

Early Literacy Strategies for Parents of Young Dual Language Learners

A Descriptive Study and Integrative Review

Mark Guiberson

There is a large and growing population of dual language learners (DLLs) represented in early intervention programs in the United States, the majority of whom are from Spanish-speaking families. To adequately serve these families, educators and speech–language pathologists must work closely with parents and provide them with *culturally responsive* strategies and activities that align with their language background and interaction styles. The purpose of this convergent parallel mixed-methods study was to identify culturally consistent early literacy strategies specifically for parents of 2- to 3-year-old DLLs. Findings from a descriptive study that included 94 young DLLs and their parents engaged in a book-reading task plus findings from an integrative literature review were converged to identify potential parent-implemented strategies that may support early literacy in young DLLs. From this process, a total of 26 strategies were identified in the categories of enhanced interaction, engagement with texts or storybooks, questioning behaviors, and other language enhancement. Fifteen of the strategies had compelling strength based on available work. Use of these strategies in pilot programs and future treatment studies is recommended.

Key words: *dual language learners, early language delays, early literacy, parents, preschoolers*

THERE is a large and growing population of children in the United States who are younger than 5 years who have a home language other than English and will be faced with learning two languages at the

same time, as well as approaching academic tasks in a new language. The term *dual language learners* (DLLs) is often used to describe these children. In a recent policy statement, the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (HHS, 2017) provided a comprehensive description of DLLs, which is summarized here. Dual language learners include limited English-proficient children, inclusive of all children who come from a home where a language other than English is spoken. Dual language learners are children learning two or more languages at the same time and include those learning a second language (L2) while continuing to develop their first language (L1). Dual language learners also include incipient bilingual children, or those who have limited exposure and passive knowledge of the second language. In 2018–2019, approximately 28% of children birth to 5 years of age in Head Start, Early Head Start, and migrant Head Start programs were DLLs, the majority of

Author Affiliation: *Division of Communication Disorders, University of Wyoming, Laramie.*

Author disclosures can be found at <http://links.lww.com/TLD/A81>.

This study was funded by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health: # 1U54GM104944. Graduate assistant support was also through the Institutional Development Award (IDeA) from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Grant # 2P20GM103432.

Corresponding Author: *Mark Guiberson, PhD, Division of Communication Disorders, University of Wyoming, 1000 E University Ave, Department 3311, Health Sciences, 265, Laramie, WY 82071 (mguibers@uwo.edu).*

DOI: 10.1097/TLD.0000000000000261

whom were Spanish-speaking (Head Start Early Childhood Learning and Knowledge Center [ECLKC], 2020, April 23). As a result, the HHS (2017) instructed early childhood programs to optimize the early experiences of these young children by setting high expectations, capitalizing on their strengths including cultural and linguistic strengths, and providing them with the individualized developmental and learning supports necessary to succeed in school, including working closely with parents. The HHS specifically called on educators to support families in teaching and exposing children to new concepts and rich vocabulary and grammar in their native language at home before introducing concepts in English in early learning programs or formal schooling.

Accordingly, parents of young DLLs must have access to *culturally responsive* strategies and activities that align with their language background, family preferences, and cultural priorities (American Speech-Language-Hearing Association [ASHA], 2021). When developing early intervention plans, educators should consider parent-child interactions, parent teaching styles, and daily routines, as these variables strongly influence families' developmental goals for children (ASHA, 2008; Guiberson & Ferris, 2018). Building upon a child's participation in the family's daily routines and activities has been found to have a positive influence on the child's language and academic development (Spagnola & Fiese, 2007; Wilcox & Woods, 2011). In a survey study with Spanish-speaking parents of toddler-aged DLLs, 89% of parents reported that they liked to read to their child either occasionally or frequently (Guiberson & Ferris, 2018). Expanding upon or introducing shared book interactions may be an effective way to support Spanish-speaking parents in teaching early language and literacy skills for young DLLs prior to enrollