

Brice, A. (2009, March). *Intervention strategies for bilingual language delayed children*. Paper presented at the Ohio Speech-Language Hearing Association Annual Convention. Columbus, OH.

Intervention Strategies for Bilingual Language Delayed Children

Alejandro E. Brice, Ph.D., CCC-SLP

Associate Professor

University of South Florida

St. Petersburg

aebrice@stpt.usf.edu

Advance organizer

Statement of the problem

Increase in CLD populations

Need for qualified speech-language pathologists

Second language issues.

Assessment issues

Performance Based Assessment; Curriculum Based Assessment;

Dynamic Assessment; Response to Intervention.

Evidence Based Best Practices

Co-teaching

Developing your own Evidence Based Practice

Rubrics

Case Study Examples

Statement of the problem

Increase in culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) populations.

17.3% in Ohio (U.S. Census Bureau State & County Quickfacts, 2008)

Hispanics are largest CLD population in the U.S. Growth of

Hispanic population in the U.S. grew from 1999 (32 million) to 2003 (38.8 million).

The Hispanic population of the United States tends to be younger than the overall non-Hispanic U.S. population.

The median age of Hispanics is 26.5 years and the mean age is 28.8 years, while the median of white, non-Hispanic U.S. population age is

38.1 years and the mean age is 38.5 years (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000).

6.1% of school age children in Ohio come from a home where English is not spoken (U.S. Census Bureau State & County Quickfacts, 2008).

These numbers will continue to increase!

Need for Qualified Speech-Language Pathologists

6.1% of the population in Ohio speaks a language other than English in the home compared to 18% nationwide (U.S. Census Bureau State & County Quickfacts, 2009).

According to Shinn, Goldberg, Kimelman, & Messick in 1999–2000, there were only approximately 416 master's and doctoral SLP and Audiology members who were fluent in another language.

As of 2006 there were 118,361 certified ASHA members (ASHA, 2003).

It is estimated that only 0.35 % of the ASHA membership speaks another language other than English.

Therefore, it is essential that monolingual SLPs know about other languages in order to treat bilingual students.

Second language issues

Brice and Roseberry-McKibbin (2001) stated that, “The current literature supports the notion that the native or home language is the best medium for working with children and adds to the child's ability to communicate in the second language (i.e., English)” (p. 10).

Thomas and Collier (2002) found in their extensive longitudinal study of four U.S. states (i.e., with 210,054 student records analyzed) that students who received five to six years of bilingual instruction reached the 50th normal curve equivalent (NCE) in L2 by their 5th or 6th year in U.S. schools.

The NCE is a standard score with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 21.06. The NCE is most useful in enabling test users to manipulate the test data algebraically (e.g., in order to compare test scores across subjects like math and reading).

The students in the Thomas and Collier study maintained their level of performance in L1.

At minimum, Thomas and Collier (2002) suggested that “students who are raised in a bilingual environment need at least 4 years of schooling in L1 and 4 years of schooling in L2 to achieve on grade level in either of the two languages” (p.14).

Other studies that support the use of the native language as a bridge to English:

Ramírez, Yuen, & Ramey, (1991).

Collier (1987).

Lindsey, Manis, and Bailey (2003).

Ricio, Amado, Jiménez, Hasbrouck, Imhoff, and Denton (2001).

Issues of transference and interference

Phonetics/Phonology:

English vs. Spanish phoneme place and manner productions

Spanish Phonology

Some consonants occur in Spanish that do not occur in English.

Spanish contains the tap /r/ and the trill /R/. The tap is less frequent. A shortened trill is the most frequent. An elongated trill is also found.

Spanish contains certain voiced fricative phonemes which are allophones of their respective voiced stop consonants, e.g., /b, β/.

Spanish vowels and consonants are simpler than English having fewer vowels and consonants. Spanish has 19 consonants and 2 semivowels (glides) while English has 24 consonants and 2 semivowels (Stockwell & Bowen, 1965).

Spanish consists of 42 phonemes with 19 consonants, while English has about 45 phonemes and 24 consonants (Navarro, 1968).

