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The traditional school curriculum reflects the European American, middle and upper middle class (i.e., the mainstream) culture and norms that have been derived from our nation's European heritage. This traditional Eurocentric curriculum is based on the 18th- and 19th-century European standards and values that have shaped our canon (i.e., the criteria by which we judge beauty, excellence, etc.) and privileged European American rules. As a result and as noted in earlier chapters, the educational system welcomes the typical learning and behavior of middle class students who speak Standard American English (SAE), while frequently alienating those students from other social and linguistic cultures and subcultures (Cheng, 1986; Hillis, 1996). In short, in the typical classroom, educators portray—and in the process teach, privilege, and paint—a limited view of the world. Students who are nonwhite, members of a lower socioeconomic class, or even female may thus be marginalized. Race and class segregation and the gender inequalities of the larger society, therefore, confound instruction in schools.

Teaching for Diversity

U.S. society is becoming increasingly diverse and students who attend U.S. schools represent this diversity. In 1990 the Bureau of the Census reported that one third of all school children were members of a nonmainstream group. It is projected that by the year 2000, more than 40% of school-age children will be...
nonmainstream group members. Currently, in 33 of the largest school districts in the nation, students from nonmainstream families already represent a majority (Lara, 1994). Further, the census data show that half the Hispanic and Asian American respondents indicated that English was not the primary language used in the home. To better serve these students, educators must learn to value diversity (and bilingualism) and work to integrate all students into the educational community.

Language both shapes and mirrors the values and beliefs of a culture. Therefore, the language that a student brings to school is intrinsically connected with family, community, and individual identity (Gee, 1990). One's culture provides the foundation that determines the way an individual experiences and participates in society. Culture defines for each group a lifestyle and language that are its own. Too often, however, because of the hegemony (i.e., dominance not by laws, but by common acceptance) of the Eurocentric curriculum, schools fail to reflect and accept the diversity and multiple world views that are actually represented within classrooms and, as a result, fail to validate and appreciate the richness of our nation's myriad cultural traditions.

No culture is inherently better than another. Still, we tend to view different cultures through the lens of the dominant one, which we presume to be best. As a consequence, educators often assume students who are culturally or linguistically different from the mainstream culture will exhibit deficient academic achievement related to both language and behavior. Deloit (1995) addressed this assumption: when a significant difference exists between the students' culture and the school's culture, teachers (and speech-language pathologists (SLPs) can easily misread students' aptitudes, intent, or abilities as a result of the difference in styles of language use and interactional patterns. . . . when such cultural differences exist, teachers (and SLPs) may utilize styles of instruction and/or discipline that are at odds with community norms. (p. 167)

Many of the difficulties that minority-language students experience in mainstream classrooms can be attributed to the devaluing of their culture by their teachers and other educationists (Darder, 1991; Macedo, 1994). Forced to choose between family and school, between the familiar and the unknown, too often language minority students or those from poor families, families of color or of nonmainstream ethnicities, perceive themselves as outsiders and are at risk of feeling as if they do not belong anywhere. Honoring cultural and linguistic differences goes a long way toward stemming students' feelings of alienation. Consequently, effective teachers and SLPs communicate a clear assumption that the language and culture each nonmainstream student brings is both appropriate and deserving of respect.

Whether students enter for English or in another language, students learn to communicate in a mainstream community. The communities in which they are educated then demonstrate to the student that they bring with them more than starting from scratch. Diversity in education, there is a body of research showing that second language achieve optimal their primary language (e.g., Bialystok, 1979, 1981, 1991; Fishman, 1989; Hakuta, 1986; Krashen & Bialystok, 1987; Strettwald-Kargas, 1981). While learning is thus greatly facilitated.

However, advocacy for natural development in a second language, because language learning, is thus greatly facilitated.

Language and Culture:

Dialects are variations in the standard linguistic group. People from a single example, will speak in a different dialect. Dialects are often related to contextual, peer-group influence factors (Owens, 1992). Sometimes called Black English or Black Vernacular, the dialect view as a dialect is considered
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- that students should not learn to communicate effectively in SAE: English is, at
all, the primary language spoken in the majority of our classrooms, as well
as the principal discourse in this country. At this point in our history, learning
to speak, read, and write in the dominant language is necessary if these students
are to succeed in the adult world. The goal, however, should be to teach stu-
dents to become competent in mainstream society without making them feel in-
adequate and taking away their cultural roots.

Language and Dialectal Variations
Associated with Race

Dialects are variations in the standard language rule system of a particular lin-
guistic group. People from a specific geographic region of a country, for ex-
ample, will speak in a different dialect from those of other regions. These di-
ialectal differences are often related to racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, situational
or contextual, peer-group influenced, and first- or second-language learning
factors (Owen, 1992). Sometimes, as is the case with Ethnic (also sometimes
called Black English or Black Vernacular English), what many in the popular
culture view as a dialect is considered by linguists to be a separate language
(American Society of Linguists, cited in “Linguists: Find the Debate over ‘Ebonics’ Uninform’d,” 1997), and the arguments about the appropriateness of its initial use and acceptance in schools, then, become political rather than linguistic.

Most dialects spoken in this country are variants of SAE (i.e., they share a common set of grammatical rules with SAE), the form of English used in textbooks and formal communication. English speakers, however, rarely use SAE in informal conversation (Edwards, 1991). Owens (1992) pointed out that at least 10 regional dialects have been identified in the United States. The primary racial and ethnic languages and dialects found in this country are what are known as Ebonics and Hispanic English (see Chapter 6 for their characteristics). Geographic and socioeconomic factors have influenced and continue to influence both. Other ethnic dialects include Hawaiian Creole or Island English, Appalachian English, and those of the various Native American and Asian communities.

Although some languages or dialects generally have higher status among some listeners (again for political reasons), all languages and dialects are actually valid rule systems within a particular social context and merely reflect differences (Owens, 1992), not disorders or lower level forms of language.

Any deficit view of linguistic behavior is incorrect—no language, or language variety, has been shown to be more accurate, logical, or capable of expression than another. Rather, it should be realized that different language communities develop speech patterns that differ in their modes of expression, vocabulary and pronunciation. There is also the possibility that different groups assign different functions to language. (Edwards, 1991, p. 73)

To consider a language or dialect inferior to another is to view the speakers and their culture also as inferior. As Delpit (1995) asserted, “Children have a right to their own language, their own culture” (p. 71). Teachers and SLPs, therefore, need to invite all students’ voices into the learning discourse.

**African American Voices**

Ebonics is the linguistic system used by most working-class African Americans, primarily in urban centers and the rural south (Owens, 1992). Although much of the American populace thinks of Black Vernacular English or Black English (i.e., Ebonics) as just plain bad English (probably because it evolved from the languages of slaves), linguists defend it as a legitimate communication method (Gollnick & Chinn, 1994) and a bodying an intact rule system. It is (Dillard, 1975). Fairchild & Edward Ebonics is its own language.

A 1997 article in Newsweek affirmed that African American students prepared explicitly to their native language taught using a technique called Ebonics with SAE, transcribed Ebonics writing, as compared to those (Joseph, 1997). Allowing students to use a rather than purporting language affirms of the linguistic diversity Delphi’s (1995) research illustrates—language- or dialect-influenced performance instruction inhibits fluency and comprehension toward both the task and the learner. Educators and SLPs need to reframe this deficit to mainstream students class—that is, SAE—expectations. We must also realize that per se: Cultural styles vary a great deal among teachers and SLPs. Students have always benefited from more direct and explicit instruction than many European American students (Sim, 1991; Siddle, 1988). Further, Heath noted for exhibition (i.e., questioning the answer) were not generally used although they are used extensively in an African American student population. The student may be indicating discomfort, dislike for working in isolation (Gierta, 1992). Those who engage to be aware that there are several behaviors and to distinguish among them.

**Storytelling and writing also development**
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A 1997 article in Newsweek affirmed that a small body of research indicates that African American students learn to use SAE optimally when it is com-
pared explicitly to their native language, Ebonics. African American students
taught using a technique called "contrastive analysis," in which texts con-
tacted Ebonics with SAE, transposed fewer Ebonics constructions into their
SAE writing, as compared to those who learned SAE in isolation (Leland &
Joseph, 1997). Allowing students to translate their primary language into SAE
rather than punctuating language instruction with contrastual correction is also
affirming of the linguistic diversity of African American speakers and
writers. Delph's (1995) research illustrates that constant correction of a student's
language, or dialect-influenced pronunciation and grammar during reading
instruction inhibits fluency and comprehension, and in some cases engenders
resentment toward both the task and the teacher (or other educators).

