardized language variety in a standardized language world is through code-switching, the use of a nonstandard or vernacular dialect within a conversation or sentence by monolingual people within their standard dialect. This bidialectalism enables them to maintain their own dialect yet use Standard English as a second dialect for different purposes in conjunction with the local community (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998). Almost all who are in contact with more than one language or dialect code-switch to a certain degree. Code-switching refers to bilingual people’s use of several languages or dialects within the same conversation or sentence (Gardner-Chloros, 2009).

Combinations of two or more linguistic varieties, known as code-switching, occur in many bilingual communities and societies. “Numerous local names designate such mixed talk: Tex-Mex, Franglais, BBC Grenglish, Chinglish, Spanglish, Tuti Futi, etc.” (p. 4). Other “linguistic outcomes” of languages, known as language interaction, include pidginization, borrowing, convergence, and language death, according to Gardner-Chloros. Thus, Haitian Creole or Kreyol, the most widely spoken creole in the world, is
the language of Haiti. About eight million people speak Kreyol, a French-based creole with influences from West African languages (Nazaire, 2011).

Bilingual people often switch language varieties and, in so doing, communicate something beyond the superficial meaning of their words. Switching between dialects, registers, levels of formality and intonations is also done by monolinguals or speakers of primarily one language (Bell, 1984; Coupland, 1985; Labov, 1971). Much is implied through code-switching by the speakers, and much is inferred by the receiver of the speech.

Although code-switching is used by many immigrants who are in a transitional stage of switching from their home language to the dominant language in their new home country, code-switching is also used in many bilingual populations as a matter of course. During code-switching, people alternate linguistic varieties within the same conversation. Myers-Scotton (1993) dated interest in code-switching (CS) from the 1972 publication of Jan Blom and John Gumperz’s collection of readings on sociolinguistics edited by Gumperz and Dell Hymes:

Blom and Gumperz (hereafter B & G) deal, not with codeswitching between languages, but with codeswitching between dialects of Norwegian in Hemnesberget, a Norwegian fishing village. The article, however, stimulated a flood of investigation of codeswitching between languages. (p. 46)

The preference for study between languages was based on the fact that separate languages were more easily distinguishable for linguists studying them than were dialects of the same language. Myers-Scotton maintained that “B & G gave a psychological boost to the possibility of making sense of CS” (p. 51).
Myers-Scotton also highlighted the works of Penelope Gardner-Chloros, published in 1985 and 1991, that presented a socio-linguistic approach to CS. Gardner-Chloros’ work discussed the bilingual community of Strasbourg, France (Alsatian/French). Myers-Scotton stated, “What makes her approach largely sociolinguistic is that she considers CS as one of the pieces within a larger discussion of patterns of language use and their social correlates” (p. 45).

Gardner-Chloros described the momentum of interest in CS: “Over the last forty-odd years there has been an explosion of interest in CS. CS had remained more or less ‘invisible’ in research on bilingualism until the work of Gumperz and his associates …” (p. 9). Gumperz established an important link between CS and monolingual stylistic choices, a theme investigated by many other subsequent researchers. Gumperz’s 1982 chapter on “Conversational Codeswitching” in his book *Discourse Strategies* was referred to more widely than any other writing on CS in the 1980s, according to Myers-Scotton (p. 51). In his 1982 collection, Gumperz extended the idea of “conversational code-switching” and paralleled it to creative performance and metaphorical switching.

A qualitative study of interest by Godley and Escher (2010) analyzed bidialectal African American adolescents’ views on code-switching in English Language Arts (ELA) classrooms. Fifty-five tenth graders in a 99% African American high school in a Midwestern, rust-belt city were asked to write a response to a prompt. Students were asked their opinion on which dialects they should speak in class: SE, AAVE, or both. A second stage of coding compared students’ reasons for their views on languages used in ELA classes. Percentages were computed for surveys. Findings indicated that one-half of the students in the study realized they should speak SE in the ELA classes at least some
of the time. Eighteen percent argued they should only speak SE in class; 38% argued they should speak both SE and AAE in class. Although this study has a secondary school population, it is one of the few current studies researched with public school students. Also, data were collected over a period of one-and-a-half years—both observational and student survey—which is longer than many studies in this area.

Particularly related to the present study, code-switching will be considered from the perspectives of monolinguals from both the southern mountain Appalachian English (AppE) or Midland South dialect, and that of African Americans, African American English (AAE), or African American Vernacular English (AAVE), as it is sometimes called. These groups regularly use code-switching in their daily speech; however, most of the research relates to AppE, as they use different language varieties in the same conversation as a matter of course.

The differentiation of standard and vernacular is explained by Bourdieu as the game that occurs in social spaces or fields being competitive with various social agents using differing strategies to “maintain or improve their position” (Grenfell, 2008, p. 17). There is an accumulation of capital in Bourdieu’s theory—both the process within and product of a field. As Grenfell says, there are four forms of capital: economic, cultural, social and symbolic, and no level playing field. “The more linguistic capital that speakers possess, the more they are able to exploit the system of differences to their advantage and thereby secure a profit of distinction” (p. 18). An example of this from Bourdieu’s writing concerned an occasion when the mayor of Pau in Bearn, France, addressed the people in the local dialect, Bearnais. The people were greatly moved, as Bourdieu said, because they recognized the “unwritten law which imposes French as the only acceptable
language on official occasions.” Therefore, the mayor was condescending to win favor with the people and draw “symbolic profit from this relation” (p. 19).

**African American English**

The largest amount of research in sociolinguistics has concentrated on the African American dialect as opposed to Appalachian English or other language varieties. According to Sweetland (2006), “Writing instruction may also be the ideal context in which to focus on teaching Standard English to learners who are not yet proficient in the code of power” (p. 20). She also contends that writing is used in most every form of student assessment and plays a crucial role as a “gatekeeper” in academic assessment and decision-making. Delpit (1995) states that “writing is a mediated process which may be written and rewritten any number of times before being introduced to public scrutiny” (p. 61). Sweetland posits that the same students who are offended when teachers correct their nonstandard speech would tolerate written teacher feedback.

Delpit (1995) took issue with a new instructional methodology—writing-process approaches to literacy inspired by the work of Graves and others from the Northeast. “The ‘process approach’ proposed in part that teachers should focus more on the larger cognitive processes of writing than solely on correcting the products” (Delpit, p. 7). To voice her concerns with the process approach and the whole writing project movement, Delpit wrote a letter to a colleague at the University of Alaska, “Skills and Other Dilemmas of a Progressive Black Educator.” It was later published as an article in the *Harvard Educational Review* in 1986 and was included as an essay in Delpit’s book as well.
Delpit contended that African Americans were excluded from the dialogue on the inclusion of writing process in literacy instruction. She maintained that the basics of process writing be kept, but that it should be open to modification by parents and teachers of color and others (p. xvi). Delpit stated that “even while teachers provide access to the ‘codes of power’ represented by acquiring facility in ‘standard edited English,’ they must also value and make use in the classroom of the language and culture children bring from home” (p. xvi).

According to Delpit, people acquire a new dialect most effectively through interaction with speakers of that dialect, rather than being constantly corrected. She reflected on her experiences growing up in a pre-integration, Black Catholic school in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, where she was constantly corrected by her teachers as well as her mother. Despite being subjected to hypercorrect English forms, she learned to speak Standard English.

This difference in end results of the approaches led to disillusionment by many minority teachers and became the basis of “the silenced dialogue” to which Delpit referred. They simply fell silent at professional developments and conferences about the writing process. Black and minority teachers maintained that writing-process teachers were “adamant about developing fluency because they have not had opportunity to realize fluency kids possess—rap, jump rope, etc.” (p. 17). However, Black teachers were eager to move on to “the appropriation of the oral and written forms demanded by the mainstream … they are eager to teach skills” (p. 18).

Delpit maintained that she didn’t mean to suggest that the writing process was wrong, or that skills orientation was all right. Suggesting that there is much to be gained
from the interaction of the two orientations of skills and writing process, Delpit made a case for the “silenced dialog.” She stated, “The saddest element is that the individuals that the Black and Native Alaskan educators speak of ‘are seldom aware that the dialogue has been silenced’” (p. 23).

Delpit summed up the controversy due to her “perspective as a product of a skills-oriented approach to writing and as a teacher of process-oriented approaches” when she stated, “I believe the answer lies in ethnographic analysis—in identifying and giving voice to alternative world views” (p. 23).

One of the oral forms demanded by the mainstream is register-shifting from teacher to peer to school registers, for instance. According to Boult (2007), Delpit (1995) maintained that register-shifting skill was viewed as a potential contributor to the relatively low academic success of African American children, given its relevance to scholastic achievement. Recently, scholars suggested that African American children “cannot be expected to passively absorb a code without being explicitly exposed to the social content in which language learning occurs” (Boult, 2007, p. 99).

In the research results of a mixed-methods study using a binomial comparison, Boult tested participants individually in four tasks of expressive and receptive types. The task types were lexical semantics and request forms. The population comprised thirty-six African American third graders between 7.6 and 9.9 years old from four different neighborhoods in suburban Detroit. Selection was by stratified random sampling from census data from the neighborhoods as to SEG and SES. Boult found that African American children do register-shift from peer to teacher-centered registers. Therefore, register-shifting is a skill African American children possess. As Boult says, “This result
is especially important to refuting the false, historical assumption that African American children have deprived linguistic skills in general” (p. 100). Milroy (1987) maintained that the stronger the intra-community ties, the stronger the use of vernacular language variety. Thus the study of register-shifting and social networking accounts for the strength of the bonding with communities (Boult, 2007). Implications are strong for educational policy as well as research methodology.

Language variation cuts across ethnicities, social classes and regions, as teachers and students alike realize that rather than being a problem, it is a natural state within the realm of linguistics (Sweetland, 2006). Conceding, however, that children who use vernacular dialects are often the target of linguistic discrimination and, while lauding Delpit’s approach, Sweetland says:

To my mind, Delpit’s most important argument is that educators concerned with the outcomes of African American youth must insist on skills in the context of critical and creative thinking, recognizing that a sound approach to student achievement has both a strong “floor” and a high “ceiling.” (p. 230)

In other words, it is important to teach skills, but they must be presented to the vernacular dialect student through a meaningful context.

According to Charity (2005), the idea of minority status is unique to African Americans. Considering the case of lower-class White speakers in the South, “Their language may vary from the standard to the same extent that African American language does, but there is no protected status for their language to the same degree that there is for AAVE” (p. 282). Although southern English and AppE have received attention in the literature, the social situation that parallels the language situation has not received as much attention in the sociolinguistic literature.
It is also critical that educators help children identify with people from similar backgrounds who have used AAVE/SE to their advantage, such as Paul L. Dunbar and Langston Hughes (Charity, 2005). Bill Clinton, as former president of the United States and a Rhodes Scholar, is a prime example of a southerner who learned to code-switch to his advantage. Other political leaders—Presidents Jimmy Carter and George W. Bush; Senators Elizabeth Dole and Kay Bailey Hutchison, as well as Governor Ann Richards of Texas—who maintained their vernacular dialects, and were in prestigious positions, helped elevate public opinion of the southern dialect (Hudley & Mallinson, 2011).

Dialect variation in school settings among African American children of low socioeconomic status was examined by Charity (2005). The dissertation of Anne Harper Charity, maiden name of Anne H. Charity Hudley, who is the co-author of Hudley & Mallinson (2011), previously cited, examines both individual and contextual variation as well as regional. The usage of grammatical, phonological, and prosodic features of AAVE by 4- to 8-year olds is also examined. In the study, story-retelling samples were collected in school of 217 kindergarten through second-grade students. Through the samples, usage of both AAVE and SE or standard American English (SAE as Charity refers to it) were studied in four different cities—Cleveland, Ohio; New Orleans, Louisiana; Washington, D.C.; and Richmond, Virginia. Across this large sample population, one important finding is that usage rates for both phonological and grammatical forms correlated inversely with reading achievement and age, which suggests that as children become more acquainted with the language of books and schools, they become more sensitive to stigmatized features of AAVE (Charity, 2005). In a small second sample from Richmond, Virginia, of children’s AAVE usage, a stronger
relationship between the retelling speech and spontaneous speech was found as opposed to sentence imitation of an SAE-speaking teacher. Regional variation in AAVE was outlined as a factor of demographic differences as well as social class differences. Charity posits: “It is possible, especially for young speakers, that the observed differences may reflect the intersection of language acquisition amidst varying local social norms for AAVE usage across formal and informal settings” (p. xiii). This was a mixed-methods study with regression analysis of some points of measurement as well as interviews with the children for the politeness sample, for instance.

The language variation of AAVE differs from others by social class and style (Rickford, 1997). Through descriptive work by Labov et al. (1968) and Wolfram (1969), which was funded by the Office of Education, sociolinguists made the following recommendations regarding elementary education:

1. Topic association style of oral narration by some African American children was noted by sociolinguists (Taylor & Matsuda, 1988);
2. African American rhetorical and expressive styles should be more fully accepted in the classroom (Foster, 1989; Ball, 1992; Smitherman, 1994).
3. In the allocation of federal and local funds, student native speakers’ linguistic needs should be considered by policymakers.
4. The use of dialect readers helps students learn to read in their native dialect; they can transfer these skills to reading the standard variety.

Reading, writing, and language arts are the applied areas of elementary education in which sociolinguists have set out to make a contribution. However, Rickford concluded that not enough had been done. His research base of East Palo Alto,
California, which was heavily African American, was a case in point. Third graders scored at the 16th percentile statewide for the reading component of the California Assessment Program in 1989-1990; by sixth grade, they dropped to 3rd percentile (Rickford, 1997).

The use of dialect readers as an aid in teaching reading to speakers of AAVE was first implemented by Stewart (1969) who claims that for AAVE speakers or speakers of other language variations, it was effective pedagogy to separate learning to read from that of learning a second dialect or language. For AAVE speakers, as well as AppE and other language varieties, SE is a second dialect.

In the reading area, experimental evidence of effectiveness of dialect readers, Leaverton (1973) reports on the use of AAVE (“everyday”) and SE (“school talk”) versions of four stories with thirty-seven students in a Chicago elementary school. More progress in learning to read was made by the experimental group, which was exposed to both everyday and school talk, than in the control group, which was exposed only to the school talk SE version. Rickford & Rickford (1995) provide specific suggestions on how to use dialect readers experimentally.

Subsequently, Simpkins et al. (1977) developed a dialectal reading program for Houghton Mifflin called Bridge, which included texts and was written in three varieties: AAVE, Standard English (SE), and a transitional variety. Simpkins & Simpkins (1981) reported on their use of the Bridge program with 417 seventh- through twelfth-grade students from across the United States. The data showed that those using the Bridge program made “significantly larger gains” on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills in Reading
Comprehension compared to the control group of 123 students who were taught with regular remedial reading instruction.

However, according to Simpkins, the Bridge program floundered by the mid to late 1970s because the publishers were losing money and the program was criticized by the media and educators, including some influential African American educators. This was true as well in 1996 when Maya Angelou and Kweisi Mfume were among the most verbal critics of the Oakland resolution. They mistakenly thought the Oakland resolution was aimed at teaching Ebonics instead of SE to African American children (Rickford, 1997).

A mixed-methods study by Rickford & Rickford (1995) entails three mini-studies which were conducted on attitudes about dialect readers in three cities on the San Francisco Peninsula in California. Angela Rickford, John Rickford’s wife, conducted the first study on attitudinal responses from students and teacher ratings of AAVE and SE studies. The study involved seven third- through fifth-grade African American students of low socio-economic status and eight teachers, four White and four Black. Open-coding for themes was used; a mean teacher rating of AAVE and SE stories regarding statements was computed. The results showed a gender split: Girls preferred the SE version, whereas most boys preferred the AAVE version. Quantitative data from the Mean Teacher Ratings showed that teachers of both races were more positive about evaluations of SE stories than those of AAVE stories.

The second mini-study involved twenty seventh graders—fourteen African Americans and six others. In the study, attitudinal responses and multiple-choice comprehension tests were given to the seventh graders. The responses were analyzed and
tests were compared for the two types of stories. The findings showed that the students preferred AAVE stories and did much better on stories written in dialect. The third mini-study was a replication of the second one, but with sixteen sixth graders, eleven African Americans and five others. In the third mini-study, the results were reversed: Comprehension was higher on SE stories than on AAVE ones. Only one-third of boys preferred SE stories, but girls still preferred SE stories. The overall attractiveness of AAVE versus SE stories was mixed. The researchers felt there was a need to replicate the tests with a larger number of students from similar low-income schools with large African American populations.

Switching to writing, specifically, which was the emphasis of the study, I highlighted Sweetland’s (2006) dissertation on a sociolinguistic approach to teaching writing in the African American classroom. In this mixed-methods study, the effects of the Sociolinguistic Approach (SA) intervention model were evaluated by quantitative and qualitative methods. The population of the study was eighty-six African American students in six classrooms of grades 4 through 6. Six upper-elementary teachers in an urban school district in Ohio participated in a workshop on sociolinguistic diversity, and then implemented the curriculum. Pre-post changes in student writing were assessed by scoring two pieces of writing from each participant by an unfamiliar school adult; the two samples were done ten weeks apart. Two independent raters assessed the writing using the Six Traits model. Students in the SA and No Treatment groups showed significant improvement in their writing over ten weeks. However, students in the Writing Process instructional group showed no significant change. Language attitude scores indicate that “teachers learn what they are asked to teach” (p. 229). Instructional recommendations
based on the study were: Increase teacher awareness of language variation; introduce dialect awareness themes in the classroom; use contrastive analysis to teach Standard English as a second dialect.

The study is supported by an excellent research design, which could be replicated using another language variation group and a smaller population sample. The dialect awareness instruction for teachers was essential to the success of the research.

Research by Wheeler (2010) was completed through qualitative action research in Wheeler’s college classes of approximately fifteen teachers of students in grades K-14 in pre-service and in-service as well as professional development. Wheeler used contrastive analysis (CA) and code-switching for teachers of students who speak AAVE or African American English (AAE). In the use of CA, grammar patterns were found and described. Teachers learned how to use a code-switching chart, which is the “graphic organizer underlying all classroom work” (p. 958) in this model. Analysis of teacher interviews revealed that teachers’ language ideology and previous lack of training in the structure of English were limiting factors in the classroom. The action research was very effective in taking advantage of the teacher resources at hand in the college classroom. It also shows the importance of teacher attitudes and dialect awareness training among those who teach students with language variations.

**Southern Appalachian Dialect**

The second dialectal emphasis in the literature review is on Southern Appalachian dialect. Labov (1970) maintained that in general, nonstandard English dialects are not radically different systems from Standard English but are closely related. He did not specifically dwell on any nonstandard dialect, but instead talked about the general
principles relating to vernacular English. Labov maintained this basis for an analysis of the nonstandard as opposed to the standard dialect:

Any analysis of the nonstandard dialect which pretends to ignore other dialects and the general rules of English will fail (1) because the nonstandard dialect is not an isolated system but a part of the sociolinguistic structure of English, and (2) because of the writer’s knowledge of standard English. (p. 17)

Reese (1976) referred to “the myth of the Southern Appalachian dialect.” For a long time, there has been debate about whether or not one Southern Appalachian dialect exists. Reese posited the controversy of the mountaineers’ language in this way:

In the world of the flesh, does such a creature exist, and if he lives, does he speak, as Cratis Williams and others seem to suggest, one Southern Appalachian dialect? One notes that often the answers to these questions are peculiarly circular, i.e., the Southern Mountaineer can be recognized by his mountain dialect, the mountain dialect being that which the mountaineer speaks. (p. 477)

As Reese reported, George Hemple, an early American philologist, believed dialectal variations existed in the Southern mountains but did not accept the hypothesis that the mountainous area shared a common dialect (p. 479). As leader of the American Dialect Society, Hemple and others deduced from speech reports that the dialect was not separate from Southern dialectal speech in general. A Midland speech area was found to exist, but there was little or no evidence that Southern Appalachia was a distinct speech area (p. 479). Therefore, the Appalachian region, while not technically a distinct dialect area, “has—and in all probability has had for a long time—speakers of very distinct ‘mountain dialects.’ Although the speakers of these dialects and therefore the dialects themselves still exist, the small geographical pockets which previously isolated them have all but vanished” (p. 483). As more isolated populations have been dispersed throughout the region, Reese suggests it may be more appropriate to speak of the language of the
Southern Highlander or Mountaineer more than an Appalachian dialect. Reese states, “It is, then, the way that the mountaineer uses his language—his rhetorical sources—not his dialect that those seeking to understand his culture and personality must study. There is little evidence that the dialects of the mountain area are disappearing” (p. 492).

Dialectal differences among the various spoken English dialects in America were documented by Labov (1991). He termed the directional principles of patterns of linguistic change as “chain shifts,” two of which existed in American English dialects—the Northern and Southern dialects (Richards, 2001). Concerning Southern American English, a dialect may be described as belonging to the “formal standard,” the “informal standard,” or the “vernacular dialect” (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998, p. 11). According to Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, the standard varieties are associated with middle- and upper-class mainstream speakers. The nonstandard dialect (also referred to as the vernacular) is differentiated from the standard in that it is associated with and used by those socially discriminated-against groups. In the words of Baugh (1980) it is termed a “stigmatized” dialect, a term which he used in reference to the dialect of Black English Vernacular (BEV). Labov (1980) cites Baugh: “BEV is a stigmatized dialect and as such represents a highly personal and consequently an emotional topic” (p. 83). Appalachian English is also a stigmatized dialect. As such, parallel measures used with one stigmatized dialect could possibly be applied successfully to another.

Richards (2001) stated that Appalachian English (AppE) is associated with people living in West Virginia and eastern Kentucky, along the southern Appalachian mountain range, which extends south into parts of mountainous east Tennessee, as cited in Luhman (1990). A surviving nonstandard regional dialect of English, AppE is still spoken in the
United States. According to Richards (2001), the research of the dialect spoken by residents of the Southern Appalachian Mountains, particularly the phonological characteristics, shows that there is a dearth of literature on the subject. However, contrary to Reese’s statement, Wolfram and Christian (1975) maintained that the dialect appeared to be fading and was transitioning toward General American English (GAE), a term coined by West, Shriberg and Kent (1995) and cited by Richards, meaning the form found in print and broadcast media that reflects the “standard.”

Suggesting that not much attention has been paid to European-American children living in poverty, especially those of Appalachian descent, McIntyre & Stone (1998) studied prospects of reforming schools for such diverse student populations, which they term as an area of research that has been “ongoing for decades.” Research on school reform, mainly focused on urban schools, shows their failure to meet the educational needs of Latino and African American students, as well (Azmitia, Cooper, Garcia & Dunbar, 1996; Purcell-Gates, 1995). However, White, rural children, referred to as the “invisible” cultural group, are often ignored due to lack of color (Purcell-Gates, 1995).

McIntyre and Stone’s study targeted twenty-one children between the ages of 5 and 9 at two school sites—thirteen in the rural site and eight in the urban site. The students were chosen because they were the youngest children in multi-age classrooms. Thus, the researchers were provided with an opportunity for a multi-year study involving the same teachers and students. McIntyre & Stone studied the use of culturally contextualized instruction (CCI), a culturally responsive program designed to be sensitive to students’ own communication patterns from home (Delpit, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1994). This is rooted in sociolinguistic theory (Gee, 1990; Moll, 1992; Tharp &
Gallimore, 1993). Much of the work is based on Moll’s “funds of knowledge” project, which has to do with household and community knowledge and skills (Moll et al., 1992).

The project provides a model of CCI instruction for diverse students, particularly of Appalachian descent, who are culturally different from their school administrators and teachers. Through the implementation of CCI and the use of the Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence (CREDE) indicators were used to analyze teachers’ instruction, and improvements were reported enhancing usual classroom routines. An integral part of the study was several home visits made by teachers as they learned how to connect home and school. Teachers based their instruction on students’ prior knowledge and helped students apply learning to home and community issues. All activities included the use of books by and about authors from the same cultural group as the children’s (McIntyre & Stone, 1998). The study was funded by CREDE.

Heath (1982) wrote an ethnographic comparative study, which was the basis for her book *Ways with Words* (1983). In the study, children of both Roadville, the White, working class community based at the textile mills, and Trackton, the Black community—formerly farmers but now also based at the textile mills—are unsuccessful in school. However, both communities, located in the Carolinas, value success in school. Parents believe in the personal and vocational rewards of school and urge their children to do well in school as a way of getting ahead. “Ways of taking” from books are a part of the culture, and are more varied than current dichotomies between oral and literate traditions. The population of the study is composed of preschool children, parents, and other adults in Maintown, Roadville, and Trackton. The study points to the inadequacy of
unilinear models of child language. It also compares tenets of enculturation for preschool children in each of the three communities (Heath, 1982).

Another factor that especially impacts AppE students in their writing is the nature of the discourse with the teacher. Powers’ (1999) qualitative research on teacher discourse with four eastern Kentucky fourth graders during writing conferences was designed with narrative case studies. Data were collected from late August through mid-January with classroom observations focused on teacher and student discourse. Formal and informal interviews with teachers and students were conducted, and audio recordings made of the same. It was found that the teacher was successful in connecting with the language and culture of the school. In some instances, however, the teacher’s limited awareness of issues of diversity was a negative factor. However, as teacher discussion shifted from the Imitation Response Evaluation (IRE) pattern to conversational, students became more engaged in the conferences. The addition of another teacher in the school and perhaps his or her four students would make an interesting comparison study if this study were to be replicated. The time put in on this study—sixty days of observing, which included four to five days weekly—was quite an investment of time, but necessary to create these narrative case studies.

