

2016

Socialization to Academic Language in a Kindergarten Classroom

Colleen E. Gallagher

University of Dayton, cgallagher1@udayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/edt_fac_pub



Part of the [Elementary Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Other Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#), [Pre-Elementary, Early Childhood, Kindergarten Teacher Education Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education and Teaching Commons](#)

eCommons Citation

Gallagher, Colleen E., "Socialization to Academic Language in a Kindergarten Classroom" (2016). *Teacher Education Faculty Publications*. 38.

https://ecommons.udayton.edu/edt_fac_pub/38

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Teacher Education at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Teacher Education Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Socialization to Academic Language in a Kindergarten Classroom

Abstract

Recognizing the importance of academic language for students' success in schools, this article reports on an investigation of how narrative-focused literacy events in the classroom provide opportunities for academic language socialization. Data were collected from one public elementary school in a major metropolitan area in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. Participants include an intact kindergarten class of 16 students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and their teacher. The results of the investigation revealed that sharing time provides opportunities for socialization to academic register through: (1) requiring that students successfully navigate the academic language demands of the interaction, (2) providing differentiated teacher scaffolding that supports students in meeting these demands, and (3) building a linguistic third space. The author discusses how the data and results demonstrate that the roots of mature academic language register are in the emergent academic language used in early childhood classrooms.

Keywords: Language socialization, scaffolding, academic language, sharing time, hybridity, classroom discourse

Introduction

A well-established body of research has examined how children are socialized to language through language at home (e.g. Heath 1983; Melzi 2000; Minami and McCabe 1995) and school (e.g. Cazden 1985; Gutiérrez et al. 2011; Michaels 1981, 1991). And while socialization in the two different settings is sometimes complementary, particularly for children from societally dominant cultures and language backgrounds (e.g. Gee, 2002; Griffin, Hemphill, Camp & Wolf, 2004), it often introduces discontinuities into the lives of children from non-

dominant backgrounds (e.g., Gutiérrez, 2008; Hadi-Tabassum, 2006; Heath, 1983; Michaels, 1981, 1991) as they work to acquire the language of the classroom.

Academic language, or the linguistic register characterized by lexical and grammatical features that carry out specific teaching and learning functions, is important for becoming a successful student in school. As such, it is important to understand both the nature and development of academic language. Studies of the language used in teaching and learning have described the mature target register (Flowerdew 2003; Schleppegrell 2004) and the developing academic register in the middle grades (e.g., Bailey and Butler 2003; Schleppegrell 2004). More work is needed, however, on the nature of academic language in the earliest school years and on the processes by which young children are socialized into the academic register.

Research into narrative use by young children finds that personal narrative skills in the pre-school years are correlated with later literacy success (Griffin et al. 2004) and suggests that narrative discourse links home and school registers (Heath 1983; Invernizzi and Abouzeid 1995; Melzi and Fernández 2004; Minami and McCabe 1995; Scollon and Scollon 1981) by offering practice with language valued in academic settings (Michaels 1981; Peterson and McCabe 1994; Griffin et al. 2004). This language of schooling is frequently characterized as specific, informative, authoritative and concise (e.g., Cummins 2000; Scarcella 2003; Schleppegrell 2004). However, little research has examined processes by which this crossover between early socially-oriented personal narration and more mature academic language takes place.

This article reports on an investigation of how narrative-focused literacy events in the classroom provide opportunities for academic language socialization. More specifically, the study focused on the following questions: Does engaging in the narrative-focused literacy event of *sharing time* in the classroom provide opportunities for academic language socialization? If

so, how? The theoretical framework for this study is language socialization (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986), which emphasizes the process of learning to use language through linguistic interaction. The sociocultural theoretical concepts of hybridity (e.g. Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, and Tejada, 1999; Moje et al. 2004) and scaffolding (e.g., Vygotsky 1978), both coherent with a language socialization perspective, were used as analytical tools. This paper shows how sharing time functions in one classroom in socializing students to an emergent academic register through (1) hybridized narrative discourse and (2) teacher verbal scaffolding.

Methods

The data collection site for this study was a public elementary school in a major metropolitan area in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The participants were one teacher and an intact kindergarten class of 16 students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. While all students in this particular class were English-dominant upon school entry, several members of the class spoke languages other than English at home. Their teacher, Mrs. Lake, was English-dominant, with some knowledge of Spanish, and apart from some limited vocabulary instruction, all instruction in her classroom was in English. The students in this class were part of the school's dual-language program, so some of their instructional time each week was with another kindergarten teacher who taught in Spanish. All data for this study are from the English-speaking classroom, however. Table 1 provides a summary of class demographics:

(Note: Table 1 here)

In summary, students came to this class with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. While their parents varied in years of education, most were in professional positions or skilled trades.