Educators and SLPs need to realize that what might look like a language
deficit in mainstream students when seen through the lens of middle-
that is, SAE—expectations, and are often merely a language or dialectal dif-
ference. We must also realize that differences do not end with language usage
per se: Cultural styles also vary and they carry over into interactions with
teachers and SLPs. Studies have shown, for example, that African Americans
benefit from more direct and explicit instruction in oral and written language
than many European American students (Delph, 1988; Macra, 1989; Reyes,
1991; Siddle, 1986). Further, Heath (1982) found that questions to elicit infor-
mation for exhibition (i.e., questions for which the questioner already knows
the answer) were not generally used in the homes of African Americans,
although they are used extensively in early schooling. Thus, for example, when
an African American student repiles to a question with "I don't know," the
student may be indicating discomfort, or lack of familiarity with the question
type, dislike for working in isolation, or a need for further instruction (G. Garcia,
1992). Those who engage such students in instructional activities need to be aware that there are several alternative interpretations of the students' behavior and to distinguish among them.

Storytelling and writing also differ in African American culture. As noted
in Chapter 1, Michaels (1981) found that, contrary to the expected SAE
mode of following a theme centering on a single topic, African American stu-
dents tended to tell stories about associated topics with no overall theme—a
preference also shared by African American adults. Because they differ so rad-
cally from Eurocentric, SAE classroom norms, teachers and SLPs may have
difficulty validating both Ebonics usage and African American forms of storytelling and writing; many simply consider them to be inadequate. Educators and SLPs need to recognize, however, that difference does not necessarily translate into deficiency and disadvantage. With immersion into mainstream language or culture and metacognitively based instruction that explicitly compares the language children bring to school with that expected in the classroom (i.e., SAE), students can be both appreciated for who they are and helped to cross the linguistic boundaries that will enable them to be successful in school and, later, in society (Gee, 1992).

Hispanic American Voices

Both Latino and Hispanic American are umbrella terms under which we cluster several subgroups of Americans of Spanish origin. Although these terms are convenient, they should not obscure the fact that these groups differ in racial or ethnic ancestry and cultures. The largest of these subgroups consist of Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cuban Americans, and people from Central or South America. A variety of Spanish dialects are spoken by Latinos, who together are the largest ethnic population in the United States, which is the fifth largest Spanish-speaking country in the world (Kersey, 1993). Spanish often affects students’ understanding and production of English and interacts with the English dialect spoken in the surrounding community. Additionally, Latino speakers often use vocabulary words that are of Spanish origin (Owens, 1992).

Students who speak both Spanish and English are bilingual. Most bilingual students develop a primary language in the home and a second language in school or other community setting. Until the age of 3, second-language learning mirrors the sequence of development of initial language acquisition (Owens, 1992). However, students who learn a second language later and, therefore, already possess a rule-governed linguistic system are better able to understand and learn a second language when literacy instruction proceeds from their primary language. Rather than attempting to change minority-language students to conform to extant classroom expectations, instruction should thus be based on the language abilities that students already possess. In this way, educators and SLPs honor the student’s voice and employ best practices, as indicated by the already listed research findings. As Bruner (1983) noted, “Learning is most often figuring out how to use what you already know in order to go beyond what you currently think” (p. 183).

Bilingual education consists of the pairing of two languages as a strategy for instruction. The objective is not merely to teach English as a second language, but also to instruct children in the and reinforce this knowledge this (1989). Bilingual education, then, through standard English as a second instruction is given in English. A taught English primarily through reach age- and grade-level norms or who have had the benefit of 2 to 3 country before emigrating to the US years to reach native English-speaking levels of ESL techniques (Collar, 1989; Coop, predictor of achievements: in second formal schooling students receive instruction, which encourages second-language and abilities a student already possess to pursue with language-minority students the best and most effective program of second language* (Nieto, 1992, p. 11). According to Nieto (1992), education. The most common approach to the transitional bilingual model, in which instruction in their native language, which approach is a means of transitioning the home to the mainstream language limit of 3 years before students attend school.

The maintenance or development on the time students can be in the dual language be more successful when literacy is for continued learning and, hence (i.e., they continue to acquire command of language). The two-way bilingual model is English with those for whom English groups is to develop bilingualism in the language while being introduced to a second language 1 to 2 years the mode of instruction. By the fifth year, the amount of instruction in both languages may be occurring.
What immersion into mainstream instruction that explicitly combines with that expected in the classroom targeted for who they are and helped to enable them to be successful in school

but also to instruct children in the language with which they are already familiar and reinforce this knowledge through the use of English (Baca & Cervantes, 1988). Bilingual education, then, is different from learning a second language through standard English as a Second Language (ESL) approaches in which all instruction is given in English. Collier (1995) found that students who are taught English primarily through ESL methods take 7 to 10 years or more to reach age- and grade-level norms of native English-speaking students. Students who have had the benefit of 2 to 3 years of first-language learning in their home country before migrating to the United States, however, typically take only 5 to 7 years to reach native English-speaking proficiency when taught by the same ESL techniques (Collier, 1989; Cummins, 1981). Therefore, the most significant predictor of achievement in second-language learning is the amount of prior formal schooling students receive in their primary language. Bilingual education, which encourages second-language learning by means of the knowledge and abilities a student already possesses, is, therefore, the most effective practice to pursue with language minority students. “Bilingual education still represents the best and most effective program for most students for whom English is a second language” (Nieto, 1992, p. 166). The controversy that surrounds bilingual education is, then, a political, not linguistic or educational, one.

According to Nieto (1992), there are several interpretations of bilingual education. The most common approach found in the United States is probably the transitional bilingual model, in which students receive content-area instruction in their native language, while learning English as a second language. This approach is a means of transitioning from the language most commonly used in the home to the mainstream language of schooling. Thus, there is usually a limit of 3 years before students are required to exit this program.

The maintenance or developmental model, on the other hand, has no set limit on the time students can be in the program. The rationale is that children will be more successful when literacy in a native language is utilized as a foundation for continued learning and, hence, students also become functionally bilingual (i.e., they continue to acquire competence in their native tongue as well as mastered English).

The two-way bilingual model integrates students whose native language is English with those for whom English is a second language. The goal for both groups is to develop bilingualism through learning content in their native language while being introduced to a new language.

Finally, in the immersion bilingual model, students are immersed in learning a second language for 1 to 2 years before their native language is introduced as the mode of instruction. By the fifth or sixth year of schooling, an equivalent amount of instruction in both languages or most instruction in the secondary language may be occurring.
In addition to being effective in teaching students content-areas knowledge in a native language, bilingual education motivates students to stay in school rather than drop out (Paulison, 1980). Bilingual education, with its emphasis on acknowledging native language and culture, provides a more meaningful and enjoyable school experience for the Hispanic American student than traditional ESL practices, which are not designed to value and build on the student’s prior linguistic knowledge and experience.

In a survey of the kinds of services for students with limited English proficiency that SLPs were delivering in schools, Roseberry-McKibbin and Zichovitz (1994) found that the majority of the clients were Hispanic Americans, 50% of whom did not speak a second language (i.e., English) fluently enough to receive services in that language, which may account for at least part of the poor showing of ESL instruction. Of the SLPs responding to the survey, 76% had not had prior coursework or classes teaching them how to address services for language-diverse students. Consequently, the “experts” often need to learn as they go. The problems that SLPs encounter most frequently relate to a lack of appropriate assessment practices and instruments and their inability to speak the languages of the students they serve. The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) has tried to respond to this situation with two initiatives: Multicultural Agenda 2000 and the establishment of an Office of Multicultural Afffairs (Quinn et al., 1996).

With Latino as well as African American students, however, it is not only language usage per se that varies. Different cultural communities interact with and socialize their children to use language in many ways that vary from European American, middle class norms (Rogosa, 1985; Damon & Damon, 1993; Heath, 1983; Phillips, 1983; Schieffelin, 1979). The dominant culture in the United States values individuality and extraversion. Hispanic culture, on the other hand, places a higher value on community and introversion (Poplack, 1992). Further, Delgado-Caian (1987) found that Mexican immigrant children were more familiar with cooperating and negotiating with others in their environment than in competing, although competition is valued by the Euro-centric educational system that is based on rank-ordering through testing and grading.

Further, Hispanic American students often enroll in schools without prior experiences comparable to those of their middle class peers (Ruis, 1989). Again, cultural differences play an important role. For example, Latino parents may not consider knowledge of letters, numbers, and colon as relevant for their children to learn as respect for and courtesy toward others (Silbert, 1983). Latino parents also do not generally see themselves as teachers. They demonstrate predominantly nonverbal interactions with infants (Garcia Coll, 1990) and emphasize observation and in 1986). Additionally, Latinos are more than accepting status to teachers and on them for more direct intervention in classrooms catering to European American (Delgado-Caian, 1987; Macias, 1977; school system and the distance lead to conflicts in values for larger.