An even more expansive study of literacy in an Appalachian family was that of Purcell-Gates (1993), a two-year ethnographic study of an urban Appalachian mother, Jenny, age 32, and her 7-year-old son, Donny, who was also having difficulty learning to read. Jenny was illiterate, even though she had been to school seven years as a child and had four years of adult school. She maintained that she had never written or read her own words during this schooling. Jenny requested reading lessons alongside her son at the
literacy clinic. The researcher agreed, provided that she could collect data for research from both as they worked together. An analysis of Jenny’s writing samples in her progression of the lessons as well as tables showing Jenny’s selection spellings reflecting Appalachian dialect, and final writing samples are included. The study found that the majority of literacy programs at all levels operate on a skills-based approach, and most adult education programs in the U.S. are of the same approach. Jenny’s dialect varied from the phonological system in SE.

Findings support the theory that “involving learners in literacy practices that validate their experiences and language will move them toward full, conventional literacy more effectively than the more traditional skills-based de-contextualized instruction” (p. 210). The exceptional quality of this ethnographic study by Purcell-Gates led to her publish Other People’s Words: The Cycle of Low Literacy (1995), which is based on the research with Jenny and Donny.

Geared toward teaching students to use informal or vernacular English as a basis for learning to write formal or Standard English, Crotteau’s (2007) study was very similar to Wheeler’s (2010) study. However, whereas the population in Wheeler’s study was African American, that of Crotteau’s was Appalachian. Although the population consisted of high school students who were failing the state Standards of Learning (SOL) test in Virginia, the study is included in this body of literature because it highlights the mismatch between AppE and SE as the cause for their failure. The context of Crotteau’s study was that students were taught to identify the features that differentiate their vernacular AppE from SE, which in turn empowered them to code-switch, or alternate between the two. The research in Wheeler’s study was about how teachers could teach
AAVE students, using the grammatical patterns of the vernacular. Teachers learned how to use contrastive analysis and code-switching. The main idea was to exhibit a linguistically informed approach in which the most frequent vernacular patterns were transferred into student writing. With this basis, teachers can use further linguistic strategies to address other student writing patterns (Wheeler, 2010).

Casting students as researchers, a study by Wolfram (1998) exhibited the kind of ethnographic studies Delpit (1995) called for when she said that the answer to the debate on skills versus process orientation of writing called for ethnographic analysis—in identifying and “giving voice” to alternative views. In this language awareness program, the Baltimore Pilot Program, twenty-seven fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students, mostly African American, from the Baltimore Public Schools collected and organized data to formulate rules. They viewed the film *American Tongues* and wrote essays on it, comparing Boston English and AppE, for instance, to use in examination of their own dialects. The ethnographic and sociolinguistic inquiry engaged students as researchers in their own communities. Students arrived at conclusions by examining data sets, formulating hypotheses and confirming these hypotheses based on data. The role language variation has assumed in language study is instructive, which gives insight into how dialect differences are part of that study (Wolfram, 1998).

According to Puckett (2003), Wolfram stressed three points about the acceptance or lack thereof of dialect awareness programs in local communities:

1. A significant obstacle for dialect awareness programs is that communities have been socialized into believing that their language variety is simply “bad
speech”; therefore, they are not very eager to exult in what they view in that light (Wolfram, 2003).

2. Scholars have profited from the communities they have researched, namely in terms of professional advancement, publication records, and in local community recognition for proactive works (Wolfram, 2003).

3. Wolfram (2003) maintains that dialect awareness programs are still worthwhile in that both the community and the researcher in social science can profit from them.

Exploring the concept of “valuation” pertaining to the circulation of Appalachian English within Southern Appalachian communities, Puckett studied the implications of the issues above stressed by Wolfram.

**Writing and Sociolinguistic Diversity**

As Sweetland (2006) says, “Writing plays a crucial role as a gatekeeper in academic assessment and decision-making, as it is used in virtually every form of student assessment, from teacher-designed classroom assignments to college application essays” (p. 20).

Beginning with elementary-age students, writing their own stories, plays, or poems gives them a sense of ownership in writing. Writing is a very self-fulfilling experience. Busch & Ball (2004) refer to writing as a transformative personal experience, especially in learning situations where children are regularly faced with poverty, crime, etc. Since writing is key to advancing educational equity, as well as excellence, it should also be considered key to the field of educational linguistics as well (Powers, 1999; Sweetland, 2006).
Among the positive responses to dialect diversity in the classroom is an existing curricular framework of elementary schools entitled *Language Diversity and Writing Instruction* (Farr and Daniels, 1986). Throughout the framework, fifteen key factors are cited, which are essential for effective writing instruction. The basis for Farr and Daniels’ framework is a foundation of linguistic knowledge and the idea that good instruction for linguistically diverse students is good teaching in general (Sweetland, 2006).

Once students go through the process of rewriting and revising, then the editing of grammar, surface features and mechanics can be addressed. Observing that because AAVE speakers may not be aware of the differences between their dialect and SE, Rickford (2002) maintains that direct instruction on those differences, sometimes “subtle and specific,” may be needed in order to move AAVE speakers toward the standard. Rickford supported direct instruction such as contrastive analysis (CA). The CA technique involves the comparison of two language varieties. Since the early 1960s, CA has been a method of teaching SE to vernacular or nonstandard dialect speakers (Allen 1969; Lin, 1963). Wheeler (2010) and Wheeler and Swords (2006) recommend inquiry learning with contrastive analysis and basically whole-language philosophy. Wheeler & Swords refer to “flipping the switch” from correction to contrast, as students code-switch between prestige and non-prestige dialects. They maintain that this is not just a U.S. phenomenon; the same issues occur around the world.

For example, speakers of the vernacular might say, “The dog needs bathed.” However, speakers from different regions of the country might express the meaning
somewhat differently, as “The dog needs to be bathed,” or “The dog needs bathing” (Wheeler & Swords, 2006, p. 53). Therefore, students must practice translating from home speech to school speech so that they can learn school speech.

Among the research showing that CA is successful in teaching SE to minority dialect speakers are the findings of Hanni U. Taylor (1989). Taylor realized that the students’ home dialect was transferring to their SE writing at White Aurora University. Instead of using a correctionist approach, she tried out ESL methods with her second-dialect learners, African American students. The performance of African American students across two first-year writing classes was studied. One group used traditional English Department techniques—correcting students and marking their errors. The second classroom led students in CA, so that they discovered for themselves “systematic contrasts” between grammatical patterns of AAVE and SE. After eleven weeks, the control group (correctionist model) showed an 8.5% increase in African American features in their writing, while the experimental group, which used CA, showed an amazing 59.3% decrease in African American features. Taylor said the students had not been aware of their dialect “nor of grammatical Black English features that interfere in their writing” (pp. 149-50).

Summary

In summation, language variations exist, and all variations are rule-governed and follow definite patterns. Sociolinguists maintain that no one dialect is inherently superior to another.

The field of sociolinguistics indicates that there is a need for combining information regarding the nature of dialect diversity and its perceptions by American
society. A large level of dialect prejudice exists in our society. In addition, inclusion of
dialect awareness is recommended in instruction materials (Wolfram & Schilling-

Teaching Standard English with an additive approach involves code-switching,
the combination of two or more linguistic varieties in discourse between two
individuals. Code-switching may occur among bilinguals who switch between
languages as well as monolinguals who code-switch between dialects of one language.
As an example of the latter, African Americans and Appalachians often code-switch
between their home dialects, AAVE and AppE, respectively, and Standard English,
the “school dialect” they learn at school.

Regarding the body of research on language varieties, a much larger amount of
research exists on AAVE as opposed to AppE. Wolfram (1976) contends that, “Some
non-mainstream varieties such as Vernacular Black English have been the object of a
great deal of attention, while others, particularly those with strong regional ties, have
been virtually ignored. One of these still neglected geographical areas is Appalachia
(p. 1). However, many of the findings concerning AAVE can be generalized to other
language varieties, specifically AppE. As concerns writing and sociolinguistic
diversity, writing is key to the advancement of educational equity. Therefore, it should
be considered fundamental to the field of educational linguistics as well, given that
students’ language varieties are reflected in their writing. Both AAVE speakers and
speakers of other language varieties such as AppE may not be aware of the differences
between their dialects and SE. Therefore, direct instruction on these differences, such
as through CA, may be necessary (Rickford, 2002). To reiterate, contrastive analysis
involves the comparison of two language varieties which are typically code-switched by a monolingual speaker.

To this end, Wheeler and Swords (2006) recommend inquiry learning with CA in which the instructional goal is switched from correction to contrast. In the CA process, students code-switch between prestige and non-prestige dialects. During the CA process, students translate from home to school speech so they can learn school speech. In conclusion, Wheeler and Swords (2006) state, “Through CS and CA we offer a way to unbind the negative stereotypes associated with AAE [African American English]—a research-proven way to teach SE” (p. 67). As Redd & Webb (2005) state, “CS is [the] goal, [and] CA is the primary means … to achieve that end” (p. 86).

Researchers have demonstrated that contrastive analysis is an effective procedure to help students (Taylor, 1989; Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998; Fogel & Ehri, 2000; Reasor, 2006; Sweetland, 2006; Adger et al., 2009; Wheeler & Swords, 2006, 2010; Hudley & Mallinson, 2011). Contrastive analysis (CA) with code-switching is the intervention being used with the experimental group. Code-switching involves the changing of registers from the informal or nonstandard to the formal or Standard as the situation demands. In speech and writing, students in both AAE and AppE switch from their informal to formal English patterns in usage such as subject-verb agreement, double negatives, plurality, possessives, etc. Typically, they will use the home dialect or informal register unless the need to use Standard English (SE) is pointed out.

Research shows that linguistically informed approaches to vernacular usage have been proven to be much more successful than traditional ones (Wheeler & Swords,
2010). Results from an experimental study of third-grade students by Fogel & Ehri (2000) showed that students who were taught with traditional English techniques, wherein correction of the vernacular was a component, either improved only 1%, or their performance in using Standard English became worse. However, students who used CA showed a nearly 100% increase in mastery of Standard English (Fogel & Ehri). Rachel Swords, an in-service third-grade teacher at a Title I school in Newport News, Virginia, and a graduate student of Rebecca Wheeler, implemented the CA and code-switching approach to teaching Standard English grammar to her students who speak the vernacular in Newport News Public Schools. Dramatic results in the performance of her African American students have been seen. In 2006, she first implemented code-switching and contrastive analysis in her classroom, where her students had performed thirty points below their White peers on year-end state tests. In 2006, 100% of her African American students passed 100% of the state tests. According to Wheeler & Swords (2010), “Rachel closed the achievement gap in her classroom, a result that has held constant ever since” (p. xiv).

The results of research indicate that effective use of CA is not limited to elementary school. Taylor (1989) used contrastive analysis effectively in two freshman English classrooms to show improvement in Standard English mastery with AAVE speakers. Her eleven-week study showed that students taught by traditional methods used 8.5% more vernacular features in writing, while the class that used contrastive analysis used 59.3% fewer African American vernacular features (Sweetland, 2006). She noted that it is crucial that contrastive analysis exercises be used in context. For her study, this often meant simply engaging students in dialogue about their experiences. This shows the
effectiveness of grammar instruction informed by research on language variation.

Sweetland maintains that “this contrastive approach to grammar is contextualized by discussions of dialect diversity so that Standard English is taught as a second dialect, not the only dialect” (p. 27). Thus, working with linguistically informed contrastive analysis, Taylor’s students showed substantial improvement.

Taylor utilized this contrastive analysis of grammatical patterns of AAE and Standard English so that the students’ home dialects did not transfer to their SE writing. Wheeler and Swords (2006) cite Smitherman (2000), who asserts that “[a]ll students need to know this language [Standard English, or the language of wider communication] if they are going to participate fully in the global world of the twenty-first century” (p. 161). Thus, she reiterates Delpit’s earlier suggestion that the language forms that students need to use are those of Standard English.
Chapter Three: Methodology

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the research study was to determine and describe the effectiveness of one method of reducing the number of vernacular features in the Standard English writing of Appalachian English dialect students.

Research Problem and Questions

Do contrastive analysis teaching methods generate demonstrable effects on student writing between Standard and vernacular usage with students in two classes—one intervention group of fourth-grade AppE students and another fifth-grade, non-intervention group of AppE—when implemented as an intervention in an Appalachian community school? Contrastive analysis is an approach that takes into account the vernacular or nonstandard dialect from the home speech of children in an effort to help them perform better in school. The contrastive analysis approach has been used successfully with African American students. In this particular study, this strategy is being used with students from the Appalachian subculture who are speakers of the Appalachian English (AppE) regional dialect.

There are three questions guiding this research:

1. How will the intervention of contrastive analysis enable AppE fourth-grade students to write Standard English with fewer vernacular features as compared to a non-intervention fifth-grade group without the use of contrastive analysis?

2. In what ways does instruction in contrastive analysis impact students’ views of themselves as writers?
3. In what ways does the contrastive analysis approach have a similar effect on AppE students’ writing as it does for other language varieties?

Implementation and evaluation of a linguistically informed approach to the vernacular was a primary goal of the study. Through this approach, there was an investigation into the effectiveness of the contrastive analysis and code-switching methods and techniques that linguists who are concerned with educational equity for speakers of language variations have long proposed. The study represents an integration of dialect-awareness methods of sociolinguistics with current elementary intermediate writing instruction. The use of the contrastive analysis intervention design represents principles and findings from relevant research such as descriptions of the structure of nonstandard language varieties; perspectives on language attitudes, and current pedagogical techniques, including the writing process (Sweetland, 2006).

Detailing the methodology of the investigation, this chapter comprises a summary of the research design, including descriptions of the research participants, research sites, and methods implemented in the experimental and control classrooms. The types of data to be collected through the study are described.

**Assertion**

The use of an intervention—contrastive analysis—during writing instruction in English Language Arts (ELA) will enable an intervention group of fourth-grade Appalachian English students to use fewer vernacular features in their writing than a non-intervention group of fifth-grade Appalachian English students who receive only conventional instruction in ELA with no reference to the vernacular.
Research Design

This is a descriptive case study defined by Kamil, Langer, and Shanahan (1985) as research that describes “characteristics, properties, or relationships of groups, events, or phenomena” (p. 66). The two groups are already established and intact. The researcher administered pre-tests to both groups, administered an intervention to one group, and gave post-tests to both groups (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). Its purpose was to describe research completed with the contrastive analysis intervention.

Researcher Role

Throughout the study, I assumed the role of “observer as participant” (Martella, Nelson, & Marchand-Martella (1999, p. 283). In the “observer as participant” method, observers do not become involved with the participants, although the observer also may interact with the participants in the study. I clearly told the participants my purpose in doing the study, as well as informed them of my identity. Though I was present in the fourth-grade classroom, I removed myself from their classroom activities and watched them and the teacher as she presented and taught the CA intervention. As such, I did not attempt to become part of the group, though I came to know some of the students who were naturally curious and asked questions or told me what they were writing on a particular day when I was observing. For instance, one girl told me between classes that she had written a sequel to a first narrative about her pet dog. She knew I had read the first in her journal. We talked about further happenings with the dog. Another time, I was called upon to take the students back to the room after lunch, as the teacher had to deal with an emergency with one of the students. When we returned to the fourth-grade room,
the students and I talked in general until the teacher came in. I visited the playground during recess a couple of times.

**Gaining Access**

Most native Appalachian students speak with a regional Appalachian dialect. The Appalachian county where the study took place has a regional university in the county seat. There are four elementary schools in the county. A professor in the university’s education department, who was involved in a regional Professional Development (PD) course on intermediate writing for teachers, was approached to see whether she knew of fourth- or fifth-grade teachers in her PD or graduate classes who were involved in action research, or those who might be open to research in their respective classes. Although she recommended a teacher in a certain school that she thought would be a good match, upon contacting the teacher, I discovered she was no longer teaching in the intermediate grades but had moved to the primary grades.

County school administrators were also asked for recommendations of schools. Initially the county superintendent was sent an email describing the research study and the kinds of assistance that would be needed from two teachers in one of the elementary schools at the intermediate level. Although it was within a couple days of the beginning of the school year, the superintendent responded positively the next day. He said he thought it would be a worthwhile study, and he would send a copy of my prospectus via email to the principals of the four elementary schools in the district. Three of the four principals declined, indicating that they were already overcommitted. However, the last elementary school principal was receptive to the idea. He also worked in the district office with curriculum and such. He responded to me via email; we set up a time that I
could telephone him at the school. His school was rather small compared to the other three. In fact, the only drawback was that they had only one fourth- and one fifth-grade class—not two of each to choose from, as was initially written in the proposal.

Upon checking with my advisor, I was given permission to proceed, using one fourth- and one fifth-grade class. The principal had conferred with the respective teachers, and they expressed interest in the study. I made a trip to the school and visited the teachers, explaining the study to them, and they agreed to participate. They signed the appropriate IRB Consent Forms (see Appendices A-G).

Once the two classes were secured, the fourth-grade teacher who was receptive to using contrastive analysis with her class was apprised of the specific components of using the intervention in her class. Class #1, which received the intervention, utilized a basic dialect-awareness approach and contrastive analysis method within language arts instruction, specifically, writing. According to Adger et al. (2009), considering the naturally occurring dialect variation helps students become aware of stereotypes that exist in society. To this end, first the teacher and later the students in the class viewed selected portions of a three-part video production on a DVD set of three called *Do You Speak American?* (MacNeil/Lehrer Productions, 2005)—specifically, selections from Part 1, “Up North,” viewed only by the teacher for dialectal awareness background, and Part 2, “Down South.” The videos were used as springboards for discussions about regional dialectal differences. Standard/vernacular contrast was taught through contrastive analysis. Students received additional direct instruction from their teacher on points of grammar that distinguish AppE from Standard English as part of their English Language Arts (ELA) class.
Research Site

Peavine Elementary School in Dawson County, located in a state within Central Appalachia, was the research site. With a school enrollment of 197 students, Peavine is a Title I school. Peavine’s online State School Report Card for the 2010-2011 school year indicated that the school did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for either 2009-10 or 2010-11. Peavine was in Year 1 School Improvement for those two years, which indicated that it was classified as two years not making AYP. Parents were notified; school choice was implemented, and the school had to write or revise its school plan. This report was part of the School NCLB Accountability Reporting Annual Yearly Progress information.

For the academic year 2011-2012, the State School Report Card reflects a change in the system, whereby public schools are no longer assessed for AYP, but rather have an Accountability Performance score. Peavine’s Overall Score was 47.2, which ranked in the 15th percentile for the state. Its classification was Needs Improvement, and its Rewards and Assistance Category indicated that it is a Focus School. As a Focus School, it “has a non-duplicated gap group score in the bottom 10% of the state …” (X School Report Card, 2011-12). As such, Peavine has an Annual Measureable Objective (AMO) of 48.2; therefore, a gain of 1.0 was needed for the next year, 2012-13. The School Report Card, 2012-13 indicated that the AMO Goal of 48.2 was met for that year. The Overall Score was 57.2. Because of changes in the testing system, “The Accountability Profile contains an updated 2012-13 Overall Score and percentile based on Next-Generation Learners and Program Reviews. This update allows the 2012-13 data displayed to be comparable to 2013-14 data.” (X School Report Card, 2012-13).
Participants

Two classes, one fourth and one fifth grade, which each had twenty-eight students at Peavine Elementary School, as well as their two teachers, in a state within Central Appalachia, serve as the population (n=58) for the research study. The participants in the study are the two teachers and their students (n=21) total from their respective participant groups of eleven students in the fourth grade and ten students in the fifth grade in a small rural public school district. These were the total numbers of students in each class who had both IRB permission from their parents to participate in the study and gave consent themselves. They also completed all aspects of the study including pre-and post-Writer Self-Perception Scale (WSPS) surveys (Bottomley, Henk, & Melnick, 1997), and pre- and post-responses to writing prompts. Several types of students were not included in the study for various reasons. Only students who were native speakers of English and were making adequate progress were included in the study. In the initial interview with Ms. Curry, the fourth-grade teacher, she indicated that out of the twenty-eight students, seventeen are males. She had two students who were identified in the area of special needs with learning difficulties and had Individual Education Plans (IEPs), and three students were identified for speech and language difficulties. However, she stated that none of these five students were in the study. Ms. Curry indicated there was also a third grader who comes into her self-contained fourth grade during ELA for the fourth-grade curriculum. However, she did not participate in the study. There were, therefore, no non-native speakers of English, special needs students, students whose parents did not give consent for their child to participate in the study, or students who did not complete
enough of the surveys or sufficient writing samples included in the analysis (Sweetland, 2006).

Labov (1970) recommended dialect study of groups at this age. He stated: “It is the fourth and fifth grade, when the 10-year-old begins to come under the full influence of the preadolescent peer group, that we obtain the most consistent records of his dialect.” He also points out that at this age, many test scores and other school records show “sharp downward trends, and this is not unconnected with the fact that peer groups present a more solid resistance to the schoolroom culture than any individual child can” (p. 34).

As to demographic data of the student participants in the fourth grade, five were White females and six were White males, for a total of eleven students. Of the fifth-grade students, there were three White males, one Black male, and six White females, for a total of ten students. On the X Report Card for 2011-2012, Peavine Elementary students receiving Free/Reduced-Price Meals were not indicated since “counts are suppressed to protect student identification required by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).” The teacher of the fourth-grade class, a Black female, is certified in K-4 and Special Education as well as having a Master’s Degree in elementary education. She has taught for thirteen years, six at the present school, but this is only her third year in a regular classroom. The fifth-grade teacher, a White female, has a Master’s Degree in elementary education and has taught for twelve years, nine at this school. Both were approximately in their late 30s or early 40s, and both had children in the school system. The fifth-grade teacher, Ms. Potter, had a kindergartener at Peavine Elementary.

A breakdown of the specific data sources collected in preparation for and during the study for the fourth- and fifth-grade groups is presented below. The parental consent
and student assent forms were the main required forms for approval to be a participant. Of the twenty-eight students in the fourth-grade group, fourteen supplied these two forms (see Appendices C & D). Similarly, of the twenty-eight students in the fifth-grade group, thirteen supplied the required consent and assent forms (see Appendices F & G). In addition, the parents of both groups of students were sent letters in more parent-friendly language about the study (see Appendices B & E) for grades 4 and 5 respectively. However, complete data sets including the consent and assent forms as well as pre- and post-study WSPS scores, pre- and post-writing prompts A and B (see Appendix L), and other selected writings were necessary for students of both grade level groups to be able to participate in the study. Therefore, of the fifty-six potential participants, only eleven in the fourth-grade group and ten students in the fifth-grade group had complete data sets and participated in the study.

Data Sources

Data sources for the study are framed by those in Sweetland’s study of writings from African American students, extending the sources to apply to writers and speakers of AppE. Baugh (1980) referred to Black English Vernacular (BEV) as a stigmatized dialect, maintaining that it “as such represents a highly personal and consequently an emotional topic” (p. 83). AppE is also a stigmatized dialect, and as such, measures used with one stigmatized dialect may be applied successfully to another.

Table 3.1 indicates the types of data collected from students and teachers. Data for fourth- and fifth-grade participants are differentiated as well as that for students and teacher respectively.
Table 3.1

**Student and Teacher Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Data</th>
<th>Teacher Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Prompt A</td>
<td>Writing Prompt A</td>
<td>Initial interview transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Prompt B</td>
<td>Writing Prompt B</td>
<td>Reflective int. transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Writings</td>
<td>Journal Writings</td>
<td>Email communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Writings</td>
<td>Selected Writings</td>
<td>Telephone conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSPS, Pre- &amp; Post-Study</td>
<td>WSPS, Pre- &amp; Post-Study</td>
<td>Lesson plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Consent Forms (11)</td>
<td>Parent Consent Forms (10)</td>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assent Forms (11)</td>
<td>Student Assent Forms (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Formal Writing Samples**

In response to prompts provided for both letters by the researcher (see Appendix L), students in both the intervention group and the non-intervention group completed the pre-test and post-test writings. Thus, data sources used as a pre-test were letters the students wrote to their fourth-and fifth-grade teachers after the first three months of the school year pertaining to activities students had participated in during the previous summer. These letters were assessed by the *Kentucky Holistic Scoring Guide for Writing* for elementary students (see Appendix M). The post-test, given eleven weeks later, involved writing a letter addressed to the principal, explaining what they liked and disliked regarding activities and aspects of their respective fourth- and fifth-grade classes.
Writing Documents

During the eleven weeks of the study, both groups of students completed their regular studies in ELA. No open-response writings were available for fourth grade. Fourth-grade writings consisted of journal writings as well as other selected writings from the last week of January through mid-April. For instance, one such writing was, “What Freedom Means to Me.” Another was about a visit to a university sports arena in a nearby large city for the “Feed the Mind Kickoff” and lunch provided by the First Lady of the state in early March. In the fifth grade, writings were specifically journaling and on-demand, as well as some open-response assignments in social studies. Writings from both groups were collected at the editing phase of writing as much as possible. The editing phase was the optimum time to access vernacular features in the writing before they were “edited out.”

Other data sources included observations of the teacher implementing CA in the classroom, field notes from these observations, teacher interview notes, both initial and post-classroom observation, student survey “Writer Self-Perception Scale” (Bottomley, Henk, & Melnick, 1997), and document collection, as previously elaborated. In addition, the teachers and researcher used email, texting, and telephoning via cell phones as communication tools.

