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Language Landscape of Indiana (Indiana Department of Education, 2016; 2017)
• More than 112,000 Indiana students speak a language other than English at home
• 275 different languages are represented in the Indiana schools (5%)
• Official language: English
• All instruction occurs in English at Indiana public schools (bilingual education exception)
• Dual language programs are available
  • First graduating class in 2006; pilot program reported successful results
List of Pilot Programs: https://www.doe.in.gov/ccr/dual-language-immersion

Language Change in the State of Indiana between 2000 and 2010

Spanish
Spoken at Home by County (2006-2010)
https://statisticalatlas.com/metro-area/Indiana/Indianapolis/Languages#overview

Vote!
• How many of you have bilingual children on your caseloads?
• What part of the state are you from?
• How many of you have a caseload where the majority of kids are bilingual?
• What part of the state are your from?
• How many of you received specialized training in bilingual speech-language pathology or audiology?
• What program did you attend?
Indiana's Diagnostic Eligibility for Speech and Language Impairment for ELLs
http://www.dspcoop.k12.in.us/eligibility.htm

511 IAC 7-41-8 Language or Speech Impairment

(b) A student is not eligible for special education and related services as a student with a language or speech impairment solely because the student’s native language is not English. Bilingual or multilingual speakers include students whose speech or language patterns:

1. deviate from those of standard English; and
2. are characteristic of dialectical differences.

A student who is bilingual or multilingual may be a student with a language or speech impairment only if the impairment is exhibited in all languages spoken by the student.

Meanwhile, elsewhere in the U.S…..

The Language Landscape in Arizona

• 30% of Arizona school children (kids & teens) speak a language other than English at home (Center for Immigration Studies, 2015)
• National average is 21%
• More than 39 million residents and immigrants in the U.S. speak Spanish at home
• Arizona ranks eighth among U.S. for percentage of non-English speakers (US Census Bureau, 2010)
• The CIS study found nationally the largest percentage increases since 2010 were from speakers of Arabic (29 percent), Urdu (23 percent), and Hindi (19 percent)
• Spanish-Only Speakers in Arizona: 9.16% (Statistic Brain Research Institute, 2016)

The Language Landscape in Arizona Schools (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2017)

• In the 2013-2014 school year, more than 91,000 language minority students attended schools in Arizona
• Arizona Proposition 203: English Language Education for Children in Public Schools (Adopted by Arizona voters, 7 November 2000)
  - Requires that all public school instruction be conducted in English
  - Districts may request a waiver of these requirements for children who already know English, are ten years or older, or have special needs best suited to a different educational approach

Why was this language policy implemented? (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2017)

• Language ideologies of policy-influential individuals
• Voters who were grounded in a culture that values the language ideology of English as a national symbol
• Pro-Monolingualism: A language ideology "supportive of the use of one language in social situations, specifically English in the US context; against the promotion of other languages other than English in the US, specifically in school settings" (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2014, p. 42)
• Shohamy (2006) states that language ideologies become policy through privileged language practices

English-Only Policy in Detail

• Structured English Immersion (SEI)
  - Also known as the 4-hour model
  - Mandatory for all ELLs
  - Children are removed from the general education classroom and placed in ELL classes
  - Children are supposed to be English-proficient after 1 year
English-Only Policy in Detail

Haas, Tran, Huang, and Yu (2015) tracked ELLs in Arizona from 2006-2012 (as measured on exams of language proficiency and content).

- After 1 year:
  - Less than 25% of Kindergarteners were English-proficient
  - Less than 40% of 3rd Graders were English-proficient
  - Less than 40% of 6th Graders were English-proficient

- After 3 years in segregated ELL classrooms:
  - 35% of the Kinder cohort were English-proficient
  - 20% of the 3rd Grade cohort were English-proficient
  - 15% of the 6th Grade cohort were English-proficient

In addition to poor outcomes, the combination of student segregation and access to the general education curriculum makes this policy a civil rights issue (Combs, et al., 2005; Gándara & Hopkins, 2010; Iddings, et al., 2012).


Lawsuit focused on violations of the Equal Educational Opportunities Act in Nogales Unified School District


The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals decided the state can fund education as it sees fit, even if it is "pennywise and pound foolish".