Spanish has only 5 monophthong vowels, while English has 13 monophthong vowels (MacKay, 1987).

Spanish does not contain the following sounds in the final position of words: /p, b, f, v, tʃ, m/.

Spanish words tend to end with: /r, s, d, n, l/ and vowels.

Consonant clusters are few in Spanish (Stockwell & Bowen, 1965).
Consonant clusters do not begin with /s/ in Spanish. Therefore “stop” becomes “estop”.

Summary

Phonological variations of Caribbean Spanish (which may apply to other dialects of Spanish) as noted by Hammond (1989) include:

- a. Syllable final, word final aspiration of /s/.
- b. General word final sound deletion
- c. /r/ and /l/ substitution in some dialects for Spanish.
- d. Vocalization of word final liquids.
- e. Word final /n/ vocalization.
- f. Alteration of /tʃ/ and /j/.

Frequency of Occurrence of Spanish and English Sounds (Nash, 1977)

Phonemic Awareness in Spanish

Since implementation of “No Child Left Behind” (2002) the identification of children in need of reading remediation has significantly increased.

Many students in schools come from diverse backgrounds, particularly Spanish-speaking homes.

38% of all 4th graders performed below the expected grade level according to the U.S. Department of Education (2003).

Only 13% of Hispanic students performed at the expected 4th grade level.

These results indicate that Hispanic students are at-risk for reading failure and as a group they will need to close the gap with the other students.

This places Hispanic students at-risk for over-identification to special education programs and possible school drop-out as strong reading skills are a pre-requisite for school success (Simmons, 1999).

Questions remain:

Which phonological/phonemic tasks are difficult in Spanish?

Does Spanish phonemic awareness have an effect on English reading (i.e., a question of language transference)?

Rhyming among Spanish speakers seems to develop prior to literacy acquisition (Adrian, Alegria & Morais, 1995). However, conscious manipulation of syllables appears to be difficult for non-readers.

Spanish speaking students develop sensitivity to (a) syllables, (b) then onset, (c) rimes, and (d) finally to individual phonemes (Denton, Hashbrouck, Weaver, & Riccio, 2000).

Spanish speaking children from Argentina who were either pre-readers or beginning readers could identify the number of syllables in words about 50% of the time, but could only identify sounds (phonemes) from 5% (preschoolers) to 35% (1st graders) (Manrique & Gramigna, 1984).

Spanish speaking pre-readers show sensitivity to rhyme (words ending the same way) and alliteration (words beginning the same way) (Carillo, 1994).

Hence, syllable identification is easier for some Spanish speaking children. A student's ability to segment Spanish words into syllables may be more important his/her ability to segment words into phonemes.

1. In Spanish there is a continued emphasis on the syllable and letter-sound correspondence, up to 3rd grade, more so than in English (Signorini, 1997).

Spanish is more phonetically based than English, thus, the letter-sound correspondence plays a significant role in decoding words.

Children who receive instruction in Spanish letter-sound correspondence were able to isolate onset from rime in simple words (Carillo, 1994).

Tasks that separated pre-readers from early readers included:

1. Phoneme segmentation (pronouncing separate sounds in words)
2. Segmenting tasks also separated average from poor 1st grade readers.

Rhyme detection is no longer a skill that needs instruction by 1st grade.

Some of the more difficult phonemic awareness tasks include phoneme deletion (repeating the word without a sound), syllable deletion (repeating the word without a syllable), word reversal, and phoneme reversal (Adrian, Alegria, & Morais, 1995).

For Spanish-speaking pre-kindergarten and kindergarten children on phoneme isolation tasks, continuants (e.g., /m/ or /s/) were easier to identify than stops (e.g., /p/ or /t/). Initial consonants in a blend (CC) were more difficult to identify than initial single consonants (CV) (González & Garcia, 1995).

English and Spanish speaking 1st grade students who were able to isolate initial sounds in words in Spanish (tested in December) were able to do well on a similar task in English (in May) even though they had little familiarity with English at the time (Cisero & Royer, 1995). Evidence of phonemic awareness transfer to English.