Contrastive Analysis (CA) Intervention Observation Protocol

The researcher observed the fourth-grade teacher who implemented CA in the classroom. An observation protocol entitled “Classroom Contrastive Analysis (CA) Observation Protocol” was utilized to determine the frequency with which the components of the intervention were implemented (see Appendix N). Planned
observations were to be made every other week of the eleven-week study. Several adjustments had to be made for observation times because of snow days and other factors such as holiday performances and student teacher observations by the fourth-grade teacher. The teachers and researcher kept in close contact via email and cell phone conversations as well as texts. This afforded us opportunities to communicate on an ongoing basis, particularly as to keeping each other informed of any questions that arose during the process of the study. Running notes of what was observed were taken every 3-4 minutes during English language arts time, when CA lessons were implemented. After reviewing the field notes, the researcher completed the observation protocol. The intervention teacher was observed five times as she implemented the interventions in the classroom. Initial interviewing of the fourth-grade teacher and continued training were accomplished on Dec. 12, 2012. Implementation of the CA lessons and concurrent observations were completed on the five observation days in 2013: Jan. 28, Feb. 11, Feb. 18, March 27, and finalized on April 10.

**Teacher Interview Protocol**

The fourth-grade teacher who implemented the CA intervention was initially interviewed subsequent to her agreement to be in the study. The purpose of this interview was to ascertain background information on the teacher as well as her reasons for being interested in the study (see Appendix H) for Interview Question Protocol. Impromptu interviews were conducted periodically after classroom observations in order to clarify any questions the teacher or the researcher may have had about the process. Interview notes were taken during and immediately after any such question/answer sessions. The fourth-grade teacher also had a final interview on April 10, 2013, at the end of the eleven-
week study, with questions specific to the intervention implementation and results (see Appendices J & K). Initial and final interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed. Member checking was initiated. Copies of the interviews were sent to the intervention teacher. She did not have any questions or concerns.

**Writer Self-Perception Scale**

In addition, the “Writer Self-Perception Scale” (WSPS) (Bottomley, Henk, & Melnick, 1997/1998) (see Appendix O) is based on Bandura’s theory (1977, 1982) which predicts that a child’s self-perception of writing ability will affect his or her subsequent growth in writing. The WSPS is also grounded in a theory of self-efficacy. Therefore, the WSPS authors stress that students who hold a belief of self-efficacy in writing are most likely to take advantage of opportunities to write, to give the writing more effort and to put forth more effort to achieve competence in writing. The WSPS is one of the few instruments of writer self-perception that has enough items to establish norms, as well as being able to highlight certain aspects of writing. As Bottomley, Henk, and Melnick maintain, “Perhaps most importantly, none of the scales appears to be rooted in an inclusive theory of motivation in the same way that self-efficacy supports the Writer Self-Perception Scale” (p. 287). The WSPS is built on research of a reading-related scale, the RSPS, the Reader Self-Perception Scale. Based on the four categories of the RSPS, the WSPS has four categories: General Progress, Specific Progress, Observational Comparison, Social Feedback, and Physiological States. This instrument was administered to the entire classes of the students, pre- and post-study, in the intervention and non-intervention fourth- and fifth-grade classes respectively. The researcher then collected the surveys of those who had parental permission to participate in the study for
analysis. The students’ regular teachers explained the directions and read the survey to
them orally as they completed it, to ensure that all students understood and that a
minimum amount of time was spent. This was done to ensure that reading ability was not
a factor in completing the scale as well.

**Vernacular Features Data**

Vernacular features data were gleaned from formal writings as well as other
selected writings of the students in both classes. Features that were found to be prevalent
were put into four categories: pronomial differences (with pronoun + conjunction), verb
regularization and past tense verbs (was/were), multiple negation, and subject/verb
agreement. These categories formed the basis for the code-switching lessons presented in
the CA lessons (Wheeler & Swords, 2010).

**Implementation of the Intervention**

The intervention group received its usual writing instruction as well as being led
in the discovery process of CA. Therefore, implementation of contrastive analysis was
the intervention used with the group of fourth graders. The teacher of the intervention
group, Ms. Curry, who was trained in this approach by the researcher, typically
implemented contrastive analysis during the editing phase of writing assignments as
much as possible. She used contrastive analysis as an intervention during her regular
English language arts classes for eleven weeks, from the end of January through the
second week of April. Within this time frame, allowances were made for two weeks of
winter holidays, M.L. King Day (Jan. 21), county school Spring Break (March 18-22), as
well as two snow days, in accordance with the school calendar. In addition, because Ms.
Curry had a student teacher, it was agreed by the teacher and the researcher that
classroom observations would be suspended after the first week of March until the second week of April. For the record, the fifth-grade teacher, Ms. Potter, also supervised a student teacher. Prior to this period of time, CA training of the fourth-grade intervention teacher had begun on Nov. 27, 2012. Subsequently, meeting with the fifth-grade non-intervention teacher and explanation of her role was accomplished on the same day.

**AppE variation in grammatical features**

Many grammatical features in American English involve aspects of the verb phrase. In regard to irregular verb usage, there are five different ways in which irregular verbs form a pattern in SE and vernacular dialects. There are dialect variations according to the patterns exhibited. Most vernaculars of the North and South use Patterns 1, 2, and 3 (Hudley & Mallinson, 2011; Adger, et al., 2009). Some rural vernaculars in the South also use Pattern 5, which the researcher, as a speaker of AppE, has also heard older people use.

The differences are:

1. **Past as participle form:** I had *went* down there; He may *have took* the wagon.
2. **Participle as past form:** He *seen* something out there; She *done* her work.
3. **Bare root as past form:** She *come* to my house yesterday; She *give* him a nice present last year.
4. **Regularization:** Everybody *knowed* he was late; They *threwed* out the old food.
5. **Different irregular form:** I *hearn* [heard] something shut the church house door; Something just *riz* [rose] up right in front of me.

(Adger, et al., p. 196)

**Format of the Code-switching Lessons**

The code-switching (CS) T-charts are the graphic organizer of choice on which Wheeler and Swords (2010) base their use of contrastive analysis (CA). CA is, of course,
comparing and contrasting the home language grammar to the school grammar.

Therefore, formal English is used as a second dialect or SE. In the format of the lesson, which is based on Wheeler and Swords’ system of using CA, students are led to “discover” the grammar pattern of informal English (in this case AppE) through use of a scientific method of grammar (p. xvii).

Following this format, in which I trained Ms. Curry, the fourth-grade teacher, we first collected data of student writing samples. Next, data were examined for a given grammar pattern, such as that related to Lesson 2, Multiple Negation, (see Appendix Q). Four to six sentences, and sometimes as many as eight or ten, were examined and selected to show a pattern that commonly occurred in the informal English or vernacular of AppE. The teacher wrote these sentences or phrases on the left hand side of the CS T-chart, a large paper chart, under the heading “Informal,” while the school English or SE equivalent was written on the right hand under “Formal.” Third, we had the students to find vernacular grammar patterns (such as “She won’t never,” or “He don’t want nobody”). Then the teacher would elicit description from the children about that pattern. With some guidance from the teacher, the students invariably produced a pattern, such as “Negative word (no, didn’t, doesn’t, won’t, etc.) + No/nobody/never, etc.” This work was usually written on the whiteboard as students brainstormed. Then each phrase or sentence was tested to see if the pattern was true for each sentence. If found to hold true for the examples, the pattern was written at the bottom of the informal phrases or sentences on the left side of the CS T-chart.

The same steps were followed for the Formal or SE side of the CS chart: examine data, find grammar patterns, describe them, test the pattern, write grammatical pattern or
rules. At this point, students were questioned as to “What changed?” from the informal side to the formal. Contrastive analysis (CA) was utilized as the home language or vernacular base used by students was compared and contrasted to the school language or SE base (xxiii).

Follow-up mini-lessons were used by the teacher to reinforce the lessons on vernacular features most prevalent in the fourth-grade student writing. The mini-lessons were implemented for fifteen minutes twice in a five-day period after the initial lesson, such as, Lesson 2, Multiple Negation was taught.

For the first two lessons, vernacular phrases and sentences were selected by the researcher as well as the teacher from selected student writings—journals and essays written during the period of time of the eleven-week study. However, as the students became more familiar with the discovery process, they were directed to look over their writings for the past two weeks, for instance, and select sentences similar to the ones selected for the previous lesson, such as multiple negatives. These were then used for a mini-lesson to reinforce the lesson. For the final lesson on pronominal differences, after the lesson was implemented by teacher selected vernacular student phrases and sentences, the students, in groups of three, were directed to look at their writings for the past week, and write down any different examples on sentences strips. Then another CS T-chart was made during the final lesson. Ms. Curry said it was so gratifying when she “saw that light come on” as students understood the discovery process and could find a pattern from the examples.

The following four lessons are code-switching lessons from the AppE variation to Standard English dialect, based on variations in grammatical features between the two.
The lessons are: vernacular usage of past time, multiple negation, plurality of nouns, and pronomial difference. The lessons are tied to the Kentucky Core Academic Standards for English/Language Arts & History/Social Studies, Science and Technical Subjects. The code-switching T-charts for Appalachian Standard English and Standard English, referred to respectively as informal and formal usage comparisons, are also discussed.

**Code-switching Lessons**

**Lesson #1: Past time.**

Similarly, a T-chart for “Showing Past Time (2)” for informal vernacular usage, including these features for past time, was written by Wheeler & Swords (2006). It shows the comparison patterns a teacher would elicit from and use with children who have these past-time vernacular features in their speech and/or writing (see Appendix P). “Students address College and Career Readiness (CCR) Anchor Standards for Writing,” standard 5 of the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects: “Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach” (Kentucky Core Academic Standards for English Language Arts, p. 18). Contrastive analysis could be considered a “new approach,” as heretofore it has not been implemented as an intervention in Kentucky public schools, though studies in Ohio and California have gauged its effectiveness (Sweetland, 2006; Rickford, 1999). The wording of Writing Standard 5 for grade 4 applies to this research: “With guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, and editing (Editing for convention should demonstrate
command of Language standards 1-3 up to and including grade 4 on pages 28 and 29” (p. 21).

Lesson 2: Multiple negation.

Patterns of multiple negatives cited may be found in Southern mountain varieties such as Appalachian and Ozark English. One prevalent pattern is marking of the negative on the auxiliary verb. For example: “The man wasn’t doing nothing.” Another is the negative marking of an indefinite before the verb phrase, as in, “Nobody didn’t like the party” (Adger et al., p. 204).

Multiple negation was found to be a vernacular feature in the writing of the fourth graders. Therefore, a T-chart for “Making Negatives” was made to help students discover the pattern comparisons for the same between informal and formal language. Once examples of multiple negation were extracted from students’ writings, a T-chart utilizing the examples was made (see Appendix Q) for a sample lesson.

Lesson 3: Plurality of nouns.

According to Wolfram & Schilling-Estes (1998), the pattern of plural absence on nouns is a dialect trait found not only in the United States but in the British Isles, parts of Northern Ireland and the north of England as well. It is also prominent in the language variations of the southern mountains of Appalachia and the Ozarks. However, no instances of usage of plurality were discovered in the writing at this time, except for one in the non-intervention group.

AppE has more than one rule for showing plurality; it shows plurality by context. When the noun is a measure noun, such as mile, ton, pound, or with words specifying amounts, such as twenty-four, etc., there is no “s” on the end of the noun. However, with
non-measure nouns (pig, desk, bear, car), the noun requires an “s.” This is one of the customized lessons provided by Wheeler and Swords (2010) as an example of how a teacher with a school population of a language variation different from AAVE, the predominant dialect used in code-switching lessons, can be adapted. Wheeler and Swords suggest the teacher “include an example or two of non-measure nouns, so students can discover the full pattern for plurality” (p. xxxi).

Examples of measure nouns similar to those of Wolfram, Schilling-Estes, and Hazen (2000):

1. We caught two hundred pound—of catfish.
2. How many bushel—of beans does he have?
3. It’s about six mile—up the road.

Examples of non-measure nouns:

1. There are six cats on the porch.
2. The toy cars are red.
3. The apples are sweet.

Wheeler and Swords (2010) suggest that the teacher, during customizing such a lesson, collect a range of student papers in which students follow a pattern the teachers have noticed. From these, the teacher should collect four to six sentences in order to make a code-switching chart for noun patterns. “Students need that number to be able to identify grammar patterns” (p. xxxi). They state that it may take eight to ten papers to get ones in which students used the AppE plurality patterns. A sample code-switching lesson is modeled on “Plurality in Appalachian English vs. Standard English” (see Appendix R).
Lesson 4: Pronomial difference.

In each of these examples (see Appendix S), objective case pronouns are used as the subjective case. Examples:

Me and my dad went fishing.

Me and her shop there.

Larry and them are coming back.

“Pronoun differences typically involve regularization by analogy and rule extension” (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 2013, p. 382.) The above examples are from the category of “extension of object forms with coordinate subject.” According to Wolfram and Schilling-Estes, this type of pronoun difference is commonly found in most vernacular dialects of English, although they actually categorized five types of pronominal differences.

In each of these four lessons, Language Standard 3c for grade 4 is used, which states: “Use knowledge of language and its conventions when writing, speaking, reading, or listening. Differentiate between contexts that call for formal English (e.g., presenting ideas) and situations where informal discourse is appropriate (e.g. small group discussions)” (Kentucky Core Academic Standards, p. 29). Also, as in using past time and making negatives, Language Standard 1 for grade 4 is appropriate: “Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking” (Kentucky Core Academic Standards, p. 28).

The non-intervention group received only its regular writing instruction through its regular English language arts class. The focus of this class is typically the periodic “On-Demand” writing (ODW) required by the district and state, as well as some different
types of writing, such as those that may be included in a “working” portfolio—personal narrative, fiction piece, etc.—now that a “formal” portfolio is no longer required of fourth-grade students by the state. In addition, the fourth- and fifth-grade teachers utilized journal writing periodically as an incentive to encourage writing on a “free write” basis.

**Data-Gathering Procedures**

According to Kamil, Langer, and Shanahan (1985), data-gathering procedures in descriptive studies generally involve interviews, observations, and collection of artifacts, i.e. documents and writings relevant to the study. All of these served as data sources for this study. Data-gathering methods included observation of the fourth-grade teacher who implemented CA in the classroom, field notes from these observations, teacher interviews of the fourth-grade teacher only, and both initial and post-classroom sets of five observations. In addition, WSPS surveys and formal writing samples by both fourth- and fifth-grade participants, both pre- and post-study, were collected as documents. Journals and other selected writing pieces for both fourth and fifth, as well as ODW for the fifth grade, were included.

Data-gathering procedures are described chronologically as follows:

1) On 11/27/2012, I made a trip to the school, some 70 miles from my region, for initial meetings with both teachers. We talked about what the project entailed and their respective roles in the study. At that point I told them about the parental or legal guardian consent forms, which I had duplicated so they could hand them out that day and return with signatures for those who would be participating. I also explained that I would need to meet with the students individually the next time (Dec. 12, 2012) in the library to obtain assent from the students whose parents
consented to their participation. The three of us met in the library during the overlap of their twenty-five-minute lunch and forty-five-minute exploratory time. We made a calendar tentative to possible snow days, their working with their respective student teachers, Spring Break, and other events that might arise. Five observation dates were tentatively set: Jan. 28, Feb. 11, Feb. 18, March 27, and April 10, 2013.

2) I wrote field notes immediately after the meeting, though I took a few notes during the meeting, but not enough to impede the progress of our meeting. Running notes were also written during and after each classroom observation of the fourth-grade teacher’s implementation of CA. Actions and events were noted that were relevant to the study. Including the initial meeting in the library with the teachers, as described above, six sets of field notes were completed during the study. These were written by hand.

3) In addition, there were approximately six texting conversations and emails with one or both teachers during which we discussed matters relating to the tentative dates of the observations and my planned visits. For instance, on March 6, 2013, Ms. Curry and I conversed about how she needed more time to work with her student teacher during March, as she had missed a week of student teaching because of snow days. Consequently, we had to push back an observation scheduled for early March to the 27th. This also involved their Spring Break dates, which are in mid-March for that district, unlike the first week of April that year for my own district.
4) Subsequent to the initial meeting, on the second visit on Dec. 12, 2012, after I collected consent forms from both the fourth-grade teacher, Ms. Curry, and fifth-grade teacher, Ms. Potter, I went to each classroom and gave the teachers a list of the participants and asked permission to take the students individually to the library to explain and request assent to the study after their parents had given consent. As they assented to the study—and all did—I wrote their initials on the signature line of the assent form, since students age 12 and under did not need to sign the form by our university’s IRB guidelines. I gave each an Airhead (a piece of taffy candy) as a small reward, and sent him/her back to class to let the teacher know I was ready for the next student. Just as a point of relating, I also asked each student if he/she knew where Appalachia was. The word Appalachia was in the consent form, of course, as I described what the study involved briefly. They all were aware that they lived in the Appalachian area.

5) After the assent meeting with the students in each class, at the end of the day, I collected journals or other writings that were readily available from both teachers as I went to their rooms individually. I told them I would be collecting writings each time. Both had an assistant they shared for intermediate grades, so sometimes they had writings ready for me that the assistant had copied, especially Ms. Potter. Most of the time, however, especially with Ms. Curry’s class, I made copies from student journals and participants’ writings at the library copy machine after my observations and field notes. This was effective, and I was eager and able to obtain the writings in this way.
As the first observation was based on a diversity chart and building dialect awareness, I was able to peruse student writings submitted by the teachers and journals dated back to the beginning of the semester, Jan. 6, 2013. From these writings I began to glean vernacular features—pronomial difference, or use of objective case pronouns instead of subjective case; multiple negation; regularization of past tense verbs; subject/verb agreement with was/were; and pronomial differences. Therefore, Ms. Curry and I agreed, after the initial diversity lesson, to do the first code-switching lesson on past-time and the second on multiple negation. The third lesson was an extended ELA period in which she taught about regularization of past-tense verbs before lunch, and pronoun differences after lunch. Each of these lessons was presented initially.

Subsequently, follow-up mini-lessons of about 15 minutes each were taught two times in a subsequent five-day period.

During each of the five observation dates that I visited Peavine Elementary, I touched base with the fifth-grade teacher, Ms. Potter, as well. This was often during her planning period, which was immediately after Ms. Curry’s ELA class when they went to lunch. Ms. Potter taught the non-intervention class, so on each date I visited her room to collect documents—journals, ODW from social studies, and persuasive writings such as one about the issue of restraining dogs in the county, as strays were becoming a growing problem in the area.

After the third observation day on March 27, 2013, I let the teachers know that it would be appropriate for them to administer the second, post-WSPS survey, as well as Prompt B of the formal writing post-test. Of course, they gave both to the whole class, but I collected the formal writing in response to Prompt B and WSPS only for the study
participants in each class. On the final day of the fourth observation, April 10, 2013, I collected the documents for both post-tests. The final observation was a culmination of code-switching tasks the students had learned in fourth grade. They also exhibited how they had learned to work in groups with the sentence strips that displayed examples of informal/formal language and how to develop a pattern for each. Both teachers promised to send me more writings as they became available through the month of April, which was sufficient for our eleven-week study. I left a bag of treats for each class to reward them for their participation.

**Data Analysis**

The scores between pre-test and post-test measurement involving counting vernacular features used in the writings of the two populations of the fourth- and fifth-grade classes—one intervention group that used contrastive analysis intervention and one non-intervention group that used only regular language arts classes, pre-post—were analyzed. As stated earlier regarding student participants, only students who were native English speakers and who made adequate progress were included. Although other students were allowed to participate in the study as long as they had parental consent, the data collected would have been identified and excluded from analysis for such students. This was not an issue, as the two students who had IEPs were not given parental consent to participate in the study.

Because the data sets of vernacular features were small—eleven students in fourth grade and ten in fifth grade—the findings were not statistically significant. However, the findings indicate certain trends in vernacular usage in each of the four categories. A
A discussion will follow in Chapter Four of the pre-test/post-test results for both grades as to vernacular usage.

A T-test, or parametric test, was used to determine whether the difference between the intervention and the non-intervention groups was of any significance on the Writer Self-Perception Scale (see Appendix T). In other words, was implementation of contrastive analysis of significance in mediating the difference in how students perceived themselves as writers between two fourth- and fifth-grade classes of nonstandard dialect writers? What effects, if any, did it have?

Objective assessment of student writing was achieved by both the researcher and a second reader evaluating the writing. Writing pieces containing usage of vernacular features from both classes were scored. The pre-tests and post-tests, as well as writings from January through April, were also scored by the Kentucky Writing Assessment Holistic Scoring Guide for Writing for elementary students. This was used as a lens to view how effectively the students can communicate in writing. The researcher enlisted the aid of a second reader to assess the numerous student writings that were submitted by the fourth- and fifth-grade teachers. The two readers had been formerly trained as scorers during their tenure by the Kentucky State Department of Education, when it was required that students in grades 4, 7, and 12 produce a writing portfolio for assessment as part of the state assessment system. The second reader was an elementary teacher from a local public school who was currently teaching. The two of us read the writings, discussed them, and came to a consensus if there was any difference of opinion on the ratings assigned. Students are rated in this scoring guide on a scale including novice, apprentice, proficient, and distinguished (see Appendix M).
The researcher and second reader also reviewed the writings for vernacular features and coded them by category for both classes. As previously mentioned, fourth-grade and fifth-grade writings included journal writings and selected writings. The four categories were: 1) pronominal difference; 2) regularization of past-tense verbs; 3) multiple negatives; 4) subject/verb agreement. Also, it was determined how vernacular features in the writing affected the overall quality and rating of the writing. The writing pieces were the unit of analysis for the vernacular feature analysis.

An initial interview with the fourth-grade teacher, Ms. Curry, was held prior to the training and implementation of the code-switching lessons. The purpose of the interview was to gain background information about Ms. Curry as a teacher. Thirteen interview questions were devised and given (see Appendix H). On the day of the final class observation, April 10, 2013, a reflective interview consisting of nine questions (see Appendix J) was held with Ms. Curry. The purpose of this interview was to gain information from Ms. Curry about the implementation of the intervention. It also delved into her perception of the study and its effectiveness. Coding of the themes during the interviews was accomplished to synthesize the information.

For analysis of the classroom observations, the CA Intervention Observation Protocol consisted of ten questions with a scale for each (see Appendix N). An accompanying rubric was devised with a frequency rating of four categories: (G) generally, (O) occasionally, and (N) for N/A or non-applicable. The researcher/observer rated the teacher’s instruction in terms of how frequently she implemented the essential components of the CA Intervention during each of the five observations within the eleven-week period of the study. As she observed Ms. Curry implementing the code-
switching lessons during the ELA classes, the researcher analyzed them as to frequency of the inclusion of the nine components of CA. Results will be discussed in Chapter Four (see Table 4.1). They were tallied by the number of days each component was observed.

**Scoring**

Scoring between pre-test and post-test measurement involved counting vernacular features in the initial writing to an unfamiliar school adult (the new teacher) about summer experiences, and that of the final letter written to the principal about fourth- and fifth-grade experiences as a post-test. Inter-rater reliability was objective scoring by a second scorer on the vernacular features.

**Summary**

Triangulation of the research was accomplished through data sources of teacher interviews, classroom observations, observation notes, pre- and post-tests, as well as other artifacts such as journals and specific kinds of writing and the Writer Self-Perception Scale results (Glesne, 2006). The following links show relationships between the research questions and the data sources. In accordance with research question #1, pre- and post-testing and other writings served as the statistical basis for review of the intervention itself. Also, classroom observations showed how well the fourth-grade teacher implemented CA in terms of how frequently she implemented the essential components of CA. Observation notes, taken during and immediately after interviews and during observations, were an important source of documentation. Research question #2 addressed the issue of how the WSPS results showed to what degree the use of CA had an impact on the intervention students’ views of themselves. Research question #3 addressed the ability of CA to be “customized,” or applied to vernacular features found in
different dialects such as AAVE or AppE. Within the context of Lesson 3, customization was discussed in the context of code-switching lessons developed for the latter dialect, whereas it was initially implemented by Wheeler and Swords (2006) for vernacular features specific to the AAVE dialect. These three findings will be discussed at greater length in the following chapter.
Chapter Four: Findings

Overview

The purpose of the research study was to determine and describe the effectiveness of one method of reducing the number of vernacular features in the Standard English (SE) writing of Appalachian English (AppE) dialect students.

This chapter describes the results of the use of contrastive analysis (CA) as an intervention in the study. These data are based on several different facets—the significance of vernacular features in writing and the impact of the intervention on students’ self-efficacy in writing as measured by the Writer Self-Perception Scale (WSPS) (Bottomley, Henk, & Melnick, 1997/1998), to name a couple of them.

Used as a backdrop of the study, the descriptions of three of the five classroom observations and descriptions of two interviews—initial and reflective—with Ms. Curry provide contextual pieces of the study. The three chosen classroom observations were based on lessons fundamental to the students’ learning about dialect awareness, diversity, and code switching. Also very creative “hooks” for students’ attention, two of the three lessons were double class periods on diversity and dialect awareness and another on code-switching in AAVE and multiple negation. The final lesson of the three was based on pronomial differences. Discussion of these lessons is found in the presentation of results under research questions 1 and 3. The other two observations were lessons on past-tense verbs and subject/verb agreement that were rather didactic in nature and more closely followed the Wheeler and Swords (2010) lessons for those subjects. Classroom observations were analyzed for data related to CA components. The occurrence of CA components was tabulated (see Table 4.1) to determine whether components of CA were
used consistently. The information from both observations and interviews is woven into the research questions. It is important to provide this backdrop in order to build connections with the different facets of the study. The backdrop explained what occurred during the classroom observations, thus verifying them. It also explained how the occurrences affected the students by adding descriptions to the observations and therefore recreating them as a backdrop of narrative vignettes.

