Journal of Urban Mathematics Education
July 2013, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 81–95

Young Children's Mathematics: Whose Home Practices Are Privileged?

Anita A. Wager
University of Wisconsin - Madison

Kristin Whyte
University of Wisconsin - Madison

In this essay, the authors share a professional dialogue about the ways in which issues of power emerge in preschool classrooms when teachers endeavor to build on children's home and school mathematical experiences and understanding. From different perspectives, as early childhood and mathematics education researchers, the authors discuss ways in which data from teacher interviews and discussions collected during a professional development program provide evidence of whose knowledge is privileged. The authors use the dialogue to explore what, how, *and* who *pre-K teachers most often privileged in their work with children and families in mathematics. And what effect that privileging had on power relationships.*

KEYWORDS: early childhood education, mathematics education, power relations, privilege, professional development

For the past three years, we (Anita and Kristin) have been working with pre-K teachers in a professional development (PD) designed to support culturally and developmentally responsive mathematics practices. The focus of the PD was to weave together understandings of early childhood education, funds of knowledge, and early mathematics so that teachers would expand their understanding of ways to draw on children's multiple resources. Last fall, as we were driving home from one of the PD classes, Anita shared some of the topics that were discussed at a conference she had attended on privilege and oppression in mathematics education (PrOMPTE[1]). This impromptu discussion led to a conversation about how power structures in preschool classrooms (i.e. relationships be-

[1] Privilege and Oppression in the Mathematics Preparation of Teacher Educators (PrOMPTE) conference (funded by CREATE for STEM Institute through the Lappan-Phillips-Fitzgerald Endowment), Michigan State University, Battle Creek, MI, October 2012. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funding agency.

ANITA A. WAGER is an assistant professor in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 225 N. Mills St., Madison, WI 53706; email: awager@wisc.edu. Her research interests include equity in mathematics education, teacher education for social justice, and culturally responsive early childhood mathematics.

KRISTIN WHYTE is a graduate student in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1025 W. Johnson St., Madison, WI 53706; email: kwhyte@wisc.edu. Her research interests include early childhood education, home-school relationships, multicultural perspectives on education, and qualitative research methods.

tween teachers and parents and teachers and children) were strengthened, or interrupted, when teachers endeavored to build on children's home and school mathematical experiences and understanding. We found it interesting to explore this idea from our different areas of expertise (Kristin's expertise in early childhood education and Anita's in mathematics education). Thinking back to interviews, observations, and conversations with teachers in our PD, we had noticed two perspectives. On one side, there were teachers who privileged the diverse mathematical practices and experiences that families and children shared at home. And on the other side, and more common, were those teachers who privileged the home mathematics activities that aligned most with their own experiences and perspectives regarding mathematics. Given the focus of the PD on culturally responsive mathematics teaching, and the fact that all of the teachers in our PD identified as White, middle-class women whereas the children in their classrooms were from diverse ethnic, linguistic, and economic backgrounds, we wanted to understand *what*, *how*, and *who* pre-K teachers privileged in their work with children and families in mathematics. And what effect that privileging had on power relationships in the classroom. In other words, how did teachers use the power inherent in the privilege they possess as adults and teachers from a dominant group to interrupt or reify the power relationships between children and teachers, and teachers and parents?

These questions, central to our work in understanding teachers' perspectives and actions, motivated this essay. In deciding how to present our conversation about privilege in pre-K mathematics, we found the dialogic methodology used by McCarthy and Moje (2002) in their work on identity particularly helpful. These scholars addressed their research question about why identity matters through a 4-month electronic mail exchange that they presented as a conversation. Through their conversation the authors explored theories of identity, research studies on identity and literacy, and implications for pre-K–12 literacy practices. We too initiated an electronic exchange, but modified McCarthy and Moje's approach by responding to data from our study of the PD through a conversation on a *Google Doc* in which we discussed power and privilege in pre-K classrooms.

