DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 914 EC 143 198

AUTHOR Wartella, Alisa Berger; Williams, Diane
TITLE Speech and Language Assessment of Black and Bilingual Children.
PUB DATE Apr 82
NOTE 60p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (60th, Houston, TX, April 11-16, 1982, Session F-55).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Black Dialects; *Black Youth; *Cultural Differences; Informal Assessment; *Language Acquisition; Language Tests; Nonstandard Dialects; Preschool Education; *Spanish Speaking; *Speech Tests; *Testing Problems

ABSTRACT

The paper examines aspects involved in providing an accurate evaluation of speech and language of culturally different preschool children. Dialectical differences of Spanish and Black English speakers are detailed. Culturally based nonverbal behaviors and situational factors, including touching behavior and eye contact, are considered. Cultural influences in such standard tests as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities are noted. The necessity of using informal testing with this population is stressed, and the existence of several developmentally referenced/commercially available tests is discussed as well as standardized tests which may be appropriate for the culturally different preschooler. (An annotated bibliography of 16 preschool tests is also provided.) (CL)

SPEECH AND LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT OF BLACK AND BILINGUAL CHILDREN

ALISA BERGER WARTELLA, M.A., C.C.C.
Senior Speech Pathologist
Head Start Clinic Team

and

DIANE WILLIAMS, M.A. C.C.C.
Speech Pathologist
Head Start Clinic Team

C.E.C. National Convention, Houston, Texas
April 1982

SPEECH AND LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT

Alisa Wartella and
Diane Williams

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of the speech and language skills of preschoolers from middle class backgrounds is itself a task which requires proficiency in the use of testing instruments, in making clinical observations and in behavior management (Allen, Bliss and Timmons, 1981). Evaluation of young children from lower socioeconomic and/or culturally different backgrounds demands even more facility on the part of the evaluator in the use of standardized instruments and the observation of behavior.

The evaluator must be aware of several issues. The first is the phonemic, semantic and syntactic variations to be expected in the dialect of the community of which the child is a part. The child's language abilities should be judged using the language of this community as a norm, not using middle class American English norms.

The second consideration is nonverbal cultural characteristics that may differ from mainstream America. These nonverbal communication cues must be interpreted as accurately as possible in order not to make false judgements about the child's communicative behavior.

A third issue is the situational factors which may influence the verbal output or responses of the child. Some of these may be alterable, others may not. However, the evaluator should be conscious of these when making observations regarding the child's performance.

Speech and Language Assessment

Introduction

The fourth area that the evaluator should become aware of is the careful selection and interpretation of standardized tests. She should ascertain what the composition of the sample population was that each test used for standardization. The evaluator should also be cognizant of any cultural biases that may be present in particular test items.

In order to overcome these obstacles the evaluator must be adept at making objective clinical observations and at interpreting these observations. She should also solicit the assistance of other professionals and non-professionals who have contact with the child. The classroom teachers and aides can be invaluable sources of information, especially if they are given some training or have experience in working with the culturally different and speech/language disordered. If residents of the child's community, much help can be obtained regarding the grammatical, lexical and social peculiarities of that locale, many of which would be familiar only to those residing within it.

Parents, of course, can also be helpful observers. However, this information should be weighed carefully because parents are not always reliable and/or truthful observers. This may be due to a lack of understanding or to the reluctance to divulge information to an authority figure.

Accurate and thoughtful evaluation of the culturally different child, although professionally demanding, is

Speech and Language Assessment

Introduction

essential in order to provide adequate and appropriate remediation services. It is critical to separate those culturally different children with actual speech and language disorders from those culturally different children with normal speech and language skills. This will avoid the unnecessary and impossible task of providing intervention for all children based on their cultural differences or, the opposite, failing to provide needed services for the speech and language disordered, culturally different child because of an inadequate knowledge of what is acceptable and what is deviant communicative behavior for that cultural community.

An unaware speech and language clinician, using only standardized test instruments, could conceivably determine that virtually all the children in a Head Start population were language disordered. However, observation, clinical judement and familiarity with the community enables the examiner to separate children with actual learning difficulties from those who are simply culturally different.

In the past, all these culturally different children have been characterized as possessing "deficient" language. Labov (1969) and Houston (1970) refute this notion. These and other researchers have demonstrated the systematic structure of dialects and their ability to provide for

Speech and Language Assessment

Introduction

abstract thinking. The differences these normal children exhibit are in performance, not in competence.

The authors accept this view that culturally different children are not verbally "deficient". These children are indeed "disadvantaged", however, because they are viewed by society in general and schools in particular as exhibiting deficient behaviors. It follows that these children may require assistance in order to compete with "advantaged" children when they enter school.

At this time, such support is more appropriately provided through preschool or readiness programs such as Head Start than through language therapy. Such intervention should be reserved for those children, culturally different or not, who have been identified as having a language-learning disability.

This paper will discuss in detail those issues that are essential for accurate evaluation of the speech and language of culturally different children. Areas to be addressed include: dialectal differences of Spanish and Black English speakers, culturally based nonverbal behaviors and situational factors influencing test results, problems encountered in the use of standardized tests, informal testing procedures, and developmentally referenced tests and standardized tests which can be used with culturally different children.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SPANISH AND STANDARD ENGLISH DIALECTS:

Sound differences between Spanish and English are likely to give the bilingual child problems in acquiring a second sound system. Sounds present in English and not in Spanish will be heard as the sound closest to it in Spanish. For example, Spanish has only five vowels /i/e/ a/o/u/. The English vowel /æ/ will be heard as /e/ or /a/, ("cat" as "kate" or "cot") and the English vowel /ɪ/ will be heard as /i/ ("bit" as "beet"). No Spanish vowel is exactly equivalent to an English vowel and there is no diphthongization. These differences require that the child learning a second sound system develop auditory discrimination skills for sounds not only in his first language, but for sounds that are different from those he has been brought up hearing.

Consonants in Spanish are also pronounced differently. Stops /b/p/g/k/d/t/ are not aspirated so they sound weaker, and may be lost at the end of a word. This may carry over to English where final stops are important to past tense production.

The interchangeability of /b/v/ may also cause difficulty and a child may pronounce "very" as "bery" and "rabbit" as "ravit". In certain dialects the /s/ may be pronounced in a more forward position and be confused with a lisp. There is also a palatal sound, not present in

Differences between Spanish & Standard English Dialects

English, which is similar to /j/ with frication which would cause the words "yellow" and "jello" to sound alike. Another difference is that many English consonants are not found at the ends of Spanish words, resulting in the addition of /e/ to English words ending in those consonants; such as /keke/ for "cake"; or the substitution of a permitted final.

In general, the Spanish speaking child will have difficulty with the following sounds: b, v, d, ð, dʒ, ʃ, ʒ, h, and all vowels.

Grammatical errors are also to be expected as a result of contrasting language structures, as in the following examples:

1. Negation - "not" is placed before the verb
   "Maria not is here" or "Maria no is here"
2. Adjective - follows the noun and agrees in number:
   "the dress yellow" or "the dresses yellow"
3. /s/ is dropped from third person singular verb:
   "he go to hool"
4. /s/ is dropped from plurals
5. /t/d/ is dropped from past tense
6. Future modals (can, will) may be dropped

Many of these endings are dropped because the Spanish system of inflection of nouns and verbs is more extensive

than the English system. The differences may confuse the children so much that they will omit these important endings, especially once they learn that they can still get their meaning across by using meaningful words, such as "time" words: "I go yesterday".

7. Articles - (the, a) may be dropped with nationality and profession:
   "I went to Dr."
8. Prepositions - may be generalized -
   "in" may be used for "on" or "at"
9. Question formation - since there is no subject - verb inversion in Spanish, children may rely on intonation:
   "You take me?"
   There is also no "do" in Spanish:
   "How they come to school?" or
   "How to come to school"

Many of these "errors" could indicate a speech or language disorder in an English speaking child. It is important to keep in mind the differences between the sound and grammatical systems of Spanish and English and what types of "errors" can be expected as a result of those differences. Children with intact Spanish development who are showing these types of errors are not likely to be displaying

Differences between Spanish &
Standard English Dialects

a speech or language disorder. Of course, children showing errors similar to these in Spanish should be evaluated in both languages to determine whether a basic language learning problem underlies his difficulties. The teacher who is aware of these differences can program her work to help bilingual children to develop better English skills.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BLACK AND STANDARD ENGLISH DIALECTS

Although there is no one dialect that can be labeled "Black Dialect", it is possible to describe the most common sound substitutions and omissions that may be found in the different variations grouped under this title. Most noteable are /f/ for /θ/, especially in medial and final positions (bafroom, monf), /d/ for /ð/, especially in initial and medial positions (den/then, budder/brother), and /v/ for /ð/, usually in medial and final positions (muver/mother, (breav/breathe). Other sounds may be omitted or weakened, such as /r/ and /l/ (cah/car, pahk/park, dǫ'/door, he'p/help), and as occurs in final consonant clusters (des/desk, neks/next, han/hand). These consonant cluster reductions directly affect plural formation in Black English. Words ending in /-st/, /-sk/, or /-sp/ are changed by reduction /-s'/. Plurals of such words, then, are formed by the addition of /-ez/ instead of the /-s/ plural suffix (desses/desks).

