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There is a gap in achievement between African American (and Hispanic) children and their peers that has been longstanding and intractable. The gap in reading achievement has been of particular concern because reading undergirds all academic subjects, including mathematics, science, language arts, and social studies.
The National Landscape

- The 25-30 point reading gap between AA and Caucasian American children as measured on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) has remained virtually unchanged for the last decade.
- The majority (86%) of AA fourth grade students read at or below “basic” levels in the 2016 NAEP sample,
- Only 14% of AA children were considered proficient or advanced readers (NCES, 2016).
• The 27-point score difference between White and Black students was not significantly different compared to 2017, the previous assessment year; however, it was smaller than the 32-point gap in 1992, the first assessment year.

(www.nces.gov)
Trend in fourth-grade NAEP reading average scores and score gaps, by race/ethnicity
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- Significant difference (p < .05)
- Significantly different (p < .05) from 2019.
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Reading failure in African American (AA) children is a longstanding high impact public health concern of enormous societal concern. At this point this failure is less about skills, and abilities and achievement, and more about access.
Consequences are significant...

• For every year that these students are in school the disparity in school achievement reportedly increases by one-tenth of a standard deviation, and this is particularly true of students from low-income families (Burchinal et al., 2011).

• That is, the longer these students are in school the larger the gap seems to grow
And Yet...

• AA and other minority students are underrepresented in Special Education:

• Morgan et al (2015): *racial, ethnic, and language minority elementary- and middle-school students are less likely than otherwise similar white, English-speaking children to be identified as having disabilities and, as a result, are disproportionately underrepresented in special education.*
• Language minority children are less likely than otherwise similar children from English-speaking homes to be identified as having learning disabilities or speech or language impairments (Morgan et al, 2015).

• Minority children's under-representation was evident across the entire elementary and middle school time periods.
Importantly...

The exclusionary criteria for LD nationally restricts children from diagnosis whose learning problems are “...primarily the result of... environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.”

(IDEA, 2004)

So currently in the U.S. it is not possible to be both poor and have LD. If you’re poor and you can’t read it is assumed that you can’t read because you are poor.
Impact of Cultural Language Differences

• It has been hypothesized that the mismatch between the language system spoken at home and the one used at school increases the cognitive load for students who speak other languages or dialects of English, making the process of learning to read much harder.

• Also, the linguistic characteristics of cultural-dialect among African American children significantly overlap with the characteristics of language impairment (LI) making it difficult to distinguish language difference from language disorder.
Impact of dialect use on a basic component of learning to read
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Can some black-white differences in reading achievement be traced to differences in language background? Many African American children speak a dialect that differs from the mainstream dialect emphasized in school. We examined how use of alternative dialects affects decoding, an important component of early reading and marker of reading development. Behavioral data show that use of the alternative pronunciations of words in different dialects affects reading aloud in developing readers, with larger effects for children who use more African American English (AAE). Mechanisms underlying this effect were explored with a computational model, investigating factors affecting reading acquisition. The results indicate that the achievement gap may be due in part to differences in task complexity: children whose home and school dialects differ are at greater risk for reading difficulties because tasks such as learning to decode are more complex for them.
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• Spelling-sound mappings were learned more slowly in the MAE-Mismatch condition than in the MAE-Match condition due to DS (contrastive) words (e.g., best).

• That is, having learned the AAE pronunciations the model had difficulty learning to generate the MAE form /bɛst/ in reading.

• Penalty was significant: 350 training trials to 75% accuracy for dialect neutral words; 1000 training trials for dialect sensitive words.
What is African American English??

• A systematic, rule-governed variation of English
• Used by most (but not all) African Americans in the United States
• Developed as an oral language with no written counterpart
• A low prestige dialect whose legitimacy is still debated in some circles: a community language that is not spoken at school
What does it do?

African American English
AAE adds and deletes bound morphemes

• Zero Possessive
• Zero Past Tense
• Zero Plural
• Third person singular -s

• I ride in my brother car
• And then he fix__ the food
• A girl puttin’ some glass_ on the table.
• Sometimes she wear__ a baseball cap.
Transforms the main verb or verb phrase

- Deletion of the copula/auxiliary
  - He ___ runnin’ fast
  - He ___ hungry.

- Subject-Verb Agreement
  - They was lookin’ for the big dog.

- Habitual be
  - He be gettin’ some ice cream

- Remote past been
  - I been knowin’ how to swim.
Pronominal Differences

• Undifferentiated pronoun case

• Regularized reflexive

• Appositive Pronoun

• Them pullin’ them up the hill.”

• He hurt hisself when he fell off his bike

• My mama she took me to the movies
“Other”

• Fitna/sposeta/bouta (communicates imminent action)
  • I’m fitna go outside.
  • I’m bouta ride my bike)

• Multiple negation
  • He ain’t never got no candy no how.

• Double modal
  • I’m am going to see if I can go.
The Sound System also is impacted

- f /θ/, v/ð, and t/θ in intervocalic and postvocalic positions
- d/ð in prevocalic positions
- Consonant cluster reduction
- Wif/with; bave/bathe; wit/with
- Dis/this; dem/them
- Col/-/cold
Dialect Density

• Dialect occurs in the language of African American students on a continuum from low to high use.