Where We Are Now (National Literacy Panel on Language Minority Children and Youth, 2009)

- Monolingualism is the standard in the educational system
  - Oral language instruction is not a focus of instruction in typical classrooms because it’s “not needed” for monolinguals (or so it is thought)
  - Places bilingual children at a “deficit” from the beginning
  - First language oral and written proficiency influences development in second language speech discrimination and production
  - Instructional programs work when they provide opportunities for students to develop proficiency in their first language
  - Studies that compare bilingual instruction with English-only instruction demonstrate that language-minority students perform better in bilingual models (as measured by English reading proficiency)

Understanding Language Contact (Anderson, 2012)

- In language contact situations, L1 will be affected
- How L1 skills are affected depend on a variety of variables
- Not understanding language contact phenomena can lead to misdiagnosis of language disorders
- Focus: Spanish (L1) and English (L2)

Vote!

- What is the language landscape of your community?
  - Have you encountered increased numbers of refugee families in your communities and schools?
    - What languages are spoken?
  - What is your biggest challenge with language contact communities and diagnosis?
  - What are positive effects of language contact communities, in your experience?

Language Loss
Definitions (Anderson, 2012)

- Certain language patterns have been observed in communities where two languages do not share equal status in the dominant society.
- Language Shift: A pattern of language use where the relative use of two languages changes across time and generations (e.g., Güirreñez, 1990)
  - Movement towards the majority language due to jobs, education, increased contact with the majority culture
  - Native-born generations continue the shift
  - End result is a loss of skill, both receptive and expressive, in the native language.

L1 Loss: A process in which one’s L1 abilities are reduced or diminished
- Happens within, rather than across, generations
- Patterns in L1 fall back to earlier linguistic forms; a reduction in L1 linguistic skill
- It co-occurs with L1 loss

Challenges for SLPs

- In Latino communities in the US, there is cross-generational language shift accompanied by structural changes to Spanish
  - Ser and estar use not as restricted (Silva-Corvalán, 1986)
  - Indicative being used in place of subjunctive (Silva-Corvalán, 1994)
  - Imperfect/perfect tense in narrative discourse not as restricted (Silva-Corvalán, 1991)
- What is occurring during language shift can mimic language disorder in Spanish-speaking children

Factors Affecting L1 Loss (Anderson, 2012)

- Occurs primarily in a context in which minimal support is provided for L1
  - Sociolinguistic environment plays a critical role
- Majority-Minority dichotomy where one language is valued over another
- L1 becomes relegated to restricted contexts – mainly the home
  - Only 10% of children who are eligible to attend bilingual programs that focus on maintaining L1 actually attend them (Ferrero, 1997)
  - The majority of bilingual programs are transitional in nature and focus on English acquisition.

Changes in Exposure and L1 Loss (Anderson, 2012)

- Changes in input and use of L1 reduces opportunities for hearing L1; thus opportunities for use are also diminished
- Reduction in exposure and use dampens the ability to increase linguistic skill in a language and maintenance of already acquired skills
  - Especially in production (Anderson, 1999a; 1999b; 2001)
- Narrower range of linguistic concepts in L1
  - Vocabulary
  - Movement towards the greater use of L2
**Factor Rationale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (females more susceptible to L1 loss)</td>
<td>Women often must learn English to gain work; Males use language as a marker of ethnicity more than females.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early immersion in English preschool programs</td>
<td>Loss occurs rapidly when it is restricted to the home environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low status of minority language for vocational and educational advancement</td>
<td>Abandonment of L1 for L2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited bilingual programs that foster L1</td>
<td>Most focused on English acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of L1 peer interactions</td>
<td>Low input in L1, narrower range of linguistic forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking English with younger siblings</td>
<td>Reduced use of L1 in the home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception/reality that L1 has lower status than L2</td>
<td>Enhancement of L2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited contact with L1 speakers outside the linguistic environment</td>
<td>Low input in L1, narrower range of linguistic forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents who are bilingual</td>
<td>Low input in L1, narrower range of linguistic forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small minority population in the community</td>
<td>Low input in L1, narrower range of linguistic forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of L1 monolingual speakers in the community</td>
<td>Lack of language in its original form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diminished use of L1 across domains</td>
<td>Low input in L1, narrower range of linguistic forms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Clinician’s Responsibility

- Understand these factors
- How are they evidenced in the Latino population you are working with?
- Determine what should be expected in a particular child (or community of children) relative to L1 and L2 skills

Patterns of L1 Loss (Anderson, 2012)

- Lexicon and grammatical system most affected
- Lower and restricted input reduced access to the lexical system
- Can result in loss of vocabulary (Kravin, 1992)
  - “Lexical Loss”

Lexical Loss (Anderson, 1999a)