Spanish speaking 1st graders who performed well on Spanish phonological awareness tasks were more successful in learning to read English words and English-like words (Durgunoglo, Nagy, & Hancin-Bhatt, 1993).

Identifying initial sounds, final sounds and rime seem to relate to reading fluency in Spanish and transfer to reading fluency in English (Riccio, Amado, Jiménez, Hasbrouck, Imhoff, & Denton, 2001).

Brice & Brice (2009) investigated English phonemic awareness and phonic skills in four groups kindergarten students with and without disabilities. The groups consisted of 20 high reading English monolinguals, 20 low reading

English monolinguals, 20 high reading level English-Spanish speaking bilinguals, and 20 low reading level English-Spanish speaking bilinguals.

Brice & Brice (2009) found an existing achievement gap between monolingual and bilingual students with and without disabilities even at the kindergarten grade level on a phoneme and letter identification task.

All students (high monolingual readers, high bilingual readers, low monolingual readers, and low bilingual readers) in her study consistently identified words with voiced phonemes more often than in words with voiceless phonemes.

Therefore, the issue of voicing seems to have an important role in helping young emerging readers differentiate among the different phonemes.

These results support the earlier findings Riccio, Amado, Jiménez, Hasbrouck, Imhoff, & Denton (2001) where they found that identifying initial sounds, final sounds and rime seem to relate to reading fluency in Spanish and transfer to reading fluency in English. Hence, some phonemic awareness tasks can transfer between Spanish and English.

Hence, some phonemic awareness tasks can transfer between Spanish and English. This indicates that use of Spanish is useful in acquiring English reading skills.

Semantics:

When do young bilingual children differentiate between their 2 languages at the word level?

It appears from the numerous studies by (Brice and Wertheim, 2004/2005; Genesee, Nicoladis, & Paradis, 1995; Lanza, 1992; Pearson & Fernandez, 1994; Pearson, Fernandez, Lewedeg, & Oller, 1997; Pearson, Fernandez, & Oller, 1995) found that words in both languages (doublets or translation equivalents) acted as a bridge (showing positive transference) between the dominant and less dominant languages that children (ages 18-30 months of age) spoke (Spanish and English).

It was found that young bilingual children can understand and use two languages independently of each other as early as 18 months of age. In addition, translation equivalents (words common to both languages) TEs appear to be normal occurrences in the children's vocabulary.

In the Brice & Wertheim study, the children with strong preference in one language tended to show fewer occurrences of TEs. The children who did not show such an extreme preference (i.e., more of a balance between the two languages; e.g., participants one, four, eight and nine) showed a higher occurrence of TEs. It appears that as children gain higher proficiency in the second language, they are more apt to use translation equivalents. Hence, transference at the word level increases with L2 proficiency.

Conclusions: It is normal for children to learn two languages simultaneously. Young children do not seem to show any signs of confusion in learning both. Exposing young children with exceptionalities to two languages does not appear to be detrimental.

Syntax:

Ellis (1987) postulated that learners of Spanish generally progressed through four sequential stages of syntactic acquisition. These consisted of:

1. Development of basic syntactic knowledge such as Subject-verb-object order,
2. Acquisition of variant word order,
3. The development of morphological knowledge, and
4. Acquisition of knowledge and information governing complex sentence structure.

Anderson (1995) reported the following regarding Spanish sentence types:

At 2:6 a Spanish speaking child will demonstrate negatives, questions, imperatives and embedded sentences.

Children as young as two years of age use rising intonation to indicate yes/no questions.

Spanish wh-question forms are also seen at this age [qué (what); quién (who); donde (where)].

At two and half years of age, Spanish speaking children also exhibited instances of other question forms [para qué (for what); cuando (when); por qué (why); como (how)].

Pragmatics:

Brice (1992a) developed a pragmatics scale, i.e., the Adolescent Pragmatics Screening Scale, APSS) to investigate student pragmatics performance in various classroom contexts at a pre-referral (pre-evaluation) level.