• An index of the degree/rate of dialect used by speakers and of linguistic distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dialect occurs in the language of African American students on a continuum from low to high use. An index of the degree/rate of dialect used by speakers and of linguistic distance.
Description of our Sample

• Nearly evenly split by gender (girls = 437, boys = 394).
• All participants had normal nonverbal intelligence ($M = 96.94; SD = 15.47$)
• Children with an active IEP were excluded.
• A longitudinal, accelerated cohort design was used to measure language and reading across 1st through 5th grades.
## Assessment Battery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WJ-IV</td>
<td>TOLD</td>
<td>DELV-ST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Reading Vocab  
  • Word Attack    
  • Reading Fluency  
  • Passage Comp    
  • Letter-Word ID  | 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> grade:  
  • Syntactic Understanding  
  • Picture Vocabulary  
  • Morphological Completion | Degree of Language Variation calculated for each child based on responses to 15 items with specific phonological and syntactic targets |
|          | 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, & 5<sup>th</sup> grade:  
  • Sentence Combining  
  • Picture Vocabulary  
  • Morphological Comprehension |               |
What have we found?
In first grade dialect density was approximately 65% (SD = 26%), followed by a nearly linear decrease in dialect density through fifth grade (about 5% per year), with a slight slowing of the trajectory over time.
High Degree of Variation

• Even with a potential decrease in dialect density for most children in first grade, the range of dialect density in this study was still wide, SD = 22% to 33% per grade.

• Children with the highest dialect density after the initial decrease in first grade may still be producing densities as high as 70% in fifth grade. These are the children at greatest risk for reading problems as they go through school.
The density of dialect use predicts performance on general language... and reading assessments:
Overall...

The relationship between Letter-Word Identification and dialect is strong, negative, and consistent across grades.

At higher levels of dialect, children consistently show lower levels of syntactic understanding.

At higher levels of dialect use, children tend to show higher levels of language risk.

Low dialect users do not show these patterns of risk.
Bivariate Growth Curve Models (Washington, Branum-Martin, Sun and Lee-James, 2018)

• Growth in reading slows down in the face of dialect usage starting in second grade

• We found a complex and dynamic relationship between dialect and reading
Bivariate Growth Curve Models (Washington, Branum-Martin, Sun and Lee-James, 2018)

• Importantly, the relationship between dialect density and reading is **reciprocal**: children who were strong readers were better at decreasing dialect use over time, and children who were higher dialect users had slower reading growth.
Gender Differences
Washington, Branum-Martin, James & Sun, 2018
Results: Language

• There was no evidence of gender differences in language or cognition in first through fifth grade.
• Growth models indicated that African American boys and girls evidenced similar growth trajectories for language across these grades.
Results: Reading

• No gender differences were apparent on any of the five reading skills measured in grades 1 – 3.

• For reading comprehension and fluency, boys and girls performed equally in the early grades (i.e., first through third grade), but differences by gender emerged in fourth and/or fifth grade.
Results: Reading

• Statistically significant differences were apparent in grades 4 and 5 for reading fluency and word attack, and in grade 5 only for letter-word identification, passage comprehension and reading vocabulary.

• In all cases girls outperformed boys.
• Why are these differences apparent for African American boys but not girls?
• The boys and girls in this investigation were recruited from the same schools, neighborhoods and classrooms, and were exposed to similar teaching and classroom environments. The SES background of students was also similar.
• Boys appear to be having difficulty developing foundational skills, including word recognition and letter-word identification – still having difficulty as late as 5th grade
• Reading comprehension and fluency appear to become casualties of these weak, basic skills
What about Writing?

Puranik, Branum-Martin & Washington, 2019
Results

• Writing showed a nonlinear growth trajectory from 1\textsuperscript{st} through 5\textsuperscript{th} grades.

• Students’ scores increased from grades one through three and then slowed down in grades four and five.
• High dialect density appears to have negative consequences for the acquisition of both reading \((r = 0.58)\) and writing \((r = 0.82)\).

• The impact of dialect on literacy skills was fairly direct: heavier dialect density slows growth in both reading and writing.

• However .... this effect appears to be moderated by the effects of reading and writing on each other.
Conclusions

• Whereas dialect has a negative relation with both reading and writing, the results of this study show that reading appears to promote growth in writing but writing does not seem to have the same facilitative effect on reading in this population.
Conclusions

• In order to improve literacy skills in African American children who used dialect, it may not be necessary to address children’s use of spoken dialect directly, as suggested by some researchers.

• Instead, it may be possible to impact dialect use indirectly by strengthening reading and writing skills.
Our Current Challenges

**Assessment**
Can’t tell the difference between poverty and disability

**Identification**
Can’t tell the difference between poverty and disability

**Intervention**
Only Tier 1 classroom instruction unless you have a moderate to severe disability
Your Challenge

Lack of opportunity/poverty should not exclude children from an appropriate dx and access to intervention.

Instead...
Why can’t we ask?

In the face of poverty and poor opportunity...

1. What distinguishes struggling readers from those who have dyslexia/reading disabilities?

2. Which assessments are we already using that will be effective for dx and identification?

3. What kind of assessments need to be developed to more accurate reflect knowledge of bidialectal children
Overall....

We need to challenge our current paradigms, both research and practice, to be more inclusive.
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