- Nouns are lost first, followed by verbs
- A significant amount of decline in the use of different nouns and verbs across time
- An increase in demonstrative pronouns (e.g., éste, eso, ésa)
- Increase in L2 vocabulary items in L1 productions

Lexical Loss (Anderson, 2012)

- Lexical innovation: Using words in L1 in a way that is distinct from competent speakers
- Meaning extension: A word in L1 can be extended to account for a range of meanings present in L2
  - E.g., Using “vasi” for every receptacle one can drink out of
- Lexical borrowing: Mixing L1 and L2 root words and morphology
  - “taquear” for “talk”;
  - “brincar” for “jumping”
Grammatical Loss (Anderson, 2012)

- Language shift takes place across generations as well as within children
- The language of the COMMUNITY, not the language of monolinguals, should be used as the norm
  - We REALLY need local norms for the Tucson region

Progressive reduction in grammatical morphology

- A leveling of grammatical distinctions; eventual regularizing of irregular forms
- Coordinating sentences rather than embedding
- Transfer of L2 structure to L1

Gender (Anderson, 2012; 1999a; 1999b)

- There are some aspects of morphology that are especially susceptible to L1 loss:
- Errors in gender agreement
- Articles will not be omitted, only errors on gender
- When omission occurs, it will be on the neutral “lo”
- Masculine for feminine article errors most common
- Plural forms maintained, only errors on gender

Verb Morphology (Anderson, 2012)

- Mood (subjunctive, indicative, imperative)
  - Could be due to incomplete acquisition in preschoolers
  - Loss of Spanish subjunctive (“Espero que vengas a la fiesta”)
  - Use of indicative for subjunctive (“Yo no sé [sabía] que ibas a ir”)
- Aspect (perfect/imperfect tense)
  - Movement towards perfect tense (Como para comida)
  - Might maintain perfect tense for entire verbs such as gustar, estar, and ir
  - Frequently used in imperfect tense
- Person number distinctions
  - Singular for plural forms
  - Overuse of third person singular form
- Regularization of irregular verbs
  - “No sabes” for “No sé”
  - Some forms are more vulnerable to loss than others (e.g., estar, or, and ir protected)
  - Overlap with language disorder marker

Verb Morphology (Anderson, 2012; Pueyo, 1992; Anderson, 1999)

- Clitics
  - Substitution, not omission, errors
- 3rd person direct object pronoun most susceptible to error
  - Le, lo, la, los
- Overuse of masculine pronoun
- Word Order
  - Applying English word order to Spanish
  - “La gente aquí”
  - “¿Qu sé hace ahí?”
L1 Loss in Children with SLI
(Anderson, 2012; Restrepo & Kruth, 2000; Anderson & Márquez, 2009)

- Research is limited
- Over time, a reduction in utterance length and complexity, much like typical kids
- Progression to simple clause types and no embedding, like typical kids
- Errors in gender agreement, tense, and subjunctive, like typical kids
- The difference between typical children and those with SLI is that the loss happens RAPIDLY for those with SLI

Summary of Main Patterns (Anderson, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun phrase</td>
<td>El casa rojo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person/number errors</td>
<td>Ellos come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite 3rd person singular</td>
<td>Yo busqué [la pluma]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb morphology</td>
<td>Yo camina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspectual errors</td>
<td>Yo fui for Yo iba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood Errors</td>
<td>Indicative for subjunctive substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yo lo hago for yo lo haría</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun phrase</td>
<td>Yo lo hago for yo lo haría</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person/number errors</td>
<td>Yo busqué [la pluma]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite 3rd person singular</td>
<td>Yo busqué [la pluma]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb morphology</td>
<td>Yo camina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspectual errors</td>
<td>Yo fui for Yo iba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood Errors</td>
<td>Indicative for subjunctive substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yo lo hago for yo lo haría</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right word order</td>
<td>Subject in English in Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of English word order</td>
<td>El grado en español</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications for Assessment

- We must move away from comparing to a monolingual Spanish norm
- Patterns of language loss can mirror characteristics of SLI in both English and Spanish (Paradis, 2005)
- Gather information on the child's linguistic community (WE can do this as a clinical community)
- The relationship between L1 and L2 is not static
- Move away from assessing each language separately – What does the child know about LANGUAGE

Assessment Parameters (Anderson, 2012)

- Of primary importance
- How are both languages used across settings and situations?
- How is code-switching used?
- How does this form of Spanish deviate from the norms (especially morphology)?
- How do we obtain this information?
**Sociolinguistic Reality of the Community (Anderson, 2012)**