Data for this particular study was collected as part of a larger investigation over a seven-month period during one school year. As part of the larger investigation, the researcher served as a participant observer in the classroom during weekly two-hour visits for the morning literacy block. Sharing time interactions, one of several routine literacy events during this morning literacy block, are the focus of this particular study. Sharing time, a common activity in early childhood classrooms (e.g. Cazden 1985; Heath 1983; Michaels, 1981, 1991), promotes oral language development, provides practice with personal narrative, and encourages careful listening by peers. Sharing time occurred daily in this classroom and was supported by physical artifacts and familiar procedures described later in this paper. During sharing time, the students were seated on a color-block rug on the floor; the teacher was seated on a chair in front of the students; and the researcher observed from the back of the room, took field notes, and audio recorded the exchanges. Table 2 provides a data summary:

(Note: Table 2 here)

This data was analyzed through a recursive process of coding for emergent themes in the transcripts, checking field notes, creating memos, and consulting with relevant literature. Through the process of analysis, the relevance of the theoretical concepts of teacher scaffolding and hybridity became clear. Prior work on the initiation-reply-evaluation (IRE) sequence (Mehan 1979), negative feedback (Lyster and Ranta 1997), and teacher scaffolding during similar literacy events (Ankrum, Genest, and Belcastro 2014) informed coding for this project.

Data and Analysis

So *does* sharing time offer opportunities for academic language socialization? In brief, these interactions do offer clear and positive opportunities for academic language socialization through (1) exposure to particular language demands, (2) teacher scaffolding, and (3) a hybrid

narrative discourse form that uses students' lived experiences and their familiarity with narration for instructional purposes. First, this section describes the typical sharing time interaction. Then it discusses the language demands of the interactions and shows how the teacher scaffolded the students' language use during what can be called hybridized narrative literacy events.

Typical sharing time interaction

The sharing time events analyzed for this study occurred between October and May of one school year. While all 16 students took part in sharing time each day, a total of nine students were selected as student narrators during the observed sessions, and they told a total of 19 narratives. Table 3 summarizes the recorded information for each sharing time session:

(Note: Table 3 here)

Not all students told a personal narrative during the study, but all did ask at least one question. Students told stories about items or events that were familiar to them. These sharing events were all multi-party talk in which the teacher allotted turns and kept the children on task and in compliance with her expectations. Sharing time followed a well-established routine set by Mrs. Lake. After entering the classroom each morning, students indicated their desire to share a personal event by moving laminated cards with their names on them to the "wants to share" side of a poster on the classroom wall. Those students who wanted to share had the opportunity to do so during the morning meeting, and each student had to wait until all had shared before taking another turn.

During sharing time, Mrs. Lake allotted the floor to one student at a time. At the start of the turn, the student narrator shared a brief abstract-like statement of a past event and then invited classmates to ask questions. Student listeners raised their hands to bid for the floor, and the teacher called on about three students to ask a question. Typical questions were *How did you*

get there?; Who went with you?; What else did you do?; and When did you do that? Mrs. Lake provided students assistance as needed in answering the questions, and she generally closed each child's turn with a brief evaluative comment on either the content or delivery of the narrative. A typical example follows:

Excerpt 1: Jasmine, 12/16, Park Visit

1. Mrs. Lake: Okay, we have four names on the wor- on the news list. Let's have Jasmine come up and share her news.
2. Jasmine: I went to the park. ((enunciated clearly and carefully as if reading aloud))
3. Mrs. Lake: Now let me hear you say it in your talking voice. I went to the park.
4. Jasmine: I went to the park. I went with my mom my brother and my sister and my-and my cousin.
5. Mrs. Lake: °Ok, ask do you have any questions?°
6. Jasmine: Do you have any questions?
7. Mrs. Lake: Ok, Adele?
8. Adele: What did you do there?
9. Jasmine: I-I played on the slide.
10. Mrs. Lake: Ok, Shauna? Do you have a question for Jasmine?
11. Shauna: What else did you do there?
12. Jasmine: I went on the monkey bars.
13. Mrs. Lake: Ok, James?
14. James: When did you go there?
15. Jasmine: On the weekend. I went on the weekends.
16. Mrs. Lake: Good, ok good Jasmine and you said your sister is home from college? She's home visiting for the holidays? That must be nice.

As is evident, teacher and student were both attuned to the orderly sequence of this interaction as well as its volume, sentence structure, and turn allocation. The student listeners asked relevant questions that prompted the student narrator for more information on the topic. Here and during sharing time in general, students followed common classroom procedure in bidding for the floor by raising their hands. The teacher selected the next speaker for each sanctioned turn, and she often concluded a student's turn with an evaluative comment pertaining to events in the story world, to the student's delivery of the narrative, or to the student's responses to questions.

Overall, the participation structure of sharing time in this classroom was also a whole-class structure in which the teacher controlled the floor and allocated turns. It followed a typical

initiation-reply-evaluation (IRE) sequence (Mehan 1979) in which the teacher initiated a turn sequence with a prompt or question, a student complied with an expected response or an approximation thereof, and the teacher evaluated implicitly or explicitly with a follow-up comment. This IRE pattern is one aspect of the hybridized narrative discourse present in this classroom, as discussed later in this paper.