Observations at Peavine Elementary

Implementation of CA, the intervention used with Ms. Tonya Curry’s fourth graders, was observed on each of five days during the eleven-week study: 1/28/2013, 2/11/2013, 2/18/2013, 3/27/2013, and finalized on 4/10/2013. Ms. Curry led the students in the discovery process of CA as well, and students received their usual writing instruction during the English language arts (ELA) time. The classroom observations were held in Ms. Curry’s fourth-grade classroom at the end of the intermediate hall at Peavine Elementary, a small, rural school in Central Appalachia, a distance of slightly more than 70 miles from my home.

Interviews with the Fourth-Grade Teacher

Both initial and reflective structured interviews were conducted on 12/12/2012 and 4/10/2013, respectively. Digitally recorded, the actual transcripts are found in Appendices I and K, respectively. Being both African American and native Appalachian herself, Ms. Curry spoke multiple language varieties or vernaculars. Studies indicate that programs which look at multiple vernaculars are usually most successful at teaching CA and code-switching to students with language variations (Young, Barrett, Young-Rivera, & Lovejoy, 2014).

Research questions #1 and #2 end with a section pertaining to the interviews with Ms.
Curry. These indicate what the teacher was thinking about CA in relation to the lessons specifically highlighted and provide narrative related to her presentation of the lessons as observed. One such lesson which exposed students to a different vernacular was Lesson #4, which included Ms. Curry’s reading the book *Flossie and the Fox* aloud in her AAVE language variety. The children utilized code-switching in CA for AAVE, and there was a lesson on double negatives with the book as a basis as well. This was an excellent example of scaffolding instruction during the implementation of CA with the fourth grade. Much more detail, which exposes Ms. Curry’s voice, is provided in the description of Lesson #4 toward the end of Research Question #3.

**Research Questions and Data Answers**

There were multiple sources of data that informed the research questions. Data sources included observation notes and initial and reflective interviews with the fourth-grade teacher. Multiple samples of student writing collected were: responses to writing prompts, journal writing and selected writings in both fourth- and fifth-grade groups, and on-demand and open-response writings in the fifth-grade group only. Also, Writer’s Self-perception Scale (WSPS) scores were pre- and post-scores, as were the multiple samples of writings and vernacular feature data pre- and post-findings.

**Question #1**

How will the intervention of contrastive analysis enable AppE fourth-grade students to write SE with fewer vernacular features as compared to a non-intervention, fifth-grade group without the use of contrastive analysis?

The classroom observations address this question initially. It was apparent in the first extended-time CA lesson that Ms. Curry was both introducing the concept of
Informal/Formal, as she taught a “Diversity Unit” and led the students in the creation of a Diversity Chart T-chart and introducing dialect awareness, as well. These two tenets of CA were essential to the students’ understanding their own language variation and developing code-switching skills, which led them to code-switch between their own vernacular, AppE, and SE. The classroom observations showed how often the fourth-grade teacher implemented CA in terms of how frequently she implemented the essential components of CA in the lessons.

Field or observation notes, taken during and immediately after observations and the initial and reflective interviews, were also important sources of data informing this research question. These allowed the researcher to recreate the classroom observations as a backdrop of narrative vignettes. Excerpts taken from the backdrop explained what happened and how it affected the students. The teacher interviews were digitally transcribed, but field notes added more details to verify the occurrences in the classroom observations. In other words, the recorded field notes added description to the observations.

In the initial lesson, Ms. Curry introduced the intervention of CA, which was used to establish a dialect awareness background for the students. Ms. Curry explained to the children that they were going to study a “different set of rules or guidelines that would tie into their speaking and writing.” The objective of the first lesson was to establish an understanding of the concepts of informal and formal in common, everyday things students know. In accordance with Unit I, “Diversity in Life and Language” (Wheeler & Swords, 2010, pp. 2-6), the students were guided in making diversity charts. As explained by Wheeler and Swords, diversity charts are featured only in the initial “Diversity Unit”
because they are different from code-switching charts used in all other lessons in two important ways: 1) “These charts are constructed with the children, whereas in later lessons, charts are constructed by the teacher on the basis of students’ writing” (p. 2). 2) The items in the left- and right-side columns are not necessarily informal and formal “equivalents,” such as ballpark and school. At this point, the instructor is merely focusing on the difference in contexts in their level of formality. Ms. Curry led the students in brainstorming about the concepts of informal/formal as they relate to clothing and places. T-charts were made for both, with column headings of informal/formal, as the class brainstormed. For example, for the concepts of clothing, see Figure 4.1, and places, see Figure 4.2.

*Figure 4.1: Clothing concept chart.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clothing</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>football uniform</td>
<td>Army uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orange jail jumpsuit</td>
<td>nice suit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nike shoes</td>
<td>nice dress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, in this diversity chart, Nike shoes and nice dress are not informal and formal equivalents, respectively. However, they are informal and formal components of clothing.
Figure 4.2 Places concept chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>swimming pool</td>
<td>church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ballpark</td>
<td>school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picnic</td>
<td>wedding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the students completed the diversity charts, Ms. Curry wrote their brainstorming responses on the whiteboard. She periodically took a quick assessment of items submitted by asking for “thumbs up” for agreement and “thumbs down” for disagreement. Students eagerly participated in this activity, as they discovered aspects of the concepts of formal/informal they perhaps had not previously considered.

Rather than using AppE vs. SE on the diversity charts, Informal vs. Formal was used, because all of the students spoke the regional dialect. Therefore, I did not want to “marginalize” the home speech of the students by emphasizing that AppE was not SE or speech appropriate for school. In this sense, I controlled certain aspects of the instruction.

Introduction of dialect awareness.

As students lined up for lunch, Ms. Curry played a segment from “Down South,” part of Do You Speak American? (MacNeil & Cran, 2005). Ms. Curry explained that they were going to hear some skits by comedian Jeff Foxworthy as they filed out of the classroom, and they would discuss whether his language was informal or formal when they returned. Mr. Foxworthy typically includes jokes about Southern speech in his acts. The children listened and looked at each other as Foxworthy gave examples of a couple
of “plays on words,” as he said, “May-o-nnaise. Man, a’s a lotta people here tonight.”

“Wichadidja. Hey, you didn’t bring your truck with you, did you?” (p. 77). The children
laughed and repeated these phrases jokingly to each other down the hall—quietly, as they
weren’t supposed to talk in the lunch line. The spirit was light and happy, as Ms. Curry
had introduced some real-life examples of informal language to the students in a way
they enjoyed. It only took a couple of minutes as she played the segment of the sound
track to the DVD.

Second segment of introduction of dialect awareness.

In the following segment of the ELA class after lunch, an extended time in the
schedule, Ms. Curry’s “voice” comes through during her interaction with the children.
They are all involved and interested in her AAVE dialect, and have perhaps heard it
popularized on television with African American stars, singers, rappers, and such. She is
clearly interesting to them.

Upon returning from lunch, Ms. Curry replayed the DVD segment for the
students. They were eager to talk about Foxworthy’s language. They agreed his words
were informal. As an extension of the lesson, Ms. Curry handed the students 6” sentence
strips. She directed twelve of them to write down common phrases that meant, for
instance, “Calm down!” as she, the teacher, might say to an overly excited student. Then
she asked the other twelve to write on their strips what they would say if they were
speaking among themselves, informally. One wrote, “Chill out!” Another example was,
“What’s going on?” (formal) ; vs. “What’s happenin’?” (informal) or “What’s up?” Ms.
Curry caused them to laugh when she said, “Or, if I’m at home, I might say, “Sup?” or
“I’m gonna hang with my homies—that’s real informal!” As an African American, Ms.
Curry gave an example from her personal language variation or idiolect. The students were then directed to come to the front of the room and tape their responses to each side—“Formal” or “Informal” of the CS T-chart.

One girl named Kayla thought she had the right idea about informal language. She volunteered that informal language was mainly just “incorrect grammar”—that someone shouldn’t say for instance, “Whatcha doin’?” Ms Curry countered, “Now think about that, because our audience sometimes changes. When we are writing for or at school, the writing needs to be ‘tidy.’ We need to put on our ‘telephone voice’ when writing. When I answer the telephone at home, I use my formal voice,” she continued. “I say, ‘Hello, Curry residence, who would you like to speak to?’” She gave them an example of how she would talk on the telephone until she knew to whom she was talking—if this was an informal or formal conversation. The students agreed that when doing writing assignments as well, they shouldn’t use informal language or slang such as “ain’t,” but those words might be all right at home or with their friends outside of class.

**Alignment with components of CA.**

Following observations and examining field notes of all five observation days, I analyzed the components of the CA intervention Ms. Curry addressed as to how frequently she did so. The nine essential components used in the Frequency of CA Intervention Observed during Five Observation Days provided a lens by which additional data from the observations were reviewed. The results are based on the Classroom Contrastive Analysis (CA) Intervention Observation Protocol (see Appendix N). Table 4.1, below, shows the results. I devised both of these tools based on the information provided by Wheeler and Swords (2006, 2010) in the formatting of their CA lessons.
Table 4.1
*Frequency of CA Intervention Components Observed During Five Observation Days*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Number of Days Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher asks questions to involve students with “discovery process” ...</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher presents the search for a pattern comparison in student-friendly language.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The pattern of code-switching, input during the discovery process, emphasizes the comparison of Informal vs. Formal Language usage in a T-chart graphic constructed from student writing.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher extends discovery of a pattern to a guided practice for students.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students discover patterns and rules in vernacular AppE samples of the class’s writing.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students assimilate patterns and rules in their own writing to include Standard English.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher’s written lesson plans indicate coordination of lesson objectives with Kentucky Core Academic Standards.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Classroom climate is conducive to discussion of dialect patterns and language variation.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Diverse learners’ needs are met by the teacher’s instruction in support of multiculturalism.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here follow some specific examples from the first part of the extended ELA lesson that show how the frequency was tallied. In the initial segment of the extended ELA lesson, Ms. Curry exhibited three of the essential components of the CA Intervention: 1) Initially in accordance with Component #7, she submitted her written lesson plan to the researcher for review, which indicated coordination of lesson
objectives with Kentucky Core Academic Standards, specifically Writing Standard 5 for grade 4 (see Appendix B). 2) Component #1 was exhibited as the teacher asked questions to involve the students with the discovery process, although since this lesson was a part of the diversity chart, it did not involve developing a pattern, but rather the difference between the concepts of Informal and Formal. Component #8 was observed in that the classroom climate was indeed conducive to discussion of dialect patterns and language variations. The brainstorming activity and the playing of the Foxworthy language variation segment were indicative of the receptive climate also.

Looking at these data from a summative standpoint, the CA intervention components were observed a total of 38 times over the five observation days. There were seven instances of components in the category “N,” “N/A,” “did not apply”—six on Day 1, and one on Day 2 (see Appendix H). Because on the first observation day a diversity chart rather than a discovery code-switching chart was made in class, six “N’s” were amassed. In addition, Component #7 was rated “N” on day #2 because the teacher was not able to provide lesson plans prior to the lesson—because of extenuating circumstances—although she did provide one by the end of the day. There were no instances of components being observed “O”—occasionally—for any of the components. Table 4.1 shows that all nine components were consistently observed.

**Writing samples/vernacular features.**

Below is a sample of the vernacular features typically found in the fourth-grade writings. The researcher and a second reader reviewed the writings for vernacular features and coded them as to category for both fourth- and fifth-grade groups. Table 4.2 shows a sample of these typical vernacular features by category, which were generated by
the fourth-grade CA group in their writings in response to the first prompt in combination with the body of writings from January through April 2013.

The students’ development of code-switching skills and use of CA were reflected in their writing samples (prompts and journaling) in school using fewer vernacular features (see Writing Prompts A & B, Appendix L). This change was verified by the Pre-post Comparison of Vernacular Feature Usage Tables for Fourth and Fifth Grade (see following Tables 4.3 and 4.4).
Table 4.2

Vernacular Features Sample of Fourth-Grade Writing, First Prompt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*S #</th>
<th>Pronominal Differences</th>
<th>Regularization of Past-Tense Verbs</th>
<th>Multiple Negatives</th>
<th>Subject-Verb Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Me and my mom.</td>
<td>He layed down.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The things he did know was not right. The last things they saw was the mummies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Me and my sister</td>
<td>She taught me how.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Me and my brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Me and Pawpaw we had to take care of my little brother.</td>
<td>I would not be cold no more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Me and Ray went.</td>
<td>I lefted a hose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Me, Kara, and Evan was</td>
<td>I dived in.</td>
<td></td>
<td>My mom don’t think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Me and my sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My class and me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Me and Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Me, Roger, and Sara went.</td>
<td>Big Foot threwed Eric at Roger.</td>
<td>I couldn’t hardly see the door.</td>
<td>There was 10 parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>It was just me and him. Me and my dad saw me and Jaden.</td>
<td>They could not laugh no more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Me and my mamaw</td>
<td>My mom and dad teached me.</td>
<td></td>
<td>We was safe. We usually has to walk home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If we say Big Mac that meaned him.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Me and Sara was gettin’ ready.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We was tryin’ not to be loud.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S = Student
Table 4.3 Pre-Post Comparison Usage of Vernacular Features for Fourth Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pre-/Pro-</th>
<th>Pre-past</th>
<th>pre-NEG</th>
<th>pre-AGR</th>
<th>Post O/S</th>
<th>post-past</th>
<th>post-NEG</th>
<th>post AGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Pre-test Totals 15 7 3 9 Post-total 1 0 2 4

Vernacular Features (VF) VF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-total %</th>
<th>Pre-total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(VF)</td>
<td>.79 = 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(VF)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Features (SF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>DIF/Pro-Dif</th>
<th>DIF/Past</th>
<th>DIF/Neg</th>
<th>DIF/Agr</th>
<th>(DIF/TOTALS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group SF Totals 4 8 0 3 0 4 3 3
Table 4.4 *Pre-Post Comparison Usage of Vernacular Features for Fifth Grade*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pre-P</th>
<th>Pre-past</th>
<th>pre-NEG</th>
<th>pre-AGR</th>
<th>postO/S</th>
<th>post-past</th>
<th>post-NEG</th>
<th>post AG</th>
<th>Post Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group Pre-test Totals (VF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vernacular Features</th>
<th>Pre-total</th>
<th>(VF)</th>
<th>.78=78%</th>
<th>.47=47%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>.40=40%</th>
<th>.10=100%</th>
<th>.52=52%</th>
<th>.25=25%</th>
<th>.58=58%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VF Post-total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard Features (SF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>DIF-Pro-DIF</th>
<th>DIF-Past</th>
<th>DIF-Neg</th>
<th>DIF-Agr (DIF/Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group SF Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIF-Pro-DIF</th>
<th>DIF-Past</th>
<th>DIF-Neg</th>
<th>DIF-Agr (DIF/Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Vernacular features formula.**

Note that the formula on which the Vernacular Features (VFs) were tabulated is as indicated below:

\[
\frac{\#VF}{\#VF+\#SE} = \#VF \quad \text{(Wolfram, 1969)}
\]

The VFs were gleaned from the student writings and tabulated for both fourth- and fifth-grade groups. They are represented as VF percentage totals for both fourth- and fifth-grade groups. As mentioned previously regarding Table 4.2, Vernacular Features Sample, the results by category of vernacular features showing the greatest percentage of decrease of usage were:

1. Regularization of past-tense verbs. The fourth-grade group showed a decrease of 47% in usage of vernacular features, between pre- and post-testing of writing prompts, while the fifth-grade group showed a decrease of only 5% fewer vernacular features.

2. Multiple negation. For the fourth-grade group, pre-post results showed a decrease of 60%, while pre-post results for the fifth-grade group showed a decrease of only 25%.

3. Subject/verb agreement. For the fourth grade, pre-post results showed a decrease of 22% in the usage of vernacular features. The fifth grade showed a decrease of 18% in the usage of vernacular features in the subject/verb agreement category. There was a difference of 4% greater for the fourth grade.

Therefore, the fourth grade showed decreases greater than the fifth grade in three out of four categories. Conversely, in pronominal difference, the fourth category, the VF decrease was greater for the fifth-grade group, with 22% as opposed to 21% in the fourth
grade CA group. However, there was only a 1% greater decrease for the fifth grade, which is a very narrow margin.

In summary, fifth grade vernacular features were trending upward, with more VFs in every category of writing except for pronomial differences. In other words, the percentages increased in three out of the four categories for the fifth grade group. One could suppose, perhaps, that they received less reinforcement in writing, as there was not the focus that accompanied the CA intervention for the fourth grade.

Teacher interviews.

Another data source that provided a window on the level of skill of the fourth-grade class was the initial interview of Dec. 12, 2012, with Ms. Curry. She estimated that 75-80% of her class of 28 students had a dialectal carryover from speech into writing. At this point, in the initial interview, however, she was thinking in terms of dialect carryover as something needing correction. As she stated, “I think about the things I hear from students and then the corrections I make every day that I make within the classroom—that I make with their speech. Then I look at their writing, and I go, ‘Well now, we just talked about that the other day, you know, when they said this or that kind of thing.’”

During the reflective interview of April 10, 2013, Ms. Curry was asked if she saw evidence of students incorporating CA in their writing. She stated that she wasn’t sure she had, but she had seen it in students’ everyday language and conversation. However, in writing, as to the written form of vernacular, it was not consistent enough to see a change. From the beginning of the 11-week study through the end, she had grown to accept the dialectal carryover of speech into writing as a legitimate basis for writing Standard English, as the students learned to code-switch.
As to her instruction, Ms. Curry indicated that she felt the use of CA had already had an effect on her instructional writing practices. She said she previously had a difficult time teaching the discovery part of writing—that it was a lot easier for her to teach by discovery method in science and math. She reflected, “I never was clear on a way to do that with the grammar side of it—thinking in terms of that so this is definitely a change there; also, just being aware myself of my use of formal and informal language and the modeling and that sort of thing, as I said—carrying that over with the writing.” She was, of course, referring to the scientific method as applied to grammar discovery as implemented by Wheeler and Swords (2010) as applied to direct instruction in code-switching lessons.

**Objective assessment of student writing.**

As mentioned previously in Chapter III, objective assessment of student writing was achieved by both the researcher and a second reader who was evaluating the writing. Writing pieces containing usage of vernacular features from both classes were scored. The student writings for the fourth-grade group included pre- and post-tests, or formal writing prompts A and B, journal writings, and specific writings from early January through mid-April 2013. The total number of writings for the fourth grade group was 66 pieces of writing for eleven students or approximately six writings per student. Student writings for the fifth-grade group included formal writing samples A & B, journal writings, selected writings of on-demand writing and open-response writing in social studies, all from early January through mid-April as well. Conversely, the total number of writings for the fifth grade group was sixty-eight pieces of writing or approximately 6.8 or seven writings per student. These were scored by the two readers using the Kentucky
Writing Assessment Holistic Scoring Guide for elementary student writing. This was used as an additional lens to view how effectively the students can communicate in writing. Though at the time the research was done, it was no longer required that the fourth grade participate in this state assessment, the two readers found it a worthwhile instrument for assessing fourth- and fifth-grade writing. Following a similar protocol for scoring portfolios, the two read the writings, rated them, and came to a consensus if there was any difference of opinion on the ratings. Students were rated by the scoring guide on a scale including: novice, apprentice, proficient, and distinguished (see Appendix M.)

**Scoring variations in pre-post writings of students.**

There was not a great variation in the pre-post writings of the CA students in fourth grade. However, the readers noted the improvement of two of the eleven students from the first prompt to the second prompt writings. Both scores improved in their ratings from novice to apprentice. Consensus between the two readers rated their apprentice scores as an informal “low apprentice,” as opposed to a regular apprentice. It was noted that the two students, Roger and Sara, were among the more vocal students who answered and asked questions during CA lessons. In the first prompt, scoring notes from the two readers indicated that Roger showed limited awareness of audience, random and weak organization, and ineffective sentence structure. By the second prompt, the readers concurred that there was much more evidence of communication with audience and development of ideas, though unelaborated. Lapses in organization were apparent, although there was much more focus in the writing. The readers conferenced and concurred that his writing assessment should be raised from Novice to Apprentice, though “low apprentice.”
In her first prompt, Sara also had limited awareness of audience, weak organization, and ineffective language. By the second prompt, she showed some evidence of communication with audience for purpose, some lapses in focus but more organization, and awkward sentence structure. Conferencing, the readers concurred that her writing assessment should be raised from novice to apprentice, albeit “low apprentice.” We discussed that perhaps CA created a greater focus on writing in the fourth grade as well as an awareness of student ownership of writing.

Among the fifth-grade group, two students’ scores also increased one level. Kayla’s first prompt was rated as apprentice, but her second prompt was rated as proficient due to the increased “depth of idea development, use of relevant details” and “logical, coherent organization” her final writings exhibited. Similarly, Joe’s writing for the first prompt was rated “high novice,” but by consensus of the two readers, his second prompt was rated “low apprentice” in that he showed more “unelaborated idea development” and more awareness of audience and purpose in his writing (Ky. Dept. of Education, 2007-2008).

**Summary**

In summation, the following supports the contention that the intervention of CA enabled the AppE fourth-grade students to write SE with fewer vernacular features as compared to a non-intervention fifth-grade group without the use of CA. Initially, both presentations by Ms. Curry of the diversity unit and dialect awareness were essential to the fourth-grade students’ understanding of the CA intervention. These tenets were reflected in the five classroom observations conducted by the researcher. Nine CA intervention components were analyzed as to the frequency with which Ms. Curry
presented them. The use of the components provided a lens by which additional data from the observations were reviewed. From a summative point of view, the CA component usage was observed a total of 38 times. This reflected that all nine components were consistently observed, as exhibited in Table 4.1.

Pre-post comparison usage of VFs for the fourth-grade group was shown in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 for fourth and fifth grades, respectively. These were tabulated on the basis of a formula (Wolfram, 1969): \(\text{VF} / \text{VF} + \text{Standard Features} = \text{number of VFs}\). They are represented as VF\% totals for both grades.

As shown in table 4.2, “VF Samples,” the results by category showing the greatest percentage of decrease of usage were: regularization of past tense verbs, multiple negation, and subject/verb agreement. Specific percentages for each of these are found in a previous section entitled “Vernacular Features Formula.” In general, the fourth grade showed decreases greater than the fifth in three of four categories. However, in the fourth category, pronomial differences, the VF decrease was greater for the fifth-grade group by a very narrow margin of 1%.

In conclusion, fifth-grade VFs were trending upward, with more VFs in every category of writing except for pronomial difference. The percentages increased in three out of four categories for the fifth-grade group as opposed to the fourth-grade group.

Finally, the assessment of student writings by the two readers who used the Holistic Scoring Guide was as follows: For the fourth-grade group of 11 students, scoring of the first prompt writings and selected writings showed ratings of eight novice and three apprentice students; final prompt writings and selected writings showed ratings of six novice and five apprentice students. For the fifth-grade group of 10 students, scoring of
the first prompt writings showed ratings of five novice, four apprentice, and one proficient; final prompt writings showed ratings of four novice, four apprentice, and two proficient students. Therefore, there was a greater variance and an attainment of a higher level of writing in the fifth-grade group than in the fourth grade. However, these students also had the benefit of two-thirds of a year more of instruction in ELA as to quality of writing than did the fourth grade. It appears that the fourth-grade group would continue to benefit from the use of CA and code-switching as they continue into fifth grade.

**Question #2**

In what ways does instruction in contrastive analysis impact students’ views of themselves as writers?

Through the lens of the Writer Self Perception Scale (WSPS) (Bottomley, Henk, and Melnick, P., 1997/1998), results for fourth- and fifth-grade students showed how student self-efficacy was impacted by CA. This scale is based on Bandura’s theory (1977) that predicts the self-efficacy of writing ability of a child will affect his or her growth in writing. A norm-based instrument, the WSPS is by its authors’ identification supported by a theory of self-efficacy. As mentioned in Ch. III, the WSPS instrument was administered to the whole classes of fourth and fifth graders, pre- and post-study. The students’ regular teachers explained the directions and read the survey to the students orally as they completed it. This was to ensure that all students understood it and that a minimum amount of time was spent on the survey. Also, by the teachers’ reading it, reading ability of the students did not pose a detriment to completing the scale. The researcher then collected the surveys for analysis of those who had parental permission to participate in the study.
**WSPS scores analysis.**

The categories of the WSPS are described to further elucidate their definitions. Note that the first category was “Progress,” which was divided into “General,” a comparison of one’s present writing performance in relation to past achievement, and “Specific,” which deals with areas of writing such as focus, clarity, organization, etc. WSPS scale categories with a phrase or sentence explaining what they exhibit are: General Progress (GPR)—e.g., “Writing is easier for me than it used to be”; Specific Progress (SPR)—e.g., “My sentences stick to the topic better now”; Observational Comparison (OC)—“how a child perceives his/her writing performance in relation to peers”; Social Feedback (SF)—“direct and indirect input about the child’s writing derived from teachers, classmates, and family members”; and Physiological States (PS)—“internal feelings that the child experiences during writing” (p. 287).