- **Cultural Informant:** Someone fluent in the Spanish variety used by the community, and patterns noted in children that deviate from the norm
- We have LOTS of community members here in Tucson who can help with this – just put a call out to the ABISPAS email list
- Obtaining speech samples from various community members
- In-depth parent and teacher interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Inquiry for Parents</th>
<th>Area of Inquiry for Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language use by the child:</td>
<td>Present educational placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of language across topic, context, and situation</td>
<td>Changes in educational placement over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use with the child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By each family member at home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in use of Spanish and English across time by the child</td>
<td>Instruction in each language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time spent using each language during classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most insight at each language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in language input for Spanish and English across time</td>
<td>Literacy and pre-literacy skills in each language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental concern about the child's language learning ability</td>
<td>Academic concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental attitudes toward maintenance of Spanish skill</td>
<td>Language use by the child within the school setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language input to the child within school setting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mining Interview Data (Anderson, 2012)**

- Data gathered from parents and teachers give the clinician a detailed view of the child's previous and current language experiences
- These data will also point to L1 loss being part of the child's linguistic reality
- Reports that indicate an increase in English input and use and a reduction in Spanish use, as well as reports of Spanish skill decreasing, point to L1 loss
- A RAPID decrease in Spanish skill with limited growth in English may be suggestive of language impairment

**Vote!**

- Do you encounter challenges obtaining parent interviews?
  - What aspects are the most prohibitive?
- Do you have strategies that work well in obtaining this information?
  - Would you mind sharing?
- How do you approach the interview process when you don't speak the parent's language?
  - What are your strategies for overcoming this barrier?
- Are interpreters readily available in your district/clinic/hospital?
  - What kind of interpretation service is available, if any?

**Alternatives to Traditional Testing (Anderson, 2012)**

In addition to lexical and morphosyntactic skill, clinicians also need to assess:

- **Pragmatics:** Strategies used to communicate in each language and in bilingual contexts
- **Comprehension:** Language processing of both Spanish and English
- **Learning Potential:** How quickly does the child learn new information? How much effort does the clinician have to invest to observe change?

**Language Samples (Anderson, 2002)**

- Language samples that incorporate a variety of language tasks will probe use of a variety of linguistic structures
  - Narratives
  - Conversations
  - Typically we choose one, but for children suspected of language loss, we utilize BOTH
  - Examining abilities that vary due to topic and listener
  - Provides a panoramic view of the child's skills
  - No more than 15 minutes in length; they do not have to be long
Analysis of Language Samples (Anderson, 2002)

- Morphosyntactic skill contrasted with community norms
- Communicative skills in each context and their effectiveness
- Watch for lexical innovations, lexical borrowings/assimilations, code-switching, nonverbal strategies
- How effective is the child across contexts?

Dynamic Assessment (Gutiérrez-Clellen & Peña, 2001)

- Test-Teach-Retest methodology
- Modifiability
- Application of newly-learned linguistic material


- Processing skills do not rely on present linguistic performance to identify language disability
- Address areas that affect language SKILL
- Nonword repetition tasks
- Tasks that probe attention and memory

Comprehension Skills (Anderson, 1999a)

- Most patterns of L1 loss occur at the production/expressive level
- Formal and informal observation of comprehension will allow clinicians to evaluate a child’s comprehension on L1
- Comprehension tasks need to conform to expected patterns in the community
  - Present person distinctions noted in the verb without the subject
  - Como vs. Yo como - Which person is performing the activity?
  - Present the child with a perfect/imperfect verb pair and have them indicate which is appropriate given the context

Conclusion

- Assessment needs to consider L1 loss as a diagnostic question
- Aspects of L1 loss and language disorder can overlap – we must consider performance across ALL areas assessed
- It is essential that clinicians gain knowledge of the child’s linguistic community and avoid monolingual norms
- Clinicians need to do in-depth parent and teacher interviews to track changes in proficiency/environment across time
- Language samples across various settings, with a variety of interlocutors, is essential
- Comprehension and processing tasks also help differentiate difference from disorder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Assessment</th>
<th>Expected Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Teacher Report</td>
<td>Noted decrease in productive use of Spanish across domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Sample</td>
<td>Perceived decrease in receptive language skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No parental concern regarding language development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance errors consistent with L1 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code-switching at the lexical level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of general terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced sentence complexity (e.g., re-embedding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to choose language according to context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension tasks</td>
<td>Generally good comprehension of Spanish in conversational situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive skills</td>
<td>Adequate conversational skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficient use of nonverbal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic and processing</td>
<td>Expected performance of a typical learner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions for You

- What are your specific challenges in this area?
- What is the norm in your district/school for qualifying kids you are concerned are experiencing L1 loss?
- What is the typical linguistic patterns in your bilingual community?
- What support structures would help you the most in this area? What are you lacking in terms of resources?