We consider this essay an initial exploration into how power and power structures, and privilege and privileging played out in our PD. We draw on Foucault (1982) in considering the way power (the ability to do something or act in a particular way) may be used to identify what knowledge counts. Thus in the traditional power relationship between adult and child (Canella, 2008), the adult/teacher identifies what counts as knowledge, which may occur by "privileging" or giving preference to particular types of mathematical practices. The power adults/teachers possess is something they can take advantage of as a result of adult privilege. Similar to white privilege, adult privilege brings with it an "invisible package of unearned assets" (McIntosh, 1988, p. 1), "which is often abused to

the disadvantage of children" (McIntosh, 2012, p. 199). The other power structure we explore is that between teacher and parent, where teachers are positioned as the professional and expert and parents are the clients (Lareau, 2000). Teachers' position as experts is particularly damaging when they hold deficit views of parents (Pushor & Murphy, 2004).

Our initial question was about how teachers privileged certain home practices in mathematics and what that implied about power relationships between children, families, and teachers. To address the first part of the question, we identified data from interviews with teachers in which they responded to questions about building on home mathematics practices. Next, we each read through the data, making comments and asking questions to each other about what teachers' perspectives implied about power. These comments began a dialogue about findings from the data and triggered recollections of examples from other data sources.

In the remainder of the essay, we present "dialogues" in which we provide examples of teachers' comments or conversations followed by our discussion of those comments. We then summarize our findings to respond to the questions that emerged through this process:

- What home mathematics practices did pre-K teachers privilege?
- How did privileging particular practices reinforce or interrupt historical power structures in parent/teacher and child/teacher relationships?
- Which families and children did teachers privilege and how might that privileging have oppressed others?

Dialogue 1: What Counts and Establishing Power Differentials

The following quote is Betty's (one of the teachers in the PD) response to the questions: What have you learned from families about their home practices that has allowed you to be more successful in your practice? What about mathematics practices in particular? We found Betty's response to be typical of those teachers who assumed they would have to help families see the mathematics in their everyday experiences:

> When I meet with families I ask questions like: "Do you count with your child when you go out in the stores?" "Do you look at different patterns and designs?" Just trying to get them to help me to understand. "What can you share with me that you do with your child that I can see is a math-related activity. And is it important to you?" ... I don't know if they [families] just don't sense that mathematics is really as vitally important. Because it's all around us. When I start pointing out to them, when you go to Wal-Mart or when you go to McDonald's you'll see patterns, you can count things; you can look at designs of things and shapes. Oh, my gosh. So, sometimes it's bringing an awareness. …To the parents that, yeah this is important. This is valu-

> able and you want to encourage your child to learn these things just as much as what are the letters in Wal-Mart when we pull up on the store or McDonald's.

Kristin: Betty expresses that "mathematics is everywhere" and then quickly slips into what she wants families to do to promote mathematics learning. The kind of mathematics that counts to Betty seems to be driven by the standards she is expected to teach toward, and it makes sense that this is the kind of mathematics that she sees.

Anita: If this is how she engages with families, it is pretty clear that she holds the power in terms of identifying what math-related activities families should be doing—what "counts" as mathematics. In particular, her comment about what she "can see" as mathematics rather than what the families consider to be mathematical. What do you think she means when she asks: "Is this important to you?" How do you think families might interpret that?

Kristin: I keep thinking about the possible responses to the question. A parent is probably not going to say, "Well, you know, mathematics is *not* important to our family or my child's education." So what is the alternative, "Yes, mathematics is important to our family." These responses both feel close to meaningless. If she asks that question during the same time she's talking about "counting at stores," it seems obvious that what Betty really wants to know is if the family is doing particular kinds of mathematics activities. Imagine how a parent whose child is just starting school might hear this question. Some families could enter pre-kindergarten already thinking about what they are doing wrong, while some might have what they are doing at home with their children reinforced. I think this example shows how *what* a teacher privileges can easily become reinforced from the very beginning of a child's schooling.