The scoring sheet for the WSPS indicates that the students’ self-perceptions as writers may fall in a low, normal, or high range (p.163). Scores that fall more than one standard deviation (SD) below the mean are in the low range: i.e., GPR <30, SPR <24, OC<23, SF<22, and PS<16. Conversely, scores exceeding the mean by more than one SD are identified as “very desirable” writer self-perceptions (see Appendix O).

Table 4.5 (below) shows all of the WSPS scores on which Table 4.6 is based.
Table 4.5 Fourth Grade Pre- and Post WSPS Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>General Progress</th>
<th>Specific Progress</th>
<th>Observational Comp.</th>
<th>Social Feedback</th>
<th>Physiological States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High 39+</td>
<td>High 34+</td>
<td>High 37+</td>
<td>High 32+</td>
<td>High 28+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average 35</td>
<td>Average 29</td>
<td>Average 30</td>
<td>Average 27</td>
<td>Average 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low 30</td>
<td>Low 24</td>
<td>Low 23</td>
<td>Low 22</td>
<td>Low 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>29 36</td>
<td>23 27</td>
<td>24 23</td>
<td>20 28</td>
<td>25 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>36 37</td>
<td>26 29</td>
<td>22 31</td>
<td>27 29</td>
<td>27 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>36 36</td>
<td>26 28</td>
<td>33 31</td>
<td>26 27</td>
<td>24 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>40 40</td>
<td>35 35</td>
<td>25 34</td>
<td>20 25</td>
<td>13 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>37 32</td>
<td>31 32</td>
<td>28 27</td>
<td>30 21</td>
<td>23 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>40 37</td>
<td>35 29</td>
<td>37 28</td>
<td>34 27</td>
<td>30 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>32 36</td>
<td>30 27</td>
<td>22 26</td>
<td>21 21</td>
<td>24 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>40 33</td>
<td>35 28</td>
<td>30 32</td>
<td>30 23</td>
<td>30 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>38 39</td>
<td>33 34</td>
<td>34 41</td>
<td>26 35</td>
<td>28 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>38 36</td>
<td>28 23</td>
<td>27 23</td>
<td>26 25</td>
<td>22 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>38 37</td>
<td>35 30</td>
<td>29 22</td>
<td>27 23</td>
<td>29 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the scores for the fourth grade CA group, pre- and post-, reveals

the following trends for WSPS scores:

Table 4.6
Fourth Grade Pre- and Post WSPS Scores per Student by Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-WPS Fourth Grade</th>
<th>Post-WPS Fourth Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPR</td>
<td>3-High (students #4, 6, 8)</td>
<td>1-High (#4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Low (student #1)</td>
<td>None in Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>4-High (students #4,6,8,&amp;11)</td>
<td>2-High(#4, 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Low (student#1)</td>
<td>None in Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>None High</td>
<td>1-High (student #9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Low (student #1)</td>
<td>1-Low (student#11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1-High (student #6)</td>
<td>2-High(students #4, 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Low (students #1,4,7)</td>
<td>2-Low (students#5, 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>3-High (students # 6, 8, 11)</td>
<td>2-High students(#1,11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Low (student #3)</td>
<td>1-Low,(student#8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Other than these students, fourth-grade participants cited in Table 4.6 all fell in the “Normal” range according to the WSPS scale. In general, in the results of the pre-test, students #6 and #8 scored high in three categories; students #4 and #11 scored high in two of those same categories. In three of the five categories, only one student scored low; it was student #1 three times. In the post-test, fewer students scored high—students #4 and #9, three times each—but fewer students scored low, with two categories having none in the low range. In total, eight students scored low in the pre-test and four in the post-test. Therefore, in general, student self-perception improved in the fourth-grade CA group.

Table 4.7

*Fifth Grade Pre- and Post WSPS Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Pre/Post Scores</th>
<th>General Progress</th>
<th>Specific Progress</th>
<th>Observational Comp.</th>
<th>Social Feedback</th>
<th>Physiological States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An analysis of the scores for the fifth-grade group, pre- and post-, reveals the following trends for WSPS scores:

Table 4.8

*Fifth Grade Pre- and Post-WSPS Scores per Student by Range*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-WPS Fourth Grade</th>
<th>Post-WPS Fourth Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPR</td>
<td>2-High (students #1,5)</td>
<td>1-High (#6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Low (student #6)</td>
<td>1-Low (#10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>2-High (students #1,5)</td>
<td>None in High range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Low (student #6)</td>
<td>1-Low (#10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>None in High range</td>
<td>None in High range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Low (students#3,8)</td>
<td>None in Low range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1-High (student#1)</td>
<td>None in High range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None in Low range</td>
<td>1-Low (student#10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>1-High (student #5)</td>
<td>2-High students(#6, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Low (student #10)</td>
<td>1-Low (#10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other than the students listed in this table, the fifth-grade participants cited in Table 4.8 all fell in the “Normal” range according to the WPS scale. In general, in the results of the pre-test, two students, #1 and #5, scored high in two categories, GPR and SPR. In category 3, OC, none scored high, but two scored below. For categories 1 & 2, student #6 scored low twice. Altogether, five scored low and six scored high.

In the Post-WPS scores, student #10 was low in four categories, all but OC, in which there were no low students. There were also no high students in categories 2, 3, and 4. There was one student who scored high in category 1, SPR, who was also one of the two high students in PS category. All totaled, three students scored above and four scored below (all #10), for a total of seven. Most students were in the normal range.

There is a correlation between positive self-perception on the WPS and actual writing ability. One indicator is item #15, a general item on the WPS that asks the
student to rate him/herself as a good writer on a scale of 1-5, meaning either a “4” (agree) or a “5” (strongly agree) (SA). However, eight of the eleven students rated themselves a good writer with either a “4” or a “5” score pre- and post-study. Fourth-grade findings showed that of eleven students, only one strongly agreed (SA) with a “5” rating that he was a good writer pre- and post-study. This student maintained his rating of “5” both times. Five students rated themselves upward one point from “4” (agree) (A), to “5” (strongly agree), considering themselves good writers before and after the study. One student rated himself down one point from “4” (agree) to “3” (undecided) (U); two others rated themselves down one point from an initial “5” to a post-study “4.” The greatest change among the students was one who initially gave a self-rating of strongly disagree (SD), but rated himself upward three levels to a “4” (agree) post-study.

With the CA group, there was, indeed, a risk in focusing on the dialect of the students, or the “otherness” of it as being different from the Standard. This could have created a negative effect on the students’ perceptions of themselves as writers, thereby impeding self-esteem. However, as described above, the results show that the majority of the fourth-grade participants maintained their self-efficacy as good writers pre- and post-study.

Fifth-grade findings on item #15 showed that of the ten students, only two strongly agreed with a “5” rating—that they were good writers before and after the study. Three more students who gave themselves a “5” rated themselves lower post-study by one point to a “4” or “agree” on the scale. Altogether, seven of the ten students either strongly agreed or agreed they were good writers both pre- and post-study. Three students rated themselves as a “3” or “undecided”, initially, but two of the three ratings went up
one point to a “4” or “agree” post-study; one went down to a “2” (disagree) post-study.
The “2” student rated himself the lowest of the group.

Of the last two students who initially rated themselves as a “4” (agree), one went up a point on the scale post-study to a “5” and one stayed the same as a “4,” (agree).

Obviously there was a great deal of variance in this group on the subject of self-efficacy in writing. This could perhaps be attributed to a lack of focus on writing in the fifth grade, while conversely the intervention provided focus on writing for the fourth graders.

Indications are that the difference between the fourth-and fifth-grade WSPS scores was not significant. An unpaired, two-tailed T-test was run on the data for the WSPS. The p-value was greater than .05 for each scale category. Therefore, the results were not statistically significant (see Appendix T).

**Teacher Interviews.**

In the reflective interview, I asked Ms. Curry if she thought student attitudes about writing had changed. She replied, “I don’t know that it’s a sole result of the implementation of this, but my whole purpose is to try to help change student attitudes toward writing at this level, because I think at this age, fourth grade, those that did enjoy writing before—once they get over that hurdle of learning to write, then they think it is all in the bag, and they don’t really want to do it anymore.”

She went on to say that she hoped their attitude had changed since August. She hoped they were more willing to write and that they saw that writing was not just writing a report or an essay. She countered, “I’ve tried to give them lots of opportunities to write creatively—to write to express themselves and to see everything in the light that writing
could be and to see what purpose it could serve outside of writing something for the
teacher to look at and grade them—that sort of thing.”

At the end of the study, when asked whether she saw evidence of students
incorporating CA in their writing, Ms. Curry stated that she wasn’t sure of that, but she
had seen it in students’ everyday language and conversation. However, in writing,
perhaps using CA was not consistent enough to “see.” She continued to say that she
thought she did a really good job of making students aware of when they should use
formal or informal language.

In conclusion, Ms. Curry exhibited her newly acquired dialect awareness in a
statement in the reflective interview. What she said was a restatement of the basic plan of
action for code-switching and usage of CA as shown in the Sweetland (2006) and
Wheeler & Swords (2010) studies. I asked Ms. Curry whether she would implement CA
with whatever she was doing in English language arts in the future within her sequence of
study. This was the plan she stated: “We’ll practice with the writing once we have
identified the pattern and looked at some drafts we have written—so giving them an
actual application of it is the plan. It gives them opportunities to look for it, see it, make
changes in the writing and apply it that way.” She was referring to the benefit of the
discovery process and the awakening of the students to the idea that they are innately
writing to the “rules” of language they have learned from home, but that they can code-
switch and transfer that from the informal to the formal language as necessary to fit the
occasion, such as language for school.
Summary

This aspect of the study involved self-efficacy of the students in both groups regarding their ability to write as measured by the WSPS. A statistical T-test run on the scores showed that the differences for the five scales of the WSPS were not significant. More importantly, it showed that the fourth graders did not develop a negative attitude toward their dialectal writing because of the implementation of CA and their subsequent development of self-awareness of their dialect. Detailed information regarding the WSPS scores is found in Tables 4.5-4.8.

Question #3

In what ways does the contrastive analysis approach have a similar effect on AppE students’ writing as it does for other language varieties?

CA effect on student writing.

In this response, I am relating my study of AppE students to other studies with AAVE students that use CA and dialect readers. In so doing, I will talk about how CA impacted AAVE students, and similarly, how it impacted AppE students in my study.

According to Sweetland (2006), “Writing instruction may also be the ideal context in which to focus on teaching Standard English to learners who are not yet proficient in the code of power” (p. 20). She contends that writing is used in most every form of student assessment and plays a crucial role as “gatekeeper” in academic assessment and decision-making.

The language variation of AAVE differs from others by social class and style (Rickford (1997). Rickford’s research base of East Palo Alto, California, which was heavily African American, was a case in point. Third graders scored at the 16th percentile
statewide for the reading component of the California Assessment Program in 1989-1990; by sixth grade, they dropped to the 3rd percentile.

Rickford utilized dialectal readers as an aid in teaching reading to speakers of AAVE. The use of dialect readers was first implemented by Stewart (1969), who claims that for AAVE speakers and speakers of other language variations, it was effective pedagogy to separate learning to read from that of learning a second dialect or language. For AAVE speakers, as well as AppE and other language varieties, SE is a second dialect. Also, showing that most students incorporate inherently gained knowledge from formal school and that SE is the language of school, as opposed to their language variation, one-half of a tenth-grade student population in Godley & Escher’s (2010) study showed a preference for speaking SE in the ELA classes some of the time. Similarly, 18% argued that they should speak only SE in class; 38% argued that they should speak both SE and AAE in class. In comparison, in my study, the students in the intermediate grades—fourth and fifth—showed a decrease in vernacular features in their writing, which showed an understood preference for using SE in their writing for school.

There is good precedent for using a combination of dialect readers and CA. Young, Barrett, Young-Rivera, & Lovejoy (2014) maintain: “There are a variety of dialect awareness programs that involve a combination of dialect readers and contrastive analysis to teach children about language variation in addition to teaching the grammar of Standard English” (p. 42). A successful program in particular that is referenced in the book is the Academic English Mastery Program, which has been run by Noma Le Moine in the Los Angeles School District for more than 20 years. According to the authors, success of the program may be attributed to the fact that “undervalued” or vernacular
varieties of language are included in the curriculum. In fact, the program includes readings from four different vernacular varieties that are considered undervalued—Native American English, AAVE, Mexican American English, and Hawaiian English. They are included in ways different from the typical corrective measures aimed at the transition of students to SE.

Parallel to my study, Rickford’s dialect reader emphasis shows the importance of using the home language in instruction with vernacular dialect students. This was readily apparent in the interest that comedian Jeff Foxworthy’s quips in AppE generated in the fourth-grade students when Ms. Curry played the segment from the “Down South” part of Do You Speak American? (MacNeil & Cran, 2005) in lesson #1. As he defined the word “May-o-nnaise. Man, a’s a lotta people here tonight” (p. 77), the children looked at each other in a very surprised manner, for they had probably never heard their own home language included in a lesson at school. They enjoyed it, though, and the use of the home language got the point across, as it stressed the difference of the concepts of informal and formal.

In lesson #4, Ms. Curry and I decided to base the first part of the lesson on her dialect, AAVE, since she is African American. After she read Flossie and the Fox (McKissack, 1986), a book of fiction included for its use of the AAVE vernacular, the students were able to code-switch some of the phrases and sentences from informal to formal. This showed their ability to code-switch, once they knew the pattern, even if it was not their own language variation. Here follows a description of the CA lesson involved. The fourth-grade group showed much interest in reading material that contained dialect variation, both AAVE and AppE. It seemed to enhance the students’
interest. Just as in Rickford, J. & A. (1995), it was found that girls more than boys tended to use more SE in their language use.

**Guided Instruction for Flossie and the Fox Extended Lesson.**

To accommodate the CA lesson with flexible extra time for ELA, the amended schedule was ELA, 45 minutes before lunch; then “small group math,” which occurred daily school-wide for 25 minutes; and then another 35 minutes of ELA before recess. The students were pumped up for the change to a book with a different dialect, AAVE, after Ms. Curry identified the dialect as her home language. *Flossie and the Fox* is a picture book we chose because of its many passages of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) dialect. Ms. Curry told the children that this was a story of a little girl who lived in the rural South whose grandmother, Big Mama, sent her to deliver a basket of eggs to Miz Viola. Big Mama warned her that there was a fox in the woods along the way who really liked eggs, and that she must deal with him. The children immediately said that this story reminded them of *Little Red Riding Hood*, so they were doubly entranced in the book and lesson.

To begin, Ms. Curry wrote three sentences on the board. She told the children these were examples from the book of informal language in the South among African Americans. Then she asked them to code-switch, or change them from informal to formal phrases, and say them the way they would say it if they were at school—more formally. She wrote these next to the informal phrases. The chart below is different from a diversity chart. It is a code-switching chart, in which the two rows are equivalents, not just facets of a concept, as in a diversity chart.
Figure 4.3 Flossie and the Fox

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* I [be] Flossie</td>
<td>I am Flossie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* A fox be just a fox.</td>
<td>A fox is just a fox.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do a fox look?</td>
<td>How does a fox look?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the code-switching grammar units, each row in the charts represents informal and formal equivalents (see Figure 4.3, above). For example, in these two sentences from that table, the language variations of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) and Standard English (SE) are compared.

*Note: The first two examples are ungrammatical for AAVE (informal). “Be” marks habitual aspect and would not be used in these sentences by native speakers of AAVE (Rickford & Rickford, 2000; Young, Barrett, Young-Rivera, & Lovejoy, 2014). Typically an AAVE speaker would say “I’m Flossie” rather than “I be Flossie,” and instead of “A fox be just a fox,” the speaker would say, “A fox just a fox” (no copula).

The children struggled some with the middle one, but came up with the coordinates, which Ms. Curry said was how to code-switch from the informal to the formal sentences. Ms. Curry was very animated as she read the folk tale, which was largely conversation between the fox, who spoke formal or standard language, and Flossie, who spoke vernacular AAVE, or informal language. The book was a picture book, and Ms. Curry read it in her best picture book display style for the children. They didn’t have enough room for all 28 students to sit up front on the carpet, so they were asked to stay in their seats. At the end, the children agreed that Flossie outsmarted the fox just as Red Riding Hood did in that story. The fox was a trickster—or “slickster,” as Big
Mama called him—in both, and the hounds were after him at the end of the story as well. The children enjoyed the story and Ms. Curry’s reading of it immensely.

Another reason we chose this story was that it had several examples of double negatives which were the basis of “multiple patterns” in this lesson (Wheeler & Swords, 2010, p. 217). Several examples from the book are: “Unless you can show you a fox, I’ll not accord you nothing!” (p. 14). “That still don’t make you no fox” (p. 16). “So … that don’t prove nothing …” (p. 19). These were written on the whiteboard, and the children code-switched from the informal to the formal forms. Double negatives or “multiple negation” was also a vernacular feature found to some extent in the writing of the AppE dialect students. This was briefly addressed in the 35 minutes after lunch. The examples in the previous paragraph of the double negatives were put on a T-chart, and the students code-switched them from informal (vernacular) to formal (standard) dialect.

**Guided Instruction on Pronominal Difference.**

Another lesson of importance Ms. Curry presented was on pronominal difference, a vernacular feature in which objective case pronouns are used instead of subjective case with coordinate subjects. Pronominal or pronoun difference (see Appendix S) was a more difficult concept for the children to understand. This lesson was an example of a “customized” lesson on the use of pronominal differences, which is the use of the objective case forms with coordinate subjects, which is found in the AppE dialect. According to Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (2013), this type of pronoun difference is commonly found in most vernacular dialects of English, but particularly in the South, as in “John and them will be home soon” and “Me and him will do it” (p. 382).
During this lesson, the students worked on code-switching “informal” (vernacular) pronouns to “formal” (standard) which Ms. Curry told them she had found in their writing over the last few weeks. Again Ms. Curry wrote three sentences on the whiteboard:

   Me and my dad went fishing.
   Jesse and him play X-box.
   Her and her mom shop.

**Narrative of guided instruction.**

Ms. Curry “had the students in her hand,” as she led them through this guided instruction extension. All were attentive; many had their hands up as questions were asked, as Ms. Curry interacted with them. At the end I almost expected to hear, “Yes, ma’am,” in response. She related well to her students and was very personable, and was able to get on their level.

“What’s a pronoun?” Ms. Curry asked Michael.

“It’s a word you use when someone’s talking about someone else, like ‘him’ or ‘her,’” he responded.

“You’re on the right track,” she said, “but let’s look in our ELA notebooks for a definition.”

Jaden waved his hand in the air, “It’s a word that takes the place of a noun,” he stated.

“Okay,” said Ms. Curry, “now when we went to Rupp Arena right after Spring Break, you all met the First Lady of our state for lunch afterwards. Some of you were
able to talk with her. Kayla, would you say to the First Lady, “Her and her mom went shopping,” if you were talking about Mia and her mom shopping?

“No,” said Kayla, “I would say, “She and her mom went shopping.”

“And why would you change it from ‘her and her mom’?” asked Ms. Curry.

“Because you’re talking to an important person in a big place, and it’s more formal,” said Kayla.

“Exactly!” said Ms. Curry. “Remember we talked about how we have to fit our audience and place with the informal or formal words. ‘Her and her mom’ is fine if you’re at home or talking to your friend on the school bus, because it’s informal. However, if you’re talking to the First Lady, the principal, a teacher, one of the ladies in the office, or answering a question in the classroom, you need to use the formal form, ‘she and her mom,’” she concluded.

The students were able to code-switch the other two examples to the formal or standard form as well. They did these as a group with a volunteer coming to the whiteboard to write the formal form under the “formal” column of the T-chart. Ms. Curry typically wrote on the board, and together they came up with the patterns (see Appendix S again). The informal pattern was me/him/her/it + subject words or me + subject words in a series, and the formal pattern of subject words + I, he/she, they, we/ or subject words in a series + I.

The students were assigned to find more examples of informal use of pronoun differences in their journals before I did the last observation. During the next week they wrote them on sentence strips and pasted them to the T-chart on the appropriate side during the next lesson or two in 15-minute mini-lessons on pronoun differences.
Providing four examples from their writings and putting them on the T-chart, the class completed this assignment. Thus, the established pattern for code-switching was reinforced.

**Discussion**

To synthesize research with findings supportive of CA and presented in comparison to my study, a discussion follows.

First, Craig and Washington (2002, 2004) studied academic failure of AAVE lower- and middle-class students, preschool through first grade, in the Detroit area. They found that upon entry to school, African American boys and low-income African American students in general used AAVE features more often than African American girls and African American students from middle-income homes.

The majority of participants in my study on CA with AppE students were from low-income SES homes, as were the AAVE students in Craig and Washington’s (2002, 2004 work). In the 2012-2013 Kentucky School Report Card for Peavine Elementary, the school in which my study took place, the percentage of Free or Reduced Lunch (FRL) was 73.6 for the year. This was higher than the state and district average. For that same year, Peavine Elementary was categorized as a “Needs Improvement/Progressing” school (X School Report Card, 2012-13).

It follows that for AAVE, a shift occurred between kindergarten and third grade. Research results indicated AAVE features used by students were reduced by more than half, as alluded to in Chapter II (Craig & Washington, 2004, 2006). Students who reflected this decrease in their use of AAVE features between kindergarten and fifth grade had higher reading achievement scores. Conversely, Hudley and Mallinson (2011,
p. 106), maintained that those who did not decrease their use of AAVE features between fourth or fifth grade typically ended up one or more grade levels behind. Thus begins a vicious cycle of low reading achievement and subsequent continuance of high levels of VF that carry over into writing.

Second, a previously mentioned study that was used as a basis for the three tenets of my study was conducted by Sweetland (2006). My study parallels the three major tenets of Sweetland’s study, which became her instructional recommendations: 1) increasing teacher awareness of language variation by giving teachers dialect awareness instruction; 2) introducing dialect awareness themes in the classroom; and 3) using CA to teach SE essentially as a second dialect. In my study, pre-post changes in writing samples showed significant improvement in the writing over an eleven-week period; Sweetland’s study involved a 10-week period with significant improvement in students’ writing. With the CA group, vernacular features decreased significantly in three of four categories. Also, two of ten students were reassessed from pre- to post-prompt from novice to apprentice in overall writing quality by the Kentucky Writing Assessment Holistic Scoring Guide With the fourth- and fifth-grade groups in my study, this showed the strategic importance of having pre-post writing prompts, selected writings, dialect awareness, and CA implementation.

Third, action research directed by Wheeler (2010) was completed by 15 teachers of students in grades K-14 who were students in Wheeler’s university classes. Wheeler used CA and code-switching for teachers of students who speak AAVE. The research showed the importance of teacher attitudes and dialect awareness training among those who teach students with language variations.
As well as with Sweetland’s research, my study, using the CA intervention, paralleled Wheeler and Swords’ (2006, 2010) work. This study was based on third graders who were, of course, close in age to the fourth- and fifth-grade population of my study. Indications were that Ms. Curry’s fourth graders were taught to identify AppE vernacular features and then to code-switch them with SE dialectal features. This was shown to be effective with the CA fourth-grade group, in that the numbers of vernacular features in three of four categories—regularization of past-tense verbs, multiple negation, and subject/verb agreement—found in their writing (as compared to the fifth-grade group) decreased significantly.

Fourth, effective use of CA is not limited to elementary school or rather to students of a certain age. Taylor (1989) used CA effectively in two freshman college English classes to show improvement in SE mastery with AAVE speakers. Taylor’s eleven-week study, and the ten-week length Sweetland chose for her study, supported the eleven-week length I chose for my study. Taylor utilized CA of grammatical patterns of AAVE and SE so that the students’ home dialects did not transfer to their SE writing. Again, utilizing CA with grammatical patterns of AppE and code-switching to SE with the fourth graders proved to be very effective in my research as well.

Finally, there is a research base which establishes that linguistically informed approaches to vernacular usage have been proven to be much more successful than traditional ones (Wheeler & Swords, 2010). Results from an experimental study of third-grade students by Fogel and Ehri (2000) showed that students who were taught with traditional English techniques, wherein correction of the vernacular was a component, either improved only 1% or their performance in using SE became worse. However,
students who used CA showed a nearly 100% increase in mastery of SE. This is an outcome to seek as a goal in parallel to AppE vs. SE mastery.

**Summary**

In the previously discussed studies, the CA approach has been proven to have a similar effect on AppE students’ writing as it does for AAVE students in particular. Work conducted by Sweetland (2006) and Wheeler and Swords (2010) has been of great interest to me as a practitioner. Both were able to get to the crux of the problem rather than simply trying to transition the students from their vernacular language variation, the language of home, to SE, the language of school. Furthermore, my study is closely aligned with both of these studies, as discussed in the previous section.

Wheeler & Swords (2006) was used as a basis for my study using CA and code-switching with fourth-grade AppE students. In 2006, Swords first implemented code-switching and CA in her third-grade classroom where her students performed 30 points below their White peers on year-end state tests. In 2006, 100% of her African American students passed 100% of the state tests. According to Wheeler & Swords (2010), “Rachel closed the achievement gap in her classroom, a result that has held constant ever since” (p. xiv).

For a different facet of the study, Rickford, J. & A. (1995) and Godley and Escher (2010) are included as examples of the use of dialect readers in class and student preference of SE versus vernacular usage in class, respectively. These studies are included as examples of dialect awareness, CA, and code-switching in my research. As previously mentioned, I planned for Ms. Curry to use an AAVE story, *Flossie and the Fox* (McKissack, 1986), in this bent. All the other articles concerned the use of AAVE
versus SE features by vernacular usage (Craig & Washington, 2002, 2004; 2004, 2006) and the effects of achievement of each on the students. In addition, Taylor (1989) demonstrated that CA strategy had utility with students of different ages, as her population sample dealt with college freshmen. Dealing with language variation preference, Godley and Escher (2010) also worked with secondary students in tenth grade.