The most common vowel differences are /I/ for /ɛ/, usually before a nasal consonant (pin/pen, thin/then), and /ǫ/ for /long i/ (waht/white, tahm/time).

Grammatical differences are often difficult to pinpoint as such since they may result from the omission of sounds, as in the final cluster reductions already discussed.

Differences between Black and Standard English Dialects

This phonological basis for change must be kept in mind, although this description pertains to grammatical differences between Standard and Black English dialects:

1. Omission of /s/ ending for third person singular present tense: he walk/he walks
   Related to this is hypercorrection, or the inappropriate addition of /s/ in first and second person and in plurals: I walks/I walk, We rides/we ride
2. Plurals - omission of /s/: ten cent/ten cents
3. Possessives - word order indicates possession instead of /s/: my aunt house/my aunt's house
4. Contractions may be omitted, usually with forms of the verb "to be": he going/his going, they going/they're going (weakening or omission of /r/ is a phonological difference)
5. Past tense omission: I talk/I talked (consonant cluster reduction)
6. Invariant "be" - in Standard English this verb has the following forms: is, am, are, was, were. In Black English, "be" itself can be used as a noun verb no matter what the subject of the sentence is: I be here this afternoon, Sometime he be busy.

Differences between Black and Standard English Dialects

7. Distributive or non-tense"be" - the use of which is highly stigmatized socially. There are two opposing theories of its function:
   a. Continuous state of action (Stewart, 1969)
   b. Intermittent action (Fasold, 1969)
8. Multiple negation - leads to the misunderstanding that two negatives equal a positive statement. In actual usage, these sentences are understood as the speaker intends them. Both Standard and Black English have only one underlying negative but Standard English allows it to be expressed only once while Black English does not have this restriction. This dialect does restrict those places in a sentences where a negative can be expressed, however: Nobody don't know.
9. Undifferentiated pronouns - personal pronouns may be substituted for possessive pronouns. This variation is more commonly found in the South: "he book" or "him book for "his book"
10. Question formation - the rules of Black English dialect are more regular than those of Standard English. It is not necessary to invert subject and verb to direct questions, especially content questions (Where a non-yes/no response is required):

Differences between Black and Standard English Dialects

i.e.,What that is? Where the white cat is? Since Standard English inversion places the auxiliary verb in the beginning of the sentence, when inversion does occur the auxiliary is more likely to be deleted: "Is" deletion: He coming with us? "Have" deletion: Where you been? "Do" deletion: You understand? Although these omissions are usually recognized as features of Black English, speakers of Standard English dialect use these forms regularly. Attempting to teach this variation in a bidialectal approach would be of low priority.

11. Pronominal apposition allows that a pronoun as well as a noun subject be used. It is characteristic of other English dialects as well: My brother, he bigger than you. It is also acceptable in Standard English, although the pronoun and noun subject are likely to be farther apart in the sentence: That man that I met on the train to Chicago last week, he turned out to be a Congressman.

12. Existential "it" serves as a substitute for Standard English "there": It's a boy in my room name Robert. Is it a Main Street in this town? This feature may cause misunderstandings: "Is it soup yet?" Could be misunderstood as "Is there any soup yet?",

Differences between Black and Standard English Dialects

where speakers of Standard dialect understand it as, "Is the soup ready yet?".

It is imperative that educators be aware of these dialect variations when evaluating and teaching students. These features by themselves do not constitute a speech and language disorder although it is important that educators do not overlook other areas related to speech and language development that may possibly indicate a delay, in the interest of being "fair" to a child who speaks Black English. The Ann Arbor decision (1979) requires that teachers be knowledgeable in dialect variations in order to properly respond to difficulties encountered in the teaching of reading. It can be seen that familiarity with cultural and dialectal differences is a necessity for today's educator.

NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION

Specific intercultural nonverbal behaviors can affect the testing situation and everyday classroom work. Space, touch and eye contact may vary with cultures and influence the impressions of an evaluator from outside that culture. These are areas which we are least likely to think of as distinctive, but which we are most likely to notice when they are different.

For the majority of white, middle-class Americans, a physical distance of 18 to 36 inches between speakers is considered acceptable. On the other hand, Hispanics feel comfortable at a distance of 6 to 18 inches (Nine-Curt, 1975). An example of how these cultural differences can cause misunderstandings can be seen in a white, middle-class teacher-Hispanic parent conference. The parent may perceive the teacher's increased interpersonal distance as an indication of aloofness, and lack of true concern for the child being discussed. The teacher, in turn, may feel threatened by the parent's attempt to decrease that distance.

Cultures also vary in the acceptability of touching. White middle-class American culture may be uncomfortable with the increased amount of touching allowed in Black American culture. Black individuals may see whites as being cold because of their haptic bias (Kochman, 1971). Hispanic

Nonverbal Communication

and Italian cultures are also known as touch or contact cultures, and touch may be used to indicate "hello". "thanks" or "come here".

Unawareness of the space and touch differences among cultures may influence the evaluator's observations of a child's verbal behavior. A normally verbal child may exhibit decreased verbal output and reduced syntactical complexity, not because of lack of competency in these areas, but because of uncomfortableness with the nonverbal communication cues of the evaluator.

Another important nonverbal factor involves eye contact. Lowered eyes are considered a sign of respect to Puerto Ricans, with the opposite being true for white, middle-class Americans. This may cause a confusion in a pupil - teacher or pupil - evaluator relationship. A teacher reprimanding a child may see her lack of eye contact as being disrespectful and may become even angrier at the child. By lifting the child's chin to gain eye contact, the teacher will have violated the sacredness of "the face" and the child will feel her punishment has been more severe than warranted (Kochman, 1971).

An evaluator, unfamiliar with this cultural difference may assume that poor eye contact on the part of the child is indicative of a problem with interactive communication skills. This faulty assumption may bias the evaluator's interpretation of other verbal and nonverbal behaviors exhibited by the child.

SITUATIONAL FACTORS

The performance of a culturally different child in an evaluation may be influenced by inherent factors in that situation. The evaluator should be cognizant of these possible influences. Some of these factors are alterable and, where necessary, should be changed in order to obtain the best possible performance from the child. Others are not changeable, but should be considered when interpreting the child's behavior.

One such influence may be the race of the examiner. As reported in the literature, the exact effect of examiner race is unclear (Marwit and Marwit, 1973). Dialect of the examiner may be more influential in determining the output of the child than examiner race. Until further evidence on this issue is obtained, it is important for an examiner to consider the factor of race differences when evaluating a particular child's behavior.

A second factor which may affect the performance of culturally different children is the setting in which the evaluation is conducted. Templin (1957) and Loban (1963) reported a tendency for lower class children to produce fewer complex sentences than middle class children when their speech was sampled in school However, the children did produce some complex sentences. Both authors theorized that the formal school setting was possibly limiting the children's use of complex sentences.

Situational factors

Labov (1969) showed differences in observed language abilities when children were interviewed in formal and informal settings. For example, a small black boy interviewed by a black man from the same community initially responded with defensive monosyllabic behavior. When the interviewer changed his approach to a less formal one, sitting on the floor, eating potato chips and introducing taboo words, the quantity of speech obtained was much larger than in the formal interview.

PROBLEMS WITH STANDARDIZED TESTS

Standardized tests may not provide accurate information about culturally different preschool children because: 1) the population the test was standardized on may not have included children from disadvantaged backgrounds, & 2) some of the items on the tests may be culture-bound

For example, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (Dunn, 1965) was originally standardized on white children ranging in age from 2 years, 6 months through 18 years living in or near Nashville, Tennessee. It should be obvious that there is a difficulty in applying these norms to children from other regions or from differing backgrounds. There are also cultural problems with some of the lexical items on this test. For example, most children are more familiar with the word "hotdog" than the word "weiner" as in item number 25. The new Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Revised (Dunn, 1981) attempts to rectify some of these problems by using a population sample based on the 1970 census.