These conflicts pervade the student span example, that Spanish writers tend voice, which is typical of that code. SLPs may be critical of this writing. Education always need to unacknowledged, unappreciated, or those students meaningfully in the

Asian American Voices
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and emphasize observation and independence in the learning process (Valdes, 1986). Additionally, Latinos are taught to hold authority figures in high regard, thus according status to teachers and other educationists who promotes relying on them for more direct intervention than might normally be offered in class-
rooms catering to European American, middle and upper middle class students (Delgado-Gaitan, 1987; Macias, 1989). The cultural expectations of the public school system and the diametrically opposed guiding principles of the home lead to conflicts in values for large numbers of Latino students.

These conflicts pervade the curriculum. Poplin (1992) pointed out, for example, that Spanish writers tend to embellish their compositions with adjectives, which is typical of that culture's preferred speaking style. Teachers and SLPs may be critical of this writing style, viewing it as too flowery and rambling. Educationists always need to keep in mind that when students' values go unrecognized, unappreciated, or even criticized, schools will fail to engage these students meaningfully in the learning process.

Asian American Voices

People from myriad Asian cultures live in this country. Although each culture is distinctive, they possess some commonalities. As with Hispanic cultures, however, one should use caution in generalizing about Asian cultures as a group, because generalizing can lead to stereotyping and erroneous conclu-

Asian American students are usually regarded as good students because they are generally quiet and well mannered in the classroom and have attained the highest educational level of new immigrant group (Lort & Felt, 1991). However, as Delipt (1993) pointed out, this stereotype can easily lead teachers to overlook their academic needs:

There is a widespread belief that Asian-American children are the "perfect" students, and that they will do well regardless of the academic setting in which they are placed. This stereotype has led to a negative backlash in which the academic needs of the majority of Asian-American students are overlooked. (p. 170)

Asian are generally viewed as formal by Western standards and this for-

style reflects in their languages (Kepler, Rosey, & Kepler, 1996). The

Asian writing style reflects circularity and indirectness, traits also found

Asian oral language, and this indirectness is often misinterpreted as their

herselves as teachers. They demon-
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as indicative of intellectual dullness (Miyagö, 1991). However, this propensity for quiet attention has been shaped by an Asian educational system that discourages the asking of questions by students who may well consider themselves to be active rather than passive learners (Takada & Hanahan, 1995). Further, because the sound of Asian languages is more modulated, enthusiasm and excitement expressed by English speakers can be misinterpreted by Asians as anger (Kepler et al., 1996).

Both Japanese and Chinese cultures value group-oriented norms (Maithiko, 1994). A sense of community, collaboration, and interaction with others is esteemed (Deloitte, 1995) over the individualism that prevails in the Eurocentric curriculum. Such differences in values between cultures may cause academic difficulty for Asian students.

A major difference between Japanese and English languages is syntax. English depends on word order for structure, whereas word order in Japanese is more flexible, with the exception that the verb always falls in the final position (Takada & Hanahan, 1995). Additionally, in conversations between Japanese individuals, the status of the speakers influences word choice (Kepler et al., 1996). Hence, Japanese students learning English as a second language have to contend with more rigid structural variations in ordering words and the status of the person who is being addressed. Sometimes these simultaneous concerns lead to confusion and miscommunication. Another potential communication difficulty for students of Japanese culture is the differing norms regarding eye contact. In Western cultures, for example, eye contact is expected between students and their teachers, but is considered a sign of disrespect in Japanese society.

The communicative style of Japanese speakers is considered to be "intuitive" and "indirect" when compared to the style of the dominant culture in this country (Clancy, 1986, p. 213). For example, a direct "no" in answer to a question is generally avoided (too as to avoid conflict); as a result, "yes" answers can also be vague. Also, a pause in conversation is an integral part of Japanese discourse; it serves the function of allowing time for reflection (Kepler et al., 1996). Particularly in the corner-respond-evaluate model of instruction, however, where rapid responses are required, reflective Japanese students may be at a disadvantage. Teachers need to allow classroom participatory frameworks to accommodate these students. In conversation, educators need to learn to wait this silence out before responding, rather than assume that the conversation has ended.

The Chinese language consists of a uniform written system, with several dialects and subsdialects. Although similar words are graphically represented by the same character, speakers of differing Chinese dialects are usually unable to understand each other (Cheng, 1995). Chinese is a tonal language, in which variations in pitch signify different words even at the end of sentence. End of a sentence can change it. This can cause misunderstanding.

As in Chinese culture, Chinese teachers are "more performance oriented" (Stegner & Perry, 1988, p. 40). These differences and adjust instruction.

Other Asian cultures, such as Chinese characteristics as well as distinct behavior, are also concerned with status. In this case, a student to ask an adult to be an important question by saying "Please consider it as clarification of the teacher's intent." The overall message for educators is that mainstream culturally diverse students. Behavior school standards may vary well but some schools are to engage all students.

Native American Voices

Currently, in the United States, a large proportion of students are of Native American ancestry, of this number. Although knowledge and traditions are most shared a common world view, African American, Latino, and Native American students are portrayed Native American. The indigenous people of North America use different languages when the European settlers assimilation policies, approx. 100 years ago, with the oldest generation. Language use is generally affirmative of native cultures that educate Native American
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(Shigato & Hoshina, 1991). However, this propensity for an Asian educational system that demands well considered answers (Tsukada & Hoshina, 1995). 

It is more modulated, enthusiasm can be misinterpreted by Asians first value group-oriented norms of collaboration, and interaction with individualism that prevails in the West values between cultures may cause violent English and languages is contexts. Shgato, whereas word order in Japanese is verb always falls in the last position in conversations between Japanese cultures word choice (Kepler et al., 1996) English as a second language have to word in ordering words and the status sometimes these simultaneous concerns Another potential communication gap is the differing norms regarding eye contact is expected between students a sign of disrespect in Japanese speakers is considered to be "naive" style of the dominant culture in (example, a direct "no" in answer to a direct conflict); as a result, "yes" answers or evasion is an integral part of Japanese time for reflection (Kepler et al., respond-evaluate) model of instruction, reflective Japanese students need to adapt classroom participation. In conversation, educationists and parents before responding, rather than uniform written system, with several words are graphically represented by Chinese dialects are usually unable to Japanese is a tonal language, in which variations in pitch signal differences in meaning, but the pitch remains unaltered at the end of sentences. In English raising or lowering pitch at the end of a sentence can change it from a declamation to a question. Obviously, this can cause misunderstanding across cultural lines (Kepler et al., 1996).

As in Japanese culture, Chinese students are discouraged from interrupting the teacher to ask questions. However, there are distinct differences between expectations found in Chinese and Japanese educational systems. The former are "more performance oriented," whereas the latter are "more reflective" (Stegel & Perry, 1988, p. 40). Thus, educators and SLPs should take note of these differences and adjust instructional methods accordingly.

Other Asian cultures, such as Vietnamese and Hmong, also have similar characteristics as well as distinct differences. Like Japanese, Korean culture is also concerned with status. In this case, age establishes rank, so it is not unusual for a Korean student to ask an adult, "How old are you?" which would seem to be an impertinent question by United States standards (Kepler et al., 1996). Teachers should not mistake this as a penchant for rudeness, but rather consider it as clarification of the standing of those engaged in conversation.

The overall message for educators is to use caution when making assumptions based on mainstream norms and values regarding ethically and linguistically diverse students. Behavior that may seem to conflict with traditional school standards may very well be typical and acceptable in specific cultures. If schools are to engage all students fully in the educational process, intrinsic cultural variations must be acknowledged and accepted, at least initially.

Native American Voices

Currently, in the United States, there are about 2 million North Americans of indigenous ancestry; of this number, approximately one third live on reservations (Hess, Matson, & Stein, 1993). A similar situation exists in Canada. Although knowledge and tradition vary among Native American nations, most share a common world view and collective experience. However, as with African American, Latino, and Asian cultures, commonalities should not be used to portray Native Americans as a monolithic population.

The indigenous people of North America spoke between 250 and 300 different languages when the Europeans first arrived (Crawford, 1995). Because of past assimilation policies, approximately 30% of tribal proficiency in ancestral language has either disappeared altogether or is retained currently only among the oldest generation (Leap, 1995). Early on, missionary schools, not generally affirmative of native cultural values, were located on or near reservations to educate Native American youth. As we are finding today with speakers
of other languages or dialects, the missionaries reported that their attempts to promote literacy among Native Americans were more successful when they used their native languages as the basis for teaching them (Reyhirner, 1992).