Specifically, he has investigated pragmatics performance among ESL (Spanish-English speaking) students, monolingual English-speaking Language Learning Disabled (LLD) students, monolingual general education students, bilingual (S-E) students in ESL-1 (1-2 years) classes and bilingual students (S-E) in ESL-2 classes(2-4 years), and also Bilingual (S-E speaking) students with Language Learning Disabilities.

Suggestions for school and classroom remediation for students with exceptionalities are taken from the following research: Brice (1992a); Brice (1992b); Brice & Absalom (1997); Brice & Montgomery (1996). They include:

1. The SLP/Exceptional Education teacher should use teacher strategies such as encouraging Latino students to ask questions. Students should

seek clarification, and ask for repetitions. The Exceptional Education teacher should reinforce these behaviors.

2. SLPs/Exceptional Education teachers should rely less on modeling as a form of correction and provide direct instruction. Bilingual students in initial learning stages should be allowed to make mistakes. Exceptional Education teachers should also employ more pauses and wait time for responses to allow for the students to monitor and reflect on their language use.
3. Bilingual and ELL students need (1) reasons to communicate, (2) interaction and opportunities to speak with proficient English speakers (peers, teachers, or community members), (3) interaction, support, and feedback from others, and (4) close and continued interaction with others lasting 3 or 4 years (Wong-Fillmore, 1992).
4. Bilingual and ELL students need to have increased student-to-teacher interactions to encourage regulatory (commands), heuristic (asking questions), informational (giving information), and instrumental language (meeting one's needs).
5. Bilingual and ELL students need opportunities to share information with other students to express, initiate, and maintain conversations.
6. Practicing an activity prepares the Latino student to later talk about it.
7. SLPs/Exceptional Education teachers should ask open-ended clarification questions, i.e., questions that allow for expansion and elaboration to encourage heuristic (i.e., information seeking) language from the student.
8. The use of grammar drills and direct instruction, i.e., teaching specific skills such as note taking, is beneficial for the exceptional needs student. A naturalistic approach can be used to reinforce learned skills.

9. Bilingual and ELL students can benefit from peer grouping with other students of similar ability levels to practice classroom interaction skills.
10. Bilingual and ELL students should have more practice at formalized, structured speaking situations to encourage classroom discourse skills.

Literacy:

Developing language skills through early literacy development.

1. A large segment of Hispanic students with limited English skills are at-risk for educational failure (England, Collins, & Algozzine, 2002).
2. Spanish rhyming develops prior to literacy development (Adrian, Alegria, & Morais, 1995).
3. Spanish speaking children can identify syllables prior to identifying phonemes (Manrique & Gramigna, 1984).
4. Harder phonemic awareness tasks include phoneme deletion, phoneme reversal, and final phoneme identification.
5. Continuants (/m/, /s/) are easier to identify than stops; CVs are easier than CC blends (González & Garcia, 1995).
6. Vocabulary growth and development is important for reading comprehension.
7. Informal definitions can transfer from Spanish to English (Carlisle, Beeman, Davis, & Spharim, 1999).
8. L1 and L2 vocabulary contributes both to formal and informal definitions (Carlisle et al., 1999).
9. L1 and L2 vocabulary and phonemic awareness skills contribute to English reading comprehension (Carlisle et al., 1999).

Assessment Issues

Performance Based Assessment (PBA) and other alternative measures vs. Traditional assessment.

What is **PBA**? PBA is an alternative to using standardized achievement or norm referenced tests.

1. **Examples** of PBA include student projects, portfolios, language samples in the form a class presentations, or other samples of work.
2. **Attributes** include allowing the student to demonstrate communication knowledge through a product. Frequently the product is assessed using a rubric (More on rubrics later). PBA allows a student's strengths and weaknesses to be displayed.
3. **Strengths** include that PBA can be aligned with classroom instruction. PBA analyzes basic skills and higher level skills such as analysis, synthesis, evaluation. Assessment tends to be more authentic for culturally and linguistically diverse students.
4. **Weaknesses** include the risk of rater bias or rubric bias.