Another often used test, the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA) (Paraskevopoulos and Kirk, 1969) was standardized on a group of "average" children from five middle-western cities, ranging in population from 27,000 to 126,000. Only about 4% of the children were black, lower than the percentage in those cities or

Problems with Standardized Tests

in the country as a whole. Again, there are problems in applying the norms of this test to Hispanic, black and white children from different regions of the country and different socioeconomic backgrounds.

Culture may also influence performance on specific test items on the ITPA. For example, the Grammatic Closure subtest requres a pluralization of a noun following the adjective,two. (Here are two _____.) In the rules of Black English pluralization of the noun is not required in this context because of redundancy associated with the adjective two (Duchan and Baskervill, 1977).

INFORMAL TESTING

Because of the inherent difficulties in using many standardized tests with culturally different children, it is essential that the evaluator be proficient in the use of informal or non-standardized evaluation methods. Informal methods include observations of behavior, interview of parents, teachers and social workers and evaluator-made tests based on developmental information.

One of the initial procedures for informal testing is classroom observation. This allows observation of the child's performance in a non-threatening situation. At this stage a language sample should be begun and the child's effective use of language for communication with others noted.

Other reports of the child's speech and language abilities can be obtained from the teacher and the parent. This allows the examiner to determine if there is a large discrepancy between the child's verbal output or performance in a formal test setting and her performance in the classroom and at home. This information may also alert the examiner to potential problem areas.

Information from the teacher can be supplied through the use of a preschool screening form, which is completed by the teacher, and a personal interview. The screening form should include evaluation of the child's behaviors in areas such as the following:

Informal Testing

I. Cognitive:

a. requires more practice & time to catch on, compared with others in class

b. doesn't seem to have concepts necessary for understanding lessons

c. does not seem to know how to use materials

d. lacks curiosity

II. Speech/language:

a. Drooling

b. Open mouth

c. Excessive echolalia - repeats others speech

d. Verbal responses don't make sense

e. Uses single words or short phrases to communicate

f. Uses no speech

g. Stutters frequently

h. Struggles to get words out

i. Difficult to understand as compared to other children in the class

j. Hard time following directions

k. Attention wanders or looks around the room while teacher is talking or reading a story

l. Prefers not to speak during most of the day.

m. Delays before responding

n. Voice volume unusually loud or soft

o. Voice pitch unusually high or low

p. Voice sounds hoarse and/or nasal

Informal Testing

The teacher may also be asked to provide a written record of some of the child's verbal utterances. This is especially important for children with low verbal output who do not exhibit any spontaneous speech in a formal setting. Bilingual teachers and aides are useful in obtaining language samples in the child's native language and in revealing the effect of one language upon the other, toward providing an explanation of specific errors.

Information from the teacher and/or the social worker is necessary for determining any factors relating to the child's home situation which may be pertinent. Understanding of environmental influences is essential for accurate interpretation of the preschool culturally different child's behaviors.

The parent or primary care-giver should be consulted with respect to the child's early development. Information should also be solicited from the parent regarding the child's speech and language functioning at home, familial history of learning difficulties and any previous speech and language evaluations the child may have received. If time and practicality permit, observation of the verbal interaction between the mother and child can provide invaluable information concerning the amount and quality of verbal stimulation the child receives.

Informal Testing

A medical history, if available, should be obtained from health professionals who have worked with the child and her family. This background is essential in verifying or eliminating possible organic causes for a child's behavior.

After this background information is procured, the child should be screened using an evaluator-made instrument for expressive, receptive and articulatory skills to determine if further evaluation is required. The items in this screening procedure should be generally accepted developmental norms for three four and five year olds. The quality and manner of the child's responses should be recorded as well as the accuracy.

Some expressive skills to be observed include the ability to answer general questions such as name, age and sex, identification of body parts, naming common actions and objects, the ability to define and describe use of objects and the ability to name members of a category. A spontaneous language sample will allow the evaluator to examine the use of plurals, pronouns, articles, prepositions, possessives, tense formation and the ability to form negation and questions. Mean length of utterance can also determined.

Assessment of child's level of concept development in the areas of numbers, colors, shapes and prepositions, can also be conducted.

Informal Testing

Receptive language skills can be determined through auditory memory tasks involving sentence repetition and digit recall and the ability to follow one, two or three-part directions. Naming of opposites, story comprehension, the ability to respond appropriately to wh-questions and the ability to answer questions on physical needs ("What do you do when you're tired?") are other valuable observations.

DEVELOPMENTALLY REFERENCED/COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE TESTS

In addition to evaluator-made instruments, there are also several commercially available, developmentally referenced tests which can provide information about the child's speech and language skills. These tests are not "standardized". However, they measure the child's abilities based on generally accepted developmental norms.

One such test is the Preschool Language Scale (Zimmerman, 1979). This test contains items from 1-6 to 7-0 years of age in the two general areas of auditory comprehension and verbal ability. Age scores for these two areas are computed as well as a language age, which is the two scores combined and divided by two. There are four test items in each 6 month interval. This test allows measurement, not only of the child's overall abilities, but also of large gaps or scatters in her development.

A similar test is the Sequenced Inventory of Communication Development (Hedrick, Prather and Tobin, 1975). The age range of this test is 4 months to 48 months. Abilities in the general areas of receptive and expressive language are measured with this performance being reported as language ages.

The Vocabulary Comprehension Scale (Bangs, 1975) can be used with children ages 2 to 6 years. This instrument involves the manipulation of objects in a play setting

which allows the examiner to assess understanding of basic pronouns, position, quality and size concepts. This test does not yield a score but instead provides an age range in which these concepts should be acquired. The information from this test can be invaluable in planning remediation activities appropriate to the child in question.

Despite the problems with using a standardized score from the ITPA, information about a child's auditory or receptive skills may be gathered by assessing the child's performance on individual subtests. The subtests that are frequently used for this purpose include Auditory Association, which tests the child's ability to complete analogies; Auditory Reception, which requires a yes/no response to logical and illogical questions (i.e., Do people marry? Do bananas eat?); Auditory Closure, which examines the child's ability to fill in missing sounds to complete a word (i.e., tele __ one - telephone); Sound Blending, which requires that the child blend individually presented sounds into common words (i.e., k - ap = cap); and, Auditory Sequential Memory, which tests memory skills for digit sequences.

Comprehension of a variety of language concepts and structures can be assessed using the Test for Auditory-Comprehension of Language (Carrow, 1973). This is a picture

Developmentally Referenced/

Commercially Available Tests

test consisting of 101 items. The child responds by pointing. No standard score is obtained. Rather, the child's performance is assessed by categorizing the child's responses as verbs, negation, etc. to determine those areas which need remediation. A Spanish version of this test is available, however, some lexical items may not be appropriate for all Hispanic children, since many are based on Mexican vocabulary. Direct translation from the English may lead to unequivalent degrees of difficulty between the English and Spanish structures (Rueda and Perozzi, 1977).

USE OF STANDARDIZED TESTS

Some standardized tests may be used with the preschool culturally different child if the evaluator is careful regarding the interpretation and reporting of the results from these tests.

The Assessment of Children's Language Comprehension (ACLC) (Foster, Giddan and Stark, 1973) provides information on the child's ability to comprehend an increasing number of syntactic units/critical elements. For example, "dog eating" would be two critical elements. Although this is a standardized test, there are difficulties in applying these norms to children from a culturally different population because representation of this portion of the U.S. population in the standardization sample is unclear. However, the evaluator can still gain valuable information from this test that is not available from any other commercially produced language test. No score should be reported for the child. Rather the information should be used in planning a remediation program appropriate for that child.

The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (Dunn, 1981) can be used to determine the child's receptive vocabulary skills. It should be noted that the revised version of this test reports the score as an "age equivalent" and "standard score equivalent" not a mental age or intelligence quotient.

Use of Standardized Tests

The evaluator should be careful to report this as a receptive vocabulary age.

The Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test (Gardner, 1979) assesses ability to label pictures and can be interpreted into mental age, I.Q., percentiles and stanines. It was standardized on children 2 to 11-11 years old residing in the San Francisco Bay area with racial-cultural and sexual factors in proportion to the population of the U.S. in 1976. Scores on this test are probably most fairly reported as an expressive vocabulary age.

There are also several commercially available tests for use with a Spanish speaking population. These must be administered by an evaluator who is fluent in Spanish or through use of a bilingual aide under the supervision of a qualified professional.

The Austin Spanish Articulation Test (1974) assesses articulatory proficiency in Spanish. Examiners must have experience in articulation testing and knowledge of the Spanish phonemic system. This test was field-tested on 29 Mexican-American children from 4 to 7 years of age. No normative data is provided. The test may not be appropriate for use with other Spanish-speaking populations.

Use of Standardized Tests

Another test of articulation abilities in Spanish is the Southwestern Spanish Articulation Test (Toronto, 1977a). This test was designed for use with Spanish-speaking children in Texas. As the author notes, the evaluator may have to adapt the test for the Spanish dialect which is spoken in her particular area.

The Screening Test of Spanish Grammar (Toronto, 1973) is a screening test of syntactic proficiency in Spanish which follows a format similar to the Northwestern Syntax Screening Test (NSST) by Laura L. Lee. The test was standardized on 192 Mexican and Puerto Rican children from the Chicago area.

The Toronto Test of Receptive Vocabulary (English/Spanish) (Toronto, 1977b) is used for identification of those English and Spanish speaking children whose receptive vocabulary falls significantly below that of their peers. The test was standardized on three groups of children: Anglo-American, predominantly English speaking Mexican-Americans and predominantly Spanish speaking Mexican-Americans. This test may not be appropriate for use with other Spanish-speaking groups.

The Del Rio Language Screening Test (Toronto et.al., 1973) can be administered to children ages 3-7 years in order to identify those with disordered language skills in

CONCLUSION

The evaluator of culturally different, preschool children must be adept in the use of both formal and informal testing procedures in order to conduct an accurate speech and language evaluation. She cannot expect to adequately complete this task alone.

The participation of professionals from a variety of disciplines is particularly advantageous. Input from a psychologist, occupational therapist, physical therapist, social worker and health professional may be invaluable in interpreting the behavior and assessing the needs of preschool children from culturally different backgrounds. Information from teachers, aides and parents is also important, not only in the assessment, but in determining appropriate areas for remediation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Doris V., Bliss, Lynn S. and Timmons, Jack. Language evaluation: Science or art? Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 1981, 46, 66-67.

Austin Spanish Articulation Test, Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, 1974.

Bangs, T.E. Vocabulary Comprehension Scale Hingham, Mass: Teaching Resources, 1975.

Carrow, E. Test for Auditory Comprehension of Language Hingham, Mass: Teaching Resources, 1973.

Duchan, J., and Baskervill, R.D. Responses of black and white children to the grammatic closure subtest of the ITPA. Language, Speech and Hearing Services in School, 1977, 22, 126-132.

Dunn, L.M. Peabody Picture Vocabulary. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services, 1965.

Dunn, L.M., and Dunn, L.M. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised. Circle Pines, Minn: American Guidance Service, 1981.

Fasold, R.W. Tense and the form "be" in Black English, Language, 1969, 40, 763-776.

Foster, R., Giddan, J.J., and Stark, J. Assessment of Children's Language Comprehension. Palo Alto, Calif: Cosulting Psychologists Press, 1973.

Foster, R., Giddan, J.J., and Stark, J. Assessment of Children's Language Comprehension (Spanish Translation). Palo Alto, Calif: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1973.

Gardner, M. Expressive one Word Vocabulary Test. Novato, Calif: Academic Therapy Publications, 1979.

Hedrick, D.L., Prather, E.M., and Tobin, A.R. Sequenced Inventory of Communication Development. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services, 1975.

Bibliography

Houston, S.H. A reexamination of some assumptions about the language of the disadvantaged child. Child Development, 1970, 41, 4.

Kochman, T. Cross cultural communication: Contrasting perspectives, conflicting sensabilities. ERIC Doc. 047026, 1971.

Labov, W. The logic of nonstandard English. The Florida F. L. Reporter, Spring/Summer, 1969, 60-74 169.

Loban, W. The Language of Elementary School Children. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Martin Luther King Junior Elementary School Children, et al., V. the Ann Arbor School District Board, Civil Action No. 7-71861. United States District Court, 1979.

Marwit, S., Marwit, K. Grammatical Response of Negro and Caucasian second graders as a function of standard and nonstandard English presentation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 65, 187-191.

Nine-Curt, C.J. Non-verbal communication and English as a second language. Bilingual/English as a Second Language Reporter, 1975, 1, 1-2.

Paraskevopoulos, J.N., and Kirk, S.A. The Development and Psychometric Characteristics of the Revised Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1969.

Rueda, R. and Perozzi. A comparision of two Spanish tests of receptive language. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 1977, 2, 210-215.

Bibliography

Stewart, W.A. On the use of Negro dialect in the teaching of reading, in Baratz, J.C., and Shuy, R. (eds.) Teaching Black Children to Read. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics. 1969.

Templin, M. Certain Language Skills in Children. Minneapolis: University of Minn. Press, 1957.

Toronto, A.S. Screening Test of Spanish Grammar. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Toronto, A.S. Developmental Assessment of Spanish grammar. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 1976, 41, 2.

Toronto, A.S. Southwestern Spanish Articulation Test. Austin, Texas: National Educational Laboratory Publishers, Inc., 1977a.

Toronto, A.S. Toronto Tests of Receptive Vocabulary (English/Spanish). Austin, Texas: National Educational Laboratory Publisher, Inc., 1977b

Toronto, A.S., Leverman D., Hanna, C. Rosenweig, P, Maldonado, A. Del Rio Language Screening Test. Austin, Texas: National Educational Laboratory Publisher, Inc., 1973.

Zimmerman, S.L., Steiner, V.G., and Pond, R.E. Preschool Language Scale. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1979.

United Cerebral Palsy Association
4700 WISSAHICKON AVENUE • PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19144 • (215)842-0500

United Cerebral Palsy Association
of Philadelphia & Vicinity
Founded 1946

HEAD START CLINIC TEAM

Selected Preschool Tests: Annotated Bibliography
(consult comprehensive list for publishers)

Carol S. Lidz, Psy.D.

Berkeley Paired-Associate Learning Test:
By N.M. Lamabert, M.R. Wilcox, and W.P. Gleason.

This test is printed in the back of the book: The Educationally Retarded Child by the above authors (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1974). It is offered as an experimental version.

Norms are provided for ages 4, 5, and 7 years, based on high SES children from San Francisco area.

The measure is intended to assess learning proficiency and can be used to assess the child's response to the assessor's attempts to teach verbal elaboration. The book includes all materials needed; i.e. the scoring form and pictures.

Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development:
by Albert Brigance (1978)

Age range: birth to 7 years.

The placement of the items on this criterion-referenced measure is according to age levels which are based on previously published standardized instruments. For curriculum-related items, pupil texts were consulted. The Inventory was also subjected to extensive field testing with critiques and modifications solicited from users.

Areas assessed: psychomotor, self-help, speech/language, general knowledge/comprehension, and early academic skills. The aim is comprehensiveness and applicability to instruction. Instructional objectives are provided for each subtest.

Extensive materials are necessary and must be purchased. This makes the instrument expensive

and cumbersome to carry and administer. The drawings are attractive and clear. It is difficult to follow directions because ceiling levels vary and the directions are embedded in a complexly written page. The measure is comprehensive, and need not be administered in its entirety.

Bingham Button Test:
by W. J. Bingham (1967)

This is a "nonverbal" test designed specifically for young children from low SES environments. However, norms are presented for high, middle, and low SES children between the ages of 3 and 6 years. The concepts tapped include colors, numbers, sizes, object/object relations, person/object relations, visual perception and motor performance.

The internal consistency coefficient is .89, with test-retest reliability of .87. One validity study is reported which compares scores with teacher ratings and obtains a correlation coefficient of .76.

No verbal expression is required. The child follows directions involving varying combinations of 10 buttons (provided), such as "show me the yellow button", "put your finger on the big button."

Carolina Developmental Profile:
by D. L. Lillie, and G. L. Harbin.

This is a criterion-referenced checklist comprised of long term objectives which correlate with an accompanying instructional program. The major advantage of this measure is the ability to go directly from the assessment to the instructional exercises, which can be provided to the teacher as concrete recommendations, relevant to instruction.

There is no manual per se, only a one page description which gives no details regarding test development except to note literature review, testing, and use of other instruments to establish age ranges for items.

Areas assessed include gross motor, fine motor, visual perception, reasoning, receptive language, expressive language, and social emotional.

Age range: 2 through 5 years.

Some of the instructions for administration and criteria for scoring are not clear, and some of the item placement is questionable, e.g. "recognizes emotions in others" (identifying sad, angry, happy faces) at age 5-6 (and the drawing of the happy face is ambiguous).

Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery:
by A. E. Boehm and R. Slater (1974; second edition, 1981)

The comments here refer to the 1974 edition.

Age range, nonspecific: prekindergarten and kindergarten.
Time required: 20 minutes.

This is criterion-referenced, derived from a review of curricula, classroom observation, teacher interviews, and literature review.

Categories assessed: orientation toward environment, coordination, discrimination, memory, and concept formation/comprehension. There are normative guidelines divided according to SES to indicate percentage of children passing each item. This information is important for determining whether a failure warrants inclusion in an IPP as an objective. However, it is based on small numbers.

This measure is briefer and less comprehensive than the Brigance. Either of these qualities may be an advantage or disadvantage, depanding upon the purpose. Another advantage is that additonal materials,other than the book with pictures and scoring form are not required (with the exception of blocks for counting).

Developmental Tasks for Kindergarten Readiness:
by W. J. Lesiak, Jr. (1978)

This is criterion-referenced, and the author states that "the subtests were selected from a child development model, instructional objectives in kindergarten curriculum guides, and from research studies citing certain processes as important for school success" (manual, P. 3).

A reas assessed with twelve subtests: oral language (auditory sequencing, auditory association), visual motor (visual discrimination, visual memory, visual motor, name printing), cognitive (body concepts, color naming, number knowledge, alphabet knowledge, relational concepts), and social development (social interaction).

Age range: 4 years 6 months to 6 years 2 months.
Minimal additional materials needed.
Time required: 20 to 30 minutes.

Directions are clear and examples are provided to aid scoring. Norm ratings are provided for each subtest. Standardized on 2,140 children, 90% Caucasian, 10% minority (AMerican Indian, Mexican-American, and Black). SES specifics not provided- or re location of sample.

Some subtests have low internal consistency; most are adequate. Test stability is good; predictive validity using the Metropolitan Achievement Test is .62. Factor analysis yielded five factors.

Discovering Learning Capability:
by D. Stott,

with accompanying book which describes the Toronto Project: The Hard-To-Teach Child (Baltimore: University Park Press, 1978)

This is a dynamic assessment procedure using educationally related materials. There are parallels between Stott's approach and Feuerstein's, with, thus far, only Stott's applying to the younger child (ages 5 and 6 years). The goal of the assessment is to identify "inappropriate learning behaviors with a view to correcting them" (P.28). As Feuerstein, Stott is interested in capability, not static performance, and the assessment provides teaching intervention to induce change. A teacher questionnaire called "Guide to Learning Styles" elicits information regarding 14 styles which have been observed to interfere with optimal functioning in the learning situation. The psychological assessment is done by means of "Discovering Learning Capability" (forms obtained from the author at University of Guelph, Ontario), and utilize the Flying Start educational materials developed by Stott for remediation purposes, obtained from Science Research Associates (Cnicago, or Palo Alto).

This is an informal measure which yields descriptive information, and in most cases would be used for supplemental evaluation of a child about to enter (or in) kindergarten.

Gesell Preschool Test:
by J. Haines, L. B. Ames, and C. Gillespie (1980).

The items from this measure are basically derived from the Gesell developmental scales with some changes and updated norms. It is intended as a behavioral, not intellectual, evaluation to facilitate developmental placement in the school.

Age range 2½ through six years.
Areas assessed: motor, adaptive, language, and personal-social.

The test strives to measure the "maturity of the organism" (P.4). The manual gives no information regarding development of the test, the normative sample, reliability or validity. An unpublished study in California is cited in support of the superiority of developmental placement.

In a book entitled The Gesell Institute's Child from One to Six: Evaluating the Behavior of the Preschool Child by Ames, Gillespie, Haines and Ilg, the authors note that the norm group for the Preschool Test was nearly all white and all lived in Connecticut. SES levels were mixed. Total N = 640.

The Test yields a Developmental Quotient, not based on standardized scores, but obtained by dividing obtained age score by chronological age x 100. Scoring criteria are not clear.

Goodman Lock Box:
by J. Goodman (1981)

This is an irresistable measure for the child between 2½ and 5½ years. It shows good discriminability regarding mental deficiency and is not sensitive to SES. The major disadvantages are expense (approaching $300) and size, making it cumbersome to carry around (also, the inclusion of baby powder, which is guaranteed to cover the examiner). Training is necessary to learn the scoring procedure.

The Lock Box consists of a large wooden box with two rows of five doors. Each door is secured with a different lock of varying difficulty to open, and behind each door is a different toy.

Administration time is 6½ minutes. Following formal scoring, testing the limits is encouraged. Of particular interest is the scoring for organization, which makes this one of the rare measures (and the best standardized) to assess cognitive processes in young children.

The Test is normed on 405 children from metropolitan Philadelphia. Low SES, inner city Black children are well represented. Inter-scorer reliability is high, and information regarding validity is promising.

Learning Accomplishment Profile:
By A. R. Sanford(1974)

"...designed to provide the teacher of the young handicapped child with a simple criterion-referenced record of the child's existing skills."

The items are sequenced according to sources such as Bayley, Bangs, Catell, Gesell, etc.

Age range 1 month to 72 months.
Areas assessed: gross motor, fine motor, social skills, cognitive, self-help, and language.

Goodwin and Driscoll (1980) criticize the measure for the lack of norms and lack of information regarding reliability and validity. It yields developmental ages in each area.

Developmental Programming for Infants and Young Children:
by D. B. D'Eugenio and M. S. Moersch (1981).

This is a package of assessment and programming ideas which attempts to relate assessment findings directly to educational intervention.

Developmental milestones in six areas are recorded: Perceptual/fine motor, cognition, language, social, self-care, and gross motor. Items were selected from other standardized tests, literature references, and, in some cases, developed for the measure and placed according to the authors' experience. Data from limited field testing is reported. A final arrangement of items according to difficulty was based on the testing of 92 white children from Springfield, Missouri from middle and some low SES families.

The authors recommend administration by a multidisciplinary team, with each professional giving the tests in his/her area of expertise. One person can administer the entire measure.

Time required: one hour. Some additional materials must be purchased.

There is a useful section in the manual which informs teachers how to relate objectives to the program and how to implement the objectives within the program.

Play assessments:

Two approaches which look interesting but with which we have not as yet had experience include:

1. an analysis of play behavior described by R. Gordon, D. White, and L. Diller in the January 1972 issue of Exceptional Children ("Performance of Neurologically Impaired Preschool Children with Educational Materials").

Norms for low SES, middle class, and brain injured children between the ages 3 and 6 years are provided, along with a scoring procedure for children's interaction with a form sorting box and Montessori cylinders. Attention is paid to processes of problem solution as well as to level of achievement.

2. a scoring procedure for free-play behavior with dolls, bears, blocks, mallet, wagon, crayons/paper, clay and toy phone. This can be obtained from Dr. Jeanne Foley, Psychology Department, Loyola University of Chicago, 6525 No. Sheridan Rd., Chicago, Ill. 60620, and is discussed in an article: "Free-Play Behavior of Atypical Children: an approach to assessment", in the Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 1979, 9(1), 61-72.

Preschool Interpersonal Problem Solving Test:
by M. B. Shure and G.Spivak (1974)

This Test strives to measure "the preschool child's cognitive ability to solve real life interpersonal problems (manual, P.1) and is geared to four year olds.

THere is also a curriculum for teaching social problem-solving skills, obtainable from the authors.

This measure developed out of reasearch findings suggesting a relationship between thinking skills (particularly ability to generate alternative solutions) and behavioral adjustment.

A problem situation is described to the child, using picture props . The children are asked for a solution, and encouraged to think of different solutions each time a similar problem is presented. Through field tryouts items were selected which elicited a variety of solutions. Standardized probes are used.

Validity and reliability are discussed in the manual. The Test has been used primarily with Black, inner city children. Training is required for high inter-rater agreement. Stability coefficients from two different studies were .72 and .59.

The Test yields a score based on total number of different solutions given by the child, and ratios can also be derived regarding relevancy of solutions, force involved, as well as information regarding verbosity. Norms are provided regarding number of solutions.