Anita: You are so right—and what concerns me most is that because this is happening before children ever enter the pre-K–12 system families whose home practices do not align with schooling are shut down (or out) from the start. This shutting down may be even more evident with mathematics as it is an area that many families (particularly those who have been historically marginalized) are not comfortable (Remillard, 2005).

I wonder if, in some ways, we as teacher educators encourage this act of telling families what to do. In reviewing articles in teacher journals, I found this idea of telling was reinforced. And, in articles such as Hansen's (2005) on the ABCs of connecting with families about mathematics, the "what to do" often came from a white, middle-class perspective. Even research studies make suggestions such as "teachers need to help parents and students label home activities as

mathematical activities" (Gautreau, Kirtman, & Guillaume, 2011), which positions teachers as the ones with the expertise rather than parents.

Dialogue 2: Learning From Families

Here, Chela (another teacher) is responding to a question asked at the beginning of the school year: What have you learned from families that you have successfully incorporated into your practice? Chela was representative of those teachers who took an asset based approach in considering home practices:

> I've been speaking with the mother much more and in a system of we want to work together as a partnership here. I tell her, you have a lot of experience with this child and you know way more as I'm only two weeks into it and so what can you do, what is it that you do at home that I can do here? What kind of the same language can be used? Sometimes we can do some of the same activities to just make it familiar and so that the student has a little bit more success.

Kristin: Chela is one of the teachers who really seemed to talk concretely about trying to learn from families. Often, I think the teachers talked about the importance of having strong partnerships, but the actual relationships, when they talked about their practices with families, reminds me of how Lareau (2000) saw home-school relationships reflective of a *professional/client* relationship, but not Chela. In this passage, Chela shows that she truly wants input from parents because she thinks home practices should have a place in the classroom.

Anita: This quote is a great example of ways to rethink parent/teacher relationships so that by viewing parents as resources, the teacher makes them the authority (Civil, Guevara, & Allexsaht-Snider, 2002). She also goes beyond asking what the family does by asking about the language they use as they engage—by language, I think she is referring to discourse practices, which research has shown may be very different in home than in school (Heath, 1982). It reminds me of some of her learning stories and her family outreach project. Chela learned from home visits and observation that her child enjoyed playing games, counting food, and loved donuts. So she designed a game similar to Hi-Ho Cheerio but using donuts. Some might argue that she was only drawing on the child's interests, much like Hedges (2011) interpretation of funds of knowledge, rather than incorporating family practices. But I would argue that we can't say what meaning game playing had in the family—it may have contributed to the families "household well-being" and thus an example of incorporating the child and family's funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1990, p. 133).

Dialogue 3: Moving Beyond Cooking Projects

We found some situations in which there seemed to be evidence of movement toward an asset view of family practices. However, the kinds of family practices that were built upon made us wonder whether or not the teacher was only supporting what she was comfortable with. In this segment of her interview, Emma shared how some of the mathematics activities in the classroom built on children's experiences in the home:

> You know, a lot of it comes from the cooking projects. We have some shared cooking projects, and a lot of times, that'll come with the special weeks or even the holiday things where you have a special treat and it's something that can be made with kids. We often ask, "Hey, can we do that?" And that—you know, the measuring, the pouring, all of the counting the scoops, and that kind of stuff. That's usually where it comes in. You know, other than if they bring stuff in from home that they want to count, or like bringing—sometimes families will bring in pinecones from their yard, not a lot—I mean, I don't know.

Kristin: This provides an example of how she brings home mathematics into the classroom.

Anita: Yes, but it is the home mathematics she is expecting to be there—pinecones in a yard (what if there is no yard) and cooking and measuring. Cooking and measuring is such a "go to" context for bridging home and school mathematics but families have multiple practices for measuring that may not include scoops (Wager, 2012). She seems to be making assumptions that the cooking she is doing in school reflects the cooking in the children's homes.

Kristin: Well, I think she is giving actual examples of home practices families and children elected to bring into the classroom. However, I hear your point. Often, I think early childhood teachers bring in food-related projects to connect with families who are different than them and that's where a family's culture being reflected in the classroom ends.