Language demands of sharing time

The teacher communicated clear expectations for sharing time through both her explicit and implicit verbal and non-verbal behaviors; these expectations had implications for the demands of participating in sharing time in terms of the students' interpersonal, presentational, and interpretive communication skills. An examination of teacher prompts and feedback as well as student language production yielded the language demands in table 4:

(Note: Table 4 here)

These demands were evident throughout the collected sharing time data and are illustrated in excerpt two:

Excerpt 2, Adele, February 17, Mall Shopping Trip

1. Mrs. Lake: No, ok. All right, Rosey has some news and she's not back right yet so we'll- Adele?
2. Adele : ... ((Clearing throat))
3. Mrs. Lake: Ok, go ahead.
4. Adele: °I went to the mall. °
5. Mrs. Lake: Did you get that?
6. Students: No! ((in chorus))
7. Mrs. Lake: Let's give Adele the signal when we can't hear, we need to do this so she knows she needs to talk louder.
8. Adele: I went to the mall.
9. Mrs. Lake: Tell us mo:re.
10. Adele: I went to the jewelry store.
11. Mrs. Lake: A:h. The jewelry store! Ok. What do you need to ask your friends?
12. Adele: Do you have any questions?
13. Mrs. Lake: () um Tara?
14. Tara: How did you get to the mall?

15. Adele: In a car. ((says each word very distinctly, almost as in careful reading aloud)) I went in a car.
16. Mrs. Lake: Ok, Mary?
17. Mary: Um when did you go to the mall?
18. Adele: I don't remember.
19. Mrs. Lake: Well, was it yesterday, or over the weeke:nd?
20. Adele: over the weekend.
21. Mrs. Lake: So- I:?
22. Adele: I went over the weekend.
23. Mrs. Lake: So that means it was either Saturday or ... Sunday, that's the weekend. All right? Do you remember which of those days you went?
24. Adele: ((nods))
25. Mrs. Lake: Which day?
26. Adele: Saturday.
27. Mrs. Lake: So tell her.
28. Adele: I went Saturday.
29. Mrs. Lake: All right, one last question. Shauna?
30. Shauna: Who went with you to the mall.
31. Adele: I ... my mommy, I went with my mommy.
32. Mrs. Lake: Good. And nobody asked the question that I was re- really wondering. What did you buy at the mall?
33. Adele: Uh, a toy skunk.
34. Mrs. Lake: ((prompts for whole sentence answer with arm motion))
35. Adele: I brought a toy skunk.
36. Mrs. Lake: A toy skunk! Did you get that at the jewelry store?
37. Adele: ((nods))
38. Ms. Lake: Wow, I didn't know they took- sold toy skunks at the jewelry store. You know you're j- going to the ... writing center today, maybe you could write a story about that when you go and tell all those details. You went to the mall, with your mom, you went in the car, you got a toy skunk; those would all be wonderful things to write about at the writing center today.

In lines 3, 13, and 16, to name a few, the teacher opened the floor to selected students, who each complied appropriately with the expectation to participate. In line 8, Adele opened with a brief, abstract-like statement about a past personal experience, and in line 9, the teacher explicitly prompted her for more detail. In lines 14, 17, and 30, students demonstrated the ability to ask relevant, well-formed *wh*- questions, which Adele interpreted accurately and answered appropriately with more or less support. The language demand of formulating contributions in complete sentences is evident in line 15, where Adele self-corrects; in line 21, where Mrs. Lake offers a sentence stem and uses what is for her a common prosodic device—a combination of an

elongated vowel and rising intonation—to invite the student to continue; and in line 34, where Mrs. Lake uses a gesture to remind her of this syntactic expectation. Finally, in lines 19-28, the teacher helps Shauna remember a detail related to the timing of her shared event and encourages Shauna to use a term more specific than just *the weekend*, which Shauna does with *Saturday*.

Thus the norms and expectations of sharing time established an orderly, rule-governed, routine event for practicing with language demands. Both students and teacher generally adhered to these norms, though exceptions are noted below. This sharing time routine regularly involved students' negotiating a set of language demands which together constitute what Gee (1996) would call a *Discourse*—in this sense, a discourse of age-appropriate academic language. In order to be full participants and to successfully enact the role of kindergarten student participating in sharing time in Mrs. Lake's classroom, students had to adhere to these expectations and meet the language demands of the literacy event.

It is evident, therefore, that by routinely requiring students to navigate the unique language demands of this classroom interaction, sharing time does provide opportunities for academic language socialization. Importantly, students are not left to navigate these demands on their own; the teacher plays a key support role in the socialization process through her provision of verbal scaffolding.

Teacher verbal scaffolding of student language use

A key mechanism by which students are socialized to use of the academic register during sharing time in this classroom is the teacher's *verbal scaffolding*, which for purposes of this study is defined as teacher support that helps a student produce an utterance that is more target-like than that which the student could produce alone. In this data, the teacher regularly used

several verbal scaffolding behaviors, listed in Table 5 from least to most linguistically supportive:

(Note: Table 5 here)

Each of these scaffolding types was used regularly throughout the school year by Mrs. Lake during sharing time interactions. As has been observed by Ankrum et al. (2014) of kindergarten teacher verbal scaffolding during small-group reading strategies instruction, Mrs. Lake seemed to employ these different levels of scaffolding as on-the-spot differentiated instruction in response to learner needs during sharing time. In excerpt 3 below, we see Mrs. Lake using a series of open and directed prompts to initiate and sustain interactions between a student narrator and peer interlocutors, whose replies seemingly comply with the teacher's expectations. As unsuccessful responses occur, the level of scaffolding becomes more directed, and even constrained, as Mrs. Lake provides increasing levels of support.

Excerpt 3, Tara, February 3, Loose Tooth

1. Mrs. Lake: ... All right. Tara what's your news?
2. Tara: I have a loose tooth.
3. Mrs. Lake: Ok, do you want to tell us something more about that?
4. Tara: ... Yesterday I found out that my tooth was loose. ... I (said) that my tooth was loose yesterday and my mom wiggled it a little but- and she she was excited.
5. Mrs. Lake: It is exciting! Is that your first loose tooth?
6. Tara: Yes.
7. Mrs. Lake: Ok s- no- and ask your friends:
8. Tara: Do you have any questions?
9. Mrs. Lake: Jasmine?
10. Jasmine: When did it come?
11. Mrs. Lake: Well wait a minute. Stop and think Jasmine she said- did she say her tooth came out?
12. Jasmine: ((inaudible or non-verbal response))
13. Mrs. Lake: What did she say? She has a-
14. Jasmine: (loose tooth)
15. Mrs. Lake: =A loose tooth=
16. Jasmine: =Loose tooth=
17. Mrs. Lake: What does that mean if your tooth is loose? ... Does it mean it already came out or does it mean it's starting to wiggle?
18. Jasmine: (Wiggle).

19. Mrs. Lake: She didn't say that it had already come out.

Line 1 included an open invitation by the teacher to Tara to share her news. This was followed by a request for elaboration in line 3, to which Tara supplied a brief narrative about her loose tooth. The teacher provided a positive evaluation of Tara's reply in the forms of a narrative evaluation and directed question that attempted to elicit further evaluation in the form of a *narrative coda* from the student. Up to this point, the sharing time interaction had proceeded smoothly, with little need for more supportive scaffolding from the teacher. In line 10, however, Jasmine asked a question that indicated a misunderstanding, and Mrs. Lake initiated a clarification sequence designed to correct the misunderstanding. As part of this clarification sequence, she used several directed prompts: a yes-or-no question in lines 11 and 17 and a sentence stem in line 13. As a whole, this series of prompts led Jasmine to indicate in line 18 her understanding of the difference between a wiggling tooth and one that has fallen out.

While this clarification sequence did not result in a felicitous question by Jasmine, a similar sequence did so for James a few turns later, as indicated in the continuation of excerpt 3 below.

Excerpt 3, Tara, February 3, Loose Tooth (continued)

27. Mrs. Lake: James?

28. James: Uh. ... How did it came out?

29. Mrs. Lake: Did she say her loose- her tooth came out or did she say it was wiggly? It was loose. So do you want to know how did it get loose? You could ask her that. How-

30. James: How did it get loose?

In line 27, the teacher selected James for the next turn with an open prompt for him to ask a question of the student narrator. His question demonstrated the same misunderstanding as did his classmate's several turns prior, and Mrs. Lake again initiated a clarification sequence. In line 29, she provided progressively more supportive scaffolding; she started with a directed prompt in the form of a yes-or-no question, followed up with a directed prompt to ask about a specific

topic, and ending with a sentence stem that the student repeated and completed in the next turn. Here we can see not only how the teacher provides scaffolding to support the language demand of asking a relevant question, but also how she provides progressively more constrained prompts that result in a higher level of linguistic support until the expected contribution is produced.

All of these prompts are moves that hand the floor back to the child and select him or her as the next speaker. In providing more or less direction about the nature of the expected response, the teacher also provides the child with the opportunity—or obligation—to use the scaffolding in constructing a response. These varying levels of scaffolding the teacher offers in response to student replies correspond with what Mehan (1979) identified as extended sequences that occur when the expected reply from a child does not materialize at first. What this analysis adds from the perspective of a sociocultural theory is that those teacher-initiated sequences, at least in this case, are responsive to the level of perceived support needed by the child.

Teacher turns tend to provide students with the level of scaffolding to participate successfully in this classroom, and they also consistently support students on the identified language demands addressed in the prior section. In the example in excerpt 3, the teacher was largely focused on supporting students in asking felicitous questions that demonstrate accurate listening comprehension. During sharing time, she also regularly supported students in producing complete sentences produced at an adequate volume, in elaborating on their narratives, in using specific vocabulary, and in carrying out each of the other language demands listed in table 4. In sum, these differentially scaffolded and regularly deployed teacher utterances should serve, over time, to socialize students to the use of the academic register during sharing time.

Sharing time as a linguistic third space

Finally, the concepts of *hybridity* and *third space* (e.g. Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez , and Tejeda 1999; Moje et al. 2004) add another perspective to this discussion of how sharing time in Mrs. Lake's classroom served as an opportunity for academic language socialization. The sharing time interaction was neither purely social nor instructional in nature; rather, characteristics of both non-institutional discourse and classroom discourse were in play. This was evident in the teacher's appropriation of the personal narrative genre for instructional purposes. Narrative has been described as a venue for developing facility with decontextualized language (Michaels 1981; Peterson and McCabe 1994; Griffin et al. 2004), which is also a hallmark of the academic register (Ochs et al.1992), and Mrs. Lake oriented to this overlap as she supported students in using specific lexical items and in expanding adequately on details of their narratives, as described in previous sections. In this overlap between social and instructional frames, the teacher drew on students' knowledge, interest, and narrative discourse skills, shaping them to fit the emergent academic discourse of her kindergarten classroom.

However, there are also areas of discontinuity between personal narrative as it is typically structured in out-of-school settings (Baynham 2003; Labov and Waletzky 1967; Peterson and McCabe 1983; Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1978) and personal narrative as it appears during sharing time (Küntay and Senay 2003; Michaels 1981 and 1991) and these differences have to do with the participation structure, the narrative structure, and the delivery of the personal narratives within an instructional frame. Rather than self-selection or selection of the next speaker by the current, the teacher in this study consistently selected the next speaker in this whole-group, teacher-controlled interaction. With regards to narrative structure, student narrators typically began their sharing time turns with a brief, abstract-like statement, but they did not generally have the opportunity to follow up with full narratives and details of their own choosing. Rather,

the narrator's peers and the teacher elicited this information through questioning. As shown in the continuation of excerpt 3 below, full narrative responses to questions were strongly discouraged in favor of concise summary statements. The teacher enforced the contribution of narratives with high tellability (Ochs and Capps 2001), defined in this classroom as new information about an interesting and important event. Finally, in this instructional setting, the academic language demands of presentational speaking were imposed upon the personal narrative genre so that students were consistently prompted to speak loudly and in full sentences.

It is in this space, where there were both overlaps and gaps between narrative and academic language, that a hybrid discourse was perceptible in this data. While the instructional frame was often superimposed upon the personal narrative genre without incident, occasional bumps served as moments of tension, which highlighted both the learning taking place and the hybrid nature of this narrative-focused literacy event. With excerpt 3, below, we return to the loose-tooth narrative, which illustrates this point by showing a student and Mrs. Lake negotiating the proper response to a question.

Excerpt 3, Tara, February 3, Loose Tooth (continued)

30. James: How did it get loose?

31. Tara: At lunchtime, I was biting I bit into apple sometimes and it started- my tooth hurted a little bit, and I wondered that my tooth was loose and when I- when- when I was i- in (the) school my- I went to my mom and said mom my tooth feels loose and my mom (would) open a little bit and she said- and she was excited.

32. Mrs. Lake: Ok so he asked you how did your tooth get loose, so the answer is I b-

33. Tara: I bi- bit into an apple.

34. Mrs. Lake: Ok, that was a hard apple sometimes if y- if your tooth is getting ready to come out it'll make it start to wiggle.

In this excerpt, Tara provided a full narrative response to James' question in line 31. Mrs. Lake clarified the original question and prompted for a more concise response with a sentence stem.

In line 33, Tara complied and provided a brief summary explanation. This exchange highlighted the instructional nature of this event; rather than being allowed to tell a full story in the format of

her choosing about this exciting personal event, Tara had to package her experience into a concise, unevaluated statement. Her initial full narrative response indicated that she had not yet learned to do this consistently, but she did so successfully with teacher scaffolding in the form of a constrained prompt.

The hybrid nature of this event was also evident in Mrs. Lake's turn-closing response to Tara in line 34. As noted in foundational work on classroom discourse (e.g., Mehan 1979), the teacher followed up an expected student response with an evaluation that closed the extended sequence before nominating another student for a turn. What is notable here is that the evaluation was oriented not to the demands of the academic register but to the student's narrative story world. In other words, the teacher did not evaluate the structure or elaboration of Tara's concise response, but provided a coda to her story by commenting in line 34 about a possible cause of lost teeth.

Here—and often at the end of student narrators' turns—the teacher oriented to the social and emotional importance of the stories students told and returned the interaction to a more social frame before opening the floor for another student. This again highlighted the linguistically hybrid nature of sharing time events. They are events that are neither fully what narrative rounds would be outside of a teacher-controlled, whole-class participation structure, nor are they entirely instructional in nature. Rather, they draw on both norms for out-of-school narrative discourse and expectations of the academic register in this classroom. By giving students a chance to talk about what was familiar to them in a manner that may not have yet been familiar, this narrative-focused literacy event created a third space. This third space was more accessible to students, given their current proficiency in the academic register, yet it also

provided opportunities for them to display their emerging competence and for the teacher to scaffold more competent performance as needed.

Discussion and Conclusions

This study took as its starting point the hypothesis (e.g., Michaels 1981; Peterson & McCabe, 1994; Griffin et al., 2004) that engaging in personal narrative serves as preparation for academic language, and it addressed the questions of whether and how the narrative-focused literacy event of sharing time indeed served this purpose in one classroom. This study found that sharing time does provide opportunities for socialization to the academic register through (1) requiring that students successfully navigate the academic language demands of the interaction, (2) providing differentiated teacher scaffolding that supports students in meeting these demands, and (3) building a linguistic third space. This third space allows students to work on language demands with familiar topics and allows the teacher to appropriate features of both personal narration and the instructional register. This kind of event keeps students engaged through use of familiar topics while at the same time helping them acquire the academic language needed to participate successfully.

Admittedly, this study is limited in its scope of observation to the members of only one classroom community. It is possible that the result would differ with the observations of additional teachers, students, ages, and varieties of narrative-focused literacy events. However, the behaviors observed in this study do echo those previously reported in the literature. Sources coming from diverse theoretical perspectives (e.g. Ankrum et al. 2014; Lyster and Ranta 1997; Mehan 1979) describe similar verbal behaviors in teachers in response to students' trouble spots in classroom discourse, though none specifically interprets them from the perspective of language socialization. The academic language demands observed in this particular kindergarten

classroom are also reminiscent of those described in the literature for more mature academic language, including lexical specificity, adequate detail, authoritative voice, and optimal grammar for packaging information densely (e.g. Bailey and Butler 2003; Cummins 2000; Scarcella 2003; Schleppegrell 2004). The commonalities with prior work noted for this study both in teacher verbal scaffolding strategies and language demands strengthen the findings reported from this single classroom case.

The findings of this study contribute to an understanding of both the nature of academic language at the kindergarten level and of the processes by which students are socialized into proficient uses of the academic register. While we have a fairly clear understanding of the mature academic language register, this study points out that the roots of that register are present in the emergent academic language used in early childhood classrooms. Through careful verbal scaffolding and the creation of hybrid third spaces, teachers not only help bridge what some young students experience as a gap between out-of-school and in-school ways of talking, but also help each student successfully appropriate the registers needed for success in the classroom.

References

- Ankrum, Julie W., Maria T. Genest, and Elizabeth. G. Belcastro. 2014. "The Power of Verbal Scaffolding: "Showing" Beginning Readers How to Use Reading Strategies." *Early Childhood Education Journal* 42, no. 1(January): 39 – 47. Accessed September 8, 2014. DOI 10.1007/s10643-013-0586-5
- Bailey, Alison, and Frances A. Butler. 2003. *An Evidentiary Framework for Operationalizing Academic Language for Broad Application to K-12 Education: A Design Document*. CSE Report. Los Angeles, CA: Cresst.
- Baynham, Michael. 2003. "Narratives in Space and Time: Beyond "Backdrop" Accounts of Narrative Orientation." *Narrative Inquiry* 13, no. 2 (July): 347-366.
- Cazden, Courtney B. 1985. "Research Currents: What is Sharing Time For?" *Language Arts* 62, no.2 (February): 182 - 188.
- Cummins, James. 2000. *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Flowerdew, Lynne. 2003. "A Combined Corpus and Systemic-Functional Analysis of the Problem-Solution Pattern in a Student and Professional Corpus of Technical Writing." *Tesol Quarterly* 37, no. 3 (Autumn): 489 – 511.
- Gee, James P. 2002. "Literacies, Identities, and Discourses." In *Developing Advanced Literacy in First and Second Languages: Meaning with Power*, edited by Mary J. Schleppegrell and Cecilia M. Colombi, 159-76. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gee, James P. 1996. *Social Linguistics and Literacies*. Bristol, UK: Taylor and Francis.
- Griffin, Terri M., Lowry Hemphill, Linda Camp, and Dennis P. Wolf. 2004. "Oral Discourse in the Preschool Years and Later Literacy Skills." *First Language* 24, NO. 2 (June): 123-47.

- Gutiérrez, Kris D., Patricia Baquedano-Lopez, and Carlos Tejeda. 1999. "Rethinking Diversity: Hybridity and Hybrid Language Practices in the Third Space." *Mind, Culture & Activity* 6, no. 4 (September): 286-03. Accessed September 8, 2014. DOI: 10.1080/10749039909524733
- Gutiérrez, Kris D. 2008. "Developing a Sociocritical Literacy in the Third Space." *Reading Research Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (April- June): 148 –64. Accessed September 8, 2014dx.doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.43.2.3.
- Gutiérrez, Kris D., Andrea C. Bien, Makenzie K. Selland, and Daisy M Pierce. 2011. "Polylingual and Polycultural Learning Ecologies: Mediating Emergent Academic Literacies for Dual Language Learners." *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* 11, no. 2 (June): 232-61. Accessed September 8, 2014. DOI: 10.1177/1468798411399273
- Hadi-Tabassum, Samina. 2006. *Language, Space and Power: A Critical Look at Bilingual Education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Heath, Shirley B. 1983. *Ways With Words: Language, life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Invernizzi, Marcia, Mary P. Abouzeid. 1995. "One Story Map Does Not Fit All: A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Children's Written Story Retellings." *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 5, no. 1: 1-19.
- Jones, Stanley E., and Curtis D. LeBaron. 2002. "Research on the Relationship Between Verbal and Nonverbal Communication: Emerging Integrations." *Journal of Communication* 52, no. 3 (September): 499 - 21. Accessed October 6, 2014. http://www.academia.edu/3741972/1-jones_and_lebaron.

- Küntay, Aylin, and Ibrahim Senay. 2003. "Narratives Beget Narratives: Rounds of Stories in Turkish Preschool Conversations." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35, no. 4: 559-87.
- Labov, William, and Joshua Waletzky. 1967/1997. "Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience." *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7, no. 1-4: 3-38.
- Lyster, Roy, and Leila Ranta, 1997. "Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19, no. 1(March): 37-66.
- Mehan, Hugh. 1979. "What Time is it, Denise?: Asking Known Information Questions in Classroom Discourse." *Theory into Practice* 18, 4 (October): 285-94.
- Melzi, Gigliana. 2000. "Cultural Variations in the Construction of Personal Narratives: Central American and European American Mothers' Elicitation Styles." *Discourse Processes* 30, no. 2: 153-77.
- Melzi, Gigliana, and Camila Fernández. 2004. "Talking About Past Emotions: Conversations Between Peruvian Mothers and their Preschool Children." *Sex Roles* 50, no. 9/10 (May): 641-56.
- Michaels, Sarah. 1981. "Sharing Time": Children's Narrative Styles and Differential Access to Literacy." *Language in Society* 10, no. 3 (December): 423-42.
- Michaels, Sarah. 1991. "The Dismantling of Narrative." In *Developing Narrative Structure*, edited by Allyssa McCabe, and Carole Peterson, 303-51. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Minami, Masahiko, and Alyssa McCabe. 1995. "Rice Balls and Bear Hunts: Japanese and North American Family Narrative Patterns." *Journal of Child Language* 22, no. 2: 423-45.
- Moje, Elizabeth B., Kathryn McIntosh Ciechanowski, Katherine Kramer, Lindsay Ellis, Rosario

- Carrillo, and Tehani Collazo. 2004. "Working Toward Third Space in Content Area Literacy: An Examination of Everyday Funds of Knowledge and Discourse." *Reading Research Quarterly* 39, no. 1: 38-70.
- Ochs, Elinor, Carolyn Taylor, Dina Rudolph, and Ruth Smith. 1992. "Storytelling as a Theory-Building Activity." *Discourse Processes* 15, no. 1 (March): 37-72.
- Ochs, Elinor and Lisa Capps. 2001. *Living Narrative: Creating Lives in Everyday Storytelling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Peterson, Carole, and Alyssa McCabe. 1983. *Developmental Psycholinguistics: Three Ways of Looking at a Child's Narrative*. New York: Plenum Press
- Peterson, Carole, and Alyssa McCabe. 1994. "A Social Interactionist Account of Developing Decontextualized Narrative Skill." *Developmental Psychology* 30, no. 6 (November): 937-48.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1978. "A Simplest Systematic for the Organization of Turn Taking for Conversation." In *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, edited by Jim Schenkein, 7-56. New York: Academic Press.
- Scarcella, Robin. 2003. *Accelerating Academic English: A Focus on English Language Learners*. Oakland, CA: Regents of the University of California.
- Schieffelin, Bambi, and Elinor Ochs. 1986. "Language Socialization." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15, (January): 163-91.
- Schleppegrell, Mary J. 2004. *The Language of Schooling: A Functional Linguistics Perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Scollon, Ron, and Suzanne Scollon. 1981. *Narrative, Literacy and Face in Interethnic Communication*. Norwoody, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.

Vygotsky, Lev S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*.

Norwood, NJ: Harvard University Press.

Appendix: Transcription Conventions (Adapted from Jones and LeBaron 2002; Duranti 1997)

- , Comma- Indicates a continuing intonation with combination of slight upward/ downward intonation
- . Period - Indicates a falling pitch or intonation.
- ! Exclamation mark- Marks the conclusion of a TCU delivered with emphatic and animated tone.
- ? Question mark- Rising vocal pitch or intonation.
- Hyphen - An abrupt (glottal) halt or self-correction.
- (()) Double parentheses- Transcript annotations ((*coughs*)). Extralinguistic information
- ° ° Degree signs- words within degree signs marks speech produced softly or at a lower volume.
- ... Untimed pause
- : Elongated vowel or consonant precedes this symbol
- () Empty parentheses represent untranscribed talk, while text enclosed in parentheses represents transcribed talk for which doubt exists
- = Equal sign-Indicates the end and beginning of two sequential 'latched' utterances that continue without an intervening gap.

Table 1 <i>Demographic Characteristics of Student Participants</i>	
Age at start of study (M, range)	5;6 (5;2-5;11)
Gender	5 boys; 11 girls
Countries of origin	United States
Language(s) spoken in home	Amharic, Arabic, Creole, English, Japanese, Spanish
Parents' countries of origin	Peru, United States, Venezuela, Virgin Islands
Parents' years of education (M, range)	16 (12-23)
Parents' occupations	attorney, loan officer, electrician mechanic, restaurant manager, social worker, homemaker, surgical technologist, truck driver, professor

Table 2 <i>Summary of Data</i>	
Data	Description
Field notes	33 pages of typed notes from 13 observations between October and May
Audio recordings	45 minutes, 31 seconds of recordings of 6 morning news sessions between December and May
Transcripts	Full transcripts of 6 morning news sessions with 9 narrators, 19 narratives, and 54 peer questions

Date	Student narrators	Topics	Peer questions count
December 16	Jasmine	Park	3
	James	Restaurant visit	3
	Shauna	Restaurant visit	3
	Adele	Carnival	3
January 7	Rosey	Restaurant visit	3
February 3	Tara	Loose tooth	4
	Shauna	Park	3
	Adele	Amusement park	3
	Cassie	Trip to sister's house	3
February 17	Michelle	Haircut	3
	Adele	Mall shopping trip	2
	Rosey	Family visit	1
April 21	Rosey	Golf course	3
	Tara	National park visit	3
	James	Spiderman toy	2
May 19	Mary	Nails painted	3
	Jasmine	Mall	3
	Michelle	Carnival	3
	James	Video game system	3

<p>Table 4 <i>Language Demands of Sharing Time</i></p>
<p>Language Demands on Student Narrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicate desire to speak through interaction with print materials • Recognize teacher intent in granting the floor and ending turn at talk • Share new information • Structure description of past or current experience as a brief abstract-like statement • Choose specific and accurate lexical items • Provide sufficient detail • Provide concise responses to questions • Interpret peer and teacher request for more detail conveyed in <i>wh</i>- question format • Use past or present tense morphology, according to choice of topic • Speak in complete sentences • Use appropriate volume • Use natural speaking prosody
<p>Language Demands on Peer Interlocutors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bid for the floor using established classroom behavior of hand-raising • Recognize teacher intent in granting the floor and ending turn at talk • Listen carefully to ask relevant and new questions about key aspects of the event or item being discussed • Formulate <i>wh</i>- format questions

Scaffolding Type	Definition	Examples
Open prompt	An invitation to participate that provides general direction about the expected contribution but largely leaves construction of response to student; includes metalinguistic explanations, elaboration requests, clarification requests	<p>Rosey: They came today. Teacher: Tod- this morning before you even got to school?</p> <p>Mrs. Lake: Hmm I'm a little confused. So the golf course was in a store?</p> <p>Mrs. Lake: Do you want to tell us anything more about that?</p> <p>Mrs. Lake: W- on the weekend tells us <u>when</u> you got it. She said <u>where</u> did you get it? ... W- W- where means what place.</p>
Directed prompt	Provides specific direction about what to say or how to say it without providing the actual words; includes yes/no and either/or questions; includes prompts and requests for specific revision	<p>Mrs. Lake: Adele said who went with you? So you need to answer in a whole sentence.</p> <p>Mrs. Lake: Can you tell them nice and loud in your big voice?</p> <p>Mrs. Lake: Ok, now can you just say-say that in your talking voice? Instead of your robot voice?</p> <p>Mrs. Lake: You want to know what games he has for his Play Station. How could you ask?</p>
Constrained prompt	Provides language students are to repeat in part or whole; includes modelled sentences, recasts, sentence stems	<p>Mrs. Lake: I had my hair cut yesterday. Michelle: I had my- I had my hair cut yesterday.</p> <p>Mrs. Lake: Ask, do you have any questions? Shauna: Do you have any questions? Michelle: I went to the morning. Mrs. Lake: I went <u>in</u> the morning.</p> <p>Mrs. Lake: So what- what could you ask her. When- Ruth: When did they come to your house?</p>