**Conclusion**

In summation, through the five days of lessons, Ms. Curry implemented the contrastive analysis (CA intervention) with her fourth-grade group of 11 students who were participants. As she was learning components of dialect awareness, she also shared them with her students. The students brainstormed concepts (informal and formal) in terms of clothing and places as they were guided in making diversity charts.

Next, from the second segment of the first through the fifth ELA classes, students learned to make code-switching charts. These lessons were aligned with components of CA (see AppendixN). The researcher used this as a guideline to check for frequency of the use of the components throughout the five days of observations.

The class was taught how to find their own vernacular features (VFs), termed “Informal Language” for purposes of the lessons. They worked in groups of two or three, putting the words or phrases on sentence strips and then placing them in the corresponding columns on a T-chart under either “Informal” or “Formal,” as per pedagogy by Wheeler and Swords (2006; 2010). Initially, Ms. Curry and I selected samples from their writings for the first couple of lessons, until the students developed an awareness of the concepts of Informal/Formal.
As this was a study based on the effects of the implementation of an intervention, CA, important data also came from the other non-intervention group, the fifth-grade group, taught by Ms. Potter. Ten students in that group participated. Their writings were reviewed for number of VFs, as well. Pre- and post-data of writing prompts and other writings, such as journaling, for both fourth- and fifth grade groups, as well as WSPS scale score, pre- and post-data, made a sound basis for comparison of results for both the fourth-grade CA group and the fifth-grade non-intervention group.

Counting VFs in writings for both groups from the beginning of the term in January through the eleven weeks of the study, it was found that the fourth-grade group’s writing maintained a greater percentage of decrease in VFs in three of four categories of VFs. The fourth category, pronominal differences, showed a greater decrease by the fifth-grade group than the fourth grade, by only one percent: 22% to 21%, respectively.

To conclude, all of these facets of the study results, put under the lens of circumspection, point to a successful implementation of the CA intervention. Considering the positive results exhibited with Ms. Curry’s class during an eleven-week study, I would estimate success in future replicated studies, especially with an intermediate-grade population in an Appalachian area. Given more time and classes of the same grade level within a school for replication of the study, writing scores of AppE students could vastly improve. Decreases of VFs in writing would increase SE in writing, which would in turn raise writing scores in both school and state assessments.
Chapter Five: Results and Conclusions, Limitations, Implications for Future Research

Overview

I will discuss the results and conclusions, limitations, and implications for future research for the study in this chapter. “Admittedly the gap between written language and spoken language will be greater for vernacular dialect speakers than it is for speakers of Standard varieties” (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 1998, p. 299). Wolfram and Schilling-Estes then counter that the resolution of this issue lacks “controlled experimentation.” My research results are one step toward answering a facet of this issue regarding the AppE dialect.

Major Results and Conclusions

Result #1: Implementation of Contrastive Analysis (CA) Intervention with the AppE fourth-grade group resulted in fewer AppE vernacular features (VFs) in student writing.

The purpose of this study was to determine and describe the effectiveness of one method of reducing the number of vernacular features in the Standard English writing of AppE dialect students. One important finding of this research was that the utilization of CA was effective in decreasing vernacular features in AppE students’ writing. During an eleven-week period in Spring 2013, fourth-grade student writings showed a decrease in VFs in three of four categories of high vernacular usage in student writing. These categories were: regularization of past tense verbs, multiple negation, and subject/verb agreement. In the fourth area, pronominal differences, results were nearly equal for intervention and non-intervention groups, with the fifth-grade group scoring a 22%
decrease and the fourth-grade group scoring a 21% decrease—a difference of only one percent (see Tables 4.3, 4.4).

Fifth-grade vernacular features trended upward, with more VFs in every category of writing except for the pronomial differences in general. In other words, the percentages increased in three of four categories for the fifth-grade group. Perhaps this could have been because the students were getting less reinforcement in writing Standard English than those in the fourth grade who were given the CA intervention. The CA intervention created a focus on writing for them, which appeared to be influential, in terms of code-switching to SE.

Result #2: Focus on intervention and AppE showed no negative effects as to self-efficacy of students in regard to writing.

It has been established that CA might lead people to see their own dialect negatively. Given Bandura’s theory (1977), which predicts that a positive perception of writing ability of a child will affect his/her subsequent growth in writing, it follows that students who hold a strong belief of self-efficacy in writing are more likely to produce more writing as an additional positive result.

Another important finding of this research was in regard to student self-efficacy in writing. In both the fourth-grade CA and fifth-grade groups, Writer Self-Perception Scale (WSPS) results pre-post were found to be not significant. There was a negligible difference between the pre-post scores of the fourth-grade group, which used CA, and the pre-post scores of the fifth-grade group, which did not. As previously stated in Chapter IV results, an unpaired, two-tailed T-test revealed that the p-value was greater than .05.
for each scale category (see Appendix U). Therefore, the scores were not statistically significant. Also, the quality of writing proved greater in fifth than in fourth grade.

Most of the students in the fourth grade fell in the “Normal” range according to the WSPS scale. In the results of the pre-test, in three of the five categories, only one student scored low. In the post-test as compared to the pre-test, fewer students scored high, but fewer students also scored low, with two categories having none in the low range. In total, eight students scored low in the pre-test and four in the post-test. Therefore, in general, student self-perception improved in the fourth-grade CA group from pre- to post-test.

Most of the students in the fifth grade fell in the “Normal” range also in regard to the WSPS scale. In general, in the results of the pre-test (see Table 4.8), two students scored high in two categories, GPR and SPR. In the OC category, none scored high, but two scored low. Altogether, five scored low and six scored high.

In the post-WSPS scores, one student was low in four of five categories, all but OC, in which there were no low students. There were also no high students in categories #2, SPR; #3, OC; and #4, PS. There was one student who scored high in category #1, SPR, who was also one of the two high students in PS category. All totaled, three students scored high and four scored low, for a total of seven students. Most students were in the normal range.

The fourth- and fifth-grade groups also assessed themselves on item #15, one indicator that asks the student to rate him/herself as a good writer on a scale of one to five. A good writer would be either self-assessed as a “4,” meaning “agree,” or a “5,” “strongly agree.” Of eleven students in the fourth grade, eight considered themselves
good writers, pre- and post-study. However, of the fifth-grade group, seven of the ten students strongly agreed or agreed that they were good writers both pre- and post-study. Both groups had three fewer students than their total number who felt they were good writers.

Conversely, students in both fourth- and fifth-grade groups who rated themselves negatively gave self-ratings of “3” (undecided), “2” (disagree), or “1” (strongly disagree). Though there were two students in the fourth-grade group who rated themselves negatively on the pre-test, there was only one in the post-test who rated himself “3” (undecided). Therefore, in the fourth-grade group, no one rated himself negatively in both the pre- and post-tests.

In comparison, in the fifth-grade group, only one student rated his/her writing negatively pre- and post-study. His pre-test rating was a “3” (undecided); post-test, “2” (disagree). Initially there were three “3s,” but the other two became “4s” (agree) post-test. Therefore, the self-perception of writing was very similar in both groups.

There was a slight risk that the CA group might have taken a negative bent toward writing due to the focus on their AppE in relation to writing practice. However, this was not the case. In fact, the students seemed to embrace CA and code-switching lessons by their regular teacher, Ms. Curry.

**Result #3: The process of intervention proven for AAVE students indicates that CA was equally effective with AppE students.**

Most important, there is a direct implication that CA and code-switching work for AppE students, in that there was a definite decrease in the carry-over of vernacular features of speech into writing with the fourth-grade CA intervention group that did not
manifest itself in the fifth-grade group. Regarding AAVE populations, as has been shown in Wheeler and Swords’ (2010) work in Norfolk, VA, school districts, CA is an effective program to increase SE in writing and, consequently, students’ understanding of the written word. Sweetland (2006) also obtained positive results with AAVE language variation in major cities of the United States, such as Washington, D.C. and Chicago. The results of this current study indicate that CA is a positive intervention to use with AppE speakers as well.

It was perhaps a “stretch” to assert that because CA worked with AAVE urban school populations that it should work with AppE rural populations of students. However, as Wheeler and Swords put forth the idea of customizing lessons to fit different dialect variations, I assumed it was workable, and results, as discussed in Ch. IV, showed the same.

Limitations

This study and its results should be viewed within a lens of several limitations. One limitation was that my research was done with a small sample of students. There were eleven participants in the fourth grade and ten in the fifth grade. As depicted in Chapter IV, the total possible sample had been 56 students with 28 students enrolled in each of the classrooms. The sample was reduced by lack of consent/assent and incomplete data sets. Had there been two fourth grades available from which to collect data, the context of the study might have been enhanced. However, as explained in the introduction, the school was very small and there was only one fourth grade and one fifth, consisting of twenty-eight students each.
Another limitation was the amount of time spent in the classroom by the researcher. Distance limited the amount of observation possible. A typical visit to the school entailed an hour and a half of travel each way and six hours of observation time. For the five observation days over an eleven-week period, there were approximately thirty hours of observation data. In addition, there were two visits of approximately six hours each in November and December, prior to the beginning of the study, which involved activities related to setting up the study—meeting the teachers and principal and his office staff. On the pre-study December date, I interviewed the fourth-grade teacher initially and explored resources to support my study—where to make copies, etc. The librarian and office staff were very supportive in this. Altogether, there were approximately forty-eight hours of time spent at the Peavine Elementary School.

Because of distance, I could not, of course, run back over to the school to check on something such as materials I had loaned the teacher, or perhaps to have an impromptu meeting with the fourth- and/or fifth-grade teachers. However, to address such instances, we emailed each other or, primarily, called on cell phones, which was effective as well. All of our physical time interactions, though, had to be very deliberate and previously mapped out or planned. This, of course, made a somewhat contrived situation, which in turn defined my role as an “outsider.” Although, I am an Appalachian by virtue of my birthplace and heritage, I was still considered an outsider, primarily because I was coming from outside the Appalachian area to observe.

This is not to say, however, that the teachers, principal, and staff were not very welcoming and supportive. They were, in fact, very positive. Although the fourth- and fifth-grade teachers had agreed to participate in my research, I also felt they regarded me,
perhaps, as an evaluator. They didn’t want to get too close or personal, which I can understand. Also, I was a person who was only going to be there for a finite eleven weeks, with whom they would likely not have any dealings with in the future. I was also from one of the largest universities in the state.

To their credit, though, both teachers were very cooperative and personable. The fourth grade teacher who was implementing the intervention gave it her best effort, perhaps for the intrinsic value of doing it well and implementing CA, which might “help her kids,” as she often said. In addition, snow days, two of which called for rescheduling, other professional commitments of the classroom teacher and my university schedule as a supervisor and teaching assistant as well, impacted the study, causing a few time changes and rescheduling.

Although my initial interview with the fourth-grade teacher was conducted during the teacher’s planning time and scheduled in advance, I felt the push to finish it. The same was true for the reflective interview, which was conducted during a combined 45-minute period composed partly of lunch and an elective class when the students went to physical education. I knew the teacher had several things she needed to tend to during this time, so we both felt somewhat rushed during the interviews. Given time to do the interviews after school, it might have been less rushed. However, Ms. Curry had older children she had to pick up following after-school activities at the middle and high school, so it might not have been a better time. As it was, we did what we could. I felt we both gave it our best effort and focused on the questions at hand.

The biases of the researcher created a limitation for this study as well. In anticipation of the study, I had preconceived notions of the types of writing data I was
going to be able to collect. I assumed there would be a large body of writings from which to choose pieces with vernacular features, as it was the middle of the school year, in January, when the study began. However, since fourth-grade portfolios had no longer been required by the state for several years, the writings were not accumulated on regular a basis, as I was used to in my previous classroom teaching tenure. I did expect that in the fourth grade there would be formal, open-response writings as mandated by the district and state for me to read. However, the fourth-grade teacher informed me that she had just sent the most recent open-response writings home and had given some to the principal to review. Therefore, I wouldn’t be able to use them. However, there were plenty of other writings—journals, special writings, prompts, etc., from which to choose. In the future, I think I would specify to the principal before the study was likely to begin that I needed these writings.

This was not the case with the fifth-grade teacher, however. She had the assistant copy “on-demand” writings, which fifth grade was mandated by the district and state to write. Another factor could have been that Ms. Potter was a more established classroom teacher, with twelve years in a regular education classroom. Ms. Curry, however, was experiencing only her third year in a regular education classroom. Most of her tenure of thirteen years was in teaching special education, both collaboratively and in self-contained classrooms.

In conclusion, the limitations of this study were based upon the nature or context of my study, the way I was positioned in the study context, the length of time I spent in the context, my own knowledge base, and the physical location and nature of the study site. However, as the study progressed, I became convinced of its importance and how
the use of CA could have an impact on future K-PREP scores with both AAVE and AppE populations—regional and migrant. Given more funds for travel and occasional overnight stays in the area would greatly augment future research replication.

**Implications for Future Research**

The results of this study suggest that more pilot projects and investigations are needed. If further studies using CA intervention and code-switching with the AppE populations are found to be as effective as the pattern studies used for my study (Sweetland 2006; Wheeler and Swords, 2006, 2010) have been in large and small urban areas with AAVE populations, they could set a precedent for AppE CA intervention implementation. Not only should other areas with significant AAVE populations pilot and implement it, but different regional language variations with AppE such as the Ozark region should find pilots useful, as Western North Carolina groups have found pilots and implementation useful (http://www.ncsu.edu/linguistics/research_dialecteducation.php; Hudley & Malinson (2011).

Other scholars have stressed in their research the importance of teacher training in dialect awareness. My study lends support to that assertion as well. Most teachers have very little if any exposure to linguistic principles and study of language variation in their professional background. However, once the topic was addressed with Ms. Curry, who has the AppE language variation herself, she was able to relate well to the marginalization and problems she and her students may have had in reading, writing, and speaking. This was mainly because of the mismatch between their AppE language variation at home and the language of their school, Standard English (SE). To name the
most prevalent ones, there were differences in subject-verb agreement, multiple negation, regularization of past-tense verbs, and pronomial differences.

Sweetland (2006) made training in dialect awareness one of the main parts of her program in large urban areas, and Wheeler and Swords (2006, 2010) did the same in a smaller frame of reference in the Norfolk, VA, area. The effectiveness of future studies would very likely be enhanced by an increase in dialect awareness training for the instructors. Indications are that dialect awareness for teachers could be a catalyst for the CA intervention with code-switching in an effort to close the achievement gap in different geographical areas. Professional development courses in dialect awareness should be made available to practitioners in the near future. Sensitivity to students’ home language is implied in the wording of Kentucky Core Academic Standards for English Language Arts. As described in the introduction of the dissertation, Language Standards 1-3 for grades 4 and 5 stress this. Also, since the early 1970s the NCTE has maintained a position statement as to the “Resolution on the Student’s Rights to Incorporate Heritage and Home Language in Writing” of 2011, which reaffirms the student’s right to use his or her home language as well as school language.

It would take much time, though, to effect a curricular change which would implement dialect awareness as a subject for students. Indeed this would address the mismatch of language of home and school in a proactive manner. One would suppose this would typically be implemented in ELA programs. However, in North Carolina it was implemented through the middle grades social studies programs through the establishment of units of study in dialect awareness. There are no known curricular large-scale dialect awareness programs in the United States (Adger, et al., 2009). Therefore,
there are no existing models for introducing such. “The argument has to be made that dialect awareness programs are consonant with the educational objectives of statewide and local curricula and readily implemented by practitioners” (p. 181). Perhaps program developers for school curricula will tackle this in the future.

Because of lower student population numbers in the current study, the results were ultimately able to be compared by percentage of vernacular features in categories to show effectiveness. However, with larger school populations and more buy-in to CA, statistical analysis could be completed as it was in Sweetland’s (2006) study. Therefore, if a whole fourth-grade population, consisting of perhaps four classes in two schools, were available for a pilot in CA, statistical analysis could be effected. Essentially, CA as an intervention should be implemented and studied with larger populations of AppE students.

Stakeholders such as local education district leaders, principals, and state education policy makers should address these positive results initially in programs such as School Improvement measures for failing schools. Replications of this study could be effected with different student grade level populations, of course. As it was rather small, the school I worked with had only one fourth and one fifth grade. Therefore, my study had more of an intermediate grade focus. Scholars have noted that this is the opportune age for such intervention. There could be a number of different population studies at the intermediate level, such as two fourth or fifth grades. There could also be a rationale for focusing on other grade levels. For that matter, Hanni Taylor (1989) did one of the earliest studies with her freshman college class with very effective results as alluded to in Chapter II literature review and Chapter IV results.
The study would also lend itself to replications in different geographical regions with different regional language variations, other than AppE, or even ethnic groups. As more immigrants and English Language Learner (ELL) populations increase in the United States, there could be a great need for CA as a universal approach to bridging the gap between the home language and Standard English or “school language.” After talking to a professor in a university-level English as a Second Language (ESL) program, I was informed that CA is used in this particular university’s ESL classes.

**Summary**

This study sought to describe the effectiveness of one method of reducing the number of vernacular features in the Standard English writing of Appalachian English dialect students. Through the use of the CA intervention and code-switching, students were able to decrease the use of VFs in their writing.

Through this descriptive study, we also observe how the instructor, Ms. Curry, incorporated dialectal awareness in her teaching of the intervention, yet helped sustain positive self-efficacy among the AppE students during their writing instruction in English language arts.

Finally, the process of CA intervention, which was proven formerly for AAVE students, indicated that CA was equally effective with AppE students. “Standard dialect instruction should focus on the particular areas of difference between the standard and vernacular varieties used in the school’s community … . A systematic comparison of the local vernacular variety with the local standard dialect will reveal particular areas of difference” (Adger, et al., 2009, p. 108). The study took this maxim and based the code-
switching lessons on the particular AppE variety of dialect as it was represented in the writing of AppE students.
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THE USE OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS IN CODE-SWITCHING FROM
VERNACULAR APPALACHIAN ENGLISH TO STANDARD ENGLISH DIALECT

Teacher Consent Form

WHY ARE YOU BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH?

You are being invited to take part in a research study about "The Use of Contrastive Analysis in Code-switching from Vernacular Appalachian English to Standard English Dialect." You are being invited to take part in this research study because you teach elementary students with Appalachian English speech in English Language Arts class. If you volunteer to take part in this study, you will be one of about two people to do so.

WHO IS DOING THE STUDY?

The person in charge of this study is Shayla D. Mettline, doctoral student, (of University of Kentucky, Department of Curriculum & Instruction. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Mary Shoake, Advisor. There may be other people on the research team assisting at different times during the study.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

The purpose of the study is to determine the effectiveness of a method of improving the use of Standard English in the writing of students who use the Appalachian dialect.

By doing this study, we hope to learn how to assist students with Appalachian dialect to write in more Standard English. Effective methods of writing instruction for upper elementary-age writers who use language variation will also be investigated. Students will be able to view themselves as writers by focusing more on their writing through the study.

ARE THERE REASONS WHY YOU SHOULD NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

You should not take part in this study if you do not teach elementary school students or do not teach English language arts.
WHERE IS THE STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

The research procedures will be conducted at Tilden Hoge Elementary School in your 4th or 5th grade classroom, during your regular English Language Arts (ELA) time beginning in the fall 2012 semester. Observations will take place in the classroom of the experimental teacher at least once every other week for a total of five to six observations. The teacher of the instructional treatment group will also need to participate in two semi-formal interviews that will last approximately forty-five minutes each—one at the beginning and one at the end of the study. We may also interact informally following the observations to clarify events in the classroom. These interactions and interviews will take place when it is convenient for the experimental teacher. Every effort will be taken to ensure that teaching time is uninterrupted. Each of those visits will take about one hour. In addition there will be some training by the researcher of approximately two to three hours before the initial observation. The total amount of time necessary to volunteer for this study is approximately 11 hours beginning in the fall semester of 2012.

WHAT WILL YOU BE ASKED TO DO?

As discussed above, the experimental teacher of the instructional treatment group, will be asked to participate in two interviews during the fall and spring of the 2012-2013 school year. The first interview will be conducted to gather general information about your classroom, students, and your own teaching/writing background. The second interview will be a reflective interview about the process and outcomes of the instructional treatment

Experimental Teacher

- The experimental teacher will give a student questionnaire, "Writer Self-Perception Scale" (WSPS), (Bottomley, Henk, & Melnick, 1997), which will be read to the class to be sure all understand and to save class time. The questionnaire will be given at the beginning of the study, and again at the end of the eleven
weeks.
- The teacher will help the researcher collect documents including the student letters as well as other writings such as extended response questions (ERQs) and other writing pieces that may be available. Thus the researcher will have a solid base of writings to analyze for dialectical features
- Classroom observations of the teacher will be conducted at least once every other week of the 11 week study for a total of five to six observations.
- Two semi-formal interviews that will be audio-taped will be conducted with the teacher—one at the beginning and one at the end of the study. The taping is necessary for fidelity of transcription.
- The teacher of the group with the contrastive analysis (CA) intervention will be trained in this approach by the researcher and will subsequently use CA during his/her regular language arts classes for approximately eleven weeks, during the editing phase of writing instruction for approximately 15 min. each week during one class period.

Control Teacher

- The control teacher will give a student questionnaire, "Writer Self-Perception Scale" (WSPS), (Bottomley, Henk, & Melnick, 1997), which will be read to the class to be sure all understand and to save class time. The questionnaire will be given at the beginning of the study, and again at the end of the eleven weeks.
- The teacher will help the researcher collect documents including the student letters as well as other writings such as extended response questions (ERQs) and other writing pieces that may be available. Thus the researcher will have a solid base of writings to analyze for dialectical features
WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?

To the best of our knowledge, the things you will be doing have no more risk of harm than you would experience in everyday life.

WILL YOU BENEFIT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

You will not get any personal benefit from taking part in this study, although this study may contribute to the field of research in literacy.

DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

If you decide to take part in the study, it should be because you really want to volunteer. You will not lose any benefits or rights you would normally have if you choose not to volunteer. You can stop at any time during the study and still keep the benefits and rights you had before volunteering.

IF YOU DON'T WANT TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY, ARE THERE OTHER CHOICES?

If you do not want to be in the study, there are no other choices except not to take part in the study.

WHAT WILL IT COST YOU TO PARTICIPATE?

There are no costs associated with taking part in the study.

WILL YOU RECEIVE ANY REWARDS FOR TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

You will not receive any rewards or payment for taking part in the study.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT YOU GIVE?

We will make every effort to keep private all research records that identify you to the extent allowed by law.

Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study. When we write about the study to share it with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered. You will not be personally identified in these written materials. We may publish the results of this study; however, we will keep your name and other identifying information private.

We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you gave us information, or what that information is. For example, when the study is written, you will not be identified in these written materials. Names of people, places, and schools will be given other names to protect the identity of all.

We will keep private all research records that identify you to the extent allowed by law. However, there are some circumstances in which we may have to show your information to other people. For example, the law may require us to show your information to a court or to tell authorities if you report information about a child being abused or if you pose a danger to yourself or someone else. Also, we may be required to show information which identifies...
you to people who need to be sure we have done the research correctly; these would be people from such organizations as the University of Kentucky.

**CAN YOUR TAKING PART IN THE STUDY END EARLY?**

If you decide to take part in the study you still have the right to decide at any time that you no longer want to continue. You will not be treated differently if you decide to stop taking part in the study.

The individuals conducting the study may need to withdraw you from the study. This may occur if you are not able to participate fully in the research, or if I should decide to stop the study early for a variety of reasons.

**WHAT IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS, SUGGESTIONS, CONCERNS, OR COMPLAINTS?**

Before you decide whether to accept this invitation to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. Later, if you have questions, suggestions, concerns, or complaints about the study, you can contact the investigator, Shayla D. Mattille, doctoral student, at 859-879-8113. If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer in this research, contact the staff in the Office of Research Integrity at the University of Kentucky at 859-257-9428 or toll free at 1-866-406-9428. We will give you a signed copy of this consent form to take with you.

Signature of person agreeing to take part in the study

Date

Printed name of person agreeing to take part in the study

Name of [authorized] person obtaining informed consent

Date
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Letter to Parent of a Fourth-Grade Child
Dear Parent of a 4th Grade Child:

Hello, I am a graduate student at the University of Kentucky, Dept. of Education. I am doing some research on writing in your child’s class. Below are the details of what your child will be asked to do. I would appreciate your permission to look at your child’s writing along with his/her teacher and to use their information from assessments in a research study. Mr. Tapp asked me to send a separate letter to you along with the consent form.

- Your child’s 4th grade class will be doing writing activities connected to the research study. I would like to have your permission to access or look at his/her writing samples and information from assessments taken in writing class and a survey they will be taking in writing class before and after the study.
- Your child’s class will be taught a strategy or method called contrastive analysis (CA). CA is a method of teaching about grammar in writing class.
- No identifiable records in the research data will be linked to your child’s results of assessments in class.

Through this procedure we hope to find out if the new grammar method will assist the students in writing in more Standard English that is necessary for assignments and tests. Every possible effort will be made by the researcher to ensure that this study does not take away from your child’s learning time.

Thank you.

Shayla D. Mettille
Teaching Assistant
University of Ky.
College of Education
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Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Improving the Use of English in Student Writing in Appalachia
Parent or Legal Guardian Consent Form
Contrastive Analysis (CA) Group

WHY IS YOUR CHILD BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH?