Anita: It is hard to know—were those projects brought in because those families felt they had agency to do so? Were there other families that didn't bring projects in because they didn't know they could, didn't know if their experiences would be validated? But you have more experience with this teacher and so I am interpreting a small portion of a comment without any context. It is interesting to think about the methodology behind what we are doing, discussing snippets of data having varying degrees of knowledge about the teacher or the context. I also think it is important to think about the lens I bring in. Am I looking for a deficit perspective?

Kristin: I don't think you're looking for a deficit perspective, I think you have a healthy amount of skepticism when it comes to cooking projects. So, what if a family brings in a cooking activity to do with the class and Emma maps school mathematics language on to it? Is that bridging home and school? Is it not acknowledging how the family enacts mathematics practices in their home?

Anita: I'd say yes, in this case it is bridging home and school and acknowledging family practice. This situation is a common issue we face when thinking about how to (and how teachers) use family practices to engage with mathematics. To what extent are the things teachers are doing in the classroom reflecting the embedded mathematical practices that families engage with in various activities (González, Andrade, Civil, & Moll, 2001). On the other hand—it is a start. She is thinking about what families do that can provide a context for mathematics in school.

Dialogue 4: Young Children and Grown-up Conversations

The following exchange is based on an observation in Birdie's classroom. She is chatting with the children during lunchtime about what they did over the weekend:

> **Naeem:** I got into a fight at my house.
> **Birdie:** Naeem, don't forget to eat your corn. Did anyone do anything fun over the weekend?
> **Tim:** I went to the zoo.
> **Birdie:** In town? And you got new boots? And you did too? Wow—lots of new clothes.
> **Amaya:** I went to Chuck E. Cheese's with my baby sister and then we was about to go somewhere else….
> **Birdie:** What did you do at Chuck E. Cheese's?
> **Birdie:** Did you do anything fun at all this weekend, Leilani?
> **Leilani:** Nothing.
> **Birdie:** Nothing! Did you play outside? No! Did you stay in bed all weekend? And what about you Naeem, did you do something with Daddy this weekend?
> **Naeem:** He played some games, then went to bed and work. I didn't go to Chuck E. Cheese's.

Kristin: This exchange doesn't necessarily have to do with math, but while looking in Nvivo for a different paper, I came across this powerful example of what teachers privilege from an observation in Birdie's classroom. It has to do with not wanting "unfun" things to be brought into the classroom.

Anita: It isn't about mathematics in this instance, but it is an example of a teacher finding out about what children do outside of school and the teachers in the PD

are learning how to connect mathematics in school to what children do out of school. In Birdie's case, it seems she is looking to learn about what children do outside of school that meets her definition of "fun." Leilani had to compare what she did to going to Chuck E. Cheese's and it didn't seem to be as fun so she did "nothing" fun. Is Birdie shutting children out of the conversation if their weekends don't match up to the fun of Chuck E. Cheese's? Doesn't this privileging of particular activities suggest that the out of school experiences Birdie has to draw on for mathematics activities will be limited to particular kinds of activities, from certain children? Thus other children may not get the opportunity to see their experiences reflected in the classroom.

Kristin: Right, and thinking of Naeem, not only did Naeem not get to see his experiences reflected in the classroom, he learned that parts of someone else's life counts more than his.

Anita: It reminds me of Gutiérrez's (2007) windows and mirrors—in Birdie's class those children like Naeem who don't share Birdie's experiences will always be looking through a window at the experiences of more privileged children whereas Amaya gets to see her home experiences reflected in school.

Kristin: And then what do the children who are looking in do? Do they find other ways to get attention? There were a couple other moments in this observation that seemed like Naeem was seeking negative attention from Birdie:

> **Birdie:** [Naeem] We don't belch at the table. That's not polite. You may do that at home, but we don't do that at school.
> **Naeem:** I can do it at home.
> **Birdie:** Ok, but not at school.