Preschool Language Assessment Instrument:
by M. Blank, S. A. Rose, and L. J. Berlin (1978)

This is an experimental version of the Test which accompanies the book: The Language of Learning, and included recommendations for enhancing the teacher/pupil dialogue.

Age range: 3 to 6 years.

The intent is to criterion-reference the measure to language demands of the teaching interaction, and the Test follows a model of cognitive development which increases in level of abstraction. Four areas are assessed: matching perception, selective analysis of perception, reordering perception, and reasoning about perception. Tentative norms based on small numbers but separated by SES are offered. The focus is on level of mastery of each of the above areas; however, we have found it useful to consult the norms because ratings of "weak" level of mastery often turn out to be "average" level of expectation for the age of the child assessed.

A real asset of the measure is that children seem to like it and assessment progresses quickly, approximating conversational style. Time required: 20 minutes.

Information regarding test development, reliability and validity is presented. Inter-rater reliability is high; split-half reliability is good except for the first group (matching perception), and stability is adequate as well. Validity is demonstrated by the test's successful discrimination of children with language disorders. Other aspects of validity are discussed.

Although black and white, the pictures are unusually attractive and well drawn, and both directions and scoring crieria are generally clear. Goodwin ai Driscoll (1980) assess the PLAI as "an important measure of language; with its age range and its discourse skills tied closely to the educational arena, it has high potential utility for early childhood education" (P. 228). These authors also cite the substantial reliability and favorable validity, with more attention needed to concurrent and predictive validity and development of norms.

Preschool Screening System:
by P. Hainsworth and M. Hainsworth(1980)

This is a downward extension and restandardization of the Meeting Street School Test and can be used as part of a large screening program which also includes a curriculum. We have found it to be a very useful general screening instrument. However, low scores need to be supplemented with other measures, as the Test appears to underestimate ability in some children. Of particular interest is a Spanish version (as well as other languages) and a scorable parent questionnaire.

Age range: 2 years 6 months to 5 years 9 months.

There is a short form and a non-language score can be derived. Time required: 20 minutes.

Areas assessed: body awareness/control, visual/motor/perception, language, learned skills, and an imitation score.

One problem is the within-subtest content, which at times is questionable regarding what is assessed versus the title of the subtest, for example, an item under spatial directions asks the child to "put the penny on the box", considered to be a measure of visual/perceptual/ motor ability. Gross comparisons between areas and the total score provide useful normative information and some specific educational objectives can be abstracted.

The norm group numbered over 2000. Information regarding reliability and validity is provided. Minimal materials are required, and directions for administration and scoring are clear. The manual is difficult to navigate, however, and we found it necessary to add index tabs to mark sections.

THe norm group is from the northeast U.S., and includes rural, suburban, urban, and inner city children from 20 communitites (mostly Rhode Is.). For the younger ages, SES distribution approximates the 1970 US census. Blacks are represented, but no minority percentages are given.

Psychoeducational Evaluation of the Preschool Child:
by E. Jedrysek, A. Klapper, L. Pope, and J. Wortis (1972).

This represents an attempt to simplify and standardize the assessment approach of Else Haeussermann, and represents an example of a "dynamic" approach to assessment.

Areas assessed include: physical functioning and sensory status, perceptual functioning, competence in learning for short term retention, language competence, and cognitive functioning. Within each section, there is approximate age coverage between three and six in descending order, but the intent is not to serve as a normative measure. It can be considered criterion-referenced to a typical preschool curriculum as well as dynamic in the nature of the administration.

The most unique feature of this measure is that when a child fails an item, a series of probes is administered to explore at what level and by what means the child can succeed. A limitation is that the probes are not uniform and are fairly limited in variety, so that it is difficult to generalize regarding methods which may be useful for intervention for the child. Another limitation is the cumbersomeness, since many materials need to be purchased and organized, and quick accessability to materials for each subtest and probe is difficult.

The Measure is also lengthy, but provides an opportunity for the assessor to interact with the child over a period of time to elicit a sample of what it is like to try to teach the child and to yield guidelines for curriculum objectives and teaching approaches. The entire test need not be administered.

There is no information regarding test development, standardizatio reliability, or validity.

Symbolic Play Test:
by M. Lowe and A. J. Costello

Age range: 1 to 3 years (most appropriate between 15 and 24 months British standardization.

This is a virtually irresistable measure, which simple checks off the toy combinations the child makes during presentation of four sets of toys. The toys are not provided (and tractor-trailers are hard to find). This is primarily a good rapport builder, and only provides a very gross estimate of developmental level. It is not sensitive to SES and therefore a good nondiscriminatory measure. Dolls can be selected which match the racial groups assessed in order to increase the nondiscriminatory property.

HEAD START CLINIC TEAM

PRESCHOOL TESTS

Compiled by: Carol S. Lidz, Psy.D.
Director, Head Start
Clinic Team

ABC Inventory-to determine Kindergarten & school readiness by Norman Adair & George Beach
Research Concepts
1368 Airport Road
Muskegon, Michigan 49444

Albert Einstein Scales of Sensori-Motor Development by Staff of Child Development Project
Dept. of Psychiatry, A. E. College of Medicine
1300 Morris Park Avenue
Bronx, New York 10461

Animal Crackers: a test of motivation to achieve by Dorothy C. Adkins & Bonnie L. Ballif
CTB/McGraw-Hill
Del Monte Research Park
Monterey, Calif. 93940

The Basic Concept Inventory by Siegfried Engelmann
Follett Publishing Co.
Chicago, Ill.

Ahr's Individual Development Survey by A. E dward Ahr
Priorty Innovations, Inc.
P. O. Box 792
Skokie, Ill. 60076

The Barclay Early Childhood Skill Assessment Guide by Lisa K. Barclay, James R. Barclay
Educational Skill Development Incorporated
431 S. Broadway, Suite 321
Lexington, Kentucky 40508

Boehm/Slater Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery
Teachers College, Press
81 Adams Drive
Totawa, New Jersey 07512

Basic School Skills Inventory by Libby Goodman & Donald D. Hammill
Fallett Publishing Co.
Chicago, Ill.

Berkeley Paired-Associate Learning Test by Nadine Lambert, M. R. Wilcox & P. Gleason
The Educationally Retarded Child
Grune & Stratten, 1974

The Bingham Button Test by W. J. Bingham
Bingham Button Test
46211 N. 125th St. East
Lancaster, Calif. 93534

Birth to Three Developmental Scale by Tina E. Bangs & Susan Dodson
Teaching Resources Corp.
100 Boyleston Street
Boston, Mass. 02116

Boehm Test of Basic Concepts by Ann E. Boehm
The Psychological Corp.
304 E. 45th Street
New York City 10017

Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development by Albert Brigance
Curriculum Associates Inc.
5 Esquire Road
North Billerica, Mass. 01862

Burks' Behavior Rating Scale by Harold F. Burks
Western Psychological Service
12031 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90025

Head Start Clinic Team Preschool Tests

Caine-Levine Social Competency Scale by
Leo F. Caine, Samuel Levine & Freeman F. Elzey
Consulting Psychologists Press
577 College Avenue
Palo Alto, Calif. 94306

California Preschool Social Competency Scale by
Samuel Levine, Freeman F. Elzey, & Mary Lewis
Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
577 College Avenue
Palo Alto, Calif. 94306

Caroline Developmental Profile by
David L. Lillie & Gloria L. Harbin
Kaplan Press
600 Jonestown Road
Winston-Salem, N. C. 27103

Child Development Assessment Form by
T. Thomas McMurrain & Fan Brooke
Humanics Ltd.
1182 W. Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

Children's Adaptive Behavior Scale by
Bert O. Richmond & Richard H. Kicklighter
Humanics Ltd.
1182 W. Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

Children's Appreception Test
Leopold Bellak & Sonya S. Bellak
C.P.S. Incorporated
P. O. Box 83
Larchmont, N. Y. 10538

Children's Behavior Inventory by
Eugene I. Burdoch & Anne S. Hardesty
Springer Publishing Co.
200 Park Avenue South
New York City 10003

Circle Preschool Individual Assessment
First Chance Project
Circle Preschool
9 Lake Avenue
Piedmont, Calif. 94611

Circus
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, N. J. 08540

The Communication Screen by
Nancy Striffer & Sharon Willig
Communication Skill Builders, Incorporated
3130 N. Dodge Blvd.
P. O. Box 42050
Tucson, Arizona 85733

Comprehensive Developmental Scale
Project Memphis
Fearon Pitman Publishers, Incorporated
6 Davis Drive
Belmont, Calif. 94002

Comprehensive Identification Process
Scholastic Testing Service, Incorporated
Bensenville, Ill. 60106

Coping Inventory by
Shirley Zeitlin
Innovative Educational Materials
250 George Road
Cliffside Park, N. J. 07010

Head Start Clinic Team Preschool Tests

Developmental Programming for Infants & Young Children
by Sally J. Rogers & Diane B. D'Erdgenio
The Univ. of Michigan Press
Ann Arbor, Mich.

Developmental Tasks for Kindergarten Readiness by W. Lesiak
Clinical Psychology Publishing Company, Inc.
4 Conant Square
Brandon, Vermont 05733

Discovering Learning Capability by D. H. Stotts
Dept. of Psychology
University of Guelph
Ontario, Canada

Erhardt Developmental Prehension Assessment
Rhoda P. Erhardt
2109 Third St., N.
Fargo, N. Dakota 58102

Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception
Consulting Psychologists Press
577 College Avenue
Palo Alto, Calif. 94306

Gesell Preschool Test
Programs for Education, Inc.
P. O. Box 85
Lumberville, Pa. 18933

Giggle McBean Screening Package
Intersect
1101 Seventeenth Ave. South
Nashville, Tenn. 37212

Goodman Lock Box by Joan F. Goodman,
Stoelting Company
1350 Kostner Avenue
Chicago, Ill. 60623

Hawaii Early Learning Profile
Vort Corporation
P. O. Box 11757
Palo Alto, Calif. 94306

Hiskey-Nebraska Test of Learning Aptitude
c/o Marshall S. Hiskey
Univ. of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment by B. M. Caldwell and R. H. Bradley
Center for Child Development & Education
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
College of Education
Little Rock, Arkansas 72204

Hyperkinesis Index by
C. K. Conners
Director, Medical Services
Abbott Laboratories
Pharmaceutical, Products Division
No. Chicago, Ill. 60064

Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities by
S. A. Kirk, J. J. McCarthy & W. D. Kirk
University of Illinois Press
Ubana, Ill. 61801

Kraner Preschool Math Inventory
Learning Concepts
2501 No. Lamar
Austin, Texas 78705

Learning Accomplishment Profile (and Early-LAP)
Chapel Hill Training-Outreach Project
Lincoln Center
Chapel Hill, N. Carolina

Head Start Clinic Team Preschool Tests

McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
The Psychological Corp.

Marshalltown Behavioral Developmental Profile
The Marshalltown Project
507 E. Anson Street
Marshalltown, Iowa 50158

Miller Assessment for Preschoolers (for O.T.S.
Charles B. Slack, Inc.
Thorofare, N.J. 08086

Neurological Dysfunctions of Children by
James W. Kuhns
Publishers Test Service
CTB/McGraw Hill
2500 Garden Road
Monterey, Calif. 93940

Pre-reading Assessment Kit
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
CTB/McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd.
330 Progress Avenue
Scarborough, Ontario
M1P2Z5

Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Revised
American Guidance Service, Inc.
Publishers' Building
Circle Pines, Minnesota 55014

Pictorial Test of Intelligence by
Joseph L. French
Houghton Mifflin Co.
Boston, Mass.

Play behavior-(analysis of)
by Jeanne M. Foley, Chr.
Department of Psychology
Loyola Univ. of Chicago
6525 N. Sheridan Road
Chicago, Ill. 60626

Porch Index of Communicative Ability in Children (speech)
Consulting Psychologists Press
577 College Avenue
Palo Alto, Calif. 94306

Portage Guide to Early Education
Portage Project by
S. Bluma, M. Shearer, A. Frohman & J. Hillard
CESA 12
P. O. Box 564
Portage, Wisconsin 53901

Pre-Academic Learning Inventory
by M.H. Wood & F.M. Layne
Academic Therapy Publications
20 Commercial Blvd.
Novato, Calif. 94947

Preschool & Early Primary Skill Survey
Mafex Associates Inc.
90 Cherry Street
Johnstown, Pa. 15902

Preschool Attainment Record by
Edgar Doll
American Guidance Service, Inc.
Publishers' Building
Circle Pines, Minnesota 55014

Preschool Behavior Questionnaire
by Lenore Behar & Sam Stringfield
LINC Press
Learning Institute of N. C.
100C Lamord Avenue
Durham, N. Carolina 27701

Head Start Clinic Team
Preschool Tests

Preschool Behavior Rating Scale
by W.F. Barker & A.M. Doeff
Child Welfare League of
America, Incorporated
67 Irving Place
New York City 10003

Preschool Interpersonal Problem Solving Skills Test
by M. Shure and G. Spivak
Hahnemann Medical College
& Hospital
Division of Research and
Evaluation
Community MH/MR Center
314 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19102

Preschool Screening System by
P.K. Hainsworth & M.L.
Hainsworth
ERISys
P. O. Box 1635
Pawtucket, R.I. 02862

Preschool Language Assessment
Instrument by
M. Blank, S.A. Rose and
L.J. Berlin
Grune & Stratton, Inc.
111 Fifth Avenue
New York City 10003

Preschool Language Scale by
I.L. Zimmerman, V.G.
Steiner, and R.L. Evatt
Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company
Columbus, Ohio

Preschool Pupil Progress
Evaluation Plan
Panhandle Child Development Assoc.
418 Coe ur d'Alene Avenue
Coe ur d'Alene, Idaho 83814

The Preschool Rating Scale by
W.F. Barker, L. Sandler,
A. Bornemann & G. Knight
Center for Early Childhood
Education
18th and Callowhill Sts.
Philadelphia, Pa. 19103

Riley Motor Problems Inventory
Western Psychological Services
12031 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90025

School Readiness Survey by
F.L. Jordan & J. Massey
Consulting Psychologists Press
577 College Avenue
Palo Alto, Calif. 94306

School Readiness Test by
O.F. Anderhalter
Scholastic Testing Service, Inc.
Bensenville, Ill.

Screening Test for the Assignment of
Remedial Treatments by
A.E. Ahr
Priority Innovations, Inc.
P. O. Box 792
Skokie, Ill. 60076

Slingerland Pre-Reading Screening
Procedures
Educators Publishing Service,
Inc.
75 Multon Street
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

Smith-Johnson Nonverbal Performance
Scale
Western Psychological Services
12031 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90025

Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test
and Profile for the Stanford
Binet by R.E. Valett
Consulting Psychologists Press
577 College Avenue
Palo Alto, Calif. 94306

Head Start Clinic Team Preschool Tests

Symbolic Play Test by
M. Lowe & A.J. Costello
NFER-Nelson Publishing Co., Ltd.
Darville House
2 Oxford Rd. East
Windsor SL4 1DF
Berkshire, England

Test of Early Language Development by
W.P. Kresko, D.K. Reid & D.D. Hammill
Pro-Ed.
333 Perry Brook Bldg.
Austin, Texas 78701

Test of Early Learning Skills by J.P. Somwaru
Scholastic Testing Service, Inc.
Bensenville, Ill. 60106

Vane Evaluation of Language Scale
Clinical Psychology Publishing Co., Inc.
4 Conant Square
Brandon, Vt. 05733

Vineland Social Maturity Scale by
E.A. Doll
American Guidance Service, Inc.
Publishers' Building
Circle Pines, Minn. 55014

Wechsler Preschool & Primary Scale of Intelligence
Psychological Corporation
304 E. 45th Street
New York City 10017

A CULTURALLY BIASED TEST FAVORING THE RURAL APPALACHIAN *

1. When you see mice running toward the exit of a coal mine, it means:

   a. danger of a cave-in or leaking gas
   b. they're hunting someone's lunch
   c. it's going to rain

2. Red-eye gravy is:

   a. gravy with red food coloring in it
   b. gravy made with ham grease
   c. unaged moonshine
   d. fish sauce

3. A twig from a small willow or sassafras limb chewed up at the end is for:

   a. chewing gum
   b. a toothpick
   c. a switch
   d. a toothbrush

4. Flax seed is used to:

   a. get something out of your eye
   b. feed chickens
   c. feed hogs

5. A pounding is:

   a. driving a nail
   b. gifts to new neighbor
   c. a one-pound chicken

6. The best time for killing hogs when the meat is to be cured is:

   a. around Thanksgiving when temperature is below 32 degrees
   b. after Ground Hog Day
   c. anytime
   d. before killing frost