Your child is being invited to take part in a research study about improving the use of English in the writing of students in Appalachia. Your child is being invited to take part in this research study because he/she is in the classroom where this study is taking place. Rowan County Public Schools and the principal at your child’s school have approved this study. If you volunteer to allow your child to take part in this study, your child will be one of about 50 children to do so. Your child’s teacher has also agreed to participate in the study.

WHO IS DOING THE STUDY?

The person in charge of this study is Shayla D. Mettite, doctoral student, of University of Kentucky, Department of Curriculum and Instruction. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Mary C. Shake.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of a method of improving the use of Standard English in the writing of students who use Appalachian dialect.

By doing this study, we hope to learn how to assist students in Appalachia to write in more Standard English. Effective methods of writing instruction for 4th grade writers who use Appalachian English will also be investigated. Your child’s 4th grade class will be learning a method called contrastive analysis (CA). Students will be able to view themselves as writers by focusing more on their writing through the study.

ARE THERE REASONS WHY YOUR CHILD SHOULD NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

There are no reasons why your child should not take part in this study unless you object to the procedures for the study.

WHERE IS THE STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

The research procedures will be conducted in your child’s classroom during the regular school day. The researcher will be in this classroom one day every other week for eleven weeks during English Language Arts (ELA) time beginning in the fall semester of 2012.
WHAT WILL YOUR CHILD BE ASKED TO DO?

- Your child’s 4th grade class will be doing writing activities connected to a research study. I would like to have your permission to access or look at his/her writing samples and information from assessments taken in writing class and a survey they will be taking in writing class.
- No identifiable records in the research information will be linked to your child’s results of assessments and writing samples in class.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?

To the best of our knowledge, the things your child will be doing have no more risk of harm than you would experience in everyday life.

WILL YOUR CHILD BENEFIT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

There is no guarantee that your child will get any benefit from taking part in this study. Your willingness to allow your child to take part, however, may, in the future, help society as a whole better understand this research topic.

DOES YOUR CHILD HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

If you decide to give permission for your child to take part in the study, it should be because you really want to volunteer for your child to do this. You and your child will not lose any benefits or rights you would normally have if you choose not to volunteer. Your child can stop at any time during the study and still keep the benefits and rights you had before volunteering.

IF YOU DON'T WANT YOUR CHILD TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY, ARE THERE OTHER CHOICES?

If you do not want your child to be in the study, there are no other choices except not to take part in the study.

WHAT WILL IT COST YOU AND YOUR CHILD TO PARTICIPATE?

There are no costs associated with taking part in the study.

WILL YOU OR YOUR CHILD RECEIVE ANY REWARDS FOR TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

You and your child will not receive any rewards or payment for taking part in the study.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT YOU GIVE?

We will make every effort to keep private all research records that identify you or your child to the extent allowed by law.

Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study. When we write about the study to share it with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered. Your child will not be personally identified in these written materials. We may publish the results of this study; however, we will keep your child’s name and other identifying information private.

We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you or your child gave us information, or what that information is.

We will keep private all research records that identify you or your child to the extent allowed by law. However, there are some circumstances in which we may have to show your information to other people. For example, the law may require us to show your information to a court or to tell authorities if you report information about a child...
being abused or if you pose a danger to yourself or someone else. Also, we may be required to show information which identifies you to people who need to be sure we have done the research correctly; these would be people from such organizations as the University of Kentucky.

CAN YOUR CHILD’S TAKING PART IN THE STUDY END EARLY?

If you decide to allow your child to take part in the study you still have the right to decide at any time that you no longer want them to continue. You and your child will not be treated differently if you decide to stop taking part in the study.

The individuals conducting the study may need to withdraw your child from the study. This may occur if your child is not able to participate fully in the research or the researcher decides to stop the study early for a variety of reasons.

WHAT IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS, SUGGESTIONS, CONCERNS, OR COMPLAINTS?

Before you decide whether to accept this invitation for your child to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. Later, if you have questions, suggestions, concerns, or complaints about the study, you can contact the investigator, Shayla D. Mettille, graduate student, at 859-879-8113. If you have any questions about your rights or your child’s rights as a volunteer in this research, contact the staff in the Office of Research Integrity at the University of Kentucky at 859-257-9428 or toll-free at 1-866-400-6428. We will give you a signed copy of this consent form to take with you.

Name of child you are giving permission to be in the study

Date

Printed name of child you are giving permission to be in the study
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ASSENT FORM

Improving the Use of English in Student Writing in Appalachia

CA Group

You are invited to be in a research study being done by Shayla D. Mettille, graduate student, from the University of Kentucky. You are invited because you are an elementary school student who participates in an English Language Arts class and lives in a county in Appalachia.

I will observe your classroom during your English Language Arts class, mainly during writing for about six times during the 2012-2013 school year. I will be visiting your class and watching your teacher as she goes over a new method of teaching about grammar in writing during one of the writing classes. I am going to assist your teacher in looking at your writing papers during the fall. Everyone in the class will fill out a survey on writing and take a pre-test and post-test before and after the study. If you agree to be in the study, I will be able to use your information from the pre-test and post-test for the research. Your family will know that you are in the study. If anyone else is given information about you, they will not know your name. A number or initials will be used instead of your name.

If something makes you feel bad while you are in the study, please tell me, Shayla Mettille. If you decide at any time you do not want to finish the study, you may stop whenever you want.

You can ask me (Shayla Mettille) or your teacher questions any time about anything in this study. You can also ask your parent any questions you might have about this study.

Please indicate that I have read this paper to you by saying “yes” if you want to be in the study. If you do not want to be in the study, say “no.” Being in the study is up to you, and no one will be mad if you do not say “yes,” or even if you change your mind later. You agree that you have been told about this study and why it is being done and what to do.

Consent by Verbal Process, Agreeing to be in the Study

_________________________  __________________________
Date
APPENDIX E

Letter to Parent of a Fifth-Grade Child
Dear Parent of a 5th Grade Child:

Hello, I am a graduate student at the University of Kentucky, Dept. of Education. I am doing some research on writing in your child’s class. Below are the details of what your child will be asked to do. I would appreciate your permission to look at your child’s writing along with his/her teacher and to use their information from assessments in a research study. Mr. Tapp asked me to send a separate letter to you along with the consent form.

- Your child’s 5th grade class will be doing writing activities connected to the research study. I would like to have your permission to access or look at his/her writing samples and information from assessments taken in writing class and a survey about how he/she sees himself/herself as a writer, before and after the study.
- No identifiable records in the research data will be linked to your child’s results of assessments in class.

Through this procedure we hope to find out if the new grammar method will assist the students in writing in more Standard English that is necessary for assignments and tests. Every possible effort will be made by the researcher to ensure that this study does not take away from your child’s learning time.

Thank you.

Shayla D. Mettille
Teaching Assistant
University of Ky.
College of Education
APPENDIX F

Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Improving the Use of English in Student Writing in Appalachia

Parent or Legal Guardian Consent Form

Control Group
Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Improving the Use of English in Student Writing in Appalachia

Parent or Legal Guardian Consent Form

Control Group

WHY IS YOUR CHILD BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH?

Your child is being invited to take part in a research study about improving the use of English in the writing of students in Appalachia. Your child is being invited to take part in this research study because he/she is in the classroom where this study is taking place. Rowan County Public Schools and the principal at your child’s school have approved this study. If you volunteer to allow your child to take part in this study, your child will be one of about 50 children to do so. Your child’s teacher has also agreed to participate in the study.

WHO IS DOING THE STUDY?

The person in charge of this study is Shayla D. Mettille, doctoral student, of the University of Kentucky, Department of Curriculum and Instruction. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Mary C. Shake.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of a method of improving the use of Standard English in the writing of students who use Appalachian dialect.

By doing this study, we hope to learn how to assist students in Appalachia to write in more Standard English. Effective methods of writing instruction for 5th grade writers who use Appalachian English will also be investigated. Students will be able to view themselves as writers by focusing more on their writing through the study.

ARE THERE REASONS WHY YOUR CHILD SHOULD NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

There are no reasons why your child should not take part in this study unless you object to the procedures for the study.

WHERE IS THE STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

The research procedures will be conducted in your child’s classroom during the regular school day. The researcher will be in this classroom one day every other week for eleven weeks during English Language Arts (ELA) time beginning in the fall semester of 2012.
WHAT WILL YOUR CHILD BE ASKED TO DO?

- Your child’s 5th grade class will be doing writing activities connected to a research study. I would like to have your permission to access or look at his/her writing samples and information from assessments taken in writing class and a survey they will be taking in writing class.
- No identifiable records in the research data will be linked to your child’s results of assessments in class.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?

To the best of our knowledge, the things your child will be doing have no more risk of harm than you would experience in everyday life.

WILL YOUR CHILD BENEFIT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

There is no guarantee that your child will get any benefit from taking part in this study. Your willingness to allow your child to take part, however, may, in the future, help society as a whole better understand this research topic.

DOES YOUR CHILD HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

If you decide to give permission for your child to take part in the study, it should be because you really want to volunteer for your child to do this. You and your child will not lose any benefits or rights you would normally have if you choose not to volunteer. Your child can stop at any time during the study and still keep the benefits and rights you had before volunteering.

IF YOU DON’T WANT YOUR CHILD TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY, ARE THERE OTHER CHOICES?

If you do not want your child to be in the study, there are no other choices except not to take part in the study.

WHAT WILL IT COST YOU AND YOUR CHILD TO PARTICIPATE?

There are no costs associated with taking part in the study.

WILL YOU OR YOUR CHILD RECEIVE ANY REWARDS FOR TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

You and your child will not receive any rewards or payment for taking part in the study.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT YOU GIVE?

We will make every effort to keep private all research records that identify you or your child to the extent allowed by law.

Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study. When we write about the study to share it with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered. Your child will not be personally identified in these written materials. We may publish the results of this study; however, we will keep your child’s name and other identifying information private.

We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you or your child gave us information, or what that information is.
We will keep private all research records that identify you or your child to the extent allowed by law. However, there are some circumstances in which we may have to show your information to other people. For example, the law may require us to show your information to a court or to tell authorities if you report information about a child being abused or if you pose a danger to yourself or someone else. Also, we may be required to show information which identifies you to people who need to be sure we have done the research correctly; these would be people from such organizations as the University of Kentucky.

CAN YOUR CHILD’S TAKING PART IN THE STUDY END EARLY?

If you decide to allow your child to take part in the study you still have the right to decide at any time that you no longer want them to continue. You and your child will not be treated differently if you decide to stop taking part in the study.

The individuals conducting the study may need to withdraw your child from the study. This may occur if your child is not able to participate fully in the research or the researcher decides to stop the study early for a variety of reasons.

WHAT IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS, SUGGESTIONS, CONCERNS, OR COMPLAINTS?

Before you decide whether to accept this invitation for your child to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. Later, if you have questions, suggestions, concerns, or complaints about the study, you can contact the investigator, Shayla D. Mettine, graduate student, at 859-879-8113. If you have any questions about your rights or your child’s rights as a volunteer in this research, contact the staff in the Office of Research Integrity at the University of Kentucky at 859-257-9428 or toll free at 1-866-400-9428. We will give you a signed copy of this consent form to take with you.

Name of child you are giving permission to be in the study __________________________ Date __________________________

Printed name of child you are giving permission to be in the study __________________________
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Assent Form

Improving the Use of English in Student Writing in Appalachia,

Control Group
ASSENT FORM

Improving the Use of English in Student Writing in Appalachia

Control Group

You are invited to be in a research study being done by Shayla D. Mettione, a graduate student, from the University of Kentucky. You are invited because you are an elementary school student who participates in an English Language Arts class and lives in a county in Appalachia.

I am going to assist your teacher in looking at your writing papers beginning in the fall. Everyone in the class will fill out a survey on writing and take a pre-test and post-test before and after the study. If you agree to be in the study, I will be able to use your information from those materials for the research. Your family will know that you are in the study. If anyone else is given information about you, they will not know your name. A number or initials will be used instead of your name.

If something makes you feel bad while you are in the study, please tell me, Shayla Mettione. If you decide at any time you do not want to finish the study, you may stop whenever you want.

You can ask me (Shayla Mettione) or your teacher questions any time about anything in this study. You can also ask your parent any questions you might have about this study.

Please indicate that I have read this paper to you by saying “yes” if you want to be in the study. If you do not want to be in the study, say “no.” Being in the study is up to you, and no one will be mad if you do not sign this paper or even if you change your mind later. You agree that you have been told about this study and why it is being done and what to do.

Consent by Verbal Process, Agreeing to be in the Study

Date
APPENDIX H

Teacher Interview Protocol

Interview Questions

The purpose of this interview is to gain background information about the teacher.

Materials needed:

    Supplies: Paper, pen, list of questions, digital recorder. Approximate time of the interview is 45 minutes.

1. Tell me briefly about your undergraduate training. Where did you do your graduate training and in what areas?

2. How long have you taught school? How long have you been at your present school? How long have you taught at the grade level you are now teaching?

3. Why did you choose teaching as a career?

4. Could you tell me about your school day?

5. Tell me about your reading/language arts time in the schedule.

6. Could you give me an idea about the students in your class as to gender, socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, special needs, etc.?

7. What do you feel are the strengths of your writing practices and instruction?

8. Describe Professional Development (PD) training you have had that influences the nature of your writing instruction.

9. To what degree do you see dialect as an influential factor in student writing?

10. Do you observe dialectal carryover from speech to writing with some students?

11. Which areas of writing practices in this regard would you like to change?
12. In your undergraduate or graduate work, have you ever had a course in linguistics?

13. Similarly, have you ever had any PD sessions in linguistics or perhaps dialect awareness?

14. Are you from the area? (meaning Appalachian region).

15. Would it be possible to have a departmental split class?

Thank the teacher for his/her time and end the interview.
APPENDIX I

Transcription of Initial Teacher Interview

Tonya Curry (TC), 4th grade teacher
Violet Potter (VP), 5th grade teacher
Sarah Dawson (SD), Interviewer

Note: Numbers in (07-segment on digital recorder, # reading);
Transcriptions are numbered by question # on protocol (Appendix H).

SD: Good morning, Ms. Curry!
TC: Good morning!

1. SD: Tell me briefly about your undergraduate training. Where did you do your graduate training and in what areas?

   TC: Graduated from BSU with dual teaching certification, K-4, Special Education, self-contained classroom, Special Ed. Certification for Kg-12th grade, and then, uh, and then students with emotional or learning-behavior disorders. And I also did or completed my Master’s at BSU in the area of Elementary Education.

2. SD: How long have you taught school? How long have you been here at your present school?

   TC: I have been teaching since the year 2000, so this is year 12 for me, and I have been here at Peavine for—this is my 5th year here at Peavine—nine years here in the district; first four years were at a juvenile detention facility for females (12-18), and then after that I worked with a special education population—students
with emotional and behavioral disorders for about three years at another elementary school in the district, and then I came here with that same population—students with emotional and behavior disorders, and this is my second year in the classroom setting. (07,144)

5. SD: Could you tell me about your reading/language arts time in the schedule, the daily schedule?

TC: In my daily schedule, it’s been restructured a number of times this school year already. I’ve tried to incorporate it in all areas, because our time is so limited. So we read and write in the area of social studies, science, and math as well. But the actual English LA., takes place. I have between an hour and an hour and a half a day that’s devoted there. A lot of it is tied in directly, where students choose a number of things that they can choose to work on related to reading and writing, and so then we have some structured core instruction that we do as well during that time frame. And it’s not always in a block, a set block of time. It may be that we have 30 min. here, and then we come back and we have additional time throughout the day. We end up getting to plan ours, a little more. (07, 306)

7. SD: What do you feel are the strengths of your writing practices and instruction?

TC: As far as practices, I think the biggest strength in my practices is giving the kids opportunities to write. I think I had students at the beginning of the year that were a lot more reluctant to write than they are now. And so I think that is one of the biggest strengths is that they have an opportunity to write about lots of different things, and it is not always about what I tell them to write about. I think I have more students that are open to writing because of that, because they get to
write about the things that they like. Right and then sometimes it’s a little more structured, so that I tell them exactly what to write, or it’s a prompt or something. But then sometimes it’s kind of open: here are a few questions, which one would you like to write about, or what’s your spin on this or “story starts” and that kind of thing. So there’s lots of opportunity for creative expression, and I think they enjoy that. So I think that is probably one of my biggest strengths—that opportunity to write.

7a. SD: At the same time, are there any challenges in this area in regard to their writing? (07, 419)

TC: Well, time is the biggest challenge as far as trying to get everything in by the end of the day with our writing and that kind of thing., but then it seems like I run short on time to kind of refine things and students have probably 30-40 starts of pieces just as journal entries or something that could turn into really good pieces, but the time to actually do that in the classroom is limited, so—that’s one of the biggest concerns for me.

8. SD: Could you describe any PD training you have had and the influences that it has had on the nature of your writing instruction?

TC: Well I went through the BSU Writing Project, which is a local section of the National Reading Project at the University in 2010. I went through that for a week instruction, and it was pretty intensive for three full weeks, and we were working with writing. And then I also take opportunities for professional development. For writing—almost two or three different opportunities each year, because it’s a weakness I think in our school—writing is—and it’s also something that I enjoy
doing, and I want more opportunities to kind of make sure that the kids are enjoying it, too.

9. SD: To what degree do you see dialect as an influential factor in student writing?
   TC: I think the biggest influence that I see has to do with spelling—in terms of students spell things the way they say them and hear them, and people in general, but when you have that dialect and you pronounce widow “winder,” then that’s what is spelled, and so I think that influences spelling heavily, which also in turn, of course, influences their reading, because then they typically don’t recognize the word “window,” because that’s not the way they say it. Window, and that’s not a particularly good example, because I don’t have a lot of students that use “winder” for /window/, but things such as that, so when they drop letters and sounds and that kind of thing off words when speaking in a dialect, then that’s what comes across in spelling, and then that’s what’s harder for them to recognize when they see the word spelled correctly, because that’s not the way they pronounce it.
   SD: “Yes, there’s a mismatch.”

10. SD: About how many do you observe in class that have the dialectal carryover from speech to writing?
    TC: Oh, gosh I would say the vast majority—I’d say probably 75-80%—just kind of thinking off the top of my head thinking about the things I hear from students and then the corrections I make everyday within the classroom with their speech, and then I look at their writing, and I go, “Well, now we just talked about that the
other day. You know, when they said that or that kind of thing, so that’s a pretty large amount or chunk of the class.

14. SD: And are you from the area?

TC: I’m not originally from Peavine. I’m from, originally from Pine Grove, Adair County, I’m from X State, Yes, I’m born and raised in X State. I did spend a school year in Ohio, in Columbus, OH, and many summers with relatives there—probably five or six summers, and I got a lot of the questions about the dialect and the twang there, and that kind of thing there. But honestly—unrecognizable to me until someone pointed it out—because everybody around me sounded alike and that kind of thing, so, so. But I am originally from X State.

11. SD: Which areas of writing practices in regard to this mismatch would you like to change? Or is there anything you think you could change about that?

TC: I think it would probably go back to the spelling and then the usage. . . as well, so when we have usage issues that are related to the dialect, then that as well in the writing, and I mean I feel like my kids have stories to tell, and there is a place for that dialect to come into the writing as far as dialog and those types of things, so I don’t want to take away from that. I want that to be completely genuine, you know--that’s what they are writing about. But in the other parts of the writing, I want it to be a more formalized writing, so that it is understood by those—so it can reach a wider audience—it’s not just that they are familiar with those sayings and that dialect, that could be their audience, it could be much wider, and then they can get that point across through that dialog and whatnot through their writing.
12. SD: In your undergraduate or graduate work, have you ever had a course in linguistics?

TC: I have not. No.

13. SD: Similarly, have you had any professional development sessions in linguistics or dialect awareness?

TC: No, I haven’t

SD: Okay, most teachers haven’t. I hadn’t until grad school.

3. SD: Why did you choose teaching as a career?

TC: I’m not really sure that is the career I ever wanted to have, quite honestly, and I’m not really sure why it is—going through school I had great teachers that were any influence, and I thought, “Oh, my goodness, I want to be a teacher just like that teacher;” and then I had teachers that were not so great that I thought, “Oh, my goodness, when I grow up I’m gonna be a teacher so I can be just the opposite of that teacher!” And so, the good, the bad, and the ugly all influenced me . . .

SD: Right, right,

TC: But it’s almost to say that I already had the preconceived notion of being a teacher – it was just that they were kind of models or good non-examples, so I don’t know, I’ve never thought of anything other than teach.

SD: All right. Just one more question:

6. SD: Could you give me an idea about the students in your class as to gender, socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, special needs, etc.?

TC: I have 28 students, and I have an additional student that comes in for ELA.

SD (What is that—an advanced student?) Yes, it is a 3rd grader who comes in for
4th grade curriculum. Out of my 28 students, 17 of the 28 are males; which is a little bit better ratio than last year, because last year 2/3 of my class were males. So yes, 27 last year and 18 of the 27 were males.

SD: Yes, it seems like she (Ms. Potter, 5th grade) had a lot of boys, too.)

TC: Yes, and when I came into the school system, I was told that same thing—I don’t know why, but we have lots of boys here. But uh, that’s my gender make-up., but with students with special needs, I have two students that are identified in the area of special needs in the area of learning difficulties, and I have three that are identified for speech—speech and language difficulties. I have one student that is identified as gifted, and then I have about ten to fifteen, a little more than half that class, that is identified as advanced, and they receive gifted services, in terms of they have pullout with the gifted teacher. In my ELA class, and my classroom is self-contained; we do everything in the classroom. We don’t switch or anything like that.

SD: Is the 5th grade self-contained?

TC: Yes.

SD: Well, would it be hard to have a departmental split then?

TC: It is. We tried it last year … because we had a 4/5 split and we had a full 5th grade, and I was gonna try to send my 5th graders to her (Ms. Potter), and she had a 4/5 split, so she was gonna send 4th graders to me, but it was too many schedules to try and accommodate, so it just didn’t work out that way.

SD: (Comments): Well I know, I was thinking of there are some websites, too, I want to send you about dialect awareness, and there’s a lot … we can get more
into discussions about, so we can start looking at patterns. But thank you, very much!

TC: Oh, you’re welcome! (07, 1537 approx.)
APPENDIX J

Reflective Teacher Interview Protocol

The purpose of this interview is to gain information on the experimental teacher’s reflection about the implementation of the intervention.

Supplies: Paper, pen, list of questions, digital recorder. Approximate time of the interview will be 45 minutes.

1. How well do you think the students incorporated contrastive analysis (CA) in their writing?
2. Could you describe an instance where you realized the students were understanding it?
3. Could you share some of your other reflections on the intervention process?
4. In what ways do you think student attitudes about writing have changed?
5. Do you think the students’ focus on writing has changed? In what ways?
6. Is CA something you would consider keeping in your writing editing process?
7. Has this focus on writing had an effect on your writing practices and instruction in any way? In what ways?
8. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Thank the teacher for the interview and her time.
Reflective Interview  4-10-13, Peavine Elementary School

Tonya Curry (TC)-4th grade teacher
Violet Potter (VP)-5th grade teacher
Sarah Dawson (SD)-Interviewer       Note: Numbers refer to digital recorder

SD: Good morning, Ms. Curry.
TC: Good morning, Ms. Dawson.

1) How well do you think the students incorporated contrastive analysis (CA) in their writing? Have you seen any evidence of that?

TC: I’m not so sure that I’ve seen so much evidence that it carries over into their writing, uh, (102) I’ve seen it in their everyday language and conversation, uh, but their writing, not so much, and I uh, think that it’s because maybe it wasn’t consistent enough to see,, and on my part as well, so I think I did a real good job for the most part to make sure that when they’re speaking that it’s that they recognize those things—that formal and informal language, but in their writing it hasn’t been consistent enough for me to address it enough constantly. I think that there will be carry over at some point, because you know , I’m hoping to then kind of continue it, and be more consistent with that.

SD: Great! Consistency always helps.
2) Could you describe an instance where you realized the students were understanding CA? (158)

TC: I had a couple of students that kind of had difficulties— in various areas— learning disabilities and what not, but there was an instance in which something was said in the classroom, and something came up. It was just a couple of days after we had completed one of the lessons, and he belted out, “Ms. G., that’s informal language!,” And so I said well, what do you mean?” And so when he could actually explain to me what it was, and I kind of backtracked with some more questioning, then there are other students that I know were getting it right away, but for this particular student to kind of point that out, I thought, “All right, they are getting this concept here, so that was kind of I think for me the point where I said, Well, okay we are gonna stick with this and try to do a little more implementation ideally next year with kind of starting from day one and that kind of thing. Yeah, it was that student there that helped me out there.

SD: Boy or girl?

TC: It was a young man.

3) SD: Could you share some of your other reflections on this intervention process? (325)

TC: Though I like the process, think I’ll be able to spend a little bit of time this summer to try and figure out a way to incorporate the lesson and carry over more into the writing. The process itself I think will be very helpful for the kids? And also for me, because there are things that I didn’t recognize when I’m in the classroom that I talk the kids about, and I kinda get lax, especially as the year goes on
and we are communicating more into a more informal type setting. So I lose sight of the fact that I am modeling for them at all times, not just when I’m actually standing up there teaching—and I’m modeling and I’m modeling at all times: “We’ll consider this a formal setting, so this is the formal language we’ll use, and that sort of thing!” And then also, hopefully that if they’re hearing that here while they’re writing here, that there will be more carry over to their writing, because of that. But I like the process—the discovery process with that—that it falls into the common core with the language and that sort of thing, so it is the kind of thing that they still need to be working with, which I think is a good way to incorporate it—without bogging them down with a lot. This allowed me to be able to give them that discovery type of education instead of, “This is what you need to do; here’s the worksheet do this.” So that discovery process is kind of key with getting that buy-in from them.

