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ABSTRACT

The study assessed the attitudes of preservice teachers in the state of Florida by using the African American Teacher Attitude Scale (AAETAS), a four point 46-item Likert Scale designed by Hoover et al (1997). This study also sought to determine which nine demographic variables were associated with the preservice teachers attitudes. The demographic variables were comprised of 1.) race, 2.) university attended, 3.) hometown size, 4.) gender, 5.) age, 6.) socio economic status, 7.) primary language spoken at home/in community, 8.) exposure to AAVE through high school course work, and 9.) exposure to AAVE through university course work.

The Likert Scale (questionnaire) was comprised of statements that were made by educators during the 1970s. The questionnaire was graded and the researcher used the standard deviation and mean to set the ranges of under 110 (low), 110-153 (middle), and 154 or above (high). Furthermore, the researcher compared the ranges of the current study with the ranges (under 120/deficit, 120-159/difference and 160 or above) set by Hoover et al (1997). The researcher conducted a multiple regression analysis on the scores (dependent variable) and the demographic variables (independent variables).

The subjects for this study were preservice teachers as well as education majors at two large universities in North Florida. The sample was a sample of convenience. A total of 153 preservice teachers completed the surveys. The results of the study indicate that
language spoken at home and hometown population are closely associated with preservice teachers’ attitudes. In addition, the results revealed that suburban bidialectical preservice teachers (i.e. those who speak both Standard English (SE) and AAVE as their primary languages at home) viewed AAVE more positively than preservice teachers from rural and urban areas who either speak SE, AAVE or both.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Teachers’ attitudes toward African American Vernacular English (AAVE) may be attributed to the knowledge that they have about this dialect of English and the contrasting cultures between both teachers and students of color (Delpit, 1999; Baugh, 2000). These attitudes may also contribute to a student’s success or failure. Research on attitudes toward language is not new, but the greatest amount of research on attitudes toward language was conducted in the seventies and eighties; few studies were conducted in the nineties. The studies that were conducted in the 1990s consisted of matched-guised techniques in which the subjects rated taped recorded voices of both an AAVE speaking voice and a standard English (SE) speaking voice (Doss & Gross, 1992; Koch and Gross 1997), surveys such as the likert-type scale (Bowie & Bond, 1994) and interview with open-ended questions (Tapia, 1999). Attitudes toward language seem to vary. Varying attitudes toward language consist of teachers viewing a student’s dialect along a “deficit” to “difference” continuum (Bronstein, Dubner, Lee & Raphael, 1970). The purpose of this research was to determine Florida preservice teachers’ attitudes about what has been called “African American Vernacular English (AAVE).”

This study was important because it has been established that teachers’ negative responses to a child’s dialect negatively influence the child’s academic performance
(Taylor, 1973; Bowie and Bond, 1994). Furthermore, this study determined whether teachers’ attitudes reflected an ‘excellence,’ a ‘deficit’ or a ‘difference’ model, and if demographic variables such as size of hometown (rural, urban, and suburban), race, gender, age, racial makeup of university and exposure to AAVE were associated with teachers’ attitudes. The study used the survey methodology to ascertain teachers’ attitudes.

Because previous research showed that the African American English Teacher Attitude Scale (AAETAS) is a useful attitudinal measurement (Hoover, McNair, Lewis & Politzer, 1997) and various demographic variables were associated with these attitudes (Taylor, 1979), the following research questions were formulated in order to research the above-mentioned purposes:

1. What attitudes do selected Florida preservice teachers exhibit toward AAVE as measured by the African American English Teacher Attitude Scale?

2. What demographic variables (race, university attended, hometown size, gender, age, socio-economic status) and exposure-to-dialect variables (home/community, high school course work, university course work) are associated with these attitudes?

The variables selected for this study were important because an extensive literature review revealed that attitudes varied both racially and on the levels at which the teachers taught, and that elementary and second school teachers hold attitudes that could operate to the detriment of the educational development of the child (Bowie and Bond, 1994; Bronstein, Dubner, Lee, & Raphael, 1970). The literature review reflected that teachers
who taught in urban or suburban schools produced contrasting attitudes towards
cChildren’s language (Woodworth and Salzer, 1971). However, studies have not been
conducted to determine teachers’ primary language socialization environment. Besides
primary language socialization, academic exposure to AAVE was used as an important
variable, because earlier studies have yielded contrasting results (Heath, 1983; Garner
and Rubin, 1986).

Because 14.6 percent of Florida’s students are African American compared with
12.3 for the United States as a whole (US Census, 2000), an investigation of Florida
perservice teachers’ attitudes of AAVE yielded important information for teacher
preparation as it relate to approaches to dialects and teachers’ attitudes toward them.
Although attitudes of teachers in the west, midwest and northeast have been studied,
there has been little research conducted on AAVE in the south and research on teachers’
attitudes is “in a time warp” (W. Wolfram, personal communication, October 18, 1998).
In addition, previous research did not ascertain whether preservice teachers attitudes
reflected an “excellence,” “deficit,” or “difference” position. Therefore this research has
filled the gap in research on AAVE in the South and has ascertained the degree of
acceptance of this dialect.

This research was designed to assist those promoting Standard English
Proficiency policies by providing them with information on the current attitudes of
teachers. Teachers’ attitudes are undeniably important because they contribute to the
academic shortcomings of students who speak dialects of English other than the standard.
For example, Baugh (2000) noted that teachers and speech pathologists misdiagnose
AAVE speaking children because neither is adequately trained in linguistics.
The researcher used the categories of race designated on university admissions applications (American Indian or native Alaskan, Asian, Black or African American, Native Islander or other Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino/Latina and White), school (two separate universities), the respondents’ primary geographical hometown area. The researcher classified the respondents’ hometown area according to three levels such as “rural,” “urban,” and “suburban.” Also included were gender, age and socioeconomic status (SES). In addition, three independent variables ascertained exposure to AAVE. One was exposure to AAVE from a high school course, the other was exposure to AAVE from a university course and the third one was exposure to AAVE in the home or community environment. All the above-mentioned variables were used in the multiple regression analysis conducted in this study.

The Conceptual Theoretical Framework

Sherif, Sherif and Nebergall (1965), introduced a theoretical framework for the social sciences that described the essential characteristics of the judgment process. This process always involves a discrimination or choice between two or more alternatives. The Social Judgment-Involvement Framework evolved from the research of Sherif and Hovland (1961) on Social Judgment. This construct entailed attitudes and attitude change. The Social Judgment Approach does not view evaluation, categorization, and subsequent behavior as events that are independent of one another. According to the Social Judgment Approach, the choice of alternatives among socially relevant items involves comparison with standards that have affective and motivational value to the person. Furthermore, the person who judges is highly ego-involved, thus using his or her own position as a standard of comparison. When the individual categorizes a social issue,
he or she takes a stand (position) in which she or he has a definite commitment. In the current research, the effects of a stand (attitude) on the language/culture were classified as a score of either “excellence,” “difference,” or “deficit” on the African American English Teacher Attitude Scale (AAETAS). Although all the language attitude studies in this research fall within the Social Judgment Approach, Hoover, McNair-Knox, Lewis and Politzer’s (1997) study on attitudes toward African American English classified attitudes on an attitude scale as high (above 160) or low (below 120).

**Excellence, Difference and Deficit Models**

Under the Social Judgment-Involvement Framework, the researcher ascertained the attitudes and positions of preservice teachers. For the purposes of this study, the researcher utilized Hoover et al (1996) AAETAS to assess preservice teachers’ scores. Hoover et al (1996) discussed both deficit and difference models, while introducing a third model known as “excellence,” or “vindicationists.” Hoover et al (1997) discussed deficit, difference and excellence attitudes, and defined an educator who adhered to an excellence view as one who views African American language and culture as multifaceted, and they believed that African American children can learn anything because their culture has the resources to enhance such learning without the use of Standard English (SE). A difference view sees AAVE as different from that of SE, while sharing similarities with the latter. A deficit view, on the other hand, views AAVE and its speakers as deficient.

Research conducted by Bernstein (1966) on African American and white children lead him to conclude that AAVE speaking children’s language was a ‘restricted code.’ During interviews the children were asked to produce responses to questions. The AAVE
speaking children produced one or two word responses, possibly due to the fact that they
were faced with a strange adult. As a result, Bernstein believed that “much lower class
language consisted of a kind of incidental ‘emotional’ accompaniment to action here and
now (Labov 1972, 204).” Alternatively, Bernstein believed that white children spoke an
‘elaborated code’ because they interacted better with the researchers, and the children
produced complete “grammatically correct” sentences. Labov (1972) reports that
Bernstein’s views favored middle class speech more than all forms of working-class
speech. In 1968, the notion of cultural deprivation was put forward by Deutsch, Katz and
Jensen (1968). The researchers reported that black children lacked favorable linguistic
factors in their home environment, thus contributing to their lack of success in school.
The researchers claimed that black children lacked certain cognitive skills not having had
verbal interaction with adults. This information about lack of parental interaction comes
from the researchers asking questions of the black child. For example, they asked
children if they had ever gone to the museum or other cultural activities with their
parents. Their main claim was that black children lacked interaction at home with their
mothers (Labov, 1972). This information was therefore used to interpret a large body of
tests that were carried out in laboratories and schools. The deficit theory therefore
emanated from these seminal studies, and such programs as Head Start were designed to
overcome these deficits. Such studies and deficit constructs completely failed to
recognize the contribution of African American cultural practices that contribute to many
strong and rich verbal practices (Heath, 1983). Unfortunately, not all these practices are
valued by mainstream and white, Eurocentric culture.
Other researchers found support for a deficit theory. Bereiter, Engelman, Osborn, & Redford (1966) continued Bernstein’s research agenda by trying to ascertain if black children had a language with which they could learn. They found that children made monosyllabic replies and they did not communicate in complete Standard English sentences. Thus Bereiter et al concluded that the children’s language was deficient and that they were culturally deprived because of their language. Bernstein (1966), Bereiter, Engelman, Osborn, & Redford (1966) as well as Deutsch, Katz and Jensen’s (1968) research showed that attitudes toward language could lead one to believe that behavior and language that differs from others could be viewed as deficient. Overall, the researchers concluded that African American students did not perform well on standardized tests because of their race.

Farrell’s (1983) deficit theory differed from that of Jensen (1969). The former argued that the acquisition of literacy was a more reliable measure of intelligence, as opposed to race. Farrell concentrated on the omission of present tense forms of copula be in AAVE, referring to IQ test scores to support his claim. Farrell claimed that the deficit occurred when speakers of AAVE omitted copula be form /is/ or /are/. Orr (1987) had even claimed that AAVE does not have comparatives, and this affects AAVE speaking children’s ability to solve some mathematics problems. The truth is that AAVE speaking children have ways of comparing that differ from those speaking Standard English. For example many speakers of AAVE use the comparative sentence “He’s badder than her” and the superlative sentence “He’s the baddest dude on the block.” In addition, Labov (1973) gave an example of a comparative in AAVE, “He’d track a duck same as a hound would take a rabbit track” (p. 386). These examples demonstrate that AAVE provides the
linguistic means to mark the same complex grammatical relations as Standard English; but does it differently.

Baratz (1970) reported that the systematic research on AAVE has produced two general conceptual positions concerning groups that differ linguistically and culturally from white middle-class society. She and Labov (1972) claimed that a large number of psychologists and educators believe that AAVE is defective, underdeveloped or restricted. They attributed this deficiency in language to environmental factors, one of which was the mother’s lack of interaction with her children. In contrast to the “deficit” model, Baratz presented the “difference” model. Most linguists adhere to this model, and they view AAVE as a dialect that is highly structured and highly developed. Baratz (1979) asked whether the two models could coexist, and posed the following question, “Could a language be a fully developed, complex system and still be deficient (p. 21)?”

Wolfram, Adger & Christian (1999) also highlighted both the “deficit” and “difference” models. The attitudes that form the deficient position were based on intelligence test scores and other standardized measures, without considering the issue of test bias. Students who encounter educators holding the deficit position are often recommended for remedial and other services such as special education courses. The educators often believe that the students’ language deficit could impede their cognitive and social development. In contrast, those who adhere to the difference position acknowledge that there are legitimate differences among language systems and that no linguistic system is inherently better than another. These linguists and educators question the evidence from test scores and school performance used to support retention and advancement. They believe that favoritism of one dialect causes problems, and that an
understanding of the social attitudes and values concerning dialects and their speakers is needed in order to deal with the differences.

Hoover, McNair-Knox, Lewis and Politizer (1996) discussed an “excellence” or “vindicationist” perspective of attitudes toward AAVE and culture. Hoover et al (1996) reported that the excellence perspective sees African American language/culture as “multifaceted, ranging from artistic to academic (p. 385).” The excellence view assumes that African American children are capable of learning anything, for their culture has adequate resources to facilitate such learning (Hoover et al, 1996). The excellence model can be thought of as the difference model in its extreme, almost to the point of holding AAVE in higher regard than SE.

**Statement of the Problem**

A thorough understanding of attitudes toward AAVE and other nonstandard dialects is especially important for educators for at least two reasons. First, Rickford (1999) points out that teachers often have unjustifiably negative attitudes towards students who speak AAVE. Other notable linguists tend to support Rickford’s claim. For example Labov (1972), DiGiulio (1973), and Bowie and Bond (1994), have all noted that these negative attitudes may lead the educators to have low expectations of the students. Low expectations from an educator may lead to a “Pygmalion effect.” As a result teachers may assign students to classes for the learning disabled or special education student that can in turn stunt the students’ academic performance (Rosenthal and Jacobson 1968, Smitherman 1981, Tauber 1997). In fact, Hacker (1992) reported that, “while black pupils represent 16 percent of all public school students in the United States, they make up almost 40 percent of those who are classed as mentally retarded, disabled,
or otherwise deficient. As a result, many more black youngsters are consigned to ‘special education’ classes… (p. 164)” Benavides (1988) reported that a disproportionate number of racial and language minority students are placed in certain special education classes because of their socioeconomic, linguistic, and/or cultural heritage, rather than because of true diagnosed learning problems.

Second, teachers trying to decide whether and how to take AAVE into account in their classroom pedagogy might benefit from understanding the attitudes of students, parents, employers, and other teachers towards this group (McGroarty, 1996). Adler (1992) also stressed that dialectical and attitudinal differences often resulted in low academic achievement in the classroom and low scores on intelligence tests. As a result of negative attitudes, children are negatively labeled because of linguistic conflicts and cultural differences between them and the teacher. These linguistic prejudices can be detrimental to a child's educational development (Baugh, 2000). Overall, language prejudices seem more resistant to change than other kinds of prejudices (Wolfram et al, 1999).

Some educators have drawn direct linguistic comparisons between black students and immigrant students for whom English is not native, claiming that both should have equal educational rights under the law (Baugh, 2000). Although this is true to an extent, Ogbu (1978, 1992) notes that the linguistic history of American slave descendants is unique and not truly comparable to any other voluntary group of immigrants. Two examples highlighted by Baugh (2000) are that AAVE is the only English dialect born of slavery and the educational restraints imposed by slavery. Brown v. Board of Education is less than 50 years old and segregation, no matter how malicious, allowed AAVE to
retain many of its unique features. Sato (1989) listed at least six dialects of nonstandard English, and AAVE is more different from the other dialects of English than they are from each other. AAVE is undoubtedly the most controversial of the 40 dialects of English spoken in the United States. In fact speakers of AAVE have many more "nonstandard" forms than any other group by a factor of ten or more (Labov, 1972). Wofford (1979) claimed that AAVE is a linguistic system utilized consistently by eighty percent of African Americans in the United States. Since many African Americans in the US utilize AAVE (Taylor 1997), it is a reasonable assumption that many children will use it in the classroom.

Baugh (2000) noted that "as long as some teachers continue to believe that nonstandard English or Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is a sign of diminished cognitive potential, the future welfare of this nation is threatened not by the more visible forms of racial intolerance that occupy the attention of presidential commissions, but by less visible forms of linguistic intolerance for others who speak in ways that some find unappealing, or worse (p. 80)". Furthermore, children are not given the chance to compare and contrast Standard English with their own dialect or language, and their vernacular may be rejected as an inferior method of communication (Adler, 1999) with no opportunity to recognize its unique characteristics (i.e. durative ‘be’). A vast number of educators hardly realize that in many African American communities, the way one speaks plays just as much a role as substance (Hacker, 1992). Therefore, teachers need to understand their students' linguistic diversity and uniqueness because their response to the students' language could have negative affects. If teachers understood that
nonstandard dialects are rule-governed forms of communication in their own right, then they might change the way they address language variation in the class.

A very wide gap exists between linguists and English teachers in terms of their perspective as to whether or not AAVE is a dialect of English. Linguists generally concern themselves with cognitive sufficiency, whereas English teachers are concerned with behavioral sufficiency. In other words, linguists encounter language within the context of its use for they point out that the person most knowledgeable about language (i.e. the linguist) is often denied any voice in what goes on in the English classroom (Dumas and Garber, 1978).

Because Florida has a large AAVE speaking student population, this investigation of Florida Perservice Teachers’ Attitudes of AAVE has yielded important information for training in approaches to dialects and teachers’ attitudes toward them. Most teachers, parents and linguists agree that children should be taught to read and write fluently as an indicator that the curriculum is successful, regardless of their attitudes (Rickford, 1999). However, non-sequitur teachers’ attitudes may be influenced by their lack of linguistic knowledge. Teachers as well as others are often under-informed about what dialects are, how they relate to each other, and what functions they fulfill. Adger (1997) reported that people have voiced views in society about language that cannot be scientifically justified, such as the myth that there is one correct way of speaking English. Adger (1997) further stated, "when the myth goes unchallenged, it is difficult for schools to treat students' competence in a vernacular dialect as relevant to developing additional uses and varieties of language… as far as AAVE and other dialects of English are concerned, the beliefs outweigh the empirical evidence. (p.1)." As with teachers, speech pathologists often
misdiagnose AAVE speaking children because they are not adequately trained to diagnose children with strong regional accents. Baugh (2000) noted that speech clinicians are often generalists; they know little or nothing of fundamental linguistics or relevant historical linguistic changes that have produced many dialects. Rickford (1999) claimed that educational psychologists berate the use of AAVE structures by young children and see them as reflecting or creating cognitive deficits.

**Purpose and Significance of the Study**

This study surveyed a selected group of Florida preservice teachers' attitudes toward AAVE, and analyzed the teachers' responses. The research assisted in determining Florida preservice teachers' beliefs about AAVE and its use by obtaining direct information from them. In addition, this research filled a gap in the research on AAVE. In fact, W. Wolfram (personal communication, October 18, 1999) and A.F. Vaughn-Cook (personal communication, May 25, 2001) have noted that there has been little if no research on AAVE in the South, which seems ironic because the majority of African Americans in the United States live in the South (US Census, 2002). Consequently, Florida has a significant number of AAVE speaking children in its schools (NCES, 2002). However, a vast majority of the seminal studies concerning AAVE have been conducted in the North, and very few if any have been conducted in the state of Florida. Taylor (1973) surveyed black and white teachers across the United States regarding their views on several aspects of Black English. The researcher surveyed teachers in the South, but it was not clear which Southern states participated in the survey. Edwards (1982) wrote an interesting book on language attitudes and their implications among speakers of
English. However, Taylor’s (1973) study was the only research mentioned that might have included teachers in the South. A unique characteristic of doing research with AAVE in the south is that the US Census reported that more than 60 percent of all African Americans live in the south, and Florida is among the ten largest places in total population and in Black or African American population (US Census, 2002). Therefore, primary language socialization as a variable in this study provided interesting attitudinal results.

This research provides the Florida Department of Education (DOE) with vital information on how its future educators perceived the language of students who speak a dialect other than the standard form. The Florida DOE can use this research to assess dialect awareness needs for both educators and students. As a matter of fact, in 1975 the Florida State Department of Education utilized “A Protocol Materials Catalog” to supplement abstract presentation of concept and principles relating to the language of AAVE speaking children. These materials were used to help prepare preservice and in-service teachers in understanding the language of the children (The State of Florida, 1975). This research demonstrates that such materials should be reintroduced into the curriculum for teacher preparation if they are updated and deemed appropriate by both linguists and educators.

Furthermore, if teachers’ attitudes have not changed within the past three decades, then there is cause to believe that improved methodologies must be established in teacher education programs at colleges and universities throughout the state. An assessment of teachers’ attitudes will reveal where these attitudes lie (i.e. towards an excellence stance, a deficit stance or a difference stance).
Means of Investigating

Agheyisi, and Fishman (1970) listed three major categories in which language attitude studies and reports could be classified. One category was those dealing with language-oriented or language-directed attitudes; another was those dealing with community-wide stereotyped impressions toward particular languages or language varieties (and in some cases, their speakers, functions, etc.); a third was those concerned with the implementation of different types of language attitudes. The current study mainly focuses on the second category because this category is generally concerned with the social significance of language and language varieties. Agheyisi and Fishman (1970) noted that some aspects of the second category included attitudes towards speakers of a situationally peculiar or appropriate language variety. In addition, this category also included attitudes towards speakers of different languages in multilingual settings. The instrument to be used in this study also includes items that assess attitudes toward the members of African American culture as well as the language itself.

Although there are various types of studies and data gathering techniques, the researcher ascertained attitudes by survey questionnaire because it is useful for the purposes of the current research where a large number of subjects are sought. In addition, the survey method used in this study was restricted to the use of closed-ended items. Closed ended items are multiple-choice and “yes” or “no” type, whereas open-ended items are questions that allow the respondent to write in an answer. Use of this item eliminated the problem of the respondents’ failing to focus on the expected dimension, since all they had to do was choose from a set of provided categories. Another rationale for using a closed ended survey is that it was easily constructed to cover more than one
dimension. Finally, surveys are the major way in which language attitudes have been assessed in the studies to be reviewed.

**Limitations of Study**

This research was limited to a large number of nonrandomly-selected preservice teachers whose intent is to be teachers at any public or private school in the state of Florida. Therefore the researcher used a sample of convenience. Because the research was conducted on a “selected” sample at both a Tier 1 and a Tier 3 university, results of this research might be “transferable” to students majoring in education at Florida four-year public institutions that have similar student population characteristics.

“Transferability” is a constructionist equivalent of the conventional term external validity. External validity refers to the ability to generalize findings across different settings. (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Lincoln and Guba (1985) noted that generalizability was "an appealing concept," because it allowed an appearance of prediction and control over situations (pp. 110-111). In the naturalistic paradigm, the transferability of a working hypothesis to other situations depends on the degree of similarity between the original situation and the situation to which it is transferred. The researcher cannot specify the transferability of findings; he or she can only provide sufficient information that can then be used by the reader to determine whether the findings are applicable to the new situation (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). As a result, the reader, not the researcher of this study, decides the transferability of the findings.

Tier 1 schools are universities that are ranked among the top 50 universities in the nation, whereas Tier 3 schools are universities that are ranked among the top 120
universities in the nation. The rankings are determined by nationally representative longitudinal data on the post-secondary educational experiences of students and data from US News and World Report’s 1995 ranking of colleges and universities (NCES, 1998).

The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) reported the 2002 data for 10 four-year public universities in the State of Florida that have education programs. The total 1999 fall enrollment of FU was 32,878, whereas the 1999 fall enrollment of OU was 12,082 (NCES, 2002). Like Florida University (fictitious name), nine of the universities had populations with at least 70% white, between 7 to 10 percent African American, and over 50% female. Both Florida University (FU) and Orange University (fictitious name) have female populations that exceed 55 percent, but FU is 75.6% white and Orange University (OU) is 93.4% African American. The race populations of the two universities are indicative of their historical racial make-up. However, there are some universities in the state of Florida with large Hispanic enrollments, a factor not present in north Florida. As a result, transferability is limited to the similar situations that the reader deems applicable.

The distribution of the questionnaire was limited to a reasonable number of nonrandomly-selected preservice teachers who completed the survey during a required undergraduate education course. The researcher conducted the surveys at the beginning of the semester in order to avoid any exposure to the teaching of AAVE features in the classes that the students attended.
Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in conducting this research:

1. The selected sample for this research, preservice teachers who intend to teach at a public or private school in the state of Florida, is representative of the sample chosen.

2. The participants of this research have been exposed to some differences that exist between the speech of AAVE speakers and SE speakers; either through direct contact or some form of schooling or exposure to media. Therefore, they are aware that differences exist between the speech of AAVE speakers and SE speakers.

3. The questionnaire used in this research will be valid and reliable since it is an existing instrument that will be used in its entirety with a similar sample (i.e. educators).

4. The participants selected in this research will respond honestly to the instrument.

Delimitation

This research was conducted and organized with the limitations herein described. It was the intent of the writer to look only at preservice teachers who were education majors at either FU or OU. The preservice teachers were selected from the colleges’ departments or schools of education. The researcher solicited the assistance of instructors of education courses. The courses were chosen because they were required for education majors who intended to teach at an elementary, secondary or high school in the state of Florida.

The results of the research were descriptive of and applicable only to the school(s) and the teachers investigated in this research. However, because of the scarcity of Hispanics anticipated in this survey, no transferability should be applied to larger
populations of Hispanics in education programs in central and south Florida. Besides the
two schools surveyed in the study, it is the reader’s determination whether the findings
are transferable to other populations or applicable to other groups and populations in
other schools in the state of Florida.

**Definition of Terms**

**African American**: A synonym for Black, Negro and Afro-American. Used to refer to
natural born Americans citizens of African descent whose ancestors might have been
slaves in the United States of America.

**African American Vernacular English (AAVE)**: A synonym for the plethora of terms
used to refer to the dialect of English spoken by over 80% of the African Americans here
in America. Such terms may included “Negro non-standard English,” “Black Bobo,”
English,” “African American English,” “Black English Vernacular,” “Vernacular Black
English,” “nonstandard Negro English” “Negro Dialect” “Afram” “substandard English”
and “Black English”

**African American Standard English (AASE)**: A form of AAVE that is distinguished
by its “standard” grammar and varying degrees of Africanized intonation, pronunciation,
and style. Also a synonym for “Black standard English.” AASE may include varying
degrees of Black vowel patterns, ethnically marked suprasegmental features, and Black
lexical items. For a contrast of AAVE/AASE features, please refer to Taylor, O. (1971).
**Standard English (SE):** The mainstream English spoken in professional circles such as universities, businesses and by the educated. SE is often attributed to the majority of White Americans.

**Vernacular:** A term used to refer to the language and/or dialect of the home. That language which is closely associated with the speaker’s immediate environment

**Attitude(s):** the “stands the individual upholds and cherishes about objects, issues, persons, groups, or institutions (Sherif et al 1965: 4).”

**Dialect:** A form of a language, spoken by group(s) who may or may not speak the standard form. Examples of American English dialects are Appalachian English, AAVE, Hawaiian English, The English spoken by many in Boston, MA.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This literature review presents issues that may contribute to the problems of students of color. Within the Social Judgment Approach, problems extend beyond attitudes toward language and encompass culture as well as personal beliefs. Teachers who reveal a deficit stance view the child as handicapped socially and cognitively, and the child is often recommended for remedial language and other educational services (Wolfram et al, 1999). A closer examination of both teachers and students reveals that attitudes are on the surface of a deeper cultural process. This literature review will present research that shows that some African American and White teachers’ teaching practices and attitudes (i.e. positions) reify the myth that difference means deficiency.

The literature review is divided into two parts. The first part consists of culture, such as multicultural education and preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools. This first part also includes a discussion of the contrasts between white and African American children, white teachers’ assessment of “whiteness” and what it means, marked verses unmarked cultures. In other words, some research suggests that because teachers do not explore the foundations of their privileged lives, they inadvertently oppress students of color. In addition, the first part discusses Delpit’s (1995) notion of the “Culture of Power,” a definition of AAVE, and the evolution of AVVE. An explanation
of how AAVE is often mislabeled is crucial because AAVE (i.e. Ebonics) suffers from definitional detriment and as long as the nonstandard English of African American children is mislabeled and misunderstood, it will continue to be misdiagnosed (Baugh, 2000). It seems appropriate to trace the evolution of AAVE, since its origins are a dilemma among both educators and linguists. The second part of the literature review includes a chronological report of the studies conducted on AAVE in the past 29 years.

**Language Socialization/An African American Community**

Attitude formation begins at an early age. Under the Social Judgment Approach, Sherif et al (1965) explains that ‘The process whereby an individual upholds and cherishes about objects, issues, persons, groups, or institutions. The referents of a person’s attitudes may be a ‘way of life.’ … From early childhood on an integral part of an individual’s interaction with adults and with other children important in his eyes is labeling the objects, persons, events and groups he encounters.

Heath (1983) provides a profound account of how two different communities taught their children to use language as well as form attitudes. The researcher wanted to know the effects of the preschool, home and community environment on the learning of language structures and uses that were needed in classrooms and the job setting. Heath focused on face-to-face networks in which each child learns the ways of acting, believing, and valuing about him/herself. Heath noted that the African American residents of Trackton believed that no one could teach a child; he or she must learn from experience. However, young people were not viewed as suitable conversation partners for adults. As a result, adults rarely addressed speech specifically to younger children. Children in Trackton were not expected to be “information givers,” It is interesting to
note that Bereiter et al’s (1966) lack of knowledge that adults rarely address speech specifically to younger children may have lead the researchers to believe that the children in their research had no language. Because the children were reluctant to answer (due to their cultural indoctrination), the researchers concluded that the children’s language (i.e. culture) was deficient.

Heath noted that the African American children’s linguistic indoctrination entailed three stages. The first entails the “repetition stage” in which children repeat words and utterances they hear. The second entails the “repetition with variation stage,” in which the child adds to his or her utterances. The third stage is the “participation stage.” This is the stage when a child breaks into a conversation by asking questions, introducing a new topic or asking for information.

Probably the most crucial aspect of African American linguistic indoctrination that educators should note is the way in which questions are formed. Heath (1983: 104) lists five types of question asked of preschool children in Trackton. They are 1.) Analogy, 2.) Story-starter, 3.) Accusation, 4.) A-I (a question in which the answerer has the information, and 5.) Q-I (a question in which the questioner has the information). Heath discovered that in the African American community questions are especially useful for testing whether a child knows what a particular utterance means. Analogy questions (e.g. What’s that like?), which are the most prevalent, call for an open-ended answer that draws on the child’s experiences. What is even more important is that children do not expect adults to ask them questions, and they (the adults) do not ask questions that give the young an opportunity to display their knowledge.
A White Community

In the working class White community of Roadville, Heath observed that adults often used baby talk to communicate with the child by dropping the endings of words, substituting vowels and using special lexical items (e.g. *tum-tum* for stomach). During the first years of speech, the child was given verbal reinforcement. At times, words were generalized as family words and adults intervened to offer reinforcement for children who were engaged in conversation. One interesting contrast between the two communities was that the adult and child were often engaged in conversation in Roadville. The child often repeated parts of the mother-child dialogue in monologue when she or he was alone, and the mother repeated and extended the phrases when she overheard the child talking. This type of “other-regulated” speech did not seem to occur in the Trackton community. Mothers often encouraged children who are together to talk to one another. Heath observed that expansions, taking minimal phrases and interpreting and expanding it characterized much of the talk adults used to address to young children.

The adult in Roadville often built discourse around words spoken by the child. Children and adults interacted with books and the child’s interest was maintained by the adult’s constant verbal assistance. Heath further noted that Roadville adults believed young children had two major types of communicative abilities. “They must learn to communicate their own needs and desires, so that if mothers were attuned to children’s communications, they could determine what these were. Secondly, children must learn to be communicative partners in a certain mold (p. 127).”

At least two question types encountered by White children in Roadville differed from those of African American children in Trackton. They were 1.) *Question statement*
and 2.) *Question directive*. Question statements were questions that the adult asked the child, but the question was directed implicitly to others. An example of a question statement highlighted by Brice Heath was “You’re too hot, aren’t you?” These questions expressed the needs and desires of the child. The use of these questions expressed the belief that the child needed to learn how to express his or her needs. Question directives functioned as directives or commands (e.g. *What you do that for?* and *Oh, Bobby, won’t you ever be still?*). These questions also functioned as ways of scolding.

In contrast to Trackton children, Roadville children had little choice in what they recited to parents or the ways they showed off to guests. Heath noted that children in Roadville learned through incrementally acquired knowledge.

Heath concluded that the social and linguistic environments of the children from the two communities differed strikingly in a number of features. Some of these included:

- The boundaries of the physical and social communities in which communication to and by children was possible.
- The limits and features of the situations in which talk occurred.
- The what, how and why patterns of choice which children could exercise in their uses of language.
- The values these choices of language had for the children in their communities and beyond (pg. 144).

The stark contrasts between the two communities lead one to wonder if those pupils who represented one community might have difficulty in a class with a teacher from the other
community. Heath noted that an African American child faced difficulty in a class with a teacher who represented a culture other than hers or his.

Overall Heath showed that the socialization of any community played a part in classroom behavior, attitudes and teacher/student relationships. Hacker (1992) summed up the issue when he purported that “white teachers must come to realize that ‘black English’ possesses a grammar, a stem of deep cultural meaning, and a linguistic integrity on a par with that of standard English... black pupils should be given more opportunities for expressive talking, since black culture gives as much attention to style as to the substance of speech (p. 171).”

**Culturally Diverse Students versus White teachers**

Ladson-Billings (1994) pointed out that three issues dominated discussions about diversity in education. They were (1) increasing diversity, (2) the performance of racially, culturally and linguistically diverse students (3) the white female make-up of the teaching population. The 1997 National Education Statistics (NEA) showed that students of color represented 35.6% of all K-12 enrollment in the US. In addition, NEA 1997 statistics showed that 84.7 percent of the teachers in grades K-12 are white (NEA, 2002). Over sixty percent of these teachers are white women. The 1997 percentage of students of color was 43.8 for the state of Florida (NEA, 2002).

Thus, we now turn to research on how being white can predispose white pre-service teachers to think and act in certain predictable ways with respect to black students, AAVE and cultural differences.
Research on Whiteness

Sherif et al (1965) noted that under the SJA Framework “the individual is no longer neutral toward the referents of an attitude. He (She) is for or against, positively inclined or negatively disposed in some degree toward them – not just momentarily, but in a lasting way, as long as the attitude in question is operative (pg. 5).” Therefore the individual is more prone to notice the shortcomings of an object that she or he has negative attitudes toward. The object of the current research is language.

McIntyre (1997) conducted a participatory action research (PAR) for her doctoral dissertation. She wanted to research what it meant to be white and to compel white female teachers to reflect on their attitudes, beliefs and life experiences. The research questions for the research dissertation were 1) What do definitions of white and race mean? 2) What exactly does it mean to be white? 3) How do white people/teachers make meaning of whiteness? 4.) What impact does one’s white racial identity has on one’s notion of what it means to be a teacher? One goal of McIntyre research was to have the teachers explore the meaning of whiteness and assist then in developing insight about their own socialization as well as provide them with ways to teach more effectively.

The researcher’s role was as a participant observer with 13 white female undergraduate education majors in student teaching. The researcher interviewed the participants and held group sessions, while the participants kept field notes and a personal journal. The researcher and the participants met regularly throughout the semester. The eight sessions conducted by McIntyre also revealed that the teachers saw themselves as committed educators with good parents, good values, good education and a good sense of
what is expected of them as teachers. In contrast their attitudes toward students of color were somehow deficient.

Although the teachers desired a more positive interpersonal relationship with their students, they lacked a shared desire to think more radically about why they felt this way about teaching students of color (i.e. a feeling that students of color were deficient). Some felt that giving up power meant that they would have to lose. Feagin and Vera (1995) term this type of thinking, “zero-sum thinking (pg.3).” Many Whites take it seriously when they envision giving up some of their white privileges. This means that they become defensive and argumentive. These white teachers pointed out that America was egalitarian, and that some Blacks keep themselves away from the mainstream. These “exception to the rule” stories were used to show the researcher that the participants believed it was Blacks’ responsibility to make it, thus shifting responsibility from themselves.

In the end, the participants in this research gained a much deeper sense of themselves as whites by reflecting on the intensity of their feelings. They were able to construct new forms of knowledge about racism and notions of whiteness (McIntyre, 1997). Teachers who come from privileged backgrounds and who have students of color must realize that “difference” is not always equated with “deficiency.” This research shows that there are deeper cultural aspects that lie in attitudes toward language and students of color as well. McIntyre (1997) demonstrated that “reactions to attitude-related items (in this case the education of students of color) are products of an underlying judgment process, in which the person’s stands and attachments (that is her attitudes) operate as a determining influence (Sherif et al 1965, p 7).”
Marked verses Unmarked Languages/Cultures

When one views an object within the Social Judgment Framework, they are ego-involved and compare the language/culture with standards that have affective and motivational value to the person. Thus “unmarked languages/cultures are the objects of preference in a community, for it is unmarked culture that possesses the power.

Fishman (1976) analyzed the education of language minority students and coined the terms “marked” and “unmarked” cultures. Fishman defines a marked language as one “a language which most likely would not be used instructionally were it not for bilingual education” (p. 76). This implies that bilingual education has contributed to the use the marked language in the class. An unmarked language in a bilingual setting is a language that would be used regardless of a bilingual situation. Although AAVE is not considered as a language under the bilingual guidelines, it is still a marked form. Marked languages are associated with those whose speakers have a lower socio-economic status and less political power. Standard English (SE) is an unmarked language in the United States. The speakers of SE (the unmarked language) tend to be white, middle-class and educated. Standard English is unmarked in the sense that it is used in corporate circles, television news programs, academic circles and courts of law.

Many educators stigmatize marked languages and exemplify their lack of knowledge of the language by suggesting that it is “bad grammar.” This view of marked languages/cultures is associated with terms such as subordinate status, Limited English Proficiency (LEP) and linguistically deprived. Children often become aware of their unmarked / markedness at an early age. Many of the curricula used in the US value the unmarked language/culture values. Therefore, minority students must learn how to have
access to the “culture of power (a term used by Delpit, 1995),” the unmarked one. Many speakers of SE may not be aware or unwilling to acknowledge that they speak an unmarked form of English, but they do know that there are nonstandard forms. Since the majority of Standard English speakers are white, the white race could be considered as the “unmarked race.” On the other hand, African Americans and other speakers of nonstandard English could be considered as the “marked race.”

**African American English: A Semantic Dilemma**

There are many labels attributed to the language of the descendants of African slaves here in the United States. The use of various euphemisms within itself poses a problem both in the social and educational spheres because linguistic terms are used for descriptive purposes, and carry no social value. However, non-linguists have imposed social value judgments by interpreting Standard English as “correct” or “proper” English (Baugh, 1999). As a result, many linguists today use the term “African American Vernacular English” (AAVE). AAVE is used in this research because it is an accurate label for the dialect of descendants of African slaves here in the United States. In order to clear up the confusion with these terms it seems appropriate to give a historical account of the terms that have been used to describe this dialect. Wolfram, Adger and Christian (1999) highlight how the terms evolved into AAVE. In the 1960s AAVE was called *Nonstandard Negro English* and *Negro Dialect*. The term ‘Black English’ replaced these. Wolfram et al (1999) reported that, first, color was used to label dialect terms such as ‘Black Bobo,’ ‘Red Thai,’ and ‘White Russian.’ Second, the name change included ethnic labeling from Negro to Black. During this time, there was also an effort to throw off pejorative stereotypical terms such as *substandard, nonstandard*, and even *dialect*. 
The term ‘Vernacular’ was added in order to avoid the stereotype that all African Americans spoke this variety. The term ‘Vernacular’ is used to imply one's mother tongue (i.e. the language that one uses in the home and immediate environment). Wolfram et al (1999) also note that whites who learn their language in the context of a Black (African American) working class community may learn this dialect. Afterwards AAVE became known as Black Vernacular English, Black English Vernacular, Vernacular Black English, and African American Vernacular English. In 1991, Smitherman used the term African American English. Although ‘Ebonics’ is a term that was coined in 1973 by Robert Williams, it is not appropriate for this research because it suffers from several definitional detriments (Baugh 2000). Besides being a term for the descendants of African slaves in the United States, Ebonics applies to the language of African descendants in the Caribbean and West Africa as well. In addition, Ebonics was thought to be a separate language from English, a claim unacceptable by many linguists (Baugh 2000).

The term ‘dialect’ refers to a variety of a language (e.g. AAVE and Appalachian English) associated with a regionally or socially defined group of people (Wolfram et al 1999). Linguists describe dialects in a way that implies that all varieties are equal. There is no judgment as to which variety is more valuable, more interesting, correct, and incorrect. There is also a list of relevant definitions in the ‘Definition of Terms’ section at the end of chapter one.
The Evolution of AAVE

Many people may wonder how AAVE came to be a dialect of English, and why it is undoubtedly the most controversial of all English dialects. All the opposition towards AAVE from both white and African American professionals during the Oakland California School Board decision may have been attributed to a lack understanding about the dialect's origins (CNN, 1996). Rickford (1999) reported the Creole origins issue—the question of whether AAVE's predecessors, two or three hundred years ago, included creoles of Jamaica, Trinidad, Guyana, Hawaii or Sierra Leone. Altough there are other origin models, the Creole origins issue is the oldest and most tenable. Therefore this research paper supports the Creole origin issue.

In order to understand the definitions of Pidgins and Creoles, Rickford and McWhorter (1997) provide definitions of pidgin and Creole languages:

“Pidgins and Creoles are new varieties of language generated in situations of language contact. A pidgin is sharply restricted in social role, used for limited communication between speakers of two or more languages who have repeated or extended contacts with each other, for instance through trade, enslavement, or migration. A pidgin usually combines elements of the native languages of its users and is typically simpler than those native languages insofar as it has fewer words, less morphology, and a more restricted range of phonological and syntactic options (Rickford 1992a: 224). A Creole, in the classical sense of Hall (1966), is a pidgin that has acquired native speakers, usually, the descendants of pidgin speakers who grow up using the pidgin as their first language. In keeping with their extended social role, Creoles typically have a larger vocabulary and more complicated grammatical resources than pidgins. However, some
extended pidgins which serve as the primary language of their speakers (e.g. Tok Pisin in New Guinea, Sango in the Central African Republic) are already quite complex, and seem relatively unaffected by the acquisition of native speakers (p. 238).

The definition above illustrates a process by which two or more groups of people who speak different first languages found a means of communication. The Pidgin Language served as the lingua franca between the two groups. The native language of the non-indigenous group (i.e. the group with the weapons, money, etc.) in most cases was considered the superstrate language, while the language of the indigenous group (i.e. the group considered as meek, curious and with no weapons) served as the substrate language. Both groups compromised on features of their language in order to create a Pidgin for trade purposes. Holm (1994) noted that the vocabulary of the superstrate group was used, but the substrate group may influence the meaning, form, and use of words. Simplification is the intended goal, accomplished by eliminating such features as 1st person possessives and copula /be/ (e.g. Me stomach hurt. and He sick.). In addition to simplification, the trade Pidgin went through a process called relexification.

Relexification is the replacement of a vocabulary item from one language with that of another (Holm 1991). An example in English and French would be:

   English- Do you speak French?
   French - Do you parler French?

In this example, the word “parler” replaces the word “speak.” Relexification of the indigenous language can occur rapidly; however the grammar (i.e. syntax) of the indigenous language remains unchanged. The African languages’ grammatical structures were hardly influenced by relexification. Researchers and other linguists might ask
“What were the Pidgin English speaking slaves' native languages?” This is a question that cannot be answered completely. However, David Dalby (1969) has documented the widespread use of Wolof, which seems to have a special lingua franca status among West African languages in the thirteen colonies. Dalby further documents American words that could have had an African origin. He specifically mentions Wolof influence in the American English vocabulary.

Today, it is still evident in the speech of many African Americans that the slave trade yielded a unique linguistic history. Baugh (1994) notes that the linguistic history of African Americans contrasts with that of European immigrants, language being the primary consideration concerning the captives. African slaves were immediately isolated in order to restrict communication and prevent uprisings. The European immigrants faced a linguistic situation in which they were able to maintain their native languages while acquiring English.

Rickford (1999, pg. 234) lists seven types of evidence showing a Creole origin of AAVE and its historical processes.

Rickford's seven types of Creole origin evidence of AAVE

1. Sociohistorical conditions (suitable for pidginization and/or creolization).
2. Historical attestations (literary texts; ex-slave narratives and recordings).
4. Creole similarities (between AAVE and Caribbean creoles, Gullah, Hawaiian, etc.).
5. African language similarities (between AAVE and West African varieties).
6. English dialect differences (between AAVE and British/White American dialects).
7. Age group comparisons (across different generations of AAVE speakers).

The slave trade presented the conditions for the seven stages. As a result, African American English has undergone each of the seven stages, and these stages represent the language processes that the native Africans and their American born offspring faced. The processes entailed creating a pidgin, which evolved into a Creole. After a considerable number of generations, the Creole language decreolized and AAVE evolved. Today many African Americans speak AAVE and/or Standard English. Decreolization may have been the most important process because it is the currently taking place among educated African Americans who speak AAVE.

Decreolization (part of a sociohistorical condition/ #1) is a process by which a creolized language becomes more like the standard form. Many linguists believe that AAVE is on a continuum, and may be going through a process of decreolization. The second evidence, historical attestations, were gathered from literary texts such as fiction, drama and poetry as well as interviews and recordings of ex-slaves. Bailey et al (1991) analyzed and published recordings of ex-slaves. The third evidence, listed by Rickford (1999), were Diaspora recordings. They include interviews with descendants of African Americans who left the United States for other countries in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century, and who, because of their relative isolation in their new countries, are thought to represent an approximation to the African American speech of their emigrating foreparents. The fourth type of evidence, which entails Creole similarities include Creoles spoken in Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad, Guyana and Gullah. Today Gullah is spoken off the Sea Islands off the coast of South Carolina, and has been compared to AAVE. Quantitative analysis of selected features has been the standard comparative
method. The fifth type of evidence is African language similarities. Rickford (1977) notes that the fact that "AAVE parallels West African languages in key aspects of its grammar might be taken as evidence of the kind of admixture or substrate influence which is fundamental to pidginization and creolization (pg. 196)." ¹

The sixth type of evidence is differences from other English dialects, namely dialects spoken by whites. There are a number of research publications on the differences between African American and White speech (Labov 1972a, Wolfram 1974, Bailey and Maynor 1985). Schneider (1983) reports that British varieties may have influenced AAVE also. The seventh type of evidence, age group comparisons, also may provide evidence of decreolization. Rickford (1998) notes that "African American children in fact use the significant creole forms more often, the exact opposite of what a theory of prior creolization and ongoing decreolization would predict. Age group data have been considered more often in relation to the divergence hypothesis." Bailey (1987) compared the data of African American adults, African American children, Southern Whites, and the recordings of ex-slaves in order to ascertain whether or not black and white vernaculars were diverging. Bailey found that the speech of African American children was diverging from the speech of older African Americans.

Rickford (1977:193) notes, "Questions of motivation and attitude must also be

¹ It is also important to note that the Oakland California School Board referred to this type of evidence as proof that AAVE speaking children speak a language other than English. It was not the evidence that caused a lack of credence to Oakland's claim, but rather the claim that AAVE was a separate language. Furthermore, the absence of the copula /be/ is a primary tenet of the AAVE/African language evidence.
added to data on numbers and apparent opportunities for black/white contact.” Rickford (1985), as well as Wolfram, Kirk and Tamburro (1997) also note striking contemporary examples of White individuals in overwhelmingly Black communities and Black individuals in overwhelmingly White communities who have not assimilated to the majority pattern because of powerful cultural and social constraints. Constraints like these might have been sufficient to provide the "distance from a norm" which Hymes (1971) associates with the emergence of Pidgin/Creole varieties. Like all Creole languages AAVE differs from standard English because it lies on a continuum.

There are different levels of dialects on this continuum. Bickerton (1975) used the terms 'basilect,' 'mesolect' and 'acrolect.' An acrolect refers to speakers of a dialect (dialects of English in this case) whose language differs little from the standard form. The term basilect refers to the variety at the other end of the continuum, the variety that would be least comprehensible to a speaker of Standard English, in some cases incomprehensible. Mesolects are intermediate varieties. All ex-slave territories in the Americas have gone through various stages of decreolization. Gullah Creole English off the coast of South Carolina has the greatest amount of Creole vocabulary, thus making it a form of Afro-American English that has undergone the least decreolization.

J.L. Dillard (1973) noted that there were differences in the language between slaves born on the North American continent and slaves born on the African continent, because the Pidgin had developed into a Creole by the eighteenth century. He listed three language groups among the slaves:

1. Those who learned the English of their masters. Most of these were either house servants or the mechanics who were allowed to work in the towns ... The
language of the freedmen and their descendants was more or less of this type.

2. The great mass of native-born fields workers, who spoke Plantation Creole.

3. Recent imports from Africa, some of whom brought Pidgin English with them.

The others must have faced a difficult language-learning problem (pg. 98).

**Knowledge of AAVE**

Knowledge of AAVE's evolution and features would assist educators in understanding its origins and use. This information surely would have been crucial to the Oakland California School Board. Because there is a lack of understanding of AAVE, its features and its origin, many educators have negative attitudes toward this dialect of English. Adger (1997) notes that “many opinions about AAVE are not scientifically justified… they (teachers) are uninformed about what dialects are, how they relate to each other, and what functions they fulfill. (pg. 1).”

Love (1973) reported on a project conducted at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville (SIU-E), which investigated the speech of African American children. This investigation yielded data, materials and audiotapes that were used to help preservice and in-service teachers identify morphological, syntactical as well as phonological (Van Syoc, 1973) features of black dialect. Thirteen speech features were studied such as “omission of s in third person singular,” “formation of past tense of verbs and the perfect tense,” “zero copula,” “auxiliary be,” “negative be,” formation of the plurals of nouns,” “formation of the possessive case of nouns,” “the pronominal appositive,” and “variant forms of pronouns” (Love, 1973, p1). However there a considerable number of rural southern white speakers who also use these features. Educators who teach AAVE
speaking children should become aware of these features in order to show the children the Standard English equivalents to such forms.

Dodl (1973) adopted the protocol materials for use in training preservice and in-service teachers at Florida University (fictitious name) and they were included in the language section of the “Protocol Catalog of Materials for Teacher Education” for the Florida State Department of Education (1975).

One could ask why speakers of AAVE have not assimilated into mainstream American culture and acquired SE. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the reason lies within cultural processes that allow individuals to become part of the “Culture of Power”

Delpit (1995) lists five aspects of the culture of power:

- Issues of power are enacted in classrooms

- There are codes or rules for participating in power; that is there is a “culture of power.”

- The rules of the culture of power are a reflection of the rules of the culture of those who have power.

- If you are not already a participant of the culture of power, being told explicitly the rules of that culture makes acquiring power easier.

- Those with power are frequently least aware – or at least willing to acknowledge its existence. Those with less power are often most aware of its existence (pp. 24-27).

Delpit went on to discuss how the first three are basic tenets in the literature of the sociology of education, but claims that the last two have seldom been addressed. In light of the last two, Delpit concluded that members of any culture transmit information implicitly to co-members and that cross-cultural transmission of these codes often results
in a breakdown of communication. The last one Delpit stressed was that those with power find it uncomfortable to admit that they have it, but those with less power were quick to admit it. Delpit noted that many liberals believe that explicitly revealing rules may limit their freedom and autonomy.

Furthermore, Delpit (1995) stated “to imply to children or adults (but of course adults won’t believe you anyway) that it doesn’t matter how you talk or how you write is to ensure their ultimate failure. I prefer to be honest with my students. I tell them that their style is unique and wonderful but there is political power game that is being played, and if they want to be in on that game there are certain games that they too must play (pp. 39-40).”

Only when educators acknowledge the attitudinal and cultural differences and grasp these profound differences, will the educational system remotely be designed to accommodate students who speak a marked language/dialect. The Social Judgment Approach has established how attitudes and cultural differences emanate, and to suggest that children who speak a nonstandard form do not need the standard form is all but assuring their failure in the educational and employment arenas in the US.

Perceptions/Attitudes of Language

Seminal Studies

Research on the perceptions of language has been conducted quite extensively. However, educators know that language plays a crucial role in the dynamics of communication, and it is an intricate part of one’s culture. Research has shown that native speakers of one language may rate speakers of a more prestigious language higher than speakers of their own language (Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum, 1960).
This, in turn, is due to perceptions that the listener may have about the language in question. Between 1939-1943, Fay and Middleton conducted many of the seminal studies pertaining to judgment of speech. The researchers conducted a series of experiments in which the subjects were asked to judge types such as, ‘occupation,’ ‘intelligence,’ ‘body types,’ ‘sociability,’ ‘truth telling or lying,’ ‘introversion and leadership,’ either from voices transmitted over a public address system or a transcribed voice. Therefore, the subjects had to listen to voices of different speakers. There were a total of nine experiments conducted by the researchers within the four years mentioned above.

However, Lickerlider and Miller (1951) summarized the results of Fay and Middleton’s nine experiments and found that the accuracy of the listeners in these studies was very unreliable (Lickerlider and Miller, 1951 p. 1071). Furthermore Lickerlider and Miller concluded that evaluations of personality based solely upon voice have little or no reliability. Out of all sixteen personality traits listed by the researchers, identification of the speaker’s gender seemed to be the most accurate judgment (Lickerlider and Miller, 1951).

In view of Lickerlider and Miller’s (1951) study, Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum (1960) conducted experimental research to determine the significance of spoken language on the listener’s evaluational reactions. The researchers evaluated the reactions of 130 judges who spoke English or French. Sixty-four judges were native English speaking, whereas sixty-six were native French speaking. The judges listened to bilingual (i.e. French/English) speakers read a short passage in French and English (i.e. the independent variable). The judges did not see the bilingual readers, but heard their taped voices. The judges rated the voices according to 14 traits on a six-point scale that
ranged from “very little” to “very much.” The traits included adjectives such as height, good looks, sense of humor, intelligence, religiousness, self-confidence, dependability, entertainingness, kindness, ambition, sociability, character and likability. The judges chose these traits to describe the speaker’s voice (i.e. dependent variables). In addition, the judges filled out a questionnaire. The findings revealed that the native English-speaking judges highly rated their own language, but the French judges did not highly rate their language. The fact that the native French-speaking judges highly rated English speakers more than the French speakers with ten out the fourteen traits proved to be a significant finding. This research supported the claim that speakers of a language with less prestige rate speakers of the prestige language higher. This could demonstrate a feeling of inferiority, unless the speakers of the low prestigious language value different traits than used for judging speech.

Techniques of Measuring Attitudes

Some of the attitudes studies mentioned in this research consist of matched-guised techniques. Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner & Fillenbaum (1960) are responsible for the creation and seminal use of the matched-guise techniques for judgment of voice. This technique consists of a person or persons reading passages or talking on a tape-recorder. The same speaker read the recorded voice in two languages or dialects. The listeners are then asked to make judgments about the speaker using a set of personality traits (i.e. adjectives and/or statements about the speaker). The adjectives are usually pairs of antonyms and they are placed on a polarized scale. Like the Likert scale, one end of the matched-guised questionnaire can have a positive trait on one end, whereas the negative
trait is on the other end (e.g. RICH-----------------POOR) with varying degrees in the middle.

Other studies in this research used the Likert Scale to measure the respondent’s (i.e. participant) responses (Likert 1932). Unlike the matched-guise techniques, the Likert scale does not require listeners to listen to tape-recorded voices. Instead, the respondent is given a survey with statements. After reading the statement, the respondent chooses according to his or her belief. An example of choices can range from strongly agree to strongly disagree and have between four and seven choices (e.g. of 4 choices: strongly agree…agree… disagree… strongly disagree). These choices are then assigned points and graded. Some researchers claim that the number of choices should be odd, as to allow the respondent to choose a neutral or central response. However, in his original paper, Likert did not consider the number of choices to be an important issue, stating only that "If five alternatives are used, it is necessary to assign values from one to five with the three assigned to the undecided position (Likert 1932)." It is implied that the actual number of choices may be left to the tastes of individual researchers. In practice researchers often do assign the number of choices arbitrarily according to personal taste or past convention.

Because many of the studies in this research use either a matched guise or a Likert scale, it is important to know that the studies which use matched guise have adjectives as choices (in some cases as many as 11 sets) and the studies that use Likert scales have degrees on choices that express the respondents' degree of agreement or disagreement. Some of the traits are listed in the studies in this research, but some are not because of the establishment of matched-guised and Likert scales in the field of research. The studies in
this research are based on the Social Judgment Approach (SJA) because they ascertained attitudes based on an individual’s belief system.

A Chronological Review of Studies on Attitudes Toward AAVE and Nonstandard Dialects of English

Bronstein, Dubner, Lee and Raphael (1970) conducted an experimental study to answer the following research questions in four categories (i.e. four facets). What are Caucasian and Negro teachers attitudes toward (1) the structure of black English (BE), (2) the consequences of using (or not using) and accepting (or rejecting) BE, (3) the importance of BE to the speakers of it, and (4) the cognitive and intellectual abilities of speakers of BE? The second part of this study consisted of a sociolinguistic comment on the results of the study. The informants consisted of two hundred and sixty-four faculty members from three educational institutions, and they represented university as well as elementary and secondary teachers of all grades. The teachers were administered the Language Attitude Scale (LAS) which consists of 25 statements on a five-point scale. The percentage scores to the responses of the 25 statements consisted of the dependent variables, whereas the level of institution and race consisted of the independent variables.

The LAS was scored and the percentages of scores were compared. The faculty members who participated in the survey were ranked according to the four attitude facets. The results showed that the faculty held more positive attitudes toward the use of BE and they recognized the importance of accepting BE. The elementary and secondary schoolteachers showed low attitude scores regarding the structure of BE. White faculty registered no low scores on their LAS and their high scores were greater than for any other group, but White elementary and secondary schoolteachers registered more low
scores in all categories than any other group. The white faculty’s lack of low scores may be due to the fact they were at the university level, in which students and teachers do not interact as much as grade school teachers and students. Both black faculty and black elementary and secondary schoolteachers scored very similarly in all categories (i.e. their scores on the LAS were similar). The researchers concluded that language attitudes varied both racially and on educational levels. It was the teachers at the elementary and secondary levels who held the attitudes that could operate at the detriment of the educational development of children.

Bronstein et al. (1970) discussed the changing views of BE and the possible methods of approaching the problems that this dialect presents. The researchers highlight two schools of thought concerning nonstandard dialects. The first is called the “deficit model.” This model presents a view of the dialect as a social handicap, an extreme view maintains that use of a nonstandard dialect contributes to and reflects deficient cognitive processes and intellectual capabilities. A teacher who adheres to the deficit model may often try to rid the child of his or her dialect and make them adopt “standard” (i.e. white, educated) English.

Bronstein et al (1970) further noted that linguists have offered the ‘difference model’ as an alternative to the ‘deficit model.’ Those who hold the ‘difference’ model view the dialect as having internal validity, which means that each dialectal subsystem serves as a complete tool for communication for its speakers. According to the difference model every dialect is open-ended, which means that expressions in one dialect have equivalents in the other. As the researchers note, there is no need to switch codes in order to express or comprehend an idea by a speaker of another dialect. The fact of the matter is
that cognitive and expressive abilities do not lie in the dialect, but in the mind and in one’s ability to creatively use the dialect. This is an ability of speakers of all languages (Bronstein et al, 1970).

Bronstein et al (1970) noted that some educators, linguists and sociolinguists have accepted the difference model, but there seem to be varying opinions about the goal of training programs based on this model. Most professionals believe that children who speak a nonstandard dialect should be at least “corrected,” “changed,” or given the standard form as an addition to their speech repertoire. The two models differ with the option of “adding to” the child’s speech repertoire. An educator who adheres to the deficit model seeks to eradicate the nonstandard forms, whereas an educator who adheres to the difference model “adds to” the child’s dialect. In Bronstein et al study, there were three factors listed as hindering the success of SE acquisition language programs for BE speakers. One is the “non” and “substandard” concepts and classification of BE. These concepts caused both black and white teachers to devalue the dialect and its speakers. The second factor is that there need to be specialists who are trained in giving English as a Second Language (ESL) principles and procedures to BE speakers, rather than speech therapists, whose approach is to rid phonological and morphological forms and replace them with others. The third factor lies in the definition of SE. This definition unites the elements of community and education and specifies that SE is spoken by the educated of the community. Many African Americans are obtaining a college education, and the failure of elementary and high school teachers to instill SE in their students has transferred into the university arena. The faculty members at the university feel as though
it was not their responsibility to teach SE to adult college students. Therefore socially stigmatized dialect prevails among the educated in the African American community.

An important question raised by the researchers was “does the stigma really reside in the dialect, or in the listener’s attitude toward the speaker of the dialect? (Bronstein et al, 1970 p. 16)” They further stressed that the latter needed to be studied in-depth. The researchers concluded by stressing that the thinking of educators and teachers must change with regard to BE. Black English must be viewed as a separate dialect and treated no differently from SE. The differences in BE should be highlighted as linguistic comparisons, and not as pathological deficiencies. In conclusion, the researchers believed that linguists and sociolinguists who teach future educators can contribute to the change in teachers’ attitudes, because it is possible for educators to hold positive views of a nonstandard dialect. Even after thirty years, Bronstein et al’s advice seems relevant although it has generally not been heeded.

In 1971, Woodworth and Salzer investigated if teachers would judge the character and worth of a child from her or his manner of speaking by assigning low evaluations based on the race of the child. The researchers conducted an investigation in which 119 elementary teachers listened to and evaluated children’s social studies reports. The researchers recorded the reports as both white and black sixth grade male pupils read them. The contents of the reports were identical and they were played in two 45-minute sessions, each report was given three weeks apart. The independent variables were race and teacher employment area such as urban and suburban, while the dependent variables were ratings of the characteristics of the presentation (e.g. introduction, variety, logical sequence, unity, transition, clarity, etc.).
Examination of the data revealed a difference between teachers’ evaluations of the material presented orally and the child’s race. The white children received substantially higher ratings than the black children for identical material. Although the teachers employed in the urban areas rated the black children higher than they rated white children, they also rated the white child’s reports higher than teachers employed in the suburban areas. Because the black child read the material as written in SE (i.e. he did not alter his syntax nor did he use BE), the researchers surmised that the raters identified the black child with his racial background and they (the raters) associated such a background with negative achievement expectations. The researchers concluded that the raters associated the child’s intonation pattern with his race. The fact that urban teachers rated the black child’s speech a little higher was encouraging. The researchers finally point out that administrators in education must find ways of sensitizing teachers to evaluating students only on their merit, and not race.

Naremore (1971) proposed the following research questions, "To what extent can teachers be grouped in terms of the commonality of their attitudinal responses to children's speech?" and "To what extent can groups of teachers be contrasted and compared in terms of teacher characteristics, child characteristics, rating scale characteristic and selected characteristics of the children's speech?" This research involved the analysis and interpretation of a semantic differential scale. The sample consisted of 33 teachers from the inner city. The researcher did not control for race or sex. The sample was chosen largely out of convenience. The researcher used recorded speech samples from the Detroit Dialect study (Shuy, Wolfram & Riley, 1967). The speech samples were comprised of both white and black fifth and sixth graders answering
questions pertaining to TV and games. Therefore the independent variables were race, grade, and questions. The researcher also used the semantic differential scale. The responses to this scale comprised the dependent variables. The teachers were divided into subgroups and these subgroups heard sixteen tapes. The researcher conducted a correlation analysis to investigate the degree of relationship between teachers' judgments and objective characteristics of the children's speech such as race, gender, intelligence, motivation, status. Therefore the teachers (i.e. judges) were categorized by factors such as black teachers vs. white teachers, attitude toward black children’s’ speech vs. attitude toward white children speech, and attitude towards high status children vs. attitude toward low status children. Race was the only characteristic that was found to differentiate any factor. In no case did any black teacher rate black children's speech above that of white children, and the ratings of high status children surpassed those of the low status children.

Taylor (1973) assessed the attitudes of 422 teachers using the Language Attitude Scale (LAS). The Lickert-type scale involved self-evaluation of opinions in four content categories. The four content categories were 1.) the structure and inherent usefulness of nonstandard and Black English (BE) dialects, 2.) Consequences of using and accepting nonstandard and BE in the educational setting, 3.) Philosophies concerning the use and acceptance on nonstandard and BE dialects, and 4.) Cognitive and intellectual abilities of both speakers of nonstandard and BE. There were twenty-five statements on the LAS. The independent variables were comprised of race, sex, age, geographical location of teaching assignment, field(s) of college degree(s), teaching experience, grade taught, racial composition of school and parents education. The score achieved on the LAS
comprised the dependent variable. A total of 18 schools were selected throughout the country.

The results were compiled for each of the four categories. Teachers in the South Atlantic rural area felt positive about the structure and inherent usefulness of nonstandard and Black English (BE) dialects. Teachers in the Pacific urban areas had significantly more positive attitudes than negative ones. Black teachers revealed significantly more positive than negative attitude responses and teachers in predominately black schools revealed significantly more positive attitudes than teachers at predominately white schools. In category 2, teachers in the West North Central rural areas and teachers in Pacific urban areas had significantly more positive than negative responses. Both male and female teachers indicated significantly more positive attitudes in this category, as did both black and white teachers. Teachers with Arts and Sciences backgrounds had approximately the same distribution of attitudes as Education teachers. Teachers with 6-10 years experience were the only ones who did not show significantly more positive than negative attitudes. Teachers at predominately black schools indicated significantly more positive than negative statements than teachers at predominately white schools. Both teachers with parents with high school degrees and teachers with parents with B.A. degrees had significantly higher positive than negative attitudes in this category.

In content category 3, teachers from both West North Central rural and Pacific urban areas had significantly more positive than negative responses. Because of their large sample size, white teachers indicated more positive than negative statements. Teachers at predominately black schools had significantly more positive than negative attitudes.
For content category 4, teachers from West North Central rural, Pacific urban and northeast rural areas had significantly more positive than negative responses. Both male and female teachers as well as black and white teachers had significantly more positive than negative attitudes toward the category 4 statement. Teachers with educational backgrounds produced significantly more positive than negative responses. Teachers with 1-2 and 3-5 years experience produced significantly more positive than negative attitudes in this content area. Teachers in grades one and five showed significantly more positive than negative responses in this area also. Teachers who had parents with high school degrees showed significantly higher positive responses than negative ones. In addition, both teachers from predominately black and mixed schools showed significantly higher positive than negative responses.

Teachers from Pacific urban areas showed significantly more positive attitudes than those from Middle Atlantic urban areas. First, third and fifth grade teachers produced significantly more positive responses than eighth grade teachers. Fifth grade teachers produced significantly more positive attitudes than eleventh grade teachers. The results also revealed that teachers with three to five years experience had significantly more positive attitudes toward dialect than teachers just beginning their careers and teachers with more than ten years experience. The researcher pointed out that teachers who were relatively new to the teaching profession were less entrenched in their attitudes than teachers who had been teaching for long periods of time.

Di Giulio (1973) conducted a pilot study to determine the attitudes of teachers toward BE. The researcher initially enumerated some attitudes that teachers have toward BE. They were (1) black children are non-verbal, (2) black language is “sloppy,” (3)
black children have “poor auditory discrimination skills, and (4) black children attempt to simplify SE. These attitudes came from Di Giulio’s conversations with teachers. Because teacher attitudes seem to be a crucial indicator of the degree to which BE is or would be accepted in schools, the researcher conducted interviews in order to collect data and created a questionnaire in order to present the data in a scale form. The procedure entailed tape-recorded responses of teachers’ answers to questions like “What is Black English.” “Should a child’s Black English be of concern to a teacher?” “Why should (shouldn’t) Black English be of concern to a teacher?” “When, how, and where should Black English be utilized as a way to learn SE?” The responses were used for individual follow-up conferences. Information from the conferences and resources from literature were used to create the Teacher Attitude Scale (TAS). The research refined the TAS by controlling for ambiguity, ambivalence, discrepant response and a number of other revision steps. The final TAS consisted of twenty-three items. Both the tape-recorded response and the TAS were used to help gather data.

The researcher discovered that the teachers tended to disagree frequently on their beliefs about Black English. However two statements seemed to reflect strongest disagreement among teachers (i.e. they yielded the highest scores on the TAS). They were “teachers should encourage the use of BE (by both teachers and children) in the classroom” and “Black English (is a logical predecessor to) the use of SE in the classroom.” Also the teachers had negative attitudes toward spoken BE and negative attitudes toward teacher in-service training about the features of BE. Another important finding was that teachers indicated that Black children should replace BE with SE. The researcher surmised that the teachers would not have expressed their negative attitudes
had other attitude gathering techniques such as videotape been used. Video tape may have gave them a sense of public to their exposure attitudes.

Some positive findings emanated from the research such as the teachers did not believe that BE was sloppy or that the children had lazy lips. Furthermore, they believed that teachers should not prohibit the use of BE in the classroom, but they felt that it should not be encouraged. Di Giulio (1970) claimed that these positive attitudes were influenced by the teachers’ negative responses. The positive attitudes may have resulted from a discussion of the negative responses on the TAS. Furthermore the TAS should not be seen as the only tool helping to build the foundation of positive attitudes. The researcher concluded by suggesting that supplementary instruments such as interviews accompany the TAS, which was designed specifically for use in elementary public schools.

Shuy and Williams (1973) reported that a person’s reactions to a dialect may not only reflect his attitudes about the social standing of that dialect, but also may include attitudes about the qualities of the dialect and the qualities of the people who speak these dialects. The researchers posed two research questions. One question pertained to the dimensionality of the attitudes, and the other referred to the generality of those dimensions among respondents from different ethnic groups and social strata as well as gender. This research described the statistical analysis of subjective judgment data from an earlier study by Shuy, Baratz and Wolfram (1969).

The judgments were obtained as responses to five stimuli labels. They were Detroit speech, White Southern speech, British speech, Negro speech and Standard speech. Unlike the earlier study, this study focuses attention upon the level of the ratings
and the use of those dimensions by different types of respondents. The researchers obtained a sample of 620 respondents who were selected from various elementary and high schools as well as adult groups in Detroit. The demographic division of the respondents entailed 364 White and 256 Black, 167 represented the upper middle class, 173 represented the lower middle class, 140 represented the upper working class and 140 represented the lower working class. There were 315 women and 305 men; their ages ranged from 10-12, 16-18, and over 21 years old. Race, class, gender and age constituted the independent variables.

Twelve semantic differential scales were selected from prior literature and these semantic differentials reflected the connotative dimensions of judgment relevant to speech attitudes. These responses to the semantic differentials comprised the dependent variables. The respondents recorded their reactions on a scale which best represented their judgment of the tape-recorded speech samples. The scale ranged from one to seven. Before they conducted the study, the researchers hypothesized that responses on the scales would be highly interrelated. The factor analysis revealed four interrelated factors. They were Value, Complexity, Potency and Activity. These four affective dimensions were revealed in the evaluation of speech. The affective dimension “Value” referred to how much the respondents valued the language, “Complexity” referred to how difficult the respondents thought the language was, “Potency” referred to how strong the use of language was and “Activity” referred to how much the language was used. The results indicated that if respondents are given the response parameters defined by the twelve semantic differential scales, they will tend to subsume individual scales into four relative response dimensions. Both the responses and the dimensions were reliable contrasts.
The researchers then investigated how the speech types (i.e. Detroit speech, White Southern speech, British speech, Negro speech and Standard speech) were differentiated relative to the four judgmental dimensions. The results revealed reliable contrasts among ratings of the five types of speech. The Detroit speech and standard speech was rated in a similar manner, the British speech was rated more positively on the four dimensions than the Negro speech, and while the Negro speech was rated more positively than the Southern speech. Black respondents rated Negro speech more positively on three dimensions as compared to the average rating of White respondents. The respondents who had the higher social status rated the British speech more positively in terms of value and potency as opposed to the lower status respondents. The lower class respondents rated Detroit and Negro speech more positively than the higher status respondents did. Adults tended to rate standard and British speech more positively in terms of value and potency than the younger respondents did, while the younger respondents rated standard speech as more complex than the adults did. There were no significant findings according to gender.

The findings suggested that although dialects may have an objective reality, there was a subjective reality in the kinds of consistent attitudes that people harbor toward each other’s speech. Different speech types, if reliably and interpretably differentiated along the four dimensions (i.e. Value, Complexity, Potency and Activity), could reveal some level of psychological reality of stereotype held by the respondents.

In 1974, Bell, Light, & Richard conducted research to explore the ways in which children from different socioeconomic backgrounds would react to standard English and Black English. In addition, the researchers wanted to determine the extent to which the
children could verbally conceptualize their attitudes towards the language. The researchers used a Social Judgment Approach by measuring their attitudes with a semantic scale designed by Osgood (1952). The subjects consisted of ninety-two randomly chosen 8 and 9-year-old boys and girls from three different schools. Thirty-two came from a school in a lower and working class neighborhood in New York City. Another thirty were from a public school in a middle-class suburban area, and the other thirty were from a high-tuition suburban private school for middle class children. The children were tested in groups of from 6 to 10. The children listened to two-recorded speech samples. Therefore, the independent variables were the three levels of social class, while gender consisted of the moderating variable. The recorded speech samples were comprised of the voice of an educated southern Black woman, who represented standard speech, and the other was an uneducated Black southern woman, who represented non-standard speech. The children were asked to respond to the two speech samples by completing the semantic scale consisting of adjectives such as smart/dumb, pretty/ugly, nice/mean, rich/poor and black/white. Their responses to the speech samples comprised the dependent variables.

The results indicated that positive qualities were attributed more often to the Standard English speaking voice, whereas the negative qualities were attributed more often to the nonstandard speaker. Although both speakers were black, fifty-three percent of the children judged the educated Black southern speaker to be white. Furthermore, the results seem to indicate that children develop full stereotypes about others on the basis of speech. Unlike children, adults are not as open-minded when it comes to race and speech (Abrahams, 1972).
Granger, Mathews, Quay and Verner (1977) conducted an experiment that investigated teacher judgments of speech samples from black and white children. The subjects were fifty-six female preschool and primary school teachers who were attending graduate school. The speech samples consisted of twelfth grade children describing pictures. Furthermore, three children from each of the following socioeconomic groups, lower SES black, middle SES black, lower SES white and middle SES white participated in describing the pictures. The graduate students were asked to listen to the taped descriptions and look at the accompanying pictures. The speakers were rated from 1 to 4, with four being the best. Socioeconomic status, race, the taped description and the pictures served as the independent variables.

Post hoc comparisons revealed that the black speakers as a group were rated lower than the white speakers, and black and white middle-class speakers were rated higher than black and white lower SES speakers. The middle SES black speakers were rated lower than the middle SES white speakers. Black and white lower SES speakers were not rated significantly different from each other. Similarly, a post hoc ranking of scores revealed that black speakers as a group were ranked lower than white speakers as a group, and lower SES speakers as a group were ranked lower than middle SES speakers. Rankings for black and white lower SES speakers as a group did not differ significantly.

In conclusion, the productions of controlled speech by both black and white middle/lower class students yielded social and racial bias. The variable ‘class’ had the strongest bias. Therefore the findings suggest that the teachers judged ‘how’ a speaker talked, rather than “what” he or she said.
Colquhoun (1978) conducted a study to measure the attitudes of people toward 5 dialects of English. The researcher wanted to know how listeners would rate different dialects of English and he examined the effects of listener variables such as age, sex, social class and region. The speaker used a personality trait questionnaire to measure the subjects’ responses. The researcher used taped passages read by twenty males. There were five males per each dialect of English; which were Canadian English, Midwestern American English, Southern English, West Indian English and British English. The subjects were 457 visitors to the Ontario Science Center in Toronto. The researcher controlled for native language (i.e. all subjects had to be native speakers of English), but consisted of all age groups, sexes, social class (listener variables). Read passages and listener variables served as the independent variables and the judgments of the speakers’ personality traits (smart/stupid, friendly/unfriendly, hardworking/lazy, kind/mean, happy/sad, sure of himself/unsure of himself, good looking/ugly, pleasant/unpleasant, can be trusted/ cannot be trusted, leader/follower, polite/rude) served as the dependent variables. The subjects participated in small groups and listened to voices; in addition, they filled out the questionnaire after hearing each voice. The questionnaire contained a list of adjectives as well as a section for the listeners to provide biographical information.

The results revealed that there was no significant variation among judgment of the dialects. Subsequently, the effect of listener variables was then examined. Age and sex were the only significant listener variables. Males showed a definite preference for the British variety in the character ratings, whereas females judged all varieties approximately the same. Although there did not appear to be any hierarchy of prestige, the British dialect received the highest score from almost every group of listeners.
Furthermore, the older the listener was, the higher the socio-economic status was given to the speaker. The researcher claimed that dialect was not statistically significant compared to the attributes of the speaker. Although AAVE was not one the English dialects assessed, the study showed that personality of the speakers and the topics of the passage were stronger factors than dialect.

Harber (1979) wanted to focus on one of the suggested causes of poor academic performance among African American children; namely, teachers’ attitudes toward Black English. The researcher mailed 400 pencil and paper questionnaires to undergraduate education majors, and received a response rate of sixty percent. The independent variable was race. Stimulus statements were designed to elicit attitude toward BE and speakers of BE. The questionnaire consisted of a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” This questionnaire measured teachers’ beliefs about the academic performance of students. The scores from the scale posed the dependent variables. The results indicated that the respondents viewed oral reading, spelling and composition as difficult aspects of English for BE speaking children as opposed to SE speaking children. In addition, more than one half of the respondents indicated that reading comprehension seemed to be more difficult for BE speaking children than for SE speaking children, while 13.7% of the respondents indicated that arithmetic seemed to more difficult for BE speaking children than for SE speaking children. Overall, these findings were similar for both black and white respondents. This study reflects that class could be an important variable in future studies about attitudes.

African Americans’ perceptions of their dialects play an important part in determining whether SE instruction is necessary for speakers of that language. Hoover
(1978) conducted a pilot study of twenty-eight African American parents and community people in order to ascertain their attitudes toward AAVE and African American Standard English (AASE). AASE is a dialect of English that is characterized by a standard syntax, and differs from AAVE. Hoover (1978) reports that AASE differs from AAVE in a number of vernacular grammar features used as well as varying degrees of phonological, vocabulary, and intonational features. In addition, Hoover et al (1997) provide taped scripts of AASE and AAVE contrasts. The respondents listened to tape recordings made by 4 African American speakers who were competent in both AAVE and AASE. Each speaker recorded two paired items (i.e. one in AASE and the other in AAVE). Initially, the respondents listened to the tape recordings in order to ascertain if they could distinguish AASE from AAVE. After the researchers obtained unanimous agreement on the AASE/AAVE speech samples, the respondents filled out a questionnaire pertaining to the items on the tapes. The results showed that parents and community people preferred AASE in all domains and channels. They also felt that the ability to “switch” from one dialect to the other was important for their children. The independent variables were demographic and other information about the parents, and the dependent variable was the parents’ attitudes as revealed on the questionnaire.

Initially Hoover conducted a pilot study. The results of the pilot prompted the researcher to further the study with a controlled random sample of one hundred and eighty-two African American parents. They were divided into two pools. One pool consisted of parents who represented low income Title I schools (N=97), while the other pool was comprised of parents from non-Title I schools (n=85). Title I schools were schools with children whose families earned below $3000.00 or if they were on Aid to
Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Non-Title I schools were schools with children whose parents were middle-class. The dependent variable consisted of 22 variations of the major question, which was in reference to the vernacular taped voice, cassette tapes and written speech samples. The major question was “Do you object to your child talking/listening/writing/reading as the person on the tape/book/note/ does on the following occasion?” The independent variables consisted of income, birthplace, size of birthplace, marital status, age, residence, previous information on Black English, ambition for child, self-speech proficiency, parents rating of child’s speech proficiency, child’s achievement, and basic skills orientation. These were considered as moderating variables. The instrument for the primary study was an interview about the use of AAVE. In addition, parents were asked to register their preference among different varieties of their own language (e.g. AASE, AAVE, and ‘Talking Proper’). The researcher also measured “black consciousness,” “political involvement,” “Cultural Behavior” and AAVE proficiency,“

The results revealed that the parents did not hate their language; in fact, they had rules for the use of AASE and AAVE. The most noticeable reasons for maintaining AASE and AAVE were “survival” and “communications.” The findings also indicated that middle-class African Americans were high in their general preference for AAVE. The parents with high occupational levels generally controlled AASE and did not object to their children being exposed to AAVE. Ninety-six percent of the parents believed that teachers needed to be informed about the existence of AAVE so that they could understand the children, but many also believed that the teachers should not use AAVE in the schools.
Parents born in the South indicated a lower preference for AAVE, but single parents tended to favor AAVE. The researcher also listed some reasons for the parents’ rejection of AAVE in some situations, and these were attributed to racism that the latter experienced. Some were ‘needs standard English to get employment,’ ‘no other nonstandard is taught, and ‘Our way has no meaning to those who are in control.’ The researcher concluded that eighty-five percent of African American parents interviewed accepted one level of African American English (i.e. AASE) in all contexts and accepted AAVE in many contexts dependent on the situation, topic and person spoken to. This finding challenges the notion that African Americans reject themselves or their dialect.

Attitudinal Research in the Eighties and Nineties

There are surely numerous professions in which language is a viable tool of expression. Attorneys must have language that is considered standard. Many successful African Americans can disassociate SE from cultural identification with white America, and adopt the prestige speech variety without embracing a frequently antagonistic culture (Garner and Rubin, 1986). Garner and Rubin (1986) wanted to explore attitudinal posture, which allowed middle class professionals to become bidialectal while retaining a sense of cultural identity. The researchers were concerned with questions about the informants’ perceptions of (1) the nature of style-shifting (i.e. the ability to shift from using one dialect of a language to another), (2) the nature of standard English, (3) the nature of Black English and (4) the influences that allowed them to acquire SE and BE habits.

The informants were comprised of residents of a major Southern city with a predominately black middle class. The informants were selected from an organization of
primarily black attorneys in which they were members. Therefore the researchers controlled for race. The informants’ ages ranged from 20 to 55 years of age. The researchers employed in-depth interviews in order to determine the manner in which these speakers used SE while maintaining their cultural identity. The research questions were scripted and the interviews were tape recorded and transcribed verbatim. Panel judges listened to edited segments of the tapes and verified the presence of code switching. The panel judges consisted of ten experienced high school and college teachers enrolled in an introductory class in English linguistics. The judges consisted of both blacks and whites. The judges then indicated their impression of the speakers’ race using a four-point scale ranging from ‘speaker is probably white’ to ‘speaker is probably black.’ The judges’ next step was to indicate the speaker’s dialect on a four-point scale ranging from ‘closer to SE’ to ‘closer to Black English.’ Both African American race (two levels such as “black” and “white”) and African American dialect (closer to SE’ to ‘closer to Black English) were the independent variables. The judgments consisted of the dependent variables.

The results indicated that most of the informants did not regard the listener’s (the person with whom they are speaking) race to be the most important determinant of style shifting. The informants’ criterion for style shifting was familiarity. In other words, the informants said that they spoke differently around people that they are not familiar with, regardless of the race, than they do around people that they are familiar with. In addition many reported they primarily used SE with business associates and in the courtroom, while they spoke BE in a ‘relaxed’ or ‘comfortable’ situation. Most informants did not identify SE as a white dialect, but a majority of them failed to recognize any linguistic
system known as ‘BE.’ The researchers note that overall successful blacks might perceive themselves as switching when appropriate, and that they might disassociate SE from cultural identification with white America. Although the informants held BE in higher regard than they did other nonstandard dialects, they also used the prestige of SE, the language of use by the sophisticated and the educated.

Cecil (1988) researched teachers' expectations of both speakers of SE and BE. The researcher addressed three major research questions, which were 1) Do teachers have higher academic expectations for Black children who speak SE than for those who speak BE?, 2) Do teachers think that Black children who speak SE are more intelligent than those who speak BE? 3) Do teachers think that Black children who speak SE will perform better in reading than those who speak BE? The teachers and survey administrators explored the identifying features of both BE and SE with teachers and administrators, the researcher recorded five Black BE speaking children and five Black SE speaking children answering questions about a stimulus (i.e. a stuffed animal). The sample was comprised of 52 White elementary school teachers in Southeastern Missouri who were randomly assigned to listen to both the BE speaking recordings and the SE speaking recording. After listening to the tapes, the teachers responded to the following questions, 1) What do you think this child's chances are of successfully completing second grade? 2) What would you imagine to be the IQ of this child? 3) How would you predict this child might perform in reading?

The responses to the recordings (the dependent variable) showed that for question one the teachers held higher overall expectations for the Black children who spoke SE. With regard to question two, the results indicated that the teachers thought that children
who spoke SE were more intelligent than their BE speaking counterparts. In addition, statistical analysis of question three revealed that the teachers expected greater reading success from the SE speaking Black children than the BE speaking Black children. This study supported the fact that the dialect a child speaks affects the way a teacher evaluates them. The researcher concluded that there needs to be more research on BE and more new ways to assist BE speaking children in learning SE.

Two other important studies pertaining to African American perceptions of AAVE and SE were conducted in 1992 and 1997. Doss and Gross (1992) conducted a similar study as well. The researchers wanted to study the effects of AAVE on stereotyping in intraracial perceptions. In the 1992 study, the researchers used a sample of 17 African American males and 21 African American females as judges of the taped recorded voices. The subjects were college students (i.e. adults). The researchers used the matched guise technique modeled from Lambert et al, (1960). Doss and Gross’s speech sample on the matched-guised consisted of a tape-recorded voiced of a speaker using both SE and AAVE. The independent variables were sex, while the researchers controlled for race and age (i.e. African American college students). The dependent variable was the responses to the 24-item questionnaire. The results indicated that the judges preferred SE over AAVE. As with Lambert et al, (1960), the researchers believed that language serves as a salient cue for cultural identity.

Bowie and Bond (1994) wanted to explore the attitudes of urban preservice teachers toward BE and to determine the effect of multicultural issues in their teacher education program. The sample consisted of seventy-five preservice teachers from a large urban university. The sample was not random and consisted of no control group. Eighty-
six percent of the participants were White, and ninety-two percent of those were females. Therefore, sex and race were independent variables. The researcher used an adapted version of the Language Attitude Scale (LAS) developed by researchers at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). The instrument contained 25 items on a three-point scale ranging from "agree" to "disagree." An agreement with a favorable statement would register as "positive", whereas a disagreement with a favorable would register as "negative." In addition, there was one open-ended question used to solicit qualitative information about BE. Scores from the LAS comprised the dependent variables.

A majority of the results were negative (41%), as opposed to 32% positive and 27% indifferent responses. Over three-fourths of the respondents felt negatively about BE sounding as good as SE. Many of the respondents believed that BE had a faulty grammar system and that there needed to be a standardization of the English language. Although sixty-three percent of the respondents believed that rejection of a child's language could be harmful, only thirty-nine percent of them agreed that attempts to eliminate BE could be psychologically damaging to the BE speaking student. Many believed that BE should be accepted socially, but only 39% agreed to BE usage in the classroom. More than half (63%) of the respondents reported to have received some exposure to language diversity, and only 19% felt that the issue had been addressed substantially in their perservice training. The open-ended question yielded some extreme comments from "BE speakers are lazy" to "They just don't care to open their mouths." The researcher points out that "preservice teachers need to be learning about culture differences in the classroom of culturally different learners. These courses should be taught by teachers who have met that challenge."
Hoover, McNair-Knox, Lewis and Politzer (1996) designed two instruments to measure teachers’ attitudes toward African American English. The first test was called “The Speech Varieties test” and it measured attitudes toward African American Standard English (AASE) and Vernacular English speech varieties. The test was designed to ascertain if the teachers could identify five dimensions of the speakers they heard, (1) the degree of education of the speaker, (2) appropriateness, (3) educational achievement potential of the speakers, (4) preference, and (5) perceived standardness. These were the five dependent variables are known as dimensions. Adapted from the Lambert et al (1960) matched-guise test, the procedures of this test entailed listening to eight randomly ordered tape-recorded passages. The recordings are of four bidialectical children reading in AASE and AAVE (each guise had a non-dialectical and a dialectical equivalent). The participants recorded their answers on an answer sheet. This technique is designed to enable the researcher to evaluate the participant’s reaction only to the speech varieties, and not the speakers. AASE is distinguished from AAVE in that the former has a “standard” grammar and varying degrees of Africanized intonation, pronunciation, and style. The researchers add that divergent grammatical patterns as well as Africanized intonation, phonology and style characterize AAVE. The researchers present two scripts on a single audio for pre and post testing (The researchers mention that pre/post testing is optional, and that a researcher could possibly test only once). Although the researchers list 22 features of AAVE, the grammatical features used in the testing were multiple negation, absence of third person singular markers, and inverted /preposed negatives.

A study was conducted with similar, if not identical tests, created by Hoover, Lewis and Politzer (1976) that assessed teachers’ attitudes. Like the 1996 tests, the first
test lasts 30 minutes and second lasts 40 minutes. The tests were part of a manual used by
the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching (SCRDT) and later
published in the “Handbook of Test and Measurements for Black Populations” which was
edited by Jones (1996). The 1996 measurements were created using information from the
SCRDT manual on Black English Attitude Measures (1976) and “A Field Test of Black
English for Teachers” (Politzer and Hoover 1977).

On the “The speech varieties test,” the teachers are required to rate the speech
passages on the five above-mentioned dimensions. The teacher rates the passages on a
five-point scale ranging from “very uneducated” to “very educated.” The appropriateness
dimension is rated on a nine- point scale. After statistical procedures the researcher(s)
interpreted the results. The difference between the AASE and AAVE scores indicates the
appreciation of one speech variety over the other. A large difference on the
“achievement” dimension may indicate a teacher’s biases against AAVE, thus upholding the hypothesis that a speaker of AAVE will achieve at a lower level in school.

The second instrument designed by the researchers was the “African American
English Teachers Attitude Scale (AAETAS).” The AAETAS scale was influenced by
Hayes and Taylor’s (1971) research on teachers’ attitudes toward black and nonstandard
English. Unlike Hayes and Taylor’s study, Hoover et al discuss the types of models used
to view African American speech. The first model is the “deficit” model which views
African culture as deficient and needs “fixing.” The second model presented by the
researchers is the “difference” model that views African American as different. This model accepts AAVE as a dialect as opposed to a mass of errors. A third perspective
purported is the “excellence” or “vindicationist” perspective. This model views African
American culture as multifaceted and African American children can learn anything because their culture has the resources to enhance such learning. The attitude scale measures teacher attitudes toward the legitimacy and use of AAVE. The test is a Likert-type scale consisting of 46 items. The teachers evaluate statements using a four-point scale ranging from “agree strongly” to “disagree strongly.” A unique aspect of this test is that it was created from actual statements made by educators. The items were paraphrased. The scoring of the items are discussed in chapter three because the currently research uses the same scoring system.

Koch and Gross (1997), measured African American Junior High School students’ perceptions of AAVE as opposed to those of college students (Doss and Gross, 1992 conducted the same study with college students). The participants were 53 African American males and 43 African American females. All the subjects were children who attended junior high school. As with the first study, the independent variable was sex, but the researchers controlled for race and age (i.e. children). The dependent variables were the responses to the 20-item questionnaire. Unlike the first study, 4 adjectives were dropped from the original scale because of low statistical values, and five adjectives were deemed more appropriate. In contrast with the first study conducted with adults, the results of this study indicated that the children preferred the BE speakers over SE speakers. This is important because children will probably encounter negative responses to their use of BE in certain environments. It is important to note that this was one of the few studies in which BE was viewed more favorably than SE.

As part of university course, Tapia (1999) designed a survey project to create awareness in teacher candidates about their (and others) attitudes on nonstandard English
usage. The researcher, who was the instructor for the class, wanted to influence the candidates’ beliefs about “good” and “bad” grammar. The course took place at a small state university in a rural area. The survey project was informal, exploratory and experiential in nature. Also the students conducted the survey. Initially the class project involved learning about internalized grammatical systems. During the semester, the students learned about language variation and how it is systematic and rooted in the speakers’ history and culture. The researcher’s intent was to have the students become actively involved with stances toward negative attitudes and nonstandard usage. The next step for the researcher was highlighting the distinction between ‘prescriptivist’ and ‘descriptivist’ approaches to grammar. The researcher believed that understanding the differences between the two approaches is the key to reckoning with attitudes about language. After discussion of the two approaches, the class discussed the attitudes towards grammatical forms. The researcher believed that arguments about language provide a symbolic way of addressing conflicts about race, class, culture and gender. The first day of class, the researcher asked the students to complete, in writing, two sentences:

“It drives me crazy (annoys me, irritates me, etc.) when people say…”

“When I hear them say this, it makes me think they …”

Some students gathered responses such as “I’ve ate,” “me and him were going,” “I ain’t going,” and “I did good.” Recycling the phrases produced from the responses to the questions contributed in the development of the survey. The students put the responses in a particular usage category, such as pronoun usage, multiple negation, agreement, etc. The students studied the development of the particular English nonstandard usage in
order to understand that the usage developed in socio-cultural contexts, and they produced nonstandard forms for discussion.

The students surveyed between 18-20 individuals who were college professors, students, the students’ relatives, students and teachers from elementary, middle and high schools. The questions were open-ended so that the respondents could elaborate on the particular nonstandard grammatical items. The students were allowed to create their own questions so that they would feel at ease engaging in dialogue with self-developed questions. Each candidate created three survey questions designed to elicit attitudes about the usage of a particular nonstandard grammatical form. The students were not to mention that the survey was for a grammar class as not to evoke "linguistic insecurity" in the respondent. The wording of the questions was created with the precaution against biasing the responses. For example prescriptive terms such as acceptable, correct, proper, right and should were not used in the survey. The teacher approved the survey before the candidates took them to the streets. Two examples of questions were:

"What do you think about this usage?"

"What kind of person do you think says this?"

Although some questions could have been answered "yes" or "no," the teacher advised the candidates to engage the respondents in conversation about the usage. After the surveys were conducted, the candidates compiled all the responses and wrote summaries of their results. The students wrote the responses on paper and compiled them. In the summaries they discussed the types of attitudes they found, and any trends or interesting aspects of these responses. In addition, they wrote possible obstacles for speakers who used the nonstandard forms.
The informal research approach to creating and conducting the surveys enabled the candidates to explore their attitudes as well as others' attitudes of nonstandard forms. The candidates reported that some respondents immediately cited grammatical rules intended to explain why the form(s) were incorrect. A few candidates observed that a standard usage was assumed to have a single usage, but the language has different levels of complexity at which that rule applies. One of the main points learned from this survey project was that nonstandard forms were viewed as "context appropriate" (i.e. appropriate for certain social situations. The candidates generally argued in favor of employing primary discourse, or home dialects that were nonstandard, in appropriate contexts. This was important because the candidates were compelled to dispel the notion of "good" and "bad" or "right" and "wrong." The candidates acknowledged that building lessons that related language to particular contexts would be appropriate. Overall, the survey project provided the opportunity for learning internal rules that are developed in the speakers' cultures and histories. The researcher stressed that before entering classrooms, the teacher candidates need to have direct exposure to the attitudes that others hold regarding nonstandard forms. This task, which simply was an educational activity, also revealed more about their own attitudes than those of the respondents.

Conclusion

This literature review attempted to establish an aspect of African American culture that is unknown to many teachers and researchers, namely, the way in which many African Americans are taught to use language. Within the Social Judgment Framework, the research highlighted attitudinal studies as well as studies that discussed how individuals formed their attitudes. Heath’s ethno graphic study highlighted the
differences between both an African American and a White working class community. Although Heath studies only two communities, there are striking similarities to the ways in which some African Americans across the country are raised. The discussion of the White working-class community was included in order to show the contrasts. It was Bernstein, Bereiter and other deficit model researchers’ lack of understanding of African American children’s relationship with adults that yielded the deficit model. For example, as Brice Heath noted, African American children rarely are conversation partners with adults. Labov (1969) explained that this lack of contact with adults is the reason why the African American children in the deficit studies gave monosyllabic responses.

It should also be noted that Hoover et al pointed out that teachers who reflect a deficit model on the African American Teacher Attitude Scale (AAETAS) should not be viewed as being racists. They stress that it only reflects that many teachers in the U.S. do not know “how” to teach African American children. In the literature review, it was Hacker (1992) who provided a partial solution. “White teachers must come to realize that ‘black English’ possess a grammar, a stem of deep cultural meaning, and a linguistic integrity on a par with that of standard English… black pupils should be given more opportunities for expressive talking, since black culture gives as much attention to style as to the substance of speech (p. 171).”

Delpit adds more to the solution by suggesting that children be taught the ways of the “Culture of Power.” She mentioned that some teachers tell the students of the political implications of language use, some have students make a dictionary of their vernacular and standard word equivalents, and some have them produce a news show and use television characters from different cultures.
Virtually all of the studies in this literature review pertain to attitudes of language. Like the Social Judgment Approach the studies involved a discrimination or choice between two or more alternatives. The studies used matched-guise techniques, Likert scales and interviews to ascertain teachers’ attitudes toward AAVE and SE. These techniques mainly involved the use of adjectives and statements about the language or dialect in the study. Several studies were conducted to create surveys (Di Giulio, 1973; Hoover, McNair-Knox, Lewis and Politizer, 1996; Tapia, 1999). The current study uses an existing survey (a Likert Scale) to ascertain attitudes about dialects.

The literature review also covers almost thirty years of research on attitudes toward nonstandard English and BE. The literature review shows that attitudes toward AAVE vary and that perception of speech may reveal unconscious prejudice. If attitudes toward AAVE have not changed in the last three decades, then it may imply that preservice teachers need better methodological approaches to understanding non-standard dialects of English. If attitudes have changed in the last three decades, then practitioners must ascertain why African American children are still being disproportionately placed in special education courses. Delpit (1997) reported that many of these children are misplaced because their teachers believe that they have language deficits. In addition the review covered attitudes of non-educators, children, teachers, parents as well as the community. The literature review suggests that it is the teachers who have the primary obligation to address the social-political implications of response to non-standard English use in the corporate and academic spheres. Attitudes of teachers are an important factor in strengthening the educational achievement of children who speak marked dialects.
Many teachers are not aware of “marked” verses “unmarked” forms of a language. This may be a reason why many of the findings had reflected varying opinions on nonstandard language use. Overall, this literature review has demonstrated that attitudes of teachers and these attitudes are often negative toward marked forms of a language. It also demonstrated that some teachers reflect either a deficit or difference position. Most of the research with AAVE was conducted in the seventies, but a majority of attitude studies have been conducted in the Northern and Western states. W. Wolfram (personal communication, October 18, 1999) and A.F. Vaughn-Cook (personal communication, January 28, 2001) have noted that there has been virtually no research conducted on AAVE in the South.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Discovering Preservice Teachers’ Attitudes

In the Spring of 1999, the researcher conducted a qualitative survey in order to ascertain preservice teachers’ attitudes about AAVE, their opinions about its usage in school and to fulfill a class requirement\(^2\). The results of that study showed those preservice teachers’ linguistic knowledge and awareness of AAVE varied considerably. In the research, the stance of some teachers toward AAVE reflected a “deficit” view, while that of others reflected a “difference” view of AAVE in the schools. The researcher posed five questions to 15 randomly selected undergraduate preservice teachers at the FU. Although these statements will not be used in the current study, they were very important because they solicited the attitudes of preservice teachers in the State of Florida (i.e. the target population).

- Please explain if any, the differences in the English that many African American students use in school?
- If this African American language variety is mainly used in specific environments (e.g. the hallway, schoolyard) please name the environment?
- Explain how you feel, as an educator, about African American English usage in the school. Should the students use it in the classroom?

\(^2\) The qualitative research was conducted for a qualitative research course at the researcher’s university.
• Can African American English speaking children speak Standard English. If yes, Why do they continue to use African American English?

• Is speaking Standard English important to African American English speaking children. Why or Why not?

The researcher encountered statements about AAVE use in school such as,

Difference Statements

1.) “If it helps a student understand a specific concept (i.e. Math) then it may be beneficial. However, Standard English should be used the majority of the time.”

2.) “Students should be exposed to both, but taught in the form of English that will be accepted in the “job world” as correct English.”

Deficit Statements

1.) “I think students should be required to know correct English even if they don’t use it because it will help in the future.”

2.) “No! The African American student should learn to use proper, standard English because there is no excuse for labeling bad grammar and speech to just our culture.”

Although all the preservice teachers believed that AAVE speaking children were competent in SE, they reflected different beliefs about the importance of SE for AAVE speaking children. All preservice teachers who took the survey volunteered in an elementary or high school as interns or observers. Therefore, their exposure to the children may be evidence of their belief that AAVE speaking children were competent in SE.

In light of the results from the researcher’s previous course project, two purposes emerged. The first was to determine how preservice teachers responded to statements made by other educators about African American language/culture, and how they would score on the AAETAS. The second was to identify demographic (race, university attended, hometown size, gender, age, socio-economic status) and exposure
variables most strongly associated with preservice teachers’ attitude scores. In order to accomplish the above purposes, the following research questions were formulated:

**Research Question 1**

What attitudes do selected Florida preservice teachers exhibit toward AAVE as measured by the African American English Teacher Attitude Scale?

**Research Question 2**

What demographic variables (race, university attended, hometown size, gender, age, socio-economic status) and exposure-to-dialect variables (home/community, high school course work, university course work) are associated with these attitudes?

**The Instrument**

The African American English Teacher Attitude Scale (AAETAS) was used to collect data answering these research questions. Hoover, McNair-Knox, Lewis and Politzer (1991) developed the AAETAS based on an earlier version. Hoover, Lewis and Politzer had developed an earlier similar version of the AAETAS in 1976 at the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching (SCRDT). It is a Likert-type scale that was based on actual statements made by educators and laypersons. The instrument followed a model developed by Taylor and Hayes (1971) for measuring teachers’ attitudes. The AAETAS is a 46-item test whose scores range from 46 to 184. In several test administrations, the reliability of the scale measured from 0.89 to 0.93. After the
survey was administered, a reliability analysis of each item was run using an SPSS computer program. Each item was determined to have an r coefficient of .30 or higher using Cronbach’s alpha to measure reliability (Siegle, 1998). Subsequently, the AAETAS had been utilized in teacher workshops across the country to explore teachers’ attitudes toward AAVE (Hoover et al, 1991).

The African American English Teacher Attitude Scale (AAETAS) was based on reactions to statements that reflect high (above 160) and low (below 120) attitude scores. Some statements on the test pertained to culture, not language, and others used outmoded terms. Nonetheless, the entire instrument was used in this study so as not to threaten its established validity and reliability. The researcher obtained permission from the researchers to use the instrument.³ The statements in the AAETAS were rearranged by the researcher to allow most questions about language to come before questions about culture. The rearranged AAETAS statements are listed below. [The original AAETAS and the four-point options are presented in appendix A]

1. African Americans need to know both standard and Black English in the school in order to survive in America.

2. African American English is a unique speech form influenced in its structure by West African languages.

3. African American English is a systematic, rule-governed language variety.

4. African American English should be eliminated.

³ Dr. Mary Hoover of Howard University gave the researcher permission to use the AAETAS via telephone.
5. African American English should be preserved to maintain oral understanding and communication among Black people of all ages and from all regions.

6. It is racist to demand that African American children take reading tests because their culture is so varied that reading is an insignificant skill.

7. African American English should be promoted in the school as part of African American children’s culture.

8. Standard English is needed to replace African American English to help with worldwide communication.

9. It is not necessary for Black children to learn anything other than their own dialect of African American English in school.

10. There is no such thing as African American English.

11. The use of African American English is a reflection of unclear thinking on the part of the speaker.

12. African American children’s language is so broken as to be virtually no language at all.

13. African Americans should talk the way everybody else does in this country.


15. The African American community concept of discipline involves not letting children “do their own thing” and “hang loose.”

16. African American kids have trouble learning because their parents won’t help them at home.

17. When a child’s native African American English is replaced by standard English, she or he is introduced to concepts which will increase his learning capacity.
18. The home life of African American children offers such limited cultural experiences that the school must fill in gaps.

19. African and African American hair and dress styles are very attractive.

20. African American kids would advance further in school without African American English.

21. African American English has a logic of its own, equal to that of any other language.

22. African American children can’t learn to read unless African American Vernacular English is used as the medium of instruction in the schools.

23. African American people have their own distinctive pattern of speech which other people in this country should accept.

24. African American English was produced by its history in Africa and this country and not by any physical characteristics.

25. African American English can be expanded to fit any concept or idea imaginable.

26. Most African American people’s major potential is in music, art, and dance.

27. African Americans should try to look like everybody else in this country rather than wearing Bubas and Afros.

28. The home life of African American people provides a rich cultural experience directly connected to African origins.

29. The reason African American children have trouble learning in school is that they are not taught properly.

30. African American English is basically talking lazy.

31. African American children can be trained to pass any test written.
32. African American children can to read in spite of the fact that most readers are written in standard English.

33. African American children have the same potential for achievement in math and science as any other people.

34. African American children are advantaged through African American English; it makes them bidialectal just as Chicanos are bilingual.

35. African American English is misuse of standard language.

36. African American children should be allowed to choose their own course of study and behavior in school from an early age and should not be directed by the teacher.

37. Standard English is superior to nonstandard English in terms of grammatical structure.

38. African American English should be preserved because it creates a bond of solidarity among the people who speak it.

39. Acceptance of nonstandard dialects of English by teachers would lead to a lowering of standards in school.

40. African American English should be preserved because it helps African American feel at ease in informal situations.

41. African American English enhances the curriculum by enriching the language background of the children.

42. African American English expresses some things better than standard English.

43. The reason African American people aren’t moving as fast as they could is that they’re not as industrious as they should be.
44. Since only standard English is useful in getting a job, it should always be preferred over African American English.

45. African American English should be abandoned because it does not provide any benefits to anybody.

46. The reason African Americans aren’t moving as fast as they could is that the system discriminates against them.

For the purpose of this research an AAETAS with 46 positive and negative statements about AAVE was used to answer the two research questions. A statement such as “African American English expresses some things better than standard English” was viewed as positive statement towards AAVE, whereas a statement such as “African American English is misuse of standard language” was viewed as a negative statement towards AAVE. The researcher divided the sentences into negative and positive categories and emailed them to the survey creator, Dr. Hoover, who confirmed the negative/positive divisions. Respondents were asked to choose from a four-point response Likert-type scale to rate each response. These were:

1 = Agree Strongly
2 = Agree Mildly
3 = Disagree Mildly
4 = Disagree Strongly

The AAETAS is comprised of 23 positive and 23 negative statements. The 46 items on the AAETAS have a range of scores from 46 to 184 when scored. Hoover et al (1997) noted, “on the attitude scale a high score (above 160 points) can be interpreted as a favorable attitude toward divergent speech patterns and the achievement potential of
African American students, whereas exceptionally low scores (below 120) tend to show significant negative attitudes” (pg. 386).

The researcher in this study reported the respondents’ scores from the current AAETAS as “high,” “middle,” and “low.” These scores were based on the statistics from the continuous scores. In other words, the researcher used the range of scores, the mean, and the standard deviation from the current study in order to ascertain which scores were viewed as high, middle or low. Furthermore, categorization of scores as “high,” “middle, or “low” was based on the statistical analyses of data in the current study, and these scores were compared with the ranges (high score above160 points and scores below 120) established by Hoover et al (1997). Hoover et al (1997), the creators of the AAETAS, provided three categories of scores by establishing that scores above 160 were interpreted as favorable, while those below 120 showed significantly (the authors’ word) negative attitudes. However, the four-point scale used in the original AAETAS was retained for use in the current study. This scoring system assigned numerical values to responses as follows:

(a) 4 points for a strong agreement with a positive statement;
(b) 3 points for a mild agreement with a positive statement;
(c) 2 points for a mild disagreement with a positive statement;
(d) 1 points for a strong disagreement with a positive statement;
(e) 4 points for a strong disagreement with a negative statement;
(f) 3 points for a mild disagreement with a negative statement;
(g) 2 points for a mild agreement with a negative statement; and
(h) 1 point for a strong agreement with a negative statement.

**Variables**

The literature review revealed that prior studies researched the attitudes of in-service teachers and variables such as race, grade level taught at the institution, gender, age,
number of years teaching, dialect, level of teaching institution (Bronstein et al, 1970; Granger et al, 1977), geographical location of teaching institution (Woodworth & Salzer, 1971), grade level of the students investigated in the study (Naremore, 1971) as well as geographical location of teaching assignment (urban vs. rural), teachers’ fields of college degree, teaching experience, racial composition of school and parents’ education (Taylor, 1973). The variables that had the most impact consisted of level of institution, race, racial make up of school, SES of teachers and students’ dialect.

It is important to ascertain if ‘hometown population’ and “primary language socialization” are associated with their attitudes. Standard English is normally associated with White and educated people living in suburban areas, while AAVE is associated with African Americans in either rural or urban areas. Most studies have concentrated on the language of the students (Di Julio, 1973; Shuy & Williams, 1973; Granger et al, 1977; Colquhoun, 1978; Harber, 1979 and Hoover et al, 1997), but not the language of the teachers. Teachers’ vernacular could be an important variable associated with their attitude toward a particular dialect of English. Although Shuy and Williams (1973) used various dialects as stimuli in order to ascertain listeners’ attitudes about a social standing of a dialect, heretofore no study has considered the respondents’ dialect.

An important aspect of this study is that it was conducted in a different geographical area than previous studies. This study was conducted in the state of Florida, which is the United States’ southernmost state. This is important because one’s primary geographical region plays a role in their language socialization. The southern part of the United States has a considerable number of African Americans, many of whom live in rural areas. Unlike many African Americans in the south, many African Americans in the northern
part of the United States live in predominately urban areas. This contrasting geographical aspect should be considered in studies conducted in the south.

Although some of the earlier studies had considered the subjects' current teaching settings (urban or sub-urban), variables such as size of the teacher’s hometown, the teacher’s dialect and exposure to AAVE through either a high or college course were not used in previous studies. The nature of the hometown is an important variable because AAVE speaking children are often found in the rural and urban areas in the south. Researchers must also consider the fact that teachers also come from urban, suburban and rural areas. As a result, teachers from these areas are not only exposed to speakers of AAVE, but many of them also have primary dialectal influences that should be noted. Teachers who were raised in suburban areas may not have had much exposure to AAVE speaking children as teachers who were raised in either urban or rural areas.

Besides the hometown and the dialect of teachers, variables such as exposure to features of AAVE through a high school or college course were included in the study because academic exposure to a dialect may be an important variable associated with attitudes toward it. In light of an extensive literature review the variables (1) Primary hometown population of teachers, (2) Primary English dialect of teachers, (3) Exposure to features of AAVE through a high school course and (4) Exposure to features of AAVE through a college course were used in the current study.

Preservice teachers’ attitudes toward AAVE have rarely been assessed. It is important to note that Doss and Gross (1992) as well as Tapia (1999) used college students in their studies. The former used African American college students who may or may have been preservice teachers, while the latter used preservice teachers. Although Tapia’s (1999)
study included preservice teachers who self-reported aspects of the dialect, it did not survey their attitudes in order to ascertain whether or not they held negative or positive attitudes. Preservice teachers’ attitudes are probably shaped by their home and schooling as well as language socialization. Teachers attitudes may be also be shaped by their teaching experiences.

Population and Sampling

A sample of convenience consisting of preservice teachers at the Florida University and the Orange University were selected for this research. The subjects comprising this sample of 153 (N = 153) were identified through education courses at their respective universities. The sample consisted only of students who were education majors, and who were planning to teach elementary or secondary school in the state of Florida.

The researcher approached the instructors of education courses required for those who were pursuing teacher certification and requested that the instructor allow the survey to be conducted in her or his class. In the demographic section of the AAETAS the respondents indicated their intent to teach. This was important because those who did not indicate any intention to teach (i.e. future engineer) were not considered preservice teachers, and their surveys were discarded. In this manner the researcher controlled for academic major.

Both FU and OU are four-year public institutions in the state of Florida. The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES, 2002) reported that FU had a student population of 33,971, whereas OU had population of 12,126. In addition, FU had a white student population of 75.3% and OU had a black student population of 94.3% (NCES,
Nearly all of the ten public universities with a predominately white student body and a predominately African American student body in the state of Florida have similar statistics (NCES, 2002).

**Method of Data Collection**

The researcher first contacted the relevant administrator and teachers at both institutions to secure permission. Each instructor of the selected course received through visitation:

1. A copy of the original AAETAS questionnaire and demographic information sheet (Appendix A)
2. The researcher’s cover letter requesting permission from the author(s) to use the original AAETAS (Appendix B)
3. Informed Consent Letter (Appendix C)
4. Human Subjects Committee Approval Letters (Appendices E and F)

The researcher was responsible for arranging to meet the students, bringing with him the cover letters and the demographic information sheet and surveys. The researcher remained in the classroom until all students had completed their surveys as well. He then inspected them at his office, and discarded any incomplete questionnaires.

**Treatment of Data**

Data from the completed questionnaires were entered on an SPSS 10.0 statistical program. The AAETAS four point response Likert-type scale was utilized, and coded as explained previously. Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations of responses for each item were tabulated. The positive statements were coded with
numbers (i.e. from 4 to 1), and the negative statements on the survey were recoded in inverse fashion (i.e. 1 to 4).

Subsequently, responses were tabulated to show the sum of scores obtained from each African American English Teacher Attitude Scale (AAETAS). The frequency distributions and a table of preservice teachers by school, race and gender were used to answer Research Question 1 (What attitudes do selected Florida preservice teachers exhibit toward AAVE as measured by the African American English Teacher Attitude Scale?). The frequency distributions were divided by preservice teachers’ attitude score categories (e.g. high, middle and low). Unlike the original AAETAS research conducted by Hoover et al (1996), the current research used the range, mean and standard deviation of the continuous scores in order to describe the preservice teachers’ attitudes toward AAVE. Research Question One was answered by displaying tables and a histogram.

A multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to answer Research Question 2, “Which variables are associated with these attitudes (i.e. race, school, size of hometown/urban vs. rural, age, gender, SES, dialect and exposure to AAVE)? The multiple regression analysis ascertained which independent variables correlated significantly with the dependent variable. The multiple regression analysis also enabled the researcher to provide a post hoc estimated marginal means of score for independent variables that yielded significant p - values.

A multiple regression analysis ascertained which variables used in this research were “associated” with attitudes toward AAVE. Overall, there were nine independent variables. The researcher sought to ascertain variables that were “associated” with the preservice teachers’ attitudes. Gliner and Morgan (2000) reported that associational
questions require “associational inferential statistics,” which entail a multiple regression analysis. Furthermore, a multiple regression analysis is necessary because a dependent variable is influenced simultaneously by several independent variables (Babbie, 1998). Using SPSS statistical programming to run a multiple regression analysis will also show whether the nine independent variables have strong relationships between one another. Seliger and Shohamy (1995) state that, “Through multiple regression analysis it is possible to examine the relationship and predictive power of one or more independent variables with the dependent variable (p. 223).” A regression analysis will indicate the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variables. A multiple regression analysis in this research will determine how the variance in the attitude score can be accounted for by the independent variables ‘race,’ ‘hometown environment, ‘dialect’ ‘school,’ ‘gender,’ ‘SES, ‘age,’ and ‘academic exposure to the features of AAVE.’

Multiple regression has major advantages over simple correlational techniques because the latter examines the relationship of only two variables, and they provide too narrow a view. The advantages of using multiple regression are especially relevant for attitudinal research because attitudes are known to emanate from one’s family, religion, government, school, peers and cognitive variables one may hold in high esteem (Sherif et al, 1965). Multiple regression analysis was also promoted by Seliger and Shohamy (1995) when attempting to capture several factors assumed to operate together in second language learning (i.e., personal, situational, contextual, and cognitive). Like languages, attitudes are thought to be “acquired” and involve many of the same variables (Sherif et al, 1965). Because many variables affect attitudes, and because the purpose of this study is to ascertain association between the variables, a multiple regression analysis is also
more advantageous than ‘difference inferential statistics’ such as an ANOVA, which tests for differences between groups (Gliner & Morgan, 2000). The significance level (p-value) for all tests was established at alpha (α) = 0.05 to be consistent with what is commonly done in the field. To facilitate the analysis SPSS 10.0 statistical programming was used to run the multiple regression analysis.

Summary

Chapter III described the purposes of this research and the various aspects of the methodology of the study including the two research questions posed. In addition, the chapter described the research approval processes, the instrument used, the process of sampling the population, the method of data collection, and the treatment of the data.

In Chapter IV, the results of the data analyses are reported. The SPSS 10.0 statistical program was used in the treatment of the data. Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations of responses for each statement were tabulated. Tables and a histogram were created to reflect answers to Research Question One, a multiple regression analysis and an estimated marginal means plot were used to reflect the answer to Research Question Two.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSES OF THE DATA

In Chapter 4, the results of the survey and data pertaining to the two research questions posed in the study will be reported. The results of the survey show the continuous attitude scores of the preservice teachers surveyed in this study. A table with the mean, median, mode, range of scores and standard deviation of attitude scores reflect on the scores were disbursed. A histogram reflects the scores of preservice teachers and their counts. In order to further answer Research Question One, the section “Preservice Teacher Attitude Scores” reports a table with scores by category (high, middle and low), school, race and gender.

The “Statistical Analyses of Dependent and Independent Variables,” section reports a multiple regression analysis, which is used to answer Research Question 2. The nine variables are important to the study because they may be associated with the preservice teachers’ attitude scores. An estimated marginal means plot of the significant variables will be included in this section as well. In the conclusion section, the researcher will summarize the procedures and methods used in this chapter. The questions were:

1. What attitudes do selected Florida preservice teachers exhibit toward AAVE as measured by the African American English Teacher Attitude Scale?
2. What demographic variables (race, university attended, hometown size, gender, age, socio-economic status) and exposure-to-dialect variables (home/community, high school course work, and university course work) are associated with these attitudes?

There was a total of 153 (N=153) preservice teachers surveyed. The researcher omitted two surveys, which brought the total from 155 to 153. These were omitted because they were either not completed or “strongly agree” was answered for all negative and positive questions. Additional findings of the data, findings not posed in the two research questions but which the researcher felt were important, are included in the ancillary analyses section. These findings were reported as a result of the compilation of the collected data and the multiple regression analysis conducted on the dependent variable (attitude score) and the nine independent variables (race, university attended, hometown size, gender, age, socio-economic status, primary language used at home, exposure to AAVE through a high school course, and exposure to AAVE through a high school course).

Chapter 3 shows the 46 items in the survey instrument given to the preservice teachers. The demographic sheet pertaining to the nine independent variables is found in Appendix A. After all the pencil and paper surveys were completed, the researcher used the SPSS 10 Statistical Data Editor for analysis. In tabulating the means and standard deviations, missing or unanswered questions by the respondents in the surveys were considered in the computation if the respondents completed the entire survey, but chose to leave a few questions unanswered. The significance level was set at alpha (α) = 0.05.
Survey Results

Table 1 portrays the mean, the median, the mode, the standard deviation, the range, the minimum score, and the maximum score for the sample of 153 preservice teachers surveyed in this study. The mean of all scores was \( M = 127.34 \), which is in the ‘middle’ range. The median (\( \text{Mdn} = 129 \)) and mode (132) of all scores were higher than the mean, and they also remain in the ‘middle’ category. The standard deviation (\( \text{SD} = 16.80 \)) reflects that a little over 68 percent of all attitude scores were between 110.54 and 144.14 on the attitude scale. The minimum score was 85, which was in the ‘low’ category. The maximum score of 170 was in the ‘high’ category. There was a range of 85 points between the minimum and maximum scores. Figure 1 is a graphic representation of attitude scores with frequencies and a normal curve superimposed.

Because \( M = 127.34 \) is the mean of all the preservice teachers’ scores, it is henceforth labeled as the “mean of all scores.” Figure 1 has a slight curve for scores between 85 and 109 as well as scores between 110 and 154. However, the scores between 85 and 109 fall less than one standard deviation below the mean of 127.34. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, they are considered as “low scores.” The scores between 110 and 154 are considered as “middle scores.” There were some preservice teachers who scored over 154, which is 1 standard deviation above the mean. Therefore, these scores are considered as “high scores.” Moreover, the mean, standard deviation and range in Table 1 as well as Figure 1 were used to set the ranges 85 to 109 (low), 110 to 154 (middle) and above 154 (high).
Table 1

Statistics for all Attitude Scores (n=153)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>127.34</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Distribution of Continuous Scores

Std. Dev = 16.80
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Figure 1: Distribution of Continuous Scores
The AATEAS Survey items in the Current Study

The Means, Standard Deviations, and Frequency of Responses on the AAETAS used in this study are discussed in this section. The mean responses to the statements on the AAETAS ranged from 1.56 to 3.61. The highest means were assigned to statements 27, 33, and 32. Those means were 3.61, 3.50 and 3.44 respectively. The lowest means value (1.56) was associated with statement 9. All the statements on AAETAS were made by teachers in the 1970s; therefore, the language reflect slang and of that era. Statement 27 (African Americans should try to look like everybody else in this country rather than wearing Bubas and Afros.) received 111 “strongly agree” replies, and statement 33 (African American children have the same potential for achievement in math and science as any other people.) received 106 “strongly agree” replies. Statement 32 (African American children can learn to read in spite of the fact that most readers are written in standard English.) received 39 “agree” replies and 96 “strongly agree” replies. Statement number 9 (It is not necessary for Black children to learn anything other than their own dialect of African American English in school), with the low mean score received 105 “strongly disagree” replies and 28 “disagree” replies.

The items on the survey were interesting to note because they were actual statements made by teachers. Statement number 9 elicited attitudes about whether or not African American children should learn a dialect of English other than AAVE in school, and a majority of preservice teachers revealed that African Americans children should conform to mainstream language. One hundred and thirty-three preservice teachers either “strongly disagreed,” or “disagreed” with this statement. The fact that 19 preservice teachers either “strong agreed,” or “agreed” with this statement was interesting. The
sentence is ambiguous because it is unclear whether African Americans should learn only AAVE in schools as opposed to another dialect, or whether they should learn only AAVE and not math, science, algebra, etc. Statement number 27 (on the previous page) elicited preservice teachers’ attitudes toward African American dress styles (i.e. culture). A total of 141 preservice teachers either “strongly agreed,” or “agreed” that African Americans should conform to mainstream dress (culture). The interesting aspect about this statement is that it did not pertain to language, and a large number of preservice teachers agreed with it. Both statements 32 and 33 addressed African American children’s ability to “achieve” in math, science and reading. The fact that any preservice teachers disagreed with these two statements (i.e. 18 preservice teachers for #32 and 18 for #33) is alarming. The frequency distributions to the 46 statements are compared on Table 5 below. A total of 12 items on several surveys were omitted, but the researcher included them in the calculation of all surveys.

In addition, a reliability analysis was conducted on the 46 statements completed on the 153 AAETASs. The reliability of the scale measured .8833 using Cronbach’s alpha procedure. Although the reliability was high, statements 6, 9, 15, 22, and 29 were determined to have negative r coefficients of -.2002, -.0219, -.0341, -.0330 and -.1152 respectively. The negative coefficients were not large, and they only slightly affected reliability. They are:

Statement 6: It is racist to demand that African American children take reading tests because their culture is so varied that reading is an insignificant skill.

Statement 9: It is not necessary for Black children to learn anything other than their own dialect of African American English in school.
Statement 15: The African American community concept of discipline involves not letting children “do their own thing” and “hang loose.”

Statement 22: African American children can’t learn to read unless African American Vernacular English is used as the medium of instruction in the schools.

Statement 29: The reason African American children have trouble learning in school is that they are not taught properly.

The five statements that had negative coefficients on the reliability analysis are listed. Possible reasons for the negative coefficients could be ambiguity, improper wording or negative statements. Statement 6 contains 2 propositions, either of which could be a response. Although the statements reflected a reliability of .9067 when the statements with negative r coefficients were removed, all statements were retained on the survey in the final analyses of the data. The statements were retained because Hoover et al (1997) established the reliability and validity of the instrument with the 46 statements. Furthermore, the researcher would have had to reestablish the reliability and validity if the existing instrument was modified. Overall the range of r coefficients was from .0713 to .6999 for all 46 statements.

Preservice Teachers’ Attitude Scores

Research Question 1

Each variable was analyzed for Research Question 1 (What attitudes do selected Florida preservice teachers exhibit toward AAVE as measured by the African American English Teacher Attitude Scale?). The range, standard deviation as well as the mean of the completed surveys was used place scores in post-hoc categories of ‘high,’ ‘middle,’ and ‘low.’

Table 2 reports comparisons of constructs for the previous and current AAETAS.
The scores in the current study are disbursed in relation to the standard deviation. Therefore, scores under 110 points are considered as ‘low,’ ‘middle’ scores are between 110 and 153 points and scores above 153 are considered as ‘high.’ In contrast, according to Hoover et al (1997) scores below 120 showed significantly negative attitudes and scores above 160 showed favorable attitudes toward AAVE. In the present study, some of the preservice teachers who fall into Hoover, Mc-Nair-Know, Lewis and Politzer’s (1997) ‘deficit’ category, placed in the ‘middle’ category of the present study. Thus, one-third of the preservice teachers surveyed in the present study fit into Hoover et al ‘deficit’ category. This has important implications for the future of AAVE speaking children in Florida schools, where these teachers are expected to work.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hoover et al (1997)</th>
<th>Present Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>under 120</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>120-159</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>160 or above</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the researcher conducted surveys at both a predominately white school and a predominately African American school, frequency divisions by school, race, gender and the three score ranges of high, middle and low are reported in Table 3. Preservice
teachers at FU comprised 58.3 of the total sample, whereas preservice teachers at OU comprised 41.2 of the total sample.

The categories of American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander and Hispanics were combined into an “Other” category because each represented sample was not large enough for statistical analysis. The “Other” racial category represented only 5.9 percent of all preservice teachers assessed. African American and White together comprised 94.1 percent of all preservice teachers surveyed. The female preservice teachers comprised 75.8 percent of the sample and male comprised 24.2 percent of the sample. There were 62 African American female preservice teachers and 18 African American male preservice teachers out of the 153 preservice teachers surveyed. White female preservice teachers comprised 51 of the total sample, whereas White male preservice teachers comprised 13 of the total sample. There were 3 female preservice teachers who reported “Other” as their race, and 6 male preservice teachers who reported “Other.”

The only African American male preservice teacher surveyed at FU represented a middle score. There were 14 African American males at OU who had middle scores and 3 who had low scores. In addition, African American males did not report any high scores. There were 1 high score, 6 middle scores and two low scores among the nine preservice teachers who classified their race as “other.”

OU had a total of 54 middle attitude scores, while FU had a total of 66 middle scores. Although OU and FU had nearly the same number of middle scores, OU had a total of 5 low scores while FU had a total of 13 low scores. Each school had 3 preservice teachers with high scores. Overall, 4.6 percent of the scores were categorized as high,
82.4 were categorized as middle and 13.1 percent of all the scores were categorized as low.

**Table 3**

Frequencies Preservice Teachers’ Attitude Scores by School, Race and Gender (n = 153)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>FU</th>
<th>OU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistical Analyses of Dependent and Independent Variables

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 is as follows:

What demographic variables (race, university attended, hometown size, gender, age, socio-economic status) and exposure-to-dialect variables (home/community, high school course work, university course work) are associated with these attitudes?

The research question above includes the nine independent variables that were used in the multiple regression analysis. The multiple regression analysis was used to determine which independent variables were associated most highly with the dependent variable. For example, the multiple regression analysis ascertained whether language used at home was associated with attitude score. In addition, the multiple regression analysis was used for a post hoc estimated marginal means comparison among the independent variables that yielded significant p – values (e.g. Language Used at Home and Hometown Population).

Table 3 is a list of null hypotheses for the nine independent variables and the dependent variable (attitude score). Age and SES were the only variables considered as “interval.” As a result, the researcher had to assign dummy variables to the seven nominal (categorical) variables. The categories of gender, school, race, language, course1, course2 and hometown population were assigned a numerical value (i.e. “dummy variable”) in order to run statistical analyses (e.g. 0 = female, 1 = male, 0 = African American, 1= White, etc.).
Table 4

Null Hypotheses in Research

Ho: There are no differences in the attitude scores among “African American,” “White” and “Other” preservice teachers.

Ho: There are no differences in the attitude scores between preservice teachers from FU and OU.

Ho: There are no differences in the attitude scores among preservice teachers from rural, urban and suburban areas.

Ho: There are no differences in the attitude scores between female and male teachers.

Ho: There are no differences in the attitude scores of preservice teachers between 18 and over 26 years of age.

Ho: There are no differences in the attitude scores among preservice teachers with different SESs.

Ho: There are no differences in the attitude scores among preservice teachers who spoke AAVE, SE or both AAVE and SE as their home language.

Ho: There are no differences in the attitude scores between preservice teachers who had a high school course with AAVE and those who had not.

Ho: There are no differences in the attitude scores between preservice teachers who had a college course with AAVE and those who had not.

The multiple regression analysis in this study entailed using 7 categorical (nominal) variables and 2 numerical (interval) variables. The 7 categorical variables were gender, race, school, language used at home, high course with AAVE, college course with AAVE and size of hometown, whereas the two numerical variables were SES and age. The researcher conducted multiple regression analysis on the independent variables and the dependent variable to ascertain which independent variable was associated with...
preservice teachers attitudes. Gliner and Morgan (2002) reported that a regression analysis is used to ascertain association among variables, especially if there is more than one independent variable. Since this research entails finding “associations” among the independent variables and the dependent variable, a multiple regression is the appropriate statistical analysis in this research. The research does not use an ANOVA because it is not the purpose of this study to find “differences” between groups; instead the purpose is to “test for associations or relationships between variables” (Gliner and Morgan, 2000: 76). Research Question 2 (What demographic variables…are associated with these attitudes?) is a complex associational question because it considers more than one independent variable at the same time.

Table 5 portrays all variables, both significant and insignificant, as a result of the multiple regression used in this study. Table 4 reflects a significant $p$-value for Language Used at Home and Hometown Population. This is an important finding because these two variables had not been used in previous studies. The additional variables that had not been used in previous studies, High School and College Course, did not yield significant $p$-values. Gender, School, Age and SES also did not yield significant $p$-values. However, the value for R-squared is .200, which implies that knowing language used at home and hometown population only explains only 20 percent of the variability of attitudes. The multiple regression analysis ran to answer Research Question 2, “Which variables … are associated with these attitudes?” revealed that Language used at Home and Hometown Population are associated with preservice teachers’ attitudes to a considerable extent. Since Language Used at Home and Hometown Population yield
significant p – values, an estimated marginal means plot was created to compare the means of these variables.

Table 5

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Attitude Score
Tests of Within-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable: Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>151.055</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>151.055</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>17.799</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.799</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>111.700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.850</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>2564.717</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1282.359</td>
<td>5.086*</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE1</td>
<td>5.495</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.495</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE2</td>
<td>23.107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.107</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMPOP</td>
<td>2376.313</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1188.156</td>
<td>4.712*</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>553.102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>184.367</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>582.757</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>194.252</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Squared = .200 (Adjusted R Squared = .106)
*significant at alpha (α) = 0.05.

An estimated marginal means plot displays the estimates of the population marginal means for the variables selected. The means of both Hometown Population and Language Used at Home were compared in order to ascertain the differences and to view
how these means are generalized to the population of preservice teachers. The plot shows that teachers who speak Standard English at home represent the lowest mean, regardless of their hometown population. It is interesting to note that race, gender, age and SES among other variables did not yield a significant $p$-values; therefore, race, gender, age and SES are not associated with the attitudes of preservice teachers, regardless of their hometown and language used at home. The above-mentioned variables that did not reflect significant $p$-values are not “associated” with preservice teachers’ attitudes, but they may yield significant values with difference inferential statistics that are used for comparative approaches. In other words, if the researcher had tested for “differences” between groups by using analysis of variance (ANOVA), then race, age SES, gender, etc may yield significant $p$-values (Gliner & Morgan, 2000: 76).

The plot also displays that the means of rural, suburban and urban teachers who speak AAVE at home are virtually the same, with the mean of rural AAVE speaking teachers slightly higher. However, the means of teachers who speak both SE and AAVE are quite distinguishable. The rural bidialectal speakers have the lowest mean, urban bidialectal teachers are slightly above rural. Interestingly, the mean of bidialectal suburban teachers is the highest of all teachers, regardless of their hometown size. This finding may mirror the fact that suburban bidialectal teachers’ knowledge and use of SE and AAVE influence their attitudes toward AAVE.
Summary

This section summarizes the findings that were obtained from the two major research questions. The subjects in this study consisted of a selected sample (sample of convenience) that was comprised of education majors who were preservice teachers. The researcher assessed the attitude scores of preservice teachers by using the AAETAS, and displayed these attitude scores on a histogram, and further displayed their attitude score categories on a table. The results were descriptive in nature, for the Florida preservice teachers’ attitudes were reported and grouped by categories such as race, school attended, and gender. A histogram reported the continuous scores as well.

This chapter reported the analyses of the data and displayed the attitude scores and categories of the teachers who took part in the survey as well as ascertained which variables were associated with their attitudes. In the statistical analysis, it was not the
researcher’s intent to compare differences between groups such as race, gender, age, etc. Therefore, individual ANOVAs did not suffice because it tests for “differences between groups,” and a multiple regression analysis tests “associations or relations between variables” (Gliner & Morgan, 2000:76). Instead, the researcher wanted to ascertain which independent variables were associated with the preservice teachers’ attitudes.

The findings in this chapter suggest that primary language (vernacular) and the size of their hometown population (i.e. the hometown in which they were raised and attended primary and secondary school) are associated with preservice teachers’ attitudes. The nine variables and the researcher’s overall findings, implications and recommendations will be discussed in chapter five.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

The United States is becoming more ethnically and linguistically diverse and the average American classroom is comprised of children from many cultures. As a result, teachers are challenged to accommodate the educational needs of these pupils. A carefully conducted study of teachers’ attitudes toward African American Vernacular English (AAVE) may reveal their attitudes toward ESL students and other minority students who are learning Standard English as a target language. Attitudes toward this dialect of English had been a forgotten issue until the Oakland California School Board’s decision to address AAVE. However, rap music, which is often a conduit for expressing social issues through AAVE, has influenced children of other ethnic groups. Consequently these children adopt the grammar in their speech. This implies that many children of other ethnic groups besides African Americans may use AAVE. Subsequently, they will probably “learn” AAVE as a dialect since children get their language use from peers (Wolfram, 1987).

Meier (1998) reports that linguistic education is important for teachers, but information alone will not solve all the problems of linguistic bias in education. Attitudes must be examined. Baugh (1998) also points to universities’ failure to support teacher education as fully as they do other professions. When teachers interpret AAVE speaking
children’s language differences as deficits, Meier (1998) claims “teachers often are likely to overlook or discount children's language strengths and create instructional settings that do not engage students linguistically or cognitively…teachers need to learn about African American literary traditions in order to help their students build literacy from oracy (p. 85).”

This study addressed an aspect of teacher education, which is the examination of their attitudes about children’s ways of speaking. AAVE was the English dialect used in this study because many preservice teachers in the state of Florida will encounter AAVE speaking children in their classrooms. The following research questions were posed in this study:

What attitudes do selected Florida preservice teachers exhibit toward AAVE as measured by the African American English Teacher Attitude Scale?

What demographic variables (race, university attended, hometown size, gender, age, socio-economic status) and exposure-to-dialect variables (home/community, high school course work, university course work) are associated with these attitudes?

The study assessed preservice teachers’ attitudes using the African American English Teacher Attitude Scale (AAETAS) by categorizing their total responses to statements (i.e. scores) as either “high,” “middle,” or “low.” It is important to note that if preservice teachers yield low scores, then they may view a child’s dialect as deficient. Teachers with low scores could see an AAVE speaking child as incapable of reaching the same level of expectations as those for non-minority students. Attitudes toward a
language may not only reflect discrimination on the basis of language, but usually masks more subtle and sinister forms of racism and/or ignorance.

The secondary purpose of this study was to determine which variables were associated with the preservice teachers’ attitudes. The research entailed the use of nine independent variables such as race, school, gender, language used at home, hometown population, age, SES, a high course that covered features of AAVE, and a college course that covered features of AAVE.

The multiple regression analysis conducted on the nine independent variables and the one dependent variable revealed that preservice teachers’ attitudes are associated with their “primary vernacular spoken at home” and their “hometown population.” Race, gender, SES, racial make up of school, a high school course that covered features of AAVE and a college course that covered features of AAVE were not associated with attitudes.

An extensive literature review highlighted a number of important variables such as race, gender, age, size of city in which school is located, number of years teaching, SES and others. The paramount reasons for the contrast in variables between the current study and previous studies mentioned in the literature review are geographical location in which the surveys were conducted, the differences between preservice and in-service teachers as well as the purposes of the research.

Geographical location of the teaching institution (Woodworth & Salzer, 1971) and geographical location of teaching assignment (Taylor, 1973) might also have contributed to differences in variables, for the current study only considered the South as a geographical location in this study. Prior to this study, Taylor’s (1973) study was the
only study that included teachers in the South Atlantic area. There was no mention whether Taylor’s study included teachers in the state of Florida or not. It is important to consider that the results of studies conducted in the south during the seventies and eighties may differ from current studies because of population growth and change of location within the state. The US census (2002) reported between 1970 and 1980 the white population in the state of Florida grew from nearly 5.8 million to nearly 8.1 million, while the African American population grew from slightly over 1 million to 1.3 million respectively. The 1990 US census (2000) reported over 10.7 million whites and over 1.7 million African Americans lived in the state of Florida. Therefore, between 1980 and 1990, the state of Florida grew from 9.7 to 12.9 million. Region to region migration (i.e. from all areas of the US) favored migration to the South and drained the Northeastern part of the US. (US Census, 2002). Geographical relocation could affect the types of people and attitudes of a specific area. Furthermore, over twenty percent of 42 million people aged one and over moved from a different county within the same state. As a result, some hometown populations may have increased while others may have decreased in the last ten to twenty years. The current study has shown a change in variables that effect attitude, which may be due to a change in population.

Taylor (1973) conducted a study of in-service teachers’ attitudes toward AAVE and found that teachers who were new to the teaching profession were less entrenched in their attitudes than teachers who had been teaching for long periods of time. The ages of in-service teachers vary considerably, whereas the ages of preservice teachers may not vary much. This fact could also be reason for the different findings in the seminal and current studies. It is reasonable to believe that because preservice teachers lack the
experience, age and exposure to the classroom, they are less capable of forming empirical judgments about students’ vernaculars.

Interestingly, Taylor (1973) also found that teachers in the South Rural Atlantic (a location that may included Florida) felt positive about the structure and inherent usefulness of nonstandard and AAVE dialects. Taylor used the Language Attitude Scale (LAS) in order to evaluate opinions in four content areas and to compare groups, while the current study entailed using the AAETAS to ascertain which variables were associated with attitudes. Contrasts between instruments (e.g. the LAS, the AAETAS, matched guise, semantic scales, the teacher attitude scale, etc) and purposes of the studies most likely yielded different significant variables. The instruments used in the current and those of previous studies differ in form as well as purpose. Taylor (1973) used the LAS, which was a 25-item Likert-scale, to “compare” groups. He concluded that at least race, age and region of school were significant. Woodworth & Salzer (1971), Colquhoun (1978), Granger et al (1977), Doss and Gross (1991) as well as Koch and Gross (1997) used a matched guised to “compare” groups, and found that race, age and gender were significant in determining attitudes toward various dialects of English.

All studies, with the exception of Tapia (2000), either concentrated on AAVE speaking students (Doss and Gross, 1972; Koch and Gross, 1997) in-service teachers (Di Giulio, 1973; Taylor, 1973; Granger et al, 1977; and Colquhoun, 1978) or people in the community (Hoover, 1978). However, only the current study ascertained “preservice” teachers’ attitude scores using the AAETAS. Tapia’s (2000) study entailed preservice teachers as surveyors of the public. The teachers surveyed individuals outside of class in order to explore attitudes about the use of nonstandard forms.
Like the current study, Hoover et al (1997) used the AAETAS. The differences between Hoover et al (1997) use of the AAETAS and the researcher’s use of the AATEAS are noteworthy. The researcher used the AAETAS to ascertain if preservice teachers’ attitude scores were “high,” “middle,” or “low;” and which variables among preservice teachers were associated with their attitudes. Hoover et al (1997), on the other hand, used the AAETAS for in-service teacher workshops and discussion. Furthermore, the current study used demographic variables, but the Hoover et al study did not use all the same variables. The purpose of the current study did not entail comparison of groups by race, gender, age, etc. Instead, its purpose was to ascertain which variables were associated preservice teachers attitudes. Therefore, a multiple regression analysis (used for finding associations among many variables) was the appropriate statistical method, as opposed to difference designs such as ANOVAs (Gliner & Morgan, 2000). The significant findings of the current study reflected that teachers’ primary language used at home and their hometown size were associated with their attitudes toward AAVE.

A post-hoc comparison of the means reflected that the means of suburban preservice teachers who speak both SE and AAVE were significantly higher than that of SE or AAVE speaking preservice teachers from the rural or urban areas as well as suburban SE or AAVE speaking teachers.

The findings may suggest that integration of the races as well as African American migration into the suburban areas in the last three decades has yielded interesting sources of attitudes. Since the study comes at least twenty years after those earlier studies, it may reflect the effects of integration in more positive ways in the
The research entailed using variables that are not normally considered in language attitude studies. Variables such as the exposure-to-dialect (courses with AAVE and dialect spoken at home) and hometown population were used in this study because their association with attitudes toward language has heretofore been unknown. Preservice teachers were chosen for this study because of their lack of experience in the classroom and because of the desire to discover the attitudes of those who will eventually become teachers in a state that is considered diverse. Their opinions were more likely formed on the basis of early socialization at home, in their schools, and in their communities than on their experiences observing in the classroom.

**Summary of Findings**

Over 75 percent of the preservice teachers were female. Over 52 percent of the preservice teachers were African American, while 42 percent of them were white. Almost 61 percent of the preservice teachers reported that SE was their primary language spoken at home, 15 percent reported that AAVE was their primary language, and slightly over 24 percent reported to be bidialectical in their primary language environments (both SE and AAVE). Preservice teachers from urban backgrounds comprised 43 percent of the sample, suburban comprised over 36 percent of the sample and rural preservice teachers comprised slightly over 22 percent of the sample.

One of the most interesting and troubling findings of this study was that low attitude scores were reported by a considerable number of preservice teachers. For example, preservice teachers reflected low scores regardless of their gender, race or
school representation. Only 5 percent of the preservice teachers reflected a high attitude score, a little over 82 percent reflected a middle attitude score, and slightly over 13 percent reflected a low attitude score. However, if Hoover et al original categories are considered, fully one-third had a deficit view of AAVE. Furthermore, females had lower attitude scores than males. White males and females had lower attitude scores than African American males and females. More African American females had high attitude scores than all other preservice teachers.

A Post hoc estimated marginal means comparison reflected that suburban bidialectal teachers had the highest mean of all teachers, whereas SE speakers had the lowest mean regardless of hometown population. The mean for rural, urban and suburban AAVE speaking preservice teachers was higher than bidialectal rural teachers but the same for urban bidialectal teachers. Overall, the mean of bidialectal suburban teachers surpassed the means of all teachers by more than 15 points (Figure 2).

The racial makeup of each university was contrastingly different, for one university was predominately white and the other was predominately African American. This was important because the skewed school populations affected the transferability of the findings. In other words, because some universities in the state of Florida have large Hispanic populations, this may change the dynamics of attitude. Therefore, transferability should be considered relevant only to those universities with similar demographic characteristics.

The findings of this study add to the research on teacher education by providing an index of teacher attitude scores in the State of Florida. Although a plethora of research exists on the features of AAVE and the educational implications on its speakers, this
research has clearly shown that teachers’ attitudes still vary after four decades of research on the dialect. This study suggests that negatively valuing students’ languages may remain un-addressed in other Colleges of Education as well as the two studied here.

Cazden (1998) stressed that, “Educators' attitudes toward language differences thus have an increased potential to influence educational outcomes: Positive attitudes reinforce opportunities for students to build on the language skills they bring to school; negative attitudes increase the risks often associated with language differences (pg. 50).”

The preservice teachers in this study were aware that AAVE exists and that it is a dialect spoken by many in the schools here in America. However, they have shown through this survey that the problem with language in the classroom may not lie with the students; instead, it probably lies with the educators themselves, just as Cazden claimed.

The results of this study also show that preservice teachers should be better educated about dialects as well as non-native languages in the classroom. A number of preservice teachers in this study with low attitude scores (e.g. 85 out of 184) have demographic characteristics of the in-service teachers today. This study shows that the deficit belief still exists among a vast number of our preservice teachers. It is important to reinforce that some are African American.

The results of this study also add to the body of literature that questions teachers’ beliefs about native English speaking minority students as well as limited English Proficiency (LEP) students. Maybe the traditional methods used in our primary and secondary schools do not take into account research on language variation. Some of the African American preservice teachers vehemently denied speaking AAVE, but inadvertently produced questions such as, “How much we get? (cf. How much do we
get?). Although the preservice teachers in this study indicated their primary language spoken at home, some inquired about what AAVE dialect was. If the teachers in this research are in denial about their own language use and lack knowledge of dialects, then they may not be concerned about the language use of their pupils. This is a crucial point because language use at home was a significant variable at $p < .007$.

In conclusion, the results clearly show that the attitudes of preservice teachers vary. The researcher stresses that the results of this study and future studies should be shared with the preservice teachers, so that they can see the variety of attitude scores and discuss their implications. This study could serve as a reference for administrators in making policy decisions as well as teacher education programs.

**Implications**

The findings of this study have important implications for teacher education programs because if teachers’ attitudes have not changed in the last several decades, then it may imply that deficiency philosophies of the sixties through nineties are still negatively affecting educational policies of today. If teachers’ attitudes can be changed through courses that explore and reveal the nature of their attitudes, then they may approach language variation in the classroom in a way that does not humiliate children who speak dialects of English other than standard. Courses that explore the nature of racial identity and teachers’ language beliefs will assist in improving knowledge about minority student dialects and how educators approach them.

The results also have implications for policy decisions because policy and curriculum planning from a deficit view can adversely affect teachers and their administrators. Awareness of preservice teachers’ attitudes can influence policies on
preservice and in-service teacher training. Although the Florida Consent Degree represents a step toward meeting the needs of language minority students, it does not accommodate those of AAVE speaking children. Negative attitudes toward a dialect that is influencing millions of SE speaking white children (through rap music) do nothing to contribute to the need for practical approaches and dialogue about language. This research has clearly shown that teachers need educational linguistic courses that address native language variation and other sociolinguistic phenomena. Finally, it is apparent by the low attitude scores that a considerable number of teachers do not view AAVE speakers as capable of academic achievement on par with that of other students.

**Recommendations**

In light of the findings, the researcher makes the following recommendations:

**Recommendations for Researchers and Educators**

1. The AAETAS and the demographic variables might be used in university education courses across the state and country in order to reveal the nature of preservice teachers’ attitudes and the variables that are associated with these attitudes. The AAETAS should also continue to be used with in-service teacher workshops across the country. Subsequently, discussion about the nature of the teachers’ attitudes could accompany actual teaching about dialect variation.

2. It is recommended that the AAETAS be used as a pre and post measurement for testing the effects of educational methodologies that cover features of AAVE. Furthermore, the AAETAS should be used in university education courses to develop a
bidialectal curriculum that exposes preservice teachers to their attitudes, and ways to use the child’s dialect in the facilitation of SE.

3. It is crucial for preservice teachers to explore their own language use and attitudes by having discourse about their views of minority students and their approaches to pedagogy of speakers of other dialects. Readings in the critical theoretical framework may lead teachers to important insights about race and identity. Only when college education majors explore themselves and the nature of the judgment process, can they see how they affect children from minority cultures.

4. Education methodology courses should have preservice teachers design a survey project to create awareness in these teacher candidates about their (and others) attitudes on nonstandard English. Projects like Tapia (1999) should be used as models.

**Recommendations for Policy Makers**

1. It is recommended that The Florida State Department of Education resume using “A Protocol Materials Catalog” to supplement abstract presentation of concept and principles relating to the language of AAVE speaking children. This catalog should be mandated in schools of education so that preservice teachers of all races could be exposed to the features of AAVE. This would have wider implications for students from ESL backgrounds as well as residents of the US who speak a native language other than English. Teachers’ attitudes have probably remained constant within the past four decades, so there is cause to believe that improved methodologies must be established in teacher education programs at colleges and universities throughout the state. Using the
Protocol Materials Catalog would compel preservice teachers to concentrate on the features of the language, rather than the speakers of the language.

2. The Florida State Department of Education should increase funding to support teacher education so that teachers would become sufficiently knowledgeable about crucial details of dialects and ESL. Funding should also be increased to teach students about language variation among native speakers. All teachers should take a course or two in sociolinguistics as well as use the AAETAS as a precursor for discussion about AAVE.

3. The federal government and the Florida State Department of Education should provide funding for research on LEP students and nonstandard English speaking students’ language use. In addition, there is a need to study the influence of rap music on young students of all races because the lyrics in rap music, which are comprised of AAVE phrases and slang, is most often the lingua franca for young people of all races.
APPENDIX A

Original African American Teacher Attitude Scale (AAETAS)
The researcher’s Demographic Information Sheet will accompany this survey


1. Most African American people’s major potential is in music, art, and dance.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

2. African Americans should try to look like everybody else in this country rather than wearing Bubas and Afros.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

3. African Americans need to know both standard and Black English in the school in order to survive in America.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

4. African American English is a unique speech form influenced in its structure by West African languages.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

5. The reason African Americans aren’t moving as fast as they could is that the system discriminates against them.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

6. African American English is a systematic, rule-governed language variety.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly
7. African American English should be eliminated.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

8. African American English should be preserved to maintain oral understanding and communication among Black people of all ages and from all regions.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

9. The African American community concept of discipline involves not letting children “do their own thing” and “hang loose.”

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

10. African American kids have trouble learning because their parents won’t help them at home.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

11. It is racist to demand that African American children take reading tests because their culture is so varied that reading is an insignificant skill.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

12. African American English should be promoted in the school as part of African American children’s culture.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

13. Standard English is needed to replace African American English to help with worldwide communication.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

14. It is not necessary for Black children to learn anything other than their own dialect of African American English in school.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

15. The reason African American people aren’t moving as fast as they could if they’re not as industrious as they should be.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

16. There is no such thing as African American English.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly
17. The use of African American English is a reflection of unclear thinking on the part of the speaker.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

18. African American children’s language is so broken as to be virtually no language at all.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

19. African Americans should talk the way everybody else does in this country.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

20. African American English is principally a Southern speech form.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

21. When a child’s native African American English is replaced by standard English, she or he is introduced to concepts which will increase his learning capacity.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

22. The home life of African American children offers such limited cultural experiences that the school must fill in gaps.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

23. African and African American hair and dress styles are very attractive.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly


Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

25. African American English has a logic of its own, equal to that of any other language.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

26. African American children can’t learn to read unless African American Vernacular English is used as the medium of instruction in the schools.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly
27. African American people have their own distinctive pattern of speech which other people in this country should accept.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

28. African American English was produced by its history in Africa and this country and not by any physical characteristics.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

29. African American English can be expended to fit any concept or idea imaginable.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

30. The home life of African American people provides a rich cultural experience directly connected to African origins.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

31. The reason African American children have trouble learning in school is that they are not taught properly.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

32. African American English is basically talking lazy.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

33. African American children can be trained to pass any test written.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

34. African American children can to read in spite of the fact that most readers are written in standard English.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

35. African American children have the same potential for achievement in math and science as any other people.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

36. African American children are advantaged through African American English; it makes them bidialectal just as Chicanos are bilingual.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly
37. African American English is misuse of standard language.

Agree Strongly  Agree Mildly  Disagree Mildly  Disagree Strongly

38. African American children should be allowed to choose their own course of study and behavior in school from an early age and should not be directed by the teacher.

Agree Strongly  Agree Mildly  Disagree Mildly  Disagree Strongly

39. Standard English is superior to nonstandard English in terms of grammatical structure.

Agree Strongly  Agree Mildly  Disagree Mildly  Disagree Strongly

40. African American English should be preserved because it creates a bond of solidarity among the people who speak it.

Agree Strongly  Agree Mildly  Disagree Mildly  Disagree Strongly

41. Acceptance of nonstandard dialects of English by teachers would lead to a lowering of standards in school.

Agree Strongly  Agree Mildly  Disagree Mildly  Disagree Strongly

42. African American English should be preserved because it helps African American feel at ease in informal situations.

Agree Strongly  Agree Mildly  Disagree Mildly  Disagree Strongly

43. African American English enhances the curriculum by enriching the language background of the children.

Agree Strongly  Agree Mildly  Disagree Mildly  Disagree Strongly

44. African American English expresses some things better than standard English.

Agree Strongly  Agree Mildly  Disagree Mildly  Disagree Strongly

45. Since only standard English is useful in getting a job, it should always be preferred over African American English.

Agree Strongly  Agree Mildly  Disagree Mildly  Disagree Strongly
46. African American English should be abandoned because it does not provide any benefits to anybody.

Agree Strongly   Agree Mildly   Disagree Mildly   Disagree Strongly

The Researcher’s Demographic Information Sheet

Section I: Demographic Information Sheet

Directions:
Please circle the letter of the item pertaining to you.

1. I am
   A American Indian or Alaskan Native
   B Asian
   C Black or African American
   D Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   E Hispanic or Latino/Latina
   F White

2. I am
   A female
   B male

3. I attend (your primary institution)
   A FSU
   B FAMU
   C Other

4. I am
   A a future or current educator
   B Other

5. I was raised in a home/community where
   A African American English was mainly spoken
   B Standard English was mainly spoken
   C Both were spoken equally
6. I have had a high school course (English literature, or other) that covered features of African American English?
A Yes
B No

7. I have had a college or university course (English literature, or other) that covered features of African American English
A Yes
B No

8. I consider the population of my hometown to be
A Rural
B Urban
C Suburban

9. My age is between
A 18-20
B 21-23
C 24-26
D 27 or above

10. My estimated family household income is between
A $5,000 to $14,999
B $15,000 to $49,000
C $50,000 to $149,000
D $150,000 or more

11. I am a US citizen or US resident for 10 years or more?
A Yes
B No
APPENDIX B
Letter Requesting Permission to use the AAETAS

Ismail A. Hakim
Instructor
Center for Intensive English Studies (CIES)
918 West Park Avenue
The Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306

(850) 644-4797
Home: (850) 575-5984
e-mail: iaa1567@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Dear Dr. Hoover,

My name is Ismail A. Hakim and I am doctoral candidate at the Florida State University in Tallahassee, Florida. I am conducting research on Teachers’ Attitudes toward African American Vernacular English (i.e. Ebonics). As part of my doctoral dissertation, I would like to utilize your African American English Teacher Attitude Scale (AAETAS) published in:


I would like to use the statements on your AAETAS. I realize that I must give full credit to you and the other researchers in,

In addition, none of the statements on the AAETAS will be modified (i.e. changed); I will only shorten the instrument by using a smaller number of items in the best interest of time.

Your permission to use the AAETAS would be greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at address above. Thank you.

Cordially Yours,

Ismail A. Hakim
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX C
Informed Consent Letter (FSU)

I freely volunteer and without element of force or coercion, consent to be a participant in the research survey entitled “Florida’s Preservice Teachers’ attitudes toward African American Vernacular English (AAVE).” In addition, I realize that in order to fill out this survey, I must be above the age of 18. And by filling out this survey, I am giving my consent.

This research is being conducted by Ismail A. Hakim, MA., who is a doctoral candidate at the Florida State University. I understand the purpose of his research project is to survey Florida Preservice Teachers in order to understand these teachers’ beliefs about AAVE. I understand that if I participate in the survey I will be asked to answer survey questions about AAVE. It is my understanding that my participation in this survey will remain anonymous, even to the researcher. My total participation will entail filling out a paper and pencil questionnaire.

I understand that my participation is totally voluntary and I may stop participation at anytime. If I decide to stop participation, I will still be entitled to the all the rights and privileges of any university student at my campus. All my answers to the questions will be kept confidential and identified by a subject code number. My name will not appear on any of the results. No individual responses will be reported. ONLY group findings will be reported.

I understand there is a possibility of a minimal level of risk involved if I agree to participate in this study. I might experience anxiety when thinking about AAVE and my beliefs toward nonstandard dialects. The instructor or researcher will be available to talk with me about any emotional discomfort I may experience while participating. I am able to stop at anytime I wish.

I understand there are benefits for participating in this research. First, my own awareness about AAVE may be increased. Also, I will be providing linguists and educators with valuable insight into teachers’ feelings about nonstandard dialects. This knowledge can assist them in providing appropriate education methods for dealing with Teachers and students who encounter nonstandard dialects.

I understand that this consent may be withdrawn at any time without prejudice, penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I have been given the right to ask and have answered and inquiry concerning the study. Questions, if any, have been answered to my satisfaction.
I understand that I may contact my advisor, **Dr. Elizabeth Platt, the Florida State University, School of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, 209 Milton Carothers Hall (850) 644-1989**, for answers to questions about this research or my rights. Group results will be sent to me upon my request.
APPENDIX D
Informed Consent Letter (FAMU)

I freely volunteer and without element of force or coercion, consent to be a participant in the research survey entitled “Florida’s Preservice Teachers’ attitudes toward African American Vernacular English (AAVE).” In addition, **I realize that in order to fill out this survey, I must be above the age of 18. And by filling out this survey, I am giving my consent.**

This research is being conducted by Ismail A. Hakim, MA., who is a doctoral candidate at the Florida State University. I understand the purpose of his research project is to survey Florida Preservice Teachers in order to understand these teachers’ beliefs about AAVE. I understand that if I participate in the survey I will be asked to answer survey questions about AVVE. It is my understanding that my participation in this survey will remain anonymous, even to the researcher. My total participation will entail filling out a paper and pencil questionnaire.

I understand that my participation is totally voluntary and I may stop participation at anytime. If I decide to stop participation, I will still be entitled to all the rights and privileges of any university student at my campus. All my answers to the questions will be kept confidential and identified by a subject code number. My name will not appear on any of the results. No individual responses will be reported. ONLY group findings will be reported.

I understand there is a possibility of a minimal level of risk involved if I agree to participate in this study. I might experience anxiety when thinking about AAVE and my beliefs toward nonstandard dialects. The instructor or researcher will be available to talk with me about any emotional discomfort I may experience while participating. I am able to stop at anytime I wish.

I understand there are benefits for participating in this research. First, my own awareness about AAVE may be increased. Also, I will be providing linguists and educators with valuable insight into teachers’ feelings about nonstandard dialects. This knowledge can assist them in providing appropriate education methods for dealing with Teachers and students who encounter nonstandard dialects.

I understand that this consent may be withdrawn at any time without prejudice, penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I have been given the right to ask and have answered and inquiry concerning the study. Questions, if any, have been answered to my satisfaction.
I understand that I may contact Dr. Verian Thomas, the Director of the FAMU Institutional Review Board, the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, 204 Perry Paige Building (850) 599-8816, or Ismail’s advisor, Dr. Elizabeth Platt, the Florida State University, School of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, 209 Milton Carothers Hall (850) 644-1989, for answers to questions about this research or my rights. Group results will be sent to me upon my request.
APPENDIX E
Questions
FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

1. **GIVE A COMPLETE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR RESEARCH PROCEDURES AS THEY RELATE TO THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS.**

   The purpose is to determine, by means of a survey, the attitudes and knowledge that preservice teachers hold toward African American Vernacular English (AAVE). The research will survey both male and female preservice undergraduate teachers in the College of Education at the Florida State University and the College of Education at Florida Agricultural and Mechanization University. The participants will be asked to choose items on a four-point Likert-Scale by circling a choice with a pencil. The research will assign a code to each participant (e.g. 001, 002, 003, etc.) They will be asked to complete a modified version of the African American Teacher Attitude Survey (attached). There are no physical risks involved in the conduction of this survey.

2. **HAVE THE RISKS INVOLVED BEEN MINIMIZED AND ARE THEY REASONABLE IN RELATION TO ANTICIPATED BENEFITS OF THE RESEARCH, IF ANY, TO THE SUBJECTS AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE KNOWLEDGE THAT MAY REASONABLY BE EXPECTED TO RESULT.**

   The risks will be minimized and reasonable because the students will remain together in the classroom setting. The researcher and/or instructor of the class will come to the class and administer the survey. The participants will not be asked to do any other physical activity.
3. **DESCRIBE PROCEDURES TO BE USED TO OBTAIN INFORMED CONSENT.**

   (A) **WHO WILL BE OBTAINING INFORMED CONSENT?**
   The researcher or the instructor of the chosen class. The instructor of the class will have the authority to decide if she/he or the researcher will conduct the survey.

   (B) **WHEN WILL THE SUBJECTS BE ASKED TO PARTICIPATE AND SIGN THE CONSENT FORM?**
   At least one class day in advance.

   (C) **IN USING CHILDREN, HOW WILL THEIR ASSENT BE OBTAINED?**
   Not applicable

4. **DESCRIBE HOW POTENTIAL SUBJECTS FOR THE RESEARCH PROJECT WILL BE RECRUITED.**

   The researcher will approach the instructors both Multilingual/Multicultural classes at FSU and FAMU and ask their permission to conduct the survey in their classes. It will be the instructor of the class who recruits the participants.

5. **WILL CONFIDENTIALITY OF ALL SUBJECTS BE MAINTAINED? HOW WILL THIS BE ACCOMPLISHED? PLEASE ALSO SPECIFY WHAT WILL BE DONE WITH ALL AUDIO AND/OR VISUAL RECORDINGS, IF APPLICABLE, PICTURES AND PERSONAL DOCUMENTATION OF SUBJECTS BOTH DURING AND AFTER COMPLETION OF THE RESEARCH.**

   The confidentiality of all participants will be maintained by not using their names or addresses. The researcher will assign a symbol for schools, gender, race (e.g. 1=FSU, 2=FAMU, M=Male, F=Female, etc.). In addition there will be no tape recording, audio or visual. The researcher will keep the surveys confidential (i.e. besides those who administer and take the survey, no one outside of the Human Subjects and doctoral committee will view the survey). The researcher will assign codes on administering the survey. The researcher will not be able to identify the participants.
6. **IS THE RESEARCH AREA CONTROVERSIAL AND IS THERE A POSSIBILITY YOUR PROJECT WILL GENERATE PUBLIC CONCERN?** if SO, PLEASE EXPLAIN.

The research area, which is nonstandard dialects of English, may be controversial, but findings are meant to help Colleges of Education to improve teacher preparation in the area of dialect awareness. The survey was designed for teacher workshops.

7. **DESCRIBE THE PROCEDURE TO BE USED FOR SUBJECT DEBRIEFING AT THE END OF THE PROJECT.** IF YOU DO NOT INTEND TO PROVIDE DEBRIEFING, PLEASE EXPLAIN.

The debriefing will take place between the instructor and students, in which the former will introduce the topic of the researcher’s research and ask for volunteers to take the survey. The consent from will be presented first.
APPROVAL MEMORANDUM
from the Human Subjects Committee

Date: May 21, 2001
From: David Quadagno, Chair
To: Ismail Abdul-Hakim 304 Pennell Circle #6 Tallahassee, FL 32310
Dept: Curriculum & Instruction
Re: Use of Human subjects in Research
   Project entitled: Florida Preservice Teachers' Attitudes
   Toward African American Vernacular English

The forms that You, submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be exempt per 45 CFR § 46-101(b)2 and has been approved by an accelerated review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by May 20, 2002 you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that
the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRBOO000446.

Cc: Elizabeth Platt
APPLICATION NO. 01.271
Human Subjects Committee

RENEWAL NOTIFICATION

Date of Notice: April 1, 2002

To: Ismail Abdul-Hakim
    304 Pennell Circle #6
    Tallahassee, FL 32310

From: Human Subjects Committee

Re: Renewal of Project Entitled: Florida Preservice Teachers' Attitudes Toward African American Vernacular English

This is to advise you that your approval for use of human subjects in the above-referenced research project will expire on May 20, 2002. No research involving human subjects may be conducted after that time unless an extension is granted by the Human Subjects Committee.

In order to be granted an extension and continue your research, you must complete and submit the attached Request for Renewal to the Committee by May 6, 2002. If you wish to continue your approval for this project, or if your study has been completed and continuation is not necessary, please indicate in the box below and return this form only to the Committee.

If no response is received to this notice by June 20, 2002 a formal termination will be issued to you, your major professor and/or department chair (whichever is applicable).

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to the Peggy Haire, Assistant to Human Subjects Committee at phairec@mail.fsu.edu.

Enclosure
Cc: Dr. E. Platt
Department: Education
Approval Category: Exempt
HSC No. 01.271
No renewal is necessary.
TO: Mr. Ismail Hakim  
Florida State University  
Department of Education

FROM: Verian Thomas, Chairperson  
Institutional Review Board

DATE: May 29, 2002

SUBJECT: An Institutional Review of the Proposal Entitled, "Florida Pre-Service Teacher's Attitudes Towards African American Vernacular English."

The Institutional Review Board has approved the above-named project (reference number 002-24), which involves the use of human subjects.

Please be reminded that you are required to submit a written report for review by the Board, describing project activities completed, any proposed changes in activities, and any problems encountered during the project, by May 29, 2003.

FAMU IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/EQUAL ACCESS UNIVERSITY
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Ismail Abdul-Hakim was born Randy Darrell Farmer in Charleston Missouri on June 9, 1963. When he was one, his family moved to Carbondale, Illinois where he attended elementary, junior high and high schools. While in high school, he joined the United States Marine Corps and completed his senior year before serving on active duty. After graduating from high school, Ismail went to the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego for boot camp (i.e. training).

He served at Camp Pendleton California, Okinawa Japan and Camp LeJeune North Carolina from 1981 to 1985. He was honorably discharged from the Marine Corps in August of 1985, and then he moved to St. Paul Minnesota where worked at an Aero Space Foundry. In 1989, Ismail enrolled at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (SIU-C) and received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Linguistics and a Master of Arts degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). While at SIU-C Ismail met and married his first wife, Pamela Williams in 1991 and had a one child whose name is Bayan. Ismail taught for three years at SIU Center for English as a Second Language (CESL). While at SIU-C, Ismail created a computer diagnostic to teach Standard English as a Second Dialect (SESD).

In 1997, Ismail taught English for English Language Schools (ELS) at the University of St. Thomas in Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota. In 1998, he left to pursue his Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Multilingual/Multicultural Education at the Florida State University. There he remarried with Charlotte Ngole-Abdul-Hakim, and they have a
child named “Queen Assala.” Ismail has been teaching at the Center for Intensive English Studies since January of 1998.