Intervention for Children with Disorders AND L1 Loss (Anderson, 2012)

- Language of intervention as primary concern
- Parents’ attitudes/values
- Parent-child communication (Fillmore, 1991)
- Every effort should be made to make Spanish the language of intervention if parents want to go that route
  - Spanish-only intervention
  - Bilingual intervention
  - Making parents members of the intervention team

We should not…

- Ask parents or children to stop code-switching
- Inhibition at this level will increase effort and processing time, something we don’t want to do to children with SLI (e.g., Hernández & Kohiart, Kohiart 2002)
- Children who are listening to code-mixing are not at a disadvantage (Kohiart & Raus, 2002)
- May decrease quality and quantity of parent-child interactions (Kohiart et al., 2005)

Intervention focusing on home language development (Kohiart, Yim, Nett, Kan, & Duran, 2005)

- Access to both home and school community languages is fundamental to social, emotional, cognitive, academic, and vocational success
- It is not necessary that both languages be used at the same time, in the same ways (Kohiart & Derr, 2004)
- Supporting the home language in intervention can help prevent L1 loss
Using Spanish as the language of intervention…

- Provides school-based contexts for using Spanish
- Raising the perceived value of Spanish
- Maintains parent-child communication
- Intervention goals should mirror what is observed in the language community and based on developmental information on Spanish
- Helping children become better communicators in Spanish helps them use and practice Spanish, combating L1 loss

Training parents, paraprofessionals, and community partners (Kohnert, Yim, Nett, Kan, & Duran, 2005)

- Law, Garrett, and Nye (2004) found that intervention that was administered by trained parents was, in general, as effective as intervention administered by SLPs
- Parent and family training programs for young children with disabilities are also consistent with federal mandates that emphasize partnerships between families and professionals (Public Law 99-457 and Public Law 94-142)
- SLPs must possess a skill set that allows them to TRAIN effectively that goes beyond their typical skill set of providing speech and language services

Characteristics of Successful Parent Training Programs (Kohnert, Yim, Nett, Kan, & Duran, 2005)

- They focus on multiple instruction methods:
  - Demonstration
  - Coaching
  - Role play
  - Mediated parent-child interactions
  - Videotaped examples
  - Specific instructive feedback

Characteristics of Successful Parent Training Programs (Kohnert, Yim, Nett, Kan, & Duran, 2005)

- Does not simply consist of homework and written assignments
- They focus on specific language facilitation strategies:
  - Modeling
  - Expansion
  - Recasts
  - Imitation
  - Responsive feedback

Incorporating interpreters into the process (Kohnert, Yim, Nett, Kan, & Duran, 2005)

- Can we incorporate members of the community or other para-professionals to aid in language support?
  - Hancock et al. (2002) found that para-professionals and parents can be trained on most language facilitation strategies
  - Language skills improved for 3/5 children who participated in the program
- Adequately trained and supervised paraprofessionals may be able to provide language facilitation techniques in the absence of an SLP who can provide services in the home language

- These programs take place over weeks and months
- They start with simple strategies and build over time
- Allow time for change, feedback, and skill monitoring
Peer-Mediated Intervention Strategies
(Kohnert, Yim, Nett, Kan, & Duran, 2005)

• Incorporate typically-developing siblings and peers into the service delivery model
  - Especially for cultures where peer-peer interaction is most common and comfortable
• Robertson and Ellis Weissner (1997) found that children with SLI who participated in peer-mediated play scripts showed significantly more gains than children who received traditional intervention only
• MacGregor (2000) found the same positive outcomes for African-American children and narrative story-telling

Questions for You

• What intervention strategies work for you with this population?
• Where and when do you struggle with intervention?
• Have you ever incorporated family into the service delivery model? What worked? What didn’t?
• Do you use interpreters during service delivery? What works? What doesn’t?
• How could you feel more supported in using the home language as a part of intervention?

Summary

• Parents should communicate in the manner most comfortable to them
• Children should not be instructed to speak in English only
• We must incorporate the family and community into treatment for children with language impairments who are also experiencing language loss
• Home language support and speech-language therapy services should be integrated for best outcomes
• Language preservation maintains culture, linguistic skill, and identity

Questions?