SD: Yes, I saw that happening, the last time for sure. I was thinking it would have been ideal if we had had time to do like start it, and do this as a pilot. But it’s great you are thinking of continuing next year, because it’s just a different thing.

4) SD: In what ways do you think student attitudes about writing have changed?

TC: I don’t know that it’s a sole result of the implementation of this, but my whole purpose is to try to help change student attitudes toward writing at this level, because I think at this age, 4th grade, kids start—those that even did enjoy writing before—once they get over that hurdle of learning to write, then they think it is all in the bag and they don’t really want to do it anymore. But I’m hoping that their attitude has changed from August until now and just in the fact that they are
more willing to write and that they will see that writing is not just writing a report, writing an essay, or whatever. But I’ve tried to give them lots of opportunities to write creatively—to write to express themselves and to see everything in the light that writing could be and to see what purpose it could serve outside of writing something for a teacher to look at and grade them and that sort of thing. And we’ve done a lot of writing that I have not even looked at, because I want them to see that you write, because you can do this or express yourself and make yourself feel good or whatever, and it’s not always going to be to hand to somebody to fix it, or to read it or (705) to critique it or whatever. And so I think a lot of the students have felt that—they still have a lot of things they want to share—“Oh, look at this; read this—that sort of thing, but I think that a lot of the students are more open now, because it’s not just, “Write this give it to me, let’s grade it, let’s see if it’s good or bad”—that sort of thing. So I’m hoping that their attitudes have changed, and we completed the perception survey this morning; so I haven’t looked at that to see if I have more agrees with “I like to write” and that sort of thing, but I’m hoping there’s a change there.

SD: But of course, some of them could go either way.

TC: Right.

5) SD: Do you think the students’ focus on writing has changed? In what ways? (Included in (10-075)

6) SD: Is Contrastive Analysis something you would consider keeping in your writing/editing process?
TC: Yes, I do plan to delve into it a little bit more and again try to tweak some things and then fit them here and there within the year to make it a little more consistent with what we are doing; I’m hoping to see better results and that sort of thing and more carry over into their writing. If I make some changes, I think that will happen.

SD: Time to implement it, just as you said, with whatever you’re doing in language arts with your sequence.

TC: We’ll practice with the writing once we have identified the pattern and looking at some drafts we have written—okay, look back and see if you have any instances of that in your writing—so giving them an actual application of it is the plan. So then they are saying, Oh, okay, and not just with conversation, because I think they’ve been there—they’ve gotten that part, but give them opportunities to look for it, see it, make changes in the writing and apply it that way.

SD: I think that’s the whole culmination when they can do that.

7) SD: Has this focus on writing had an effect on your writing practices and instruction in any way?

TC: Not so much I think this year, because okay, we need to get this in, this in, and not being able to get a good feel for the program before, but it definitely will, like I said with my plan to continue and make changes there, it will definitely have a big impact on the way that I do things in writing.

SD: And are there any specific ways that you can think of that it may have had an effect already in your instruction or writing practices? Maybe as pertains to the writing process?
TC: Well, yes, just the incorporation. I’ve always had a hard time with the discovery part—trying to give kids the opportunity to discover things. It’s a lot easier for me in science and in math to discover those ideas and to get there. I never was clear on a way to do that with the grammar side of it—thinking in terms of that, so this is definitely a change there. But then also just being aware myself, so you know a change in me being aware myself—my use of formal and informal language and the modeling and that sort of thing, as I said –carrying that over with the writing. So, some of those things—just being able to incorporate it, I think better—the whole formal and informal language and the grammar—the writing, instead of it being a separate exercise that we do editing and that sort of thing in the writing process. (1132)

SD: Okay, so in conjunction with that, are there ways that you can think of—has your attitude changed at all about the writing process or not, as you said this may be very helpful in the editing in the future. Or are you more into free-write, or just for formal things you do writing process?

TC: Well, I’ve tried to cover a whole lot of everything in here from pre-writing to publishing, and lots and lots and lots of prewriting. And then giving students choices in the things that they then want to take and then work through the process. Some things that I have requested that they take and then work through the process, but I don’t know that my attitude or my views have changed on that per se. I’m not sure, I can’t think of anything that has really changed from it. I love to write; I don’t have a lot of opportunities myself to write, but I love to write, and I
have a great feeling that there are many ways or many purposes that writing can fill. So I want to convey that to my students.

SD: What I’m trying to say is: Is the writing process still the main strategy for writing that you see used in intermediate

TC: Oh, well, yeah, I think for the most part it is. We’ve tried some other things, and I can’t think—the writing traits—trying to teach writing through voice and that sort of thing. And I’ve used a conjunction? Of that, but I think the writing process is probably the basis of what everybody shoots for—let’s prewrite, now we’re gonna draft, and now we’re gonna.

SD: Oh, okay, I thought we were on the same page.

TC: Oh, yes, that’s the basis that most everyone uses. Next year I’ve talked with our 5th grade teacher, because we only currently have one 3rd, one 4th, and one 5th grade classroom. She (Ms.Potter) approached me earlier in the week to see if I could look at my schedule, to see if I teach English and Language Arts in 5th grade, and she does all the math. So she would teach 4th and 5th grade math, and we talked about it the end of last year to prepare for this year, and it just didn’t work out with the schedule. So we are going to try a little bit harder, so I would be able to do that for a couple of years. I think I would be able to see more growth with student.

SD: Yes, you would have these students.

TC: Right, I would have them and be able to then take this same process and do more with it. So I am really open to that idea so I can see that consistency and those changes I want to make, and incorporation of this program—as 5th graders
did it really make a difference—were they growing, were they maturing? Did it really help? and that sort of stuff.

SD: I’m trying to think there’s a name for that. We did that when I was teaching Title I Reading/Writing for 6th, 7th, and 8th. We would have the same students—looping!

TC: Right, looping, and we talked about it last year, because I had a 4th/5th split last year. We talked about looping, so then I would teach 5th grade this year, and then go back to 4th grade, and then I would teach 5th—we discussed it—kind of tossed the idea around. This would allow for the English and Language Arts—kind of looping for this one subject. So it would and she feels that’s her area of strength. Well, you know, I feel pretty competent in math, so I’ll do that and you can do this. She would do math, science, and social studies, and I would do English, science, and social studies. (1616) And I’m open, but I enjoy math, too, so I’m not real sure I want to give that up. I like the advantages for myself with the other, but there are lots of other ways and areas I can incorporate that math as well, so I can still do it. It definitely would be, but just thinking in terms of this program, the CA, as being a kind of pilot, me getting my feet wet, thing now. I’m thinking, Okay, now I can see how I can change it, and I’ll be better able to see if it has an impact on the kids with that consistency and stuff.

SD: I wish we had a grant or something where we could have actually had a book, (ha ha), a book for you and all that. It just sort of was “taking off running!”
TC: Oh, yeah, and I honestly don’t know if I would have had time for much more. So, you know, it kind of worked out, but I think, “You know, I think this could work. I think I can incorporate it.”
SD: Wonderful! Well, thank you so much for accepting the program and allowing me to come into your classroom
Appendix L: Writing Prompts A and B

Writing Prompt A: Letter to the Teacher

Dear Students,

We are a couple of months into the school year, and I would like to know more about what each of you did last summer. Write a letter to me, your fourth-grade teacher, telling me about it. The letter should be one page long. Include at least three things you did, such as: 1) Where did you go, and what did you do there? 2) Did you begin a new activity like swimming or hiking? 3) Did you take on a new job at home or in your neighborhood such as babysitting or cooking, or helping with the lawn, or painting?

Your teacher,

Mr./Ms.________________

Writing Prompt B: Letter to the Principal

Dear 4th Grade Students,

I would like to know what you think about being in 4th grade so far this year. Write a letter to me that is at least a page long, explaining how you feel about 4th grade. You may include things you like as well as dislike, but talk about at least three things. Ideas for you to write about are: lunch, your schedule, recess, our school T-shirt, etc. I’m looking forward to what you have to say.

Sincerely yours,

Mr./Ms.___________, Principal
APPENDIX M

Kentucky Writing Assessment Holistic Scoring Guide
## KENTUCKY WRITING ASSESSMENT
### Holistic Scoring Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Portfolio ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOVICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>APPRENTICE</strong></td>
<td><strong>PROFICIENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISTINGUISHED</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited awareness of audience and/or purpose</td>
<td>• Some evidence of communicating with an audience for a specific purpose; some lapses in focus</td>
<td>• Focused on a purpose; communicates with an audience; evidence of voice and/or suitable tone</td>
<td>• Establishes a purpose and maintains clear focus; strong awareness of audience; evidence of distinctive voice and/or appropriate tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal idea development; limited and/or unrelated details</td>
<td>• Unelaborated idea development; unelaborated and/or repetitious details</td>
<td>• Depth of idea development supported by elaborated, relevant details</td>
<td>• Depth and complexity of ideas supported by rich, engaging, and/or pertinent details; evidence of analysis, reflection, insight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Random and/or weak organization</td>
<td>• Lapses in organization and/or coherence</td>
<td>• Logical, coherent organization</td>
<td>• Careful and/or subtle organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorrect and/or ineffective sentence structure</td>
<td>• Simplistic and/or awkward sentence structure</td>
<td>• Controlled and varied sentence structure</td>
<td>• Variety in sentence structure and length enhances effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorrect and/or ineffective language</td>
<td>• Simplistic and/or imprecise language</td>
<td>• Acceptable, effective language</td>
<td>• Precise and/or rich language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Errors in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization are disproportionate to length and complexity</td>
<td>• Some errors in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization that do not interfere with communication</td>
<td>• Few errors in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization relative to length and complexity</td>
<td>• Control of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SCORING CRITERIA

### PURPOSE/AUDIENCE: The degree to which the writer maintains a focused purpose to communicate with an audience by
- narrowing the topic to establish a focus
- analyzing and addressing the needs of the intended audience

- adhering to the characteristics (e.g., format, organization) of the form
- employing a suitable tone
- allowing a voice to emerge when appropriate

### IDEA DEVELOPMENT/SUPPORT: The degree to which the writer develops and supports main ideas and deepens the audience’s understanding by using
- logical, justified, and suitable explanation
- relevant elaboration

- related connections and reflections
- idea development strategies (e.g., bulleted lists, definitions) appropriate for the form

### ORGANIZATION: The degree to which the writer creates unity and coherence to accomplish the focused purpose by
- engaging the audience and establishing a context for reading
- placing ideas and support in a meaningful order

- guiding the reader through the piece with transitions and transitional elements
- providing effective closure

### SENTENCES: The degree to which the writer creates effective sentences that are
- varied in structure and length
- constructed effectively

- complete and correct

### LANGUAGE: The degree to which the writer demonstrates
- word choice
  ➢ strong verbs and nouns
  ➢ concrete and/or sensory details
  ➢ language appropriate to the content, purpose, and audience

- concise use of language
- correct usage/grammar

### CORRECTNESS: The degree to which the writer demonstrates
- correct spelling
- correct punctuation
- correct capitalization

- appropriate documentation of ideas and information from outside sources (e.g., citing authors or titles within the text, listing sources)

## COMPLETE/INCOMPLETE PORTFOLIOS

A portfolio is incomplete if it does not contain:
- a Table of Contents* which indicates the following:
  - Required writing in each category
    - Reflective (Letter to Reviewer), Personal, Literacy, and Transactional
  - Required number of pieces in each category
    ➢ 4th grade – 4 pieces
      1 in each category
    ➢ 7th and 12th grade – 5 pieces
      1 in each category plus
      1 extra in either Personal, Literary, or Transactional
  - Required number of Content Pieces identified by content area class
    ➢ 4th and 7th grade – at least 1 content piece other than English/language arts identified by content area class
    ➢ 12th grade – at least 2 content pieces other than English/language arts identified by content area class

- a Signed Student Signature Sheet

A portfolio is also incomplete if any pieces:
- are proven to be plagiarized.
- are different from those listed in the Table of Contents.
- are written in a language other than English.
- demonstrate only computational skills.
- consist of only diagrams or drawings.
- represent a group entry.

*Use of the Table of Contents in the Kentucky Writing Portfolio Developmental Handbook is recommended.

If a portfolio contains too many pieces, remove the first piece that may be removed without making the portfolio incomplete. Repeat this process until the portfolio contains the correct total number of pieces, the correct number of content pieces, and the correct number of pieces in each category.
APPENDIX N

Classroom Contrastive Analysis (CA) Observation Protocol

Classroom Contrastive Analysis (CA) Intervention Observation Protocol
The statements indicate the frequency with which the teacher implements essential components of the CA Intervention during the classroom observation. The observer will circle the letter of the appropriate rating. The rating of frequency includes:
Generally = Almost every time
Occasionally = Once or twice
N = N/A (non-applicable)

Totals: G = 38; O = 0; N = 7

1. Teacher asks questions to involve students with “discovery process” of developing a pattern.       G  O  N
2. Teacher presents the search for a pattern comparison in student-friendly language.         G  O  N
4. Charts are constructed from student writing and input during the discovery process.       G  O  N
5. Teacher extends discovery of a pattern to a guided practice for students.                    G  O  N
6. Students discover patterns and rules in vernacular AppE samples of the class’s writing. .G  O  N
7. Students assimilate patterns and rules in their own writing to include Standard English.  

8. Teacher’s written lesson plans indicate coordination of lesson objectives with common core standards.  

9. Classroom climate is conducive to discussion of dialect patterns and language variations. Diverse learners’ needs are met by the instruction.  

10. Diverse learners’ needs are met by the teacher’s instruction in support of the multicultural tenet of every student’s uniqueness.
# Appendix C, WSPS, Form M

## THE WRITER SELF-PERCEPTION SCALE

Listed below are statements about writing. Please read each statement carefully. The circle the letters that show how much you agree or disagree with the statement. Use the following scale:

SA=Strongly Agree  A=Agree  U=Undecided  D=Disagree  SD=Strongly Disagree

**Example:** I think Batman is the greatest super hero.  
SA A U D SD

If you are really positive that Batman is the greatest, circle SA (Strongly Agree).  
If you think that Batman is good but maybe not great, circle A (Agree).  
If you can't decide whether or not Batman is the greatest, circle U (Undecided).  
If you think that Batman is not all that great, circle D (Disagree).  
If you are really positive that Batman is not the greatest, circle SD (Strongly Disagree).

| (CC) 1. I write better than other kids in the class. | SA A U D SD |
| (PS) 2. I like how writing makes me feel inside. | SA A U D SD |
| (CPR) 3. Writing is easier for me than it used to be. | SA A U D SD |
| (CC) 4. When I write, the organization is better than the other kids in my class. | SA A U D SD |
| (SF) 5. People in my family think I am a good writer. | SA A U D SD |
| (CPR) 6. I am getting better at writing | SA A U D SD |
| (PS) 7. When I write, I feel calm. | SA A U D SD |
| (CC) 8. My writing is more interesting than my classmates' writing | SA A U D SD |
| (SF) 9. My teacher thinks my writing is fine. | SA A U D SD |
| (SF) 10. Other kids think I am a good writer. | SA A U D SD |
| (CC) 11. My sentences and paragraphs fit together as well as my classmates' sentences and paragraphs. | SA A U D SD |
| (CPR) 12. I need less help to write well than I used to. | SA A U D SD |
| (SF) 13. People in my family think I write pretty well. | SA A U D SD |
| (CPR) 14. I write better now than I could before. | SA A U D SD |
| (C/N) 15. I think I am a good writer. | SA A U D SD |
| (CC) 16. I put my sentences in a better order than the other kids. | SA A U D SD |
| (CPR) 17. My writing has improved. | SA A U D SD |
| (CPR) 18. My writing is better than before. | SA A U D SD |
| (CPR) 19. It's easier to write well now than it used to be. | SA A U D SD |
| (CPR) 20. The organization of my writing has really improved. | SA A U D SD |
| (CC) 21. The sentences I use in my writing stick | SA A U D SD |
to the topic more than the ones the other kids use.

(SPR) 22. The words I use in my writing are better than the ones I used before.

(OC) 23. I write more often than other kids

(PS) 24. I am relaxed when I write.

(SPR) 25. My descriptions are more interesting than before.

(OC) 26. The words I use in my writing are better than the ones other kids use.

(PS) 27. I feel comfortable when I write.

(SF) 28. My teacher thinks I am a good writer.

(SPR) 29. My sentences stick to the topic better now.

(OC) 30. My writing seems to be more clear than my classmates' writing.

(SPR) 31. When I write, the sentences and paragraphs fit together better than they used to.

(PS) 32. Writing makes me feel good.

(SF) 33. I can tell that my teacher thinks my writing is fine.

(SPR) 34. The order of my sentences makes better sense now.

(PS) 35. I enjoy writing.

(SPR) 36. My writing is more clear than it used to be.

(SF) 37. My classmates say I would write well.

(SPR) 38. I choose the words I use in my writing more carefully now.

THE WRITER SELF-PERCEPTION SCALE SCORING SHEET

Student Name

Grade

Teacher

Scoring Key: 5 = Strongly Agree (SA)
4 = Agree (A)
3 = Undecided (U)
2 = Disagree (D)
1 = Strongly Disagree (SD)

Scales
General Specific Observational Social Physiological Progress Progress Comparison Feedback State
(GPR) (SPR) (OC) (SF) (PS)
3. 22. 1. 5. 2.
6. 25. 4. 9. 7.
THE WRITER SELF-PERCEPTION SCALE

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION, SCORING AND INTERPRETATION

The Writer Self-perception Scale (WSPS) provides an estimate of how children feel about themselves as writers. The scale consists of 38 items that assess self-perception along five dimensions of self-efficacy (General Progress, Specific Progress, Observational Comparison, Social Feedback, and Physiological State). Children are asked to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree with each statement using a 5-point scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1). The information yielded by this scale can be used to devise ways of enhancing children's view of themselves as writers, and, ideally, to increase their motivation for writing. The following directions explain specifically what you are to do.

Administration

To ensure useful results the children must (a) understand exactly what they are to do, (b) have sufficient time to complete all items, and (c) respond honestly and thoughtfully. Briefly explain to the children that they are being asked to complete a questionnaire about writing. Emphasize that this is not a test and that there are no right or wrong answers. Tell them that they should be as honest as possible because their responses will be confidential. Ask the children to fill in their names, grade levels, and classrooms as appropriate. Read the directions aloud and work through the example with the students as a group. Discuss the response options and make sure that all children understand the rating scale before moving on. The children should be instructed to raise their hands to ask questions about any words or ideas that are unfamiliar.

The children should then read each item and circle their response to the statement. They should work at their own pace. Remind the children that they should be sure to respond to all items. When all items are completed, the children should stop, put their pencils down, and wait for further instructions. Care should be taken that children who work more slowly are not disturbed by classmates who have already finished.

Scoring

To score the WSPS, enter the following point values for each response on the WSPS scoring sheet (Strongly Agree = 5, Agree = 4, Undecided = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1) for each item number under the appropriate scale. Sum each column to obtain a raw score for each of the five specific scales.

Interpretation

Each scale is interpreted in relation to its total possible score. For example, because the WSPS uses a 5-point scale and the General Progress (GP) scale consists of 8 items, the highest total score is 40 (8 X 5 = 40). Therefore, a score that would fall approximately at the average or mean score (35) would indicate that the child's perception of her/himself as a writer falls in the average range with respect to General Progress. Note that each remaining scale has a different possible maximum raw score (Specific Progress = 35, Observational Comparison = 45, Social Feedback = 35, and Physiological State = 30) and should be
interpreted accordingly using the high, average, and low designations on the scoring sheet.
**APPENDIX P**  
*Lesson 1, Showing Past Time*

**Code-switching Chart**

*I seen my uncle vs. I saw my uncle*

*I seen my uncle vs. I had seen my uncle.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMAL</th>
<th>FORMAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I looked around and <em>seen</em> my uncle.</td>
<td>I looked around and <em>saw</em> my uncle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He <em>thrown</em> a ball to me.</td>
<td>He <em>threw</em> a ball to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not believe what I <em>seen</em>.</td>
<td>I could not believe what I <em>saw</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She <em>done</em> a lot more work than Gary.</td>
<td>She <em>has done</em> a lot more work than Gary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE PATTERN**

Past participle form (seen, thrown, etc.)  
Verb + *ed* (or change in shape)  
“*have*” + past participle (seen/done …)

Writing Standard 5 for Grade 4 applies to this research: “With guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, and editing (Editing for convention should demonstrate command of Language standards 1-3 up to and including grade 4 on pages 28 and 29)” (Kentucky Core Academic Standards for ELA, p. 21).  
(Wheeler & Swords, 2006, NCTE)
APPENDIX Q

Lesson 2, Making Negatives

Code-Switching Chart

MAKING NEGATIVES

*She won’t never vs. She won’t ever*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMAL</th>
<th>FORMAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No gossip should be told about nobody.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No gossip should be told about anybody.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>She didn’t want nobody to call her.</strong></td>
<td><strong>She didn’t want anybody to call her.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>He doesn’t (or don’t) want no melon.</strong></td>
<td><strong>He doesn’t want any melon.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I don’t like no other book but that one.</strong></td>
<td><strong>I don’t like any other book but that one.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>She won’t never stay over at our house.</strong></td>
<td><strong>She won’t ever stay over at our house.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE PATTERN

Negative (no, didn’t, doesn’t, won’t, etc.) + No/nobody/never, etc.

Negative (no, didn’t, doesn’t, won’t, etc.) + any/anybody/ever, etc.

(Wheeler & Swords, 2006, NCTE)
“Students address College and Career Readiness (CCR) Anchor Standards for Writing,” standard 5 of the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects: “Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach” (Kentucky Core Academic Standards for English Language Arts, p. 18).
APPENDIX R
Lesson 3, Plurality
Customizing Code-Switching Lessons

PLURALITY

APPALACHIAN ENGLISH (INFORMAL) STANDARD ENGLISH (FORMAL)
We caught thirty pound of catfish. We caught thirty pounds of catfish.
How many bushel of beans are there? How many bushels of beans are there?
It’s about six mile up the road. It’s about six miles up the road.
Six catş are on the porch. Six cats are on the porch.
The toy carş are red. The toy cars are red.

THE PATTERN
Number words + measure noun Noun + S
Other nouns + S

Writing Standard 5 for grade 4 applies to this research: “With guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, and editing (Editing for convention should demonstrate command of Language standards 1-3 up to and including grade 4 on pages 28 and 29)” (p. 21).

(Wheeler & Swords, 2010)
APPENDIX S

Lesson 4, Pronominal Difference

Code-switching Chart
(Objective Case Used as Subjective)

Use of Me and I as subject/Me and I in a series of words

*Me and my dad fished vs. My dad and I fished.*

*Me, Dad, and Evan drove home vs. Dad, Evan, and I drove home.*

*Pronouns used as subjects, possessives, and words in a series.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMAL</th>
<th>FORMAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me and my dad went fishing.</td>
<td>My dad and I went fishing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Him and his dad bake cookies.</td>
<td>He and his dad bake cookies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse, John, and him play X-box.</td>
<td>Jesse, John, and he play X-box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her and her mom shop.</td>
<td>She and her mom shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin, Kayla, and her cheer the team.</td>
<td>Robin, Kayla, and she cheer the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me and my dog run.</td>
<td>My dog and I run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me, Dad, and Evan drove home. (series)</td>
<td>Dad, Evan, and I drove home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me and you ate the candy.</td>
<td>You and I ate the candy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PATTERN

ME/him/her/it + subject words or Me
+ subject words in a series.

Subject words +1, he/she, they, we/
or subject words in a series
+ I.

Writing Standard 5 for grade 4 applies to this research: “With guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, and editing (Editing for convention should demonstrate command of Language standards 1-3 up to and including grade 4 on pages 28 and 29)” (p. 21).

(Wheeler & Swords, 2010)
### APPENDIX T

**WSPS Raw Scores for Two-Tailed T-Test**

**Fourth and Fifth Grades**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>GPR</th>
<th>SPR</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>post-GPR</th>
<th>post-SPR</th>
<th>post-OC</th>
<th>post-SF</th>
<th>post-PS</th>
<th>GPR-diff</th>
<th>SPR-diff</th>
<th>OC-diff</th>
<th>SF-diff</th>
<th>PS-diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WSPS Raw Scores 12/12/12-4/10/13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>GPR</th>
<th>SPR</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>post-GPR</th>
<th>post-SPR</th>
<th>post-OC</th>
<th>post-SF</th>
<th>post-PS</th>
<th>GPR-diff</th>
<th>SPR-diff</th>
<th>OC-diff</th>
<th>SF-diff</th>
<th>PS-diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERVENTION GROUP - 4TH GRADE**

**INTERVENTION GROUP - 5TH GRADE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>GPR</th>
<th>SPR</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>post-GPR</th>
<th>post-SPR</th>
<th>post-OC</th>
<th>post-SF</th>
<th>post-PS</th>
<th>GPR-diff</th>
<th>SPR-diff</th>
<th>OC-diff</th>
<th>SF-diff</th>
<th>PS-diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.53475</td>
<td>0.791283</td>
<td>0.807903</td>
<td>0.10684</td>
<td>0.5241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (p-value for unpaired, two tailed T-test)
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