Because he couldn't get attention for talking about the fight he finds memorable from his weekend (his mirror), I wonder, is he doing things on purpose to get in trouble because that's how he learned he could get attention in this classroom? I feel like it's easy for situations like this to arise in classrooms. This situation seems true in early childhood classrooms because our conceptions of childhood are wrapped up in ideas of fun and innocence (Johnny, 2006), which doesn't make talking about things like fighting feel easy or appropriate (Zipin, 2009). That being said, I do think there are ways to talk about "uncomfortable" topics with young children.

Anita: Speaking of uncomfortable topics, I can't let this conversation go without bringing up Birdie's comments about "lots of new clothes." This comment brings to mind a remark Clover, another teacher, made two years ago. She and her group

were planning a lesson connecting mathematics to social justice using the children's book *Those Shoes* (Boelts & Jones, 2009) when it suddenly occurred to her how often we comment on new clothes or shoes that children wear without regard to how those children who don't have new things must feel.

Kristin: I think talking about clothes feels like an easy, "nice" thing to talk about, giving and receiving compliments feels good and little kids beam when you talk about their new shoes. I think they've learned some of these lessons before they enter school so children who are used to receiving compliments about their appearance seek that kind of attention. When I taught pre-K if a little person would come in and proudly show me their new shoes, of course, I would share in their excitement. However, as a classroom practice, we would talk about the importance of giving compliments about how we treated each other. Consequently, the children did give and seek out more compliments about their interactions with each other and their learning than they did their appearance.

Dialogue 5: What Children Bring to the Classroom

The following section of an interview with Amanda provides an interesting contrast to "what should be fun" and who identifies what is fun. Amanda began by talking about what happened at lunch with one of her children and shifted to a discussion about objects she has children bring in from home to share:

> **Amanda:** One little girl last year was eating a hamburger. And we had peas that day. And she took her finger, and I just watched her. And she poked holes all the way around her hamburger bun. And then she counted her peas as she placed them in the holes.
> **Interviewer:** Now someone would say that's playing with your food, but somebody
> **Amanda:** I know. I—I just looked at her and I said, "That's really neat." And then when her dad came in that night I said, "You know, spontaneous learning. And she's counting."
> **Amanda:** I try to encourage them to bring stuff in. And we usually have a morning time where I read stories and it's just as easy to drop off a story if somebody brings something in. And they're all learning from it. And it seems like the more children that do that, the more they want to bring in. And—and typically like on show and tell days it's usually a toy. And I always leave a note for the parents, "Please think of something other than a toy."
> **Interviewer:** Ah. Now why is that?
> **Amanda:** Why is that? Because there's so many things in everyday life. And I think that children think they have to bring something that's fun and exciting for the class. But the girl that brought in the apple, which is very simple, she told me, "Amanda, if you cut it this way, there's a star inside." So you know what that child has done at home because they already came in with that. So we cut it that way, and then we talk about how many compartments there are, how many seeds there are.

Anita: Amanda presents an interesting example of privileging the child in the child-teacher relationship. Rather than taking control as some might by worrying about "playing with her food," Amanda allows the peas and bun example to continue and sees it as a site for engaging with mathematics.

Kristin: I agree; this is a great example child-centered pedagogy. Amanda is both creating and allowing learning to flow from the child by starting with the child's interests and actions.

Anita: The other thing I find interesting here is how she positions fun. For Birdie "fun" was what she expected young children to consider fun. To Amanda, any object can be interesting and revealing about children's home practices.

Kristin: Yes, but what would Amanda do if this topic was more sensitive or violent? I bet Birdie would be thrilled if Naeem wanted to bring in an apple or count peas on his hamburger bun. I do think this is a great example of how a teacher can support both child initiated learning and get clues into what's important to a child's family. However, I still wonder how we, as early childhood educators, feel about what place "heavier" conversations have with young children. If early childhood classrooms are supposed to be protective places for young children, I sometimes think teachers consider conversations about things like who can afford new clothes to be unsafe teaching topics. If that's the case, I have to wonder, unsafe for whom?