The federal government decided that in order to hasten assimilation of Native Americans into the dominant culture, native youth needed to be removed physically from indigenous cultural influences by being sent to boarding schools where they were expected to speak English and emulate white, European culture. Promoting assimilation into the mainstream society (rather than education per se) was the goal of these boarding schools (Hess et al., 1995). Government officials presumed that stripping native languages from Native Americans would hasten their assimilation. A statement by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1887 reflects this premise: “If we expect to infuse into the rising generation the leaven of American citizenship, we must remove the stumbling blocks of hereditary customs and manners, and of these language is one of the most important elements” (cited in D. Adams, 1988, p. 3). Ironically, the majority of Native Americans were not even granted citizenship until 1924. Nevertheless, between 1889 and 1910, most Native American youth learned to speak English through the boarding school experience (Orlando & Gourd, 1996).

In the 1950s the focus shifted from boarding schools to local, state-administered public schools, but the goal of assimilation remained essentially the same (Sarvia-Shore & Arruza, 1992). Once children began attending schools that employed English as the language of instruction, native languages eroded more rapidly and literacy achievement levels in English also dropped. The Cherokees, for example, had a literacy rate of 90% in their native language (McDonald, 1989) and high levels of English literacy (Medicine, 1979) during the 1850s. After the takeover of schools by the federal government, however, literacy levels in both Cherokee and English dropped dramatically (Medicine, 1979). This loss of literacy, particularly the loss of the native language—the primary means for oral communication—has had profound effects on Native American communities, where there are high rates of poverty, unemployment, alcoholism, and substance abuse. Retention of language is imperative for cultural survival—when the connection between language and community is broken, a culture is lost.

A 1988 Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) status report found that 90% of all Native Americans attended public schools; the remainder were enrolled in BIA and private schools. Most schools have been responsive to tribal concerns and needs regarding education. The dropout rate for Native American students was 45% in 1980, and family illiteracy continues to hinder youth from mastering basic educational skills (Sarvia-Shore & Arruza, 1992). Further, school dropout rates among Native Americans tend to be higher in urban schools than in schools located in rural, reservation areas for students, 1985).

Although there is no substantial evidence that Native American-English dialects spoken by Native Americans cause learning difficulties for their children, Native American students with communication disorders 5 to 10 years of age reach instructional level when assessed at baseline (Robinson & Walton, 1995). However, this is not an accurate measure of cultural identity, but rather probably indicates a parallel feature of the speakers' culture.

Additionally, Native American students with language disorders 5 to 10 years of age appear to be less proficient in spoken language, which may be due to a more oral-oral tradition in their communities based on the Western world view (Tharp, 1989) and the tendency to respond to the traditional oral oral tradition as a way to value and reinforce the story. (Oral storytelling is not only a mode of communication but also a mode of teaching and learning, and the oral tradition is highly valued in Native American cultures.)

Native American students tend to be more successful in oral reading tasks involving traditional stories, proverbs, and oral history. They also appear to be less proficient in written language, which may be due to a more oral-oral tradition in their communities based on the Western world view (Tharp, 1989) and the tendency to respond to the traditional oral tradition as a way to value and reinforce the story. (Oral storytelling is not only a mode of communication but also a mode of teaching and learning, and the oral tradition is highly valued in Native American cultures.)

1Because of limited healthcare, Native American children are likely to experience higher rates of language disorders than children in the general population. These rates may be influenced by the cultural context in which the child is raised. Therefore, it is important to consider cultural factors in evaluating language disorders among Native American children.
...ried native youth needed to be assimilated into the mainstream society (rather than boarding schools) (Hess et al., 1995). A statement by the Com- monwealth: "If we expect to influence American citizenship, we must remove the barriers, and of these language s (Katzoff in D. Adams, 1988, p. 8). Ironi- zation and not even granted citizenship until 1920; most Native American youth faced with discrimination (Ovando &...
nation we lose an important opportunity of our wonderfully rich and diverse past (in the bargain) maintain diverse ways of speaking. SLPs need to become first aware of the behavioral and linguistic traditions we are teaching them the language and code-switching to bilingual and monolingual). Additional cultural knowledge can be gained by learning about the history, traditions, and values of other cultures. This is particularly important for students and teachers who are not from a bilingual or multicultural background. The Impact of Social Class

A social class is a group of people whose values, beliefs, and behaviors are similar. In the United States, class is often defined by factors such as income, education, occupation, and social status. It is important to acknowledge class divisions in society and understand how they affect people's lives. Education is strongly associated with social class, and the sociocultural context in which people grow up plays a significant role in determining their educational outcomes. According to the Department of Education, approximately 15% of the people living in the United States live in poverty. This means that they earn less than the federal poverty line, which is currently set at $14,335 for a family of four. Poverty is most likely to be a problem for women, people who are illiterate, and people with disabilities. As we know from the news, these groups often do not have access to the same opportunities as those who are more fortunate. Education is a key factor in promoting social mobility and reducing poverty. It is important to provide equal access to education for all people, regardless of their background or social class.
The Impact of Socioeconomic Class

A social class is a group of people associated by common economic factors, values, and practices (Nieto, 2002). Although there are discrete class divisions in the United States, vocabulary signifying social class status is largely absent from public discourse; one rarely hears social class referred to in ordinary conversation or in the media (Muntisios, 1995). Despite our reluctance as a society to acknowledge class divisions overtly, we cannot escape the recognition that variations in socioeconomic status have a powerful impact on the education of children. "Education is strongly influenced by societal factors such as race, class, and the sociocultural context in which it occurs" (Hillis, 1996, p. 115).

According to the Department of Commerce (Bureau of the Census, 1993), 15% of the people living in the United States were living below the U.S. government’s official poverty line (calculated in 1992 at $7,143 for an individual and $14,335 for a family of four). Of these, about 3 million were homeless people and 25% were children under the age of 6. Additionally, over 42% of households earned less than $25,000 in 1990 (Bureau of the Census, 1992). Poverty is most likely to be a condition of children, the aged, minorities, women, people who are alienate, and full-time workers employed in the lowest paying jobs (Gollnick & Chinn, 1994).

As we know from government statistics, the vast majority of poor people do not choose to live in poverty. Rather, they are casualties of a social system, they often do not understand well and whose opportunities favor more
mainstream groups (Kozol, 1995). It is not surprising, then, that African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans are the most economically deprived ethnic groups in this country (Golnick & Chinn, 1994). According to the 1992 Census Bureau, African American families' median income is 58% that of European Americans and Hispanic families is 63%. Further, a disproportionate number of people of color live in poverty while 11% of the white population fall below the federal poverty level, 32% of the African American and 38% of the Hispanic American populations do so (Bureau of the Census, 1992). The poverty rate on reservations is generally between 45% and 58% (Bureau of the Census, 1988) and life expectancy is the lowest of all ethnic groups in the United States (Hess et al., 1995). A number of factors perpetuate this disparity. One of the most important is educational level: Because U.S. public schools are generally so inhospitable to students of color, these students drop out in greater numbers and are thus more likely to be either employed in lower paying jobs or unemployed (Golnick & Chinn, 1994).

Performance in school (Mantia, 1995; Penell, 1993) and level of school completed (Bowles & Gintis, 1976; National Coalition, 1985) have been strongly correlated with social class. Mantia found that class position is probably the single greatest factor in determining future educational success. In a 1978 study by the Carnegie Council of Children, de Lone examined the test scores of over half a million students who took college entrance examinations. Consistent with previous studies (e.g., Sewell, 1971), he found that a relationship exists between social class and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores and concluded "the higher the student's social class, the higher the probability that he or she will get higher grades" (p. 19). This pattern continues to persist. Table 5.1 depicts the correlation between social class and SAT scores in 1996.