7. Sorghum is made from:

   a. sugar cane
   b. sugar beets
   c. sorghum cane

8. Light bread is:

   a. hot bread
   b. store bread
   c. corn bread
   d. cream puffs

9. Trees generally used for pulpwood are:

a. dogwoods
b. pines
c. oaks
d. sugar maple

10. Poke salad generally refers to:

a. berries of poke plant used for dye
b. tender greens of poke
c. greens bought at the store
d. salad made from whatever you have on hand

11. Burley is usually cured:

a. by the processor
b. in flue forms
c. in open air barns
d. on the stalk
e. a year after it is cut

12. A man who has granny trouble can look forward to:

a. abstaining from sex
b. the birth of his child
c. having only daughters
d. his mother-in-law moving in

13. Jumping jig refers to:

a. dance b. escaped convict c. groom
d. racial slur e. toy

14. Which of the following belongs least with the others?

a. dodger b. grits c. hush puppy
d. pone e. scrapple

15. Southern mountain people usually express their political feelings by:

a. voting independently
b. seldom voting
c. rejecting traditional candidates
d. voting strongly Democratic
e. voting strongly Republican

(*Taken from a test devised by K. Rogers and D. Stulberg as part of Operation Mainstream, in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 1970 and from "Mountain Quiz" in "The Mountain Call", Christmas, 1974, II, 1, p. 6).

BLACK ENGLISH DIALECT FEATURES

Pronunciation

/th/sounds

1. f/th in medial & final positions
   baf-room/bathroom, monf/month
2. v/th in medial & final positions
   muver/mother, breav/breathe
3. d/th in initial & some medial positions
   den/then, brudder/brother

/r/, /l/sounds

1. omitted or weakened
   fawk/fork, do'/door, you/your, they/their
   he'p/help

Consonant Cluster Reduction

1. des/desk, neks/next, han/hand
2. plural formations: words ending in /-st/, /-sk/, or /-sp/ change to /-s'/, then plurals are formed by adding /-ez/ desses/desks, tesses/tests

Final /b/,/d/,/g/sounds

1. devoicing at end of syllable: p/b, t/d, k/g salat/salad

Nasalization

1. nasalized vowel replaces a final nasal consonant: mã'/man, rũ'/run

Grammar

Past tense

1. regular /ed/ suffixes not pronounced because of consonant reduction rule: I talk/I talked, he wave/he waved
2. irregular forms may be regularized: knowed/knew, heared/heard

Third person singular present tense

1. /-s/ suffix is absent: he walk/he walks
2. hypercorrection: I walks, you walks, the children walks

Plurals

1. /-s/ suffix is absent: ten cent/ten cents

Possessives

1. indicated by word order: my aunt house/my aunt's house

Invariant "be"

1. "be" used as main verb for is, are, am, was, were: I be here this afternoon. Sometime he be busy.

Black English Dialect Features

Distribution or Nontense "be" — Two different theories of function

1. continous state of action
2. intermittent action

Undifferentiated Pronouns

1. may substitute personal pronouns for possessives: "he book" or "him book" for "his book"

Pronominal apposition

1. pronoun used as well as noun subject: My brother, he bigger than you.

Questions

1. inversion not necessary
   What that is?, Where the white cat is?

Existential "it"

1. used in place of "there"

   It's a boy in my room name Robert.
   Is it a main street in this town?

   May cause misunderstandings: "Is it soup yet?" Could be understood as "Is there any soup yet?" where most people understand it as "Is the soup ready yet?"

Multiple Negation

1. negative attached to main verb and all indefinites

   She didn't do nothing.

SOME HISPANIC DIALECT FEATURES

Pronunciation

Sounds with which speakers are likely to have difficulty:

b - v
d - th (/th/ not found in Spanish)
j - sh (neither found in Spanish)
zh - h (neither found in Spanish)
All vowels

Vowels

1. Five vowels, none of which are exactly equivalent to any English vowel.

   i, e, a, o, u, pronounced: ē, ā, ah, ō, oo

2. English vowels will be "heard' as the closest Spanish vowel

   /æ/ (hat) heard as "ā" or "ah"

3. Must learn to discriminate those vowels not present in Spanish

   /I/ as in "bit"

Consonants

Stops
1. stops (/p/, /t/, /k/) are not aspirated so may be lost in final position. In English final stops are important for past tense production (/t/)

b, v
2. /b/ is a stop only in initial position or after /m/ (hombre), otherwise /b/ and/v/ are used interchangeably, pronounced as a bilabial fricative very = berry, rabbit=ravit

s
3. /s/ is produced farther forward in some dialects and may be confused with a lisp.

4. Spanish has a palatal sound, similar to "y" which may be pronounced with friction. yellow, jello may sound alike.

final consonants
5. since few words in Spanish end in consonants, final English consonants may be omitted or followed by "ā" (cakay/cake) or replaced by a permitted final.

Some Hispanic Dialect Features

Grammar

Grammatical errors may be caused by contrasts in the language structures:

Subject	1.	Omission of pronoun subject: Is big, Is teacher (Article omitted also)
Negation	1.	Not before verb: Maria not is here. Also, Maria no is here. Maria no here.
	2.	Use of no for don't in commands: No run. Not run.
Adjectives	1.	Adjective following noun: The dress yellow, the dresses yellows (with agreement in number).
Comparatives	1.	The comparative forms used with more, most where English uses -er, -est: It is more big. He is most fat of the boys.
Third person	1.	Dropping of -s inflection on third person singular verbs: He go to school.
Plurals	1.	Dropping of -s inflection on plurals: The book are here.
Past tense	1.	Dropping of past tense inflection: The boy play.
Future tense	1.	Omission of "will" in future: The boy play.
	2.	Use of "go" with "to for future: He go to sing (for He's going to sing).
Progressive Tense	1.	Use of simple present where English uses progressive: He sleep now.
Articles	1.	Omission of article with nationality, profession, etc: Is American. Is teacher.
Possession	1.	Use of "the" for possessive in parts of the body and personal articles: The foot hurts me. The coat (of him) is blue.

Some Hispanic Dialect Features

Grammar

Titles	1.	Titles used with definite article: The Mr. Jones.
Prepositions	1.	In used for on, at: In the table, in Michigan Avenue, in 1515 Michigan Avenue. Prepositions in English are difficult.
Have/Be	1.	Use of "have" for "be" I have hunger. He have six years (for He's six years old).
Question formation	1.	Avoidance of inversion in questions: Juan can go? Juan like(s) this? (Spanish does not use the "do" function word-verb form.) Also, How come they to school? or How they come to school?
Compound words	1.	Noun-compounding not used or order in error: The wife-house, the wife of the house (for house-wife).

GUIDE FOR INFORMAL PRESCHOOL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT

Receptive Language

1. Auditory memory

   a. Sentence repetition

      3 year old repeats 6 syllables
      4 year old repeats 8 syllables
      5 year old repeats 12 syllables

      (Sentence structure must be considered since it will vary the complexity and affect child's ability to repeat)

   b. Digit repetition

      3 year old repeats 2 digits
      4 & 5 year old repeats 3 digits

   c. Direction following

      3 year old follows 2 step command (related)
      4 year old follows 2 step command (unrelated)
      5 year old follows 3 step command

2. Auditory verbal comprehension

   a. Story comprehension

      4 year old will attend for 5 minutes while story is read.

   b. Question comprehension

      3 year old answers "where", "who" questions appropriately
      4 year old answers simple "how" questions appropriately

3. Auditory association

   a. Opposite analogies

      4, 5 year old completes final word

Expressive Language

1. General information questions

   3 year old gives first name, sex
   4 year old gives full name

Guide for Informal Preschool Language Assessment

2. Naming

3 year old names common objects, actions in pictures

3. Language Sample (Consider dialect variations)

3 year old uses "-ing" verb form, regular plurals, "no" or "not", articles (the, a), demonstratives (this, that), some pronouns; average phrase length 3.4 words
4 year old uses regular past tense forms, expresses future (going to, have to, want to), changes word order to ask questions, beginning to use complex and compound sentences, 6-8 words; average phrase length 4.5 words
5 year old develops relative clause use and phrase embedding is common

Concept Development

1. Colors

4 year old knows 3 colors
5 year old knows 8 colors

2. Numbers

4 year old counts to 5, (rote), has concept of "2"
5 year old counts to 10 (rote)

3. Shapes

4 year old names 3 shapes

4 Prepositions

3 year old knows 3 prepositions (on, in, under)
4 year old knows in front, in back, next to
5 year old knows beside, down