Anita: I can't say how Amanda would address a more critical issue. From my perspective, many of these topics can be connected to or explored through mathematics, much the way Clover and her group were planning to do.

Dialogue 6: Mathematizing Home Practices Versus Worksheets

Another theme that teachers often raised was the appropriateness of workbooks. Sophie is responding to the interview question: Have families ever shared with you strategies that they use in terms of mathematics at home?:

> **Sophie:** Not really. I mean a lot of families, in all honesty, they just buy a workbook from Walgreens and have their kids practice writing their numbers at home—which isn't bad, but I mean, that's just how they practice math, and they don't really see the real-life connection that could be—that is possible with math. Especially, for younger children.
> **Interviewer:** Have you been working with families and learned some things about how they use mathematics at home?
> **Sophie:** I guess mostly in kindergarten, I've just tried to get families to incorporate mathematics into their everyday lives. Counting settings at the table, counting differ-

> ent like objects maybe when they're driving along, counting signs, counting cars; when they're out on a walk, maybe counting their steps or something, I mean, just trying to incorporate that into their everyday life as far as, you know, that skills has been going.

Anita: It is interesting that Sophie states that families haven't really shared how they use mathematics at home but then says they do workbooks. How does she know this if they haven't shared? Is it an assumption she has made based on observations at the drug store?

Kristin: Maybe she's responding this way because some early childhood pedagogy does not encourage using worksheets with young children (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009). If this is something Sophie believes then maybe workbooks don't count? Maybe she's trying to think of mathematics practices that are more reflective of a play-based pedagogy—I know that's what the district she's working in is pushing for four-year-old kindergartners.

Anita: Then she goes on to talk about what she encourages families to do. This remark is similar to Betty's comments from Dialogue 1.

Kristin: Definitely. Sophie makes me think about when I was teaching and how I didn't feel comfortable using worksheets as teaching tools with four-year-olds, but that parents often asked for them. I was being guided by what I learned in my teacher preparation program about developmentally appropriate practices and I think families are guided by their own sets of experiences from when they were in school (Lightfoot, 2003). Also, to be honest about it, even though I wouldn't use worksheets in my classroom and I would talk to families about why I felt more contextual ways of teaching mathematics were more effective; I definitely loved those mathematics workbooks when I was little. So it's tricky, but I think we need to examine why we are teaching in particular ways and then ask ourselves: how do I teach mathematics this way and validate what the families are doing; are there things I can change about my teaching, why or why not; how do I show how I see how much they're caring about their children's education when they're buying that workbook? I also think we need to consider both whether or not we are doing the child an injustice if we don't talk to their family about what we see as best practices. However, at the same time, we need to think about if by telling a family to "count signs while they're driving" are we changing a family's ways of being with their children and how do we feel about that? When pondering these questions, I always came around to thinking about the importance of *balance.* I took solace in the idea that by continuously thinking complexly about these kinds of questions and pushing my comfort levels hopefully I ended up creating more space for families in *our* classroom.

What Did We Learn About Privilege in Pre-K Mathematics?

We embarked on our dialogue with a goal of answering three questions: What home mathematics practices did pre-K teachers privilege? How did privileging particular practices reinforce or interrupt historical power structures in teacher/parent (Wallard, 1932; Laureau, 2000) and teacher/child (Canella, 2008) relationships? Which families and children did teachers privilege and how might that privileging have oppressed others? Through our discussion of the data presented, it is not surprising that we found our three questions were connected. In situations when teachers privileged their view of what home mathematics should look like, it reinforced existing teacher-child and teacher-parent power structures and oppressed those children and families who did not share the same experiences. On the other hand, in those instances in which teachers privileged children's and family's experiences and voices interrupted historical practices and repositioned power and agency to families and children. In the following brief discussion, we respond to our questions based on what and how teachers privileged home mathematics practices when teaching young children. We then conclude with a few considerations for other mathematics teacher educators involved in this work.