Examples of student portfolios (All examples are taken from bilingual students regarding English school work)

Coloring example of 1st grade student without disabilities.

Observations

1. Coloring within lines indicating fine hand motor control.
2. Varied intensity of coloring indicating ability to control pressure on the crayon, again suggesting fine hand motor control.

Coloring example of 1st grade student with Learning Disability classification.

Observations

1. Coloring outside of lines indicating poor fine hand motor control.
2. Single, dark intensity of coloring indicating inability to control pressure on the crayon, again suggesting poor fine hand motor control.

Writing example of 2nd grade student without disabilities.

Observations

1. Proper use of spacing and letter height.
2. Proper use of upper and lower case letters.
3. Proper punctuation (periods). Beginning use of quotation marks.

4. Use of diverse vocabulary, e.g., “famine”.
5. Story grammar components include: setting, initiating event, plan, consequence, and ending.

Writing example of 2nd grade student with Learning Disability

Observations

1. Difficulty with spacing and letter height even with written model.
2. Difficulty with upper and lower case letters even with written model.
3. Limited vocabulary.
4. Letter spacing and height difficulties.
5. Story grammar components needed extensive clinician prompting.
6. Story grammar components include: setting, initiating event,, consequence, and ending with clinician prompting.

What is **Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM)**? CBM is another alternative to assessing students.

1. **Examples** include classroom assignments, such as, reading a loud from a basal reader, answering math problems in a 2 minute probe.
2. **Attributes** include are taken directly from the classroom curriculum employing common tasks, frequently those that may take one minute or less.
3. **Strengths** include that CBM is a direct sample of the student’s knowledge. CBM is a quick probe of abilities. The SLP can develop local caseload, classroom or school norms.
4. **Weaknesses.** If the curriculum is poor, then CBM is a reflection of the curriculum and subsequently poor. Sometimes only basic skills are assessed.

What is **Dynamic Assessment (DA)**? DA refers to assessing a student’s abilities over time involving (a) an initial assessment; (b) targeting of objectives to the student’s weaknesses; and (c) assessing the student’s growth over a period of time.

1. **Attributes** include allowing the SLP and classroom teacher the abilities to draw conclusions on the student’s rate of learning. It is a test-teach-test process.

2. **Strengths** include focusing on learning where the SLP can interact with student.

Weaknesses include that it is time consuming and requires an SLP with highly developed assessment, teaching, therapy and collaborative skills.

What is Response to Intervention? RTI refers to a problem solving method to assessment (Mills, 2005).

Attributes:

1. Disability is documented by a slow rate of learning over time when given specific strategic instruction.
2. Mills(2005) stated that RTI is “A graduated series of increasingly intense interventions guided by data-based decision making.”

Define the communication and/or learning problem. Develop an assessment strategy. Implement the strategy. Evaluate outcomes.

Strengths:

Focusing on the student’s learning compared to others in his/her classroom environment using Curriculum Based Assessment.

Weaknesses:

Requires extensive collaboration and “letting go” of the psychometric model of assessment.

Assessing first and second language skills using alternative assessments

How should ELL students be assessed?

Language is more than normed-referenced tests results.

Assessment Pie (adapted from Roseberry-McKibbin, 1995).

1. Best Practices for Evaluating ELL Students

The following specific recommendations are given for best practices in evaluating CLD students who are English Language Learning:

1. Evaluate the student in her or his native language and in English (Anderson, 1994; Brice, 2002; Fradd & Weismantel, 1989).
 2. Obtain information from classroom teachers and others who have frequent and sustained contact with the student (Anderson, 1994; Brice, 2002; Roseberry-McKibbin, 2002).
- Best Practices cont.**
3. Conduct the evaluation over a sustained period of time (Hamayan & Damico, 1991).
 4. Involve an interdisciplinary team of professionals in the evaluation process.
 5. Use a variety of formal and informal measures (Anderson, 1996; Robinson-Zañartu, 1996).
 6. Avoid reliance on formal, standardized measures as the primary indicators of a language disorder (Peña & Quinn, 1996).
 7. Avoid translation of English tests into the student's primary language (Anderson, 1996).
 8. Compare the student to others from a similar linguistic and cultural background, including socioeconomic status (Taylor & Clarke, 1994). Include students who have had similar experiences and exposure to English, literacy, schooling, etc. (Roseberry-McKibbin, 1995).
 9. Evaluate the language learning ability of bilingual students through use of dynamic assessment or other similar approaches that assess the student's ability to learn over time when provided with instruction (Lidz & Peña, 1996). This is especially critical for students who have not had many opportunities to learn in mainstream United States schools with mainstream United States school values.
 10. Involve the parents in the assessment process (Langdon & Cheng, 1992). Utilization of case history information about the student's developmental milestones in the primary language is especially valuable in distinguishing a language difference from a language disorder.

11. Make sure that the task is one familiar to the child.
12. Encourage the child to expand upon responses.
13. Give the child extra time to respond.

14. Confer with other professionals.
15. Confer with others from a similar cultural and linguistic background.

Evidence Based Best Practices

EBP consists of:

- An accumulation of evidence, i.e., knowledge is obtained from using “many different methodological tools and research designs to resolve important questions [emphasis added]” (Justice & Fey, 2004; p. 3).
- A preponderance of evidence where the outcomes of accumulated evidence are scrutinized or critically appraised (Dollaghan, 2004; Justice & Fey, 2004).
- Evidence is scrutinized, assessed “with a consistent, scientifically accepted methodology [emphasis added]” (Mullen, 2005; p. 21).
- Evidence is obtained from high yield sources of high quality (e.g., refereed journal articles) that have direct clinical applicability. Sources that are difficult to update and are of questionable validity are de-emphasized (Dollaghan, 2004).

A Summary of Evidence Based Practice

- Ø Clinical applicability
- Ø Clinical decisions
- Ø Clinical expertise
- Ø Clinical research
- Ø Consistent, scientifically accepted methodology
- Ø Contextual factors
- Ø Evidence
- Ø Evidence that is critically appraised
- Ø Evidence that is of high quality
- Ø Experience
- Ø Outcomes
- Ø Solve problem; solve important questions.
- Ø Systematic

- Ø Theoretical knowledge
- Ø Values and perspective of the client/patient

Developing your own Evidence Based Practice Rubrics

A. Developing a performance based assessment rubric (Perlman 2003).

- Use an existing rubric
- Rewrite an existing rubric
- Develop a new rubric

Perlman, C. (2003). *Performance assessment: Designing appropriate performance tasks and scoring rubrics*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 480070).

B. Guidelines for developing a new rubric:

1. Define the dimensions to be assessed
2. Examine student work for aspects of the dimensions to be assessed
3. Cluster dimensions into a few categories
4. Write a definition for each category
5. Develop a continuum or scoring scale
6. Pilot test the rubric with a few students
7. Revise the rubric
8. Share the rubric

Example Rubric

1. Define dimensions: Reading in Kindergarten or 1st grade children
2. Examples of student work include phonemic awareness and phonics skills
3. Cluster dimensions into few categories. (a) identification of sounds; (b) phonics; (c) rhyming; (d) segmenting; (e) blending.
4. Definition for each category: (a) distinguishing between beginning, middle and ending sounds in single syllable words; (b) recognizing that vowels and consonants can be represented by different letters; rhyming of words; (c) adding or deleting sounds to change words; (e) blending 2-4 phonemes into recognizable words.
5. Develop a scoring scale: Criterion referenced (skill is present or absent)
6. Pilot test the rubric (Will use the probe developed by the Chicago Schools Office of Accountability Kindergarten-Assessment Tools for

Phonemic Awareness)

http://intranet.cps.k12.il.us/Assessments/Kg-PrimaryTools/phonemic_aware.pdf

Examples:

Video Observations of Child Performance

Four videos to follow (R. Brice, 2004).