Poverty, in particular, has been consistently associated with low academic achievement (Allington & Cunningham, 1996; Cooley, 1993; Guislain & Wagner, 1995). Parents who live in poverty may not have access to the resources that more financially stable families may possess, such as books, school supplies, and other tools needed to promote literacy. Additionally, economically oppressed parents may, out of necessity, be more concerned and involved with basic survival than their children's education, at least in traditionally expected ways (Allington & Cunningham, 1996; Nieto, 1992). However, despite these possible explanations, no specific factor can be blamed

---

Remember that Asians are the most highly educated immigrant group in the United States and that, when educated Cubans settled in Miami, they established a community that flourished. African Hispanic, and Native Americans have not had the benefit of highly intense family backgrounds.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Combined Scores by Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 to $80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: from College Bound Nation by College Entrance Exam. Copyright 1996 by College Entrance Exam.
surprising then, that African Americans are the most economically (Nelson & Chinn, 1994). According to families’ median income is 58% of the average. Further, a disproportionate poverty: while 11% of the white population is 32% of the African American population. In African American education (Bureau of the Census, 1999) generality between 45% and 58% is the lowest of all ethnic groups. A number of factors perpetuate educational level; Because U.S. students of color, these factors are more likely to be either employed in de Lune, 1994) and level of social capital (Coalition, 1985) have been found that class position is a strong educational success. In a study by de Lune examined the test scores of college entrance examinations. In the study, (1971), he found that a relationship between SAT scores and median income, the higher the probability that the pattern continues to persist. The social class and SAT scores in 1996 are strongly associated with low academic achievement. (Cooley, 1993; Gaddis & Neisser, 1993; O’Neil & Dill, 1993). Poverty may not have access to the educational opportunities, such as books, which may promote literacy. Additionally, economic necessity, be more concerned with children’s education, at least in Cunningham, 1996; Nieto, 1992). Now, no specific factor can be blamed for lack of academic achievement. Indeed, and most important for our purposes, Nieto (1992) pointed out that teacher perception of a student’s special class has also been shown to be a significant factor in school failure for these students.

Furthermore, Ayson (1980) and Cheng (1996) have described attitudes among educators that both imitate and perpetuate the social class stratification in society. The practical outcome of such attitudes is that they lead to messages, both subtle and blatant, that may influence student achievement. One example is the widespread belief that poor or working class students are less capable than their middle class peers. “It is important to understand that as teachers and SLPs, all the decisions we make, no matter how neutral they seem, may impact in unconscious but fundamental ways on the lives and experiences of our students” (Nieto, 1992, p. 219). Hence, the expectations of teachers and SLPs, albeit both unintentional and unintentionally communicated, can have a profound effect on the way students view themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Income</th>
<th>Median SAT Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than $100,000</td>
<td>1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 to $100,000</td>
<td>1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 to $80,000</td>
<td>1,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $70,000</td>
<td>1,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $60,000</td>
<td>1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $50,000</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $40,000</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $30,000</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $20,000</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiculturalism and Special Education

It has long been known that ethnicity and social class are related to the issue of exceptionality; students from nonmainstream and poor families have traditionally been overrepresented in special education placements. Significant numbers of African, Hispanic, and Native American students, many of lower socioeconomic status, are labeled as developmentally delayed, learning disabled, or emotionally disturbed. Dunn pointed out as early as 1969 that 60% to 80% of the students labeled as having mental retardation were nonmainstream children from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Mercer (1973) later documented the disproportionate numbers of both Mexican and African Americans in programs for students with mental retardation in a California school district. He found that although Hispanics represented only 12% of the total school population, over 45% were placed in classes for the developmentally delayed, while African Americans were overrepresented in the same placements at a rate 3 times greater than their overall representation in the school population. Further, although Caucasians comprised 81% of the school population, only about 32% were receiving special education for mental retardation.

Through their analysis of the 1978 to 1984 U.S. Office of Civil Rights Surveys of elementary and secondary schools, Chinn and Hughes (1987) concluded that African Americans continued to be overrepresented in classes for students with mild and moderate developmental delays and serious emotional disturbance. Indeed, twice the percentage of African Americans found in the general school population were labeled as having mild development delays. Similarly, Native Americans were overrepresented in classes for residents with moderate developmental delays and learning disabilities. Additionally, Latinos, African Americans, and Native Americans were all significantly underrepresented in gifted and talented programs. Unfortunately, these trends persisted in the 1986, 1988, and 1990 Office of Civil Rights Surveys (Office of Civil Rights, 1988, 1990, 1992) and continue today. Table 5.2 depicts the breakdown of blacks, whites, and Hispanics in special education placements, based on the 1990 Civil Rights Survey results.

Although true exceptionalities certainly exist among mainstream students, the disproportionate numbers enrolled in special education suggest that differences rather than disability may well be a causal factor in referrals, a factor that represents one way that disabilities are socially constructed. There is no syndrome from which many of these students suffer. Indeed, it was suggested twenty years ago that attitudes toward culturally and linguistically diverse students affect referral for special education services (High & Udall, 1983). The majority of teachers and SLPs in this country are from European-American, middle-class backgrounds and are incompatible with those of non-Caucasian students. When teachers perceive linguistic deficits, they are likely to label students as having educational handicaps (Harris, 1990; Edwards, 1991). The SLPs to be aware that what often looks like a speech impediment may not be in itself disabling.
American, middle-class backgrounds with inherent values and norms that may be incompatible with those of nonmainstream and lower socioeconomic class students. When teachers perceive students as exhibiting social, learning, and linguistic deficits, they are likely to refer them to special education (Chinn & Harris, 1990; Edwards, 1991). That is why it is so important for teachers and SLPs to be aware that what often look like disabilities are really language or dialect differences.

The assessment process also has been implicated as a reason for the disproportionate placement of students from nonmainstream groups in special education. Qualifications for special education services are partially based on standardized test scores. Standardized tests are, however, for the most part, biased against culturally and linguistically different populations (Gardner, 1995; Gollnick & Chinn, 1994; Perkins, 1995; Sosuda & Lewis, 1992), because they are standardized in ways that reflect racial and socioeconomic distributions in the society at large. Hence, through their use of averages to calculate norms, they always favor the most numerous group in the United States, the white middle class. Furthermore, assessments conducted in English with minority-language students will not yield accurate results. Nor will test items normed on predominantly white, middle-class samples elicit "correct" responses from nonmainstream students. Educators and SLPs, therefore, need to monitor test results to determine whether they are consistent with what they observe in the classroom and whether they indicate a real disability or merely an ethnic difference (i.e., a characteristic that is not considered a disadvantage in the student's home community).

Lack of acceptance in the home community is the key test for a language disorder. The language and learning disabilities label is commonly given to linguistically different students, especially students with dialectical (as opposed to language)
differences, because we professionals have not been as careful as we should be about examining and cultural factors found in a student's speech community (Taylor, Payne, & Anderson, 1987). Furthermore, assessment in the student's native language is essential to revealing a true communication disorder (Kaye, 1993). Still, as noted earlier, we do not often have appropriate tests or the skill to administer them. It is incumbent that SLPs and school psychologists differentiate between true pathology and language or dialectal variation. ASHA (1983) addressed linguistic differences thus:

An essential step towards making accurate assessments in communicative disorders is to distinguish between those aspects of linguistic variation that represent the diversity of the English language from those that represent speech, language, and hearing disorders. The speech-language pathologist must have certain competencies to distinguish between dialectical differences and communicative disorders. These competencies include knowledge of the particular dialect as a rule-governed linguistic system, knowledge of the phonological and grammatical features of the dialect, and knowledge of nondiscriminatory testing procedures. Once the differences - disorder distinctions have been made, it is the role of the speech-language pathologist to treat only those features or characteristics that are true errors and not those attributable to the dialect. (pp. 23–25)

Hence, teachers, SLPs, and other specialists should begin with the premise that all students are members of a community who share a common communicative norm and then determine what the student needs to know to communicate appropriately within this community. Taylor et al. (1987) suggested that, to ensure optimal understanding of tasks and a successful evaluation, children should be observed in a variety of settings that embody familiar objects and activities “Less structured conversational activities elicit more language than structured activities and picture-describing tasks” (p. 421). Family members and significant people in the student’s cultural environment can provide the necessary information regarding communicative norms (Taylor et al., 1987).

Additionally, research on language acquisition has yielded relevant information regarding nonstandard English norms. Stockman (1986), for example, found that the acquisition patterns of children who acquire Ebonics prior to 3 years of age are similar to those of children who acquire SAE. Hence, a disorder may be present when young children fail to exhibit these expected language behaviors. However, between the ages of 3 and 7, children acquiring Ebonics demonstrate different patterning and specific grammatical rules. Therefore, these norms suggest that older children acquiring Ebonics who fail to evidence SAE forms are more likely to be exhibiting a different language or dialect rather than a disorder. Teachers, SLPs, and other specialists should have the potential for developing intervention strategies with children from language minority students.

The danger in misdiagnosing lies in further confusing students with patterns of others in their community different and, thus, alienated from others. The goal should always be teaching them SAE.

### Implication and Speech-Language Pathologist

What do educators and SLPs do, therefore, the knowledge, languages, and experts are respected and honored irrespective where differences are all should be assumed that all children strategies which, although different, as valid. “To be inclusive of all learners in particular, must begin with the valid language and culture to the individual needs.”
not been as careful as we should be in identifying these factors found in a student’s speech (1985). Furthermore, assessment in language pathology and language or dialectal differences than.


different assessments in communicative aspects of linguistic variation that emerge from those that represent The speech-language pathologist’s knowledge of dialectal differences competencies include knowledge of the dialectal features of the dialect, and procedures. Once the difference- the role of the speech-language characteristics that are true errors (pp. 23-25)

Table 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Assumptions of Multicultural Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The diagnosis and therapeutic process needs to be family centered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication and language are always culturally based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Every person belongs to some culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The client and family direct the intervention process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The clinical process is a social occasion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Intervention must be culturally sensitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intervention should focus and build on the client’s strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. All children have the potential to make substantial gains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Intervention should include strategies to support the development of natural speech and literacy skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: From Building Bridges: Multicultural Practice in Speech-Language Pathology, American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, no date. Rockville, MD. Author reprinted with permission.

dialect rather than a disorder. Table 5.3 delineates some basic assumptions that teachers, SLPs, and other specialists should promote in diagnosing and serving language minority students.

The danger in misdiagnosing a communication difference as a disability lies in further confusing students when they observe the speech and language patterns of others in their community, as this suggests that they need to become different and, thus, alienated from others in their speaking circle (Taylor et al., 1987). The goal should always be to preserve students’ native dialects while teaching them SAE.

Implications for Educators and Speech-Language Pathologists

What do educators and SLPs do, then, to create classroom climates in which the knowledge, languages, and experiences that students bring to school with them are respected and honored? How does one develop a multicultural perspective where differences are affirmed rather than negated? Foremost, it should be assumed that all children come to school with previously learned strategies which, although different from the mainstream, are nonetheless just as valid. "To be inclusive of all learners, teaching practices, literacy instruction in particular, must begin with the explicit premise that each learner brings a "valid language and culture to the instructional context" (Reyes, 1992, p. 443).
Further, we should endeavor to gather knowledge of students’ lives outside the classroom—it is as simple as asking or interviewing them or their parents—in order to ascertain their strengths, and to introduce new skills and concepts in contexts with which students are already familiar. “Knowledge about culture is but one tool that educators may use when devising solutions for a school’s difficulty in educating diverse children” (Delphy, 1995, p. 167). A multicultural perspective, therefore, goes beyond merely celebrating the diversity in students, but rather acknowledges and builds on the strengths and abilities of all students and incorporates this knowledge into the curriculum. Indeed, connecting the curriculum and reading and writing with students’ personal experiences has been shown to support greater progress and increased investment in school and learning (Au & Jordan, 1981; Barnitt, 1986; Flores, Ruiter, & Polder, 1986; Steffensen, Jong-dev., & Anderson, 1979; Willig & Swedo, 1987).

Generally, as noted in Chapter 4, skill-oriented approaches that focus on isolated, decontextualized parts, such as typical and rote activities, are less effective in encouraging language acquisition than are approaches that emphasize meaningful context and connectedness for the student (Delphy, 1995). Engaging students fully in the learning process necessitates using activities and techniques that are familiar and generate interest and enthusiasm (see Appendix 5A for suggestions). Of utmost importance, however, is recognizing the student’s potential and promoting high expectations for success. “When teachers do not understand the potential of the students they teach, they will under-teach them no matter what the methodology” (Delphy, 1995, p. 173).

Also, cooperative learning has been shown to (a) build successfully on the interactional styles of some cultural groups (Shvim, 1983) and (b) encourage trusting relationships in the classroom (Oakes, 1985). In cooperative learning, small homogeneous groups of students work together for collective reward (Gollnick & Chinn, 1994). Hence, the focus is on interacting, negotiating, and cooperating with others, a format similar to the socialization principles found in many ethnic communities. In fact, the concept of cooperative learning came about through observing how Native and Mexican American students interacted with each other as a result of cultural socialization (Fopolin, 1992). Additionally, Collier (1995) found that interactive classes, problem-based discovery, and thematic learning promote language acquisition.

In our current research, we have found that classes in school that are highly interactive, emphasizing student problem-solving and discovery learning through thematic experiences across the curriculum are likely to provide the kind of social setting for natural language acquisition to take place, simultaneously with academic and cognitive development, (p. 7)

Another technique that fosters reading is negotiating linguistic forms among independent readers (McClusky, 1988; Freeman & Swain, 1985; Wong Fillmore, 1986). Rap songs to discover inherent patterns based on these patterns. Students explain the structure of grammatical patterns or be used as an actual writing task (1988).

Reading to children is the single most important independent reading task. Assessment research has not only identified students’ personal experiences but also research studies to promote literacy. The stories, and writing language experience enhance classroom support for children (Rigg, 1989).

Students literate in a native language reading and writing in their native language. Foreign language books, filmable in classrooms and school libraries, and additional benefit of providing for helps nonmainstream as well as education of the cultures of their classrooms, are an important foundation for volunteers to read books.

Many favorite big books are available: the English and other languages and folktales are a good source of universal themes. Poetry also mirrors thoughts in a few words.

Student-made bilingual dictionaries featuring non-English speaking students (Cunningham, 1996). These can be used in English speaking classes who are should be drawn from the core courses such as social studies, science, etc. Dictionaries can be updated be sent home with students to further enhance learning. Bilingual can be asked to help
Another technique that fosters both oral and written language acquisition is negotiating linguistic forms and meaning among peers (Ellis, 1985; Enright & McCloshery, 1988; Freeman & Freeman, 1992; Goodman & Wilde, 1997; Swain, 1985; Wong Fillmore, 1991). An example of this method is analyzing rap songs to discover inherent patterns and using rules for creating new rap songs based on these patterns. Such a technique can become a base for teachers to explain the structure of grammar and to make comparisons across languages or be used as an actual writing assignment for a real audience (Delpit, 1988).

Reading to children is the single most important predictor of achievement among independent readers (M. Adams, 1990). Reading to children not only models the process of reading, but also fosters the growth of vocabulary and syntax. The language of books is different from that of speech and television (two other primary sources of exposure to language) and is also more interactive. Reading several texts per day therefore, appears to be one of the best strategies to promote literacy. Use of predictable texts, repeated readings of stories, and writing language experience stories are all excellent ways to enhance classroom support for children acquiring English as a second language (Rigg, 1989).

Students literate in a native language other than English need to continue reading and writing in their native language while learning English (Cummins, 1994). Foreign language books, thus, and computer software should be available in classrooms and school libraries to promote literacy acquisition. An additional benefit of providing foreign language materials in schools is that it helps nonmainstream as well as other students develop a better understanding of the cultures of their classmates. Parents of second-language learners can be recruited as volunteers to read books to children in their native language. Many favorite big books are available in Spanish and multiple-language editions; the English and other-language editions can thus be contrasted. Fairy and folktale are a good source of reading material, as they often touch on universal themes. Poetry also mirrors one's culture and presents big, important thoughts in a few words.

Student-made bilingual dictionaries are an inexpensive tool for incorporating non-English speaking students into the classroom (Allington & Cunningham, 1996). These can be put together by both English and non-English-speaking children who are literate in their first language. Vocabulary should be drawn from the core curriculum, with sections for different subjects, such as social studies, science, and math, as well as a general vocabulary section. Dictionaries can be updated, via computer, as needed, and copies can be sent home with students to further support language learning. Parents who are bilingual can be linked to help in proofreading final copies.
“Language buddies” are another way to support non-English speaking stu-
dents (Allington & Cunningham, 1996). Children pair up with older students
with English language proficiency who help with homework, reading, and
writing in a quiet, comfortable space provided for these activities. Additionally,
students with the same first language should be placed in the same classroom so
that they can support each other.

Students with non-English language proficiency can also serve as tutors for
English-speaking children interested in learning a second language. An after-
school program can be set up to facilitate tutoring. The staff can consist of stu-
dents, parents, people from the community, or staff members who speak the
language to be learned. English speakers can thus learn the rudiments of
another language while non-English speakers have an opportunity to practice a
second language.

Telecommunications is another option for promoting literacy. For
example, Vasquez (1993) discussed an after-school program for Latino children
called “La Clase Magica.” Using computer software, Spanish-speaking students
participate in a role-playing activity and later write letters and progress reports,
via a telecommunications network, to other students in schools also involved in
the activity. Another telecommunications program is the “Scholastic Place
Network” of Americas Online, which links second-language learners to other
speakers, readers, and writers of their native language.

An approach linked more directly to classroom instruction is the Cogni
tive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA), which supports students
learning English as a second language in the regular classroom by targeting
high-priority content from the grade-level core curriculum (Chamot &
O’Malley, 1994). The premise is that all language learners succeed best when
instructional activities are meaningful and authentic. Hence, CALLA uses
natural language involving the regular curriculum, rather than drill and prac-
tice of isolated speech components. Learning is supported concurrently with
developing language proficiency (Allington & Cunningham, 1996).

If ESL students are to catch up academically with their native English-
speaking peers, their cognitive growth and mastery of academic content
must continue while English is being learned. Thus the teaching of
English as a second language should be integrated with the teaching of
other academic content. . . . All content teachers must recognize them-
selves also as teachers of language. (Connors, 1994, p. 50)

Currently, a wide range of children from homes where SAE is not the
primary language attend schools in which the Eurocentric curriculum is the
norm. Because the population of students in our schools is becoming increasingly
diverse, SLPs and teachers needing educational support for learn-

ing, we need to rise to the

challenge of providing them with educational support in a manner that valuing their diversity (rather than
the mold), fostering literacy in

the curriculum, and ensuring a successful integration of all students.

Moreover, it is essential to sustain an educational stream few.
to support non-English speaking students. Children pair up with older students who help with homework, reading, and other activities. Additionally, bilingual education can also serve as tutors for learning a second language. An after-school tutoring program for Latino children software, Spanish-speaking students write letters and progress reports, or in schools also involved in a program is the "Scholastic Place," a second-language learners to other core subject areas. The classroom instruction is the Cognitive CALLA (CAL), which supports students in the regular classroom by targeting core curriculum (Chanot & CALLA users). Similarly, in the school, language must be supported concurrently with the CALLA's (Chanot & Cunningham, 1996).

Patriarchal with their native English, and mastery of academic content learned. Thus the teaching of women integrated with the teaching of men must recognize them. Thus, it is not the same (1994, p. 36).

from homes when SAE is not the case in our schools is becoming increasingly diverse, 3 Ps and teachers need to become even more responsible for enhancing educational support for learners who are acquiring English proficiency. Collectively, we need to rise to the challenge of better serving these children by valuing their diversity (rather than thinking of them as students who do not fit the mold), fostering literacy in a multitude of languages, and promoting the successful integration of all students in the educational community. To do otherwise is to sustain an educational system that benefits primarily the mainstream few.

Gender Issues

No discussion of attitudes and prejudices that affect educational outcomes would be complete without a discussion of gender-based expectations, which often have a negative impact on both males and females. Nevertheless, the Eurocentric curriculum has tended to privilege males, while silencing females. Until recently, education, for example, was the only institution in which those who entered with an advantage—that is, girls—existed doing less well than their male counterparts—and that after 12 years of instruction and "man" for a report aired on National Public Radio on October 14, 1998, however, the National Association for University Women's recent study on gender equity in schools indicates that girls have been made in recent years toward the use of nonsexist language in educational settings and in female students' achieving educational parity. According to their report, the one difficulty for female students that may still remain, although there is some controversy about this issue, is whether female students use technology in the same ways as males. As teachers and other professionals, we must acknowledge that language practices have played and continue to play a key role in what happens to girls and women throughout schooling. As Moore (1995) pointed out in his essay on racism in the English language, "Language not only expresses ideas and concepts but actually shapes thought." (p. 376).

Through concerted efforts to change the climate for females, according to the National Association of University Women study, the society has both changed and been changed by our attention to sexist language and its relation to privilege. As Besma (1995) pointed out, we had become used to making women invisible in our everyday references to humankind and to the professions, to having women identified in the media in ways that would be ludicrous if they were applied to descriptions of men (and vice versa); and to using words
Language About Women

In the English language, the generic form of most terms related to groups, roles, and professions (e.g., mankind, chairman, doctor, senator) is masculine (the National Association of University Women study is silent on such issues). For that reason, we also use the masculine pronouns he and him when we speak of non-specified persons we use the term to refer to all persons, both male and female. In every case, we make women invisible and, as Hernandez remarked in 1971, through such language usage "[i]n all areas that count, we discount women" (p. 6).

Attempts to correct such emissions have often led to cumbersome and even ludicrous constructions, such as Madam Chairman or person hours and, for that reason, many people have been reluctant to construct alternatives to the masculine form. Furthermore, many men and women argue that we understand the term mankind or doctor, for example, to mean both sexes; so we need not change the phrasing. The consequence of resisting linguistic change is that the visions women and girls may have about the range of possibilities for their own lives are limited. They cannot be judges or senators, but must always be labeled as the outsider, the female judge, the female senator. It is good to know that these problems no longer hamper girls in school, but they are still very much a part of the larger society.

Because of our assumption that the agent is male unless otherwise noted, awkward and insidious references to women often appear in the media. Bosmajian (1995, p. 103) listed several examples from newspaper headlines—"Grandmother Wins Nobel Prize," "Blonde Hijacks Airliner," and "Housewife To Run for Congress"—all of which would be thought to contain superfluous, and even ludicrous, information if the agents were males. We simply cannot imagine the headline that announces "Grandfather Wins Nobel Prize."

In addition, women are often seen as professionals in their own right, and the emphasis on "Jeopardy" introduced the two men, there was no reference to woman, a highly accomplished and respected man of the Federal Reserve Board.

Even more demeaning in many cases, the language and perspective of the major New York newspaper, for example, as having a "bathtub beauty figure" (e.g., body builder's, or considered completely irrelevant.

Teachers and SLPs must be aware that these language forms send clear and strong signals to students and reflect on such messages. Maintenance of gender-based stereotypes is a problem as the individualistic, and however, because it is they who are affected. Furthermore, now that we have been enlightened into the problem, and SLPs need to continue to insist on correcting the mistakes in writing. Although often cumbersome, one can usually "he the executive, he," by using the proper pronouns, female executive, "she the executive, she." (1994).

Language of Women

In 1975 Lakeff published a book that contained studies of how women's language prompts assertiveness training programs for women's better performance. Lakeff, whether women's language is, in fact, and whether those differences should be ignored.

One of the best known social problems in which women use language differently is the one in which communication between men
multicultural and multilingual perspectives

Language of Women

In 1975 Lakoff published a book that both established a new line of research—studies of how women’s language usage differed from that of men—and prompted assertiveness training programs that were designed to help women overcome their more deferential language behaviors and, therefore, succeed better in the corporate world. Since that time, a controversy has raged about whether women’s language is, in fact, different from that of men, how it differs, and whether those differences should be considered as deficiencies.

One of the best known sociolinguists who studies and defends the idea that women use language differently from men is Tannen (1986, 1990, 1993, 1994, 1997). She argues that women and men grow up primarily in same-sex groups, so communication between men and women is essentially cross-cultural and
often leads to misunderstanding and confusion. She notes that women are more comfortable using language in private settings and that this language can be characterized as "report-talk." That is, it is used to establish connections and negotiate relationships. Men's language, on the other hand, is used to establish independence and to negotiate and maintain their status in our society's hierarchical social order. Although Tannen is careful to note that the language patterns of the two sexes are simply different, she does acknowledge that it is but a short step from people's translating different into worse. Because men are dominant in our society, they serve as the standard and it is consequently women who are usually encouraged to change, to become more like men.

Tannen argues, furthermore, that despite the possible dangers, it is important to recognize the differences, because recognizing them helps people to understand that the differences are often cultural, rather than personal (e.g., "Men tend not to talk much at home"—that is, engage in private talk—versus "My husband doesn't talk much at home") and they also work to expose stereotypes. For example, it is commonly believed that females talk more than males. This belief is so pervasive that teachers who viewed a film in which boys did three times as much talking as girls perceived and reported that the girls had done most of the talking (Sadker & Sadker, 1995). Such beliefs are likely implicated in the earlier finding that teachers call more often on boys and use follow-up questions and the like that support reasoning and enable boys to talk longer (Sadker & Sadker, 1994). It probably feels to teachers as if boys need more encouragement to talk, since they believe that girls just naturally do more of the talking.

Similarly, LaFrance and Henley (1997) argue that well-documented differences between men and women exist in nonverbal behavior, with women being both more sensitive and more expressive nonverbally. They argue that these differences are "attributable to power inequities rather than personality differences" (p. 105). LaFrance and Henley believe that women become better at nonverbal communication because it is safer. It enables them to demonstrate compliance with the social order (i.e., to show that their subordinate status is intact). It is after all, the authors argue, wise of the less powerful to monitor behavior among those who are in power.

Arnes (1997) has reviewed the objections to Tannen's hypothesis that men and women use language differently, and Hall and Habenrost (1997) have raised similar arguments against the substantiation hypothesis proposed by LaFrance and Henley (1997). Primary among the objections is that we cannot essentialize women (i.e., pretend that there is an "essential" woman and therefore talk about women as a group, rather than respect the individual differences among them; Badr, 1990): Some women may use language differently as be superior in nonverbal communication and others not. Furthermore, in both cases, although the results of studies are often instructive, the effects tend to be large. Language usage is not a trait, but a process that is culturally, dynamic, and flexible.

In conclusion, there is some concern with issue. of race. Similarly, it may be the case that nonverbally, what is important, is the capacity to develop a wide range of communication. It is the obligation of their female students develop as their male counterparts and that men further their nature without similar restrictions on teachers and SLTs to help students and conserve societal expectations. Differences do exist on the results of University Women's study and that the culture is the freedom to be who gender is for eye color.

Language and the Curriculum

Chapman (1997) provided some schooling in the opening words of his boys:

Who am I? and What can I be children and adolescents. They should be affected by their answers. They are about being male or female, and answers they are able to come
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cases, although the results of studies are consistently statistically different,
the actual site of the effects tends to be small and nonsupporting examples abun-
dant. Language usage is not a trait that is a stable characteristic. Rather, lan-
guage usage is a process that is culturally sensitive (see, e.g., Phillips, Steele, &
Tanc, 1987), dynamic, and flexible. It changes with circumstances, needs, and
partners. Consequently, it is probably more appropriate to locate usage in the
interaction between the conversants, rather than attribute specific characteris-
tics to a particular person, who may use language quite differently in a new sit-
uation. For example, a teacher may dominate a conversation with a learner
during a social studies lesson and respond altogether differently just a few
minutes later when the student is guiding the teacher through the use of an
unfamiliar computer program.

In conclusion, there is some indication that women as a group might be
more concerned with issues of rapport, while men are more individualistic.
Similarly, it may be the case that women are more sensitive and expressive
nonverbally. What is important, however, is that both women and men have
the capacity to develop a wide range of preferences, styles, and competencies in
communication. It is the obligation of teachers and SLPs to make certain that
their female students develop as broad and useful a range of competencies as
their male counterparts and that male students be given the freedom to explore
their natures without similar restrictions. Furthermore, it is incumbent upon
teachers and SLPs to help students understand how language is used to play out
and conserve social expectations and stereotypes. It is likely that whatever
differences do exist are the results of socialization (as the new National Associ-
ation of University Women's study bears out) rather than immutable charac-
teristics of women and men. What we want to work toward in a democratic
culture is the freedom to be who and what we are with no more regard for
gender than for eye color.

Language and the Curriculum

Chapman (1997) provided some idea how important gender issues are in
schooling in the opening words of her text on equitable education for girls and
boys:

Who am I? What can I become? are questions of great urgency for
children and adolescents. Their own lives and the society of the future will
be affected by their answers. The idea that they absorb from those around
them about being male or female will be of decisive importance in the
answers they are able to construct. (p. 1)
Furthermore, language is a central factor in influencing aspirations and supporting or impeding their realization. Consequently, language differences have serious educational implications, especially when race, socioeconomic status, and gender are all confounded as in the case of poor African American women (Carli, 1990).

Whether or not differences in communication styles between females and males actually exist, they are perceived to exist and, as a result, certain language patterns have become female or male associated. Female-associated language (a) is supportive of other speakers, usually through the use of nonverbal cues and short, uninterrupting comments, such as "Mmmmm" and "Righ?"; (b) uses questioning incursion frequently and therefore appears deferential and uncertain; and (c) involves considerable self-disclosure. Male-associated language, on the other hand, is characterized by (a) friendly arguing that often reaches the status of a bonding ritual; (b) verbal prompting in an impatient and somewhat abstract style that focuses on content and yields little self-disclosure; and (c) tends toward monologues that assert dominance and leave little time for listening to others. Of course, either style may be used by women or men in any given situation and most people probably move back and forth between them, depending on the situation. However, the perceptions that women should behave one way and men another are so pervasive that these perceived style differences may continue to have a subtle impact on schooling.

In her review of the literature on the impact of gender-associated language in classrooms, Chapman (1997) concluded that female-associated speakers are at a disadvantage. While girls are being taught, however subtly, to adopt female-associated language patterns and are judged by their ability to do so (see Carli, 1990), the evidence suggests that both female and male teachers prefer classroom comments that are made in the assertive male-associated style. Female-associated speakers, whether they be males or females, are less convincing and are interrupted more often by both teachers and peers. Not only do they not finish what they want to say, but they stay out of the conversation once interrupted. This lack of participation may then be reflected in grades or affect levels of achievement.

There are also some difficulties associated with male-associated language usage, but these are typically less detrimental. Boys are much more likely to call out in class than girls, but teachers are also more likely to let boys (than girls) get away with not raising their hands. Male-associated language behaviors, however, may be interpreted as challenges to authority or may prohibit speakers from listening to and learning from others. Furthermore, males who believe that they must conform to male-associated expectations are just as limited and constrained in the range of behaviors they allow themselves to engage in as are females who are limited by female-associated constraints.

Finally, differences in expectations even hurt feelings when students are unaware of the differences in communication point. In mainstream culture, look-talk is generally perceived as less polite; one is talking is interpreted as a sign of manners generally expect students when they talk. Yet, as we mentioned earlier, male and looking down a sign of males are most likely to maintain are least likely (Chapman, 1997). This they do not equate the maleficiency or of interest.

In sum, although the recent scrutiny Women reveals positive finding of sex-based language in its most obvious courses, the achievement levels as going on to college and other fields did not include some of the more recent scientific literature. Consistently in the fact that things are getting better, we must be aware that the job of monitoring our classrooms is not yet done.
Influencing aspirations and subsequently, language differences have been shown to influence race, socioeconomic status, and, as a result, certain language styles. Female-associated language (a) is often characterized by the use of nonverbal cues and minimalism and "Right?" (b) uses questions more often and is deferential and uncertain; (c) tends to talk and leave little time for listening to others; (d) in a given situation, women or men in any given situation, and forth between them, depending on the situation, different styles of speech may be used. This perceived style difference may contribute to the impact of gender-associated language that females are more likely to talk less assertively than males. Boys are much more likely to talk more, are more likely to let boys (than girls) talk without question. Male-associated language behaviors, as Walton notes, may be assertive. In conclusion, there is no evidence to suggest that one gender is more effective than the other. Finally, differences in expectations can lead to miscommunications and even hurt feelings, when students who must collaborate in classrooms are unaware of the differences in communication patterns that are expected of female and male students. Another source of miscommunication can be differences in expectations for nonverbal communications. Eye contact is a case in point. In mainstream culture, looking at other people while listening to them talk is generally perceived as less powerful, while looking at a person to whom one is talking is interpreted as a sign of having higher status. As a result, teachers generally expect students who are listening to them to maintain eye contact. Yet, as mentioned earlier, eye contact in some cultures is considered rude and looking down a sign of respect. The evidence suggests that white females are most likely to maintain eye contact, while African American males are least likely (Chapman, 1997). Teachers must be aware of such propensities, so that they do not evaluate the maintenance of eye contact as a sign of attentiveness or interest.

In sum, although the recent study by the National Association of University Women reveals positive findings, the variables studied were about the use of sexist language in its most obvious form, the presence of females in science courses, the achievement levels as specified in grades, the numbers of women going on to college and other forms of advanced training, and so forth. They did not include some of the more subtle forms of sexism, which, in much of the recent scientific literature. Consequently, although we should find comfort in the fact that things are getting better for our female students, we should be aware that the job of monitoring our language usage and language expectations is not yet done.


**Conclusion**

Race, class, and gender are all associated with variations in language patterns, dialects, and nonverbal communications that have consequences for schooling. In fact, females, people from nonmainstream cultures, and the poor often experience very similar situations and events (Chafe, 1995). Teachers, SLPs, and other specialists must be aware of these variations in communication patterns and styles, so as to interpret them in ways that support the enhancement of individual potential and reduce the incidence of the stereotyping and misclassification that lead to the overrepresentation of nonmainstream students in special education and the possible undervaluing and consequent underdevelopment of females. As SLPs and teachers, we must learn to invite all voices into the classroom and to accept the language and associated styles.
that students bring to school. We can then help the students make direct comparisons between their speech and writing patterns and those of the SAE that we must teach them for ideological purposes (Gee, 1990).

Furthermore, we must teach our students about cultural and language differences, about prejudice and hierarchy, and the impact they are likely to have on their lives (Banks, 1996; Freire, 1996; hooks, 1994; Macedo, 1994). We must help them understand the political nature of the educational enterprise and help them to succeed within it while inviting them to have an impact upon it. We cannot rely on the banking system of education in which teachers "impart" knowledge of the Eurocentric curriculum to students. Students must become agents and collaborators in their own learning (hooks, 1994). If we cannot as a nation accommodate our race-, class-, and gender-based diversity within education, our society's primary instrument of acculturation, and promote the talents of all citizens, how will we as a nation fare in this increasingly competitive world?