What Practices Were Privileged

There were two approaches to the ways teachers thought about mathematics in the home: (a) an appreciation for families' diverse mathematical practices, or (b) an expectation for home mathematical practices that teachers considered "appropriate." Emma (Dialogue 3) and Amanda (Dialogue 5) privileged the practices of families and children. They both sought out what families did and thought about how to incorporate those practices in the classroom. In Emma's case, she "added" the mathematics to what she saw families doing, whereas Amanda recognized the mathematics that children brought in. In so doing, both teachers provided a mirror (Gutiérrez, 2007) through which the children could see their home practices reflected. Furthermore, the teachers shifted agency to the children who, as a population, have historically been oppressed (Cannella, 2008).

Birdie (Dialogue 4), on the other hand, privileged those out-of-school practices that aligned with what she considered as appropriate and interesting school topics (e.g., going to Chuck E. Cheese's, having new clothes). By focusing on the practices of children whose experiences were considered appropriate, Birdie maintained the privileged status of those children, thereby oppressing others. Sophie offered an interesting example of privileging home practices over what she saw as school-like practices in the home such as workbooks. One might expect that in the current standards-driven climate, workbooks would be seen as a positive practice, yet early childhood "standards" call for play-based learning, thus

workbooks are the antithesis of standards. As such Sophie (as we found with many of our teachers) disdained worksheets. The home mathematics practices that teachers did or did not find appropriate may have been connected to the early childhood practice of mathematizing activities children engage with in the classroom (Ginsburg, 2006). As a result, early childhood teachers may expect families to do the same (e.g., counting oranges as they are placed in the cart at the market).

How Practices Were Privileged

From our perspectives, teachers viewed their role in one of two ways: (a) learning from families and bringing those ideas in the classroom, or (b) "telling'" families what they should be doing (Graue, Kroeger, & Prager, 2001; Pushor & Murphy, 2004). Chela (Dialogue 2) saw families as a resource and endeavored to learn from them. By asking families for specific examples of how they interacted with their children at home and explaining how she would use the family's practices to support classroom experiences, she shifted power to the family positioning them as experts.

Others, such as Betty (Dialogue 1) and Sophie (Dialogue 6), reified their role as the expert by making suggestions of mathematics practices families should do, rather than asking families about their own practices. In posing yes-or-no questions about those practices she expected or approved of, Betty provided recommendations for ways families could support their children's mathematics learning, which may or may not have been disconnected from family practices. Those teachers who assumed it was their responsibility to teach the families, rather than learn from them, both created and maintained the power reminiscent of a professional/client relationship rather than a collaborative relationship with families.

Parting Thoughts

Our dialogue revealed to us how simple it seems to reinforce power structures in the relationships between teacher/family and teacher/child, and there are direct consequences for things that teachers hold dear: collaborative relationship, child-centered pedagogy, early math learning. We suggest that teachers need to have explicit conversations about what they privilege and what the consequences of that power to privilege might have in their work with families and children. In some cases, the funds of knowledge framework used in the PD provided teachers with a "feel good" approach to pedagogy yet "still reflected a pervasive power relationship that positions the educator as one who can pick and choose those aspects of students' lives that 'belong' in the realm of the classroom" (Rodriguez, 2013, p. 94). We recognize that this move toward learning about and incorporat-

ing children's mathematical funds of knowledge in the classroom is difficult, particularly when it challenges existing structures and practices. It also decenters teachers, forcing them to disconnect from their established practices—particularly if their experiences are different from those of the child they teach. As we move forward, we will consider how funds of knowledge can provide opportunities for disrupting current inequitable power structures/practices hopefully shifting "whose" knowledge counts.

Finally, during our dialogue, issues arose about our role in supporting and studying teachers as they learn to work with families and children in culturally responsive ways. We remind ourselves as we do this work to assure that we set teachers up for success in the questions we ask and assignments we give them and to watch out for our own biases so as not to reify the power relationship between researcher/facilitator and teacher.