High Reading Level English Monolingual

All DIBELS scores in the “Low Risk” range

Teacher reported:

- “Very Low Risk” for literacy difficulties based on classroom performance

Low Reading Level English Monolingual

Speech Therapy 2Xs weekly

DIBELS scores varied:

“At Risk” and “Moderate Risk”

Teacher reported:

- Moderate to High At Risk based on classroom performance
- Difficulties: beginning sounds, rhyming, blending, segmenting

Observations during testing:

- Difficulty staying on-task
- Articulation errors:
r » w; d » t; t » k;
l » w; T » w; tS » S
- Ceiling: final stimuli list (#48)

High Reading Level Spanish-English Bilingual

4/6 DIBELS scores: “Low Risk”

Teacher reported:

- Low Risk based on classroom performance (4)
- speaks mostly English, some Spanish at school

Parents reported in the home:

- both parents speak Spanish
- daughter speaks English and Spanish equally at home

Observations during testing:

- Good listening skills
- Completed initial & final words
- Some difficulty switching tasks

Low Reading Level
Spanish- English Bilingual

All DIBELS scores: “At Risk”

Teacher reported:

- “Very High At-Risk” based on classroom performance
- difficulty in letter identification, segmenting, beginning sounds
- speaks mostly English, some Spanish at school

Parents reported in the home:

- both parents speak only Spanish
- son speaks mostly Spanish, some English

XI. Interventions

Communication styles

1. Hispanics,
2. African Americans,
3. Asian Americans, and
4. Native Americans

Hispanic communication styles (Brice, 2002; Wong-Fillmore, 1982).

- A. Communication is typically initiated on a personal note before proceeding with formal, business conversations.
- B. Close body distances are typically seen.
- C. Others may be beckoned with “psst”, snapping of the fingers or a whistle. This not considered to be rude.
- D. Children may look away when conversing with adults.
- E. Children do not interrupt adults.
- F. Children engage in dialogue more with siblings or peers than with adults.
- G. Gestures are used more in conversation.
- H. Adults do not ask children to eventcast (foretell) about current or

future events (Wong-Fillmore, 1982).

African American communication styles (Roseberry-McKibbin, 2002).

- A. Approval and agreement between participants may be expressed through touching and physical contact.
- B. Conversations are viewed as private interactions.
- C. Public behavior is often intense and demonstrative.
- D. Interruptions in conversation are not seen as rude.
- E. Individuals are expected to participate verbally in conversations and not to remain silent.
- F. Stories may include personal judgments and evaluations about the characters.
- G. Social skills are emphasized over vocabulary development among many African American families.
- H. Charismatic speech with distinctive rhythm and intonation is valued.

Asian American communication styles (Cheng, 1991; Roseberry-McKibbin, 2002).

- A. Many Asian languages have formal rules of communication based on the relative status of the participants in the interaction.
- B. Much information is communicated non-verbally.
- C. Public confrontations and open competition are often avoided.
- D. Communication may be indirect. This gives the impression to North Americans, Westerners that the individual is being evasive and noncommittal.
- E. Anger is not displayed publicly.
- F. When asked to do something many Asians may give a positive response (in order to avoid conflict and save face for the person who made the request), however, completion of the task may not be carried out.
- G. Silence is valued. Westerners are viewed as being too verbose.
- H. Laughter can be a sign of embarrassment.
- I. Personal questions relative to one's status are acceptable to ascertain status between speakers, e.g., How old are you? What is your job? How many children do you have?

Native American communication styles (Roseberry-McKibbin, 2002).

- A. Respect is highly valued. One means of showing respect is to avoid eye contact (e.g., this was referred to as “burning eyes” by one Hopi Native American colleague).
- B. Children are taught via the “look and listen” approach.
- C. Comprehension skills may be more advanced than speaking skills.
- D. Tribal languages are not spoken by children until the child is capable of correct articulation.
- E. Native American pragmatics requires a time lapse between a question and answering.
- F. Children may not answer a question if they are not confident in their answer.
- G. Children do express opinions on subjects. They have not earned the right to do so.
- H. It is inappropriate to express strong feelings in public.

References Available Upon Request