Acknowledgments

The work presented here was supported in part by a grant from the National Science Foundation, grant number 1019431. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

References

Boelts, M., & Jones, N. Z. (2009). *Those shoes.* Somerville, MA: Candlewick.

Canella, G. S. (2008). Deconstructing early childhood: Social justice revolution. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Civil, M., Guevara, C., & Allexsaht-Snider, M. (2002). Mathematics for parents: Facilitating parents' and children's understanding in mathematics. In D. S. Mewborn, P. Sztajn, D. Y. White, H. G. Wiegel, R. L. Bryant, & K. Nooney (Eds.), *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education,* (Vol. 4, pp. 1755–1765). Columbus, OH: ERIC.

Copple, C., & Bredekamp, S. (Eds.) (2009). *Developmentally appropriate practice* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject of power. *Critical Inquiry, 8*, 777–795.

Gautreau, C., Kirtman, L., & Guillaume, A. (2011). Promoting mathematical competence and confidence in Latina preservice teachers: Examining home and school experiences. *Multicultural Education*, *18*(2), 44–49.

Ginsberg, H. P. (2006). Mathematical play and playful mathematics: A guide for early education. In D. G. Singer, R. M. Golinkoff, & K. Hirsh-Pasek (Eds.), *Play = learning: How play motivates and enhances children's cognitive and social-emotional growth* (pp. 145–165). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

González, N., Andrade, R., Civil, M., & Moll, L. (2001). Bridging funds of distributed knowledge: Creating zones of practices in mathematics. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *6*(1-2), 115–132.

Graue, M. E., Kroeger, J., & Prager, D. (2001). A Bakhtinian analysis of particular home-school relations. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*, 467–498.

Gutiérrez, R. (2007). Context matters: Equity, success, and the future of mathematics education. In T. Lamberg & L. R. Weist (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 29th annual meeting of the North American Chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education*, Statleline (Lake Tahoe), NV: University of Nevada, Reno.

Hansen, L. E. (2005). ABCs of early mathematics experiences. *Teaching Children Mathematics, 12*, 208–212.

Heath, S. B. (1982). Questioning at home and at school: A comparative study. In G. Spindler (Ed.) *Doing the ethnography of schooling* (pp. 102–131). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Hedges, H. (2011). Rethinking Spongebob and Ninja Turtles: Popular culture as funds of knowledge for curriculum construction. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood, 36*(1), 25–29.

Johnny, L. (2006). Reconseptualising childhood: Children's rights and youth participation in schools. *International Education Journal, 7*(1), 17–25.

Lareau, A. (2000). *Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary education.* Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.

Lightfoot, S. L. (2003). *The essential conversation: What parents and teachers can learn from each other.* New York, NY: Random House.

McCarthy, S. J., & Moje, E. B. (2002). Identity matters. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*, 228–238.

McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies.* Working Paper No. 189. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley Centers for Women.

McIntosh, P. (2012). Reflections and future directions for privilege studies. *Journal of Social Issues, 68*, 194–206.

Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(4), 132–141.

Pushor, D. & Murphy, B. (2004). Parent marginalization, marginalized parents: Creating a place for parents on the school landscape. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 50*, 221–235.

Remillard, J. T. (2005). Rethinking parent involvement: African American mothers construct their roles in the mathematics education of their children. *School Community Journal, 15*(1), 51–73.

Rodriguez, G. M. (2013). Power and agency in education: Exploring the pedagogical dimensions of funds of knowledge. *Review of Research in Education, 37*, 87–120.

Wager, A. A. (2012). Incorporating out-of-school mathematics: From cultural context to embedded practices. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 15*, 9–23.

Waller, W. (1932). The sociology of teaching. New York, NY: John Wiley.

Zipin, L. (2009). Dark funds of knowledge, deep funds of pedagogy: Exploring boundaries between lifeworlds and schools. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 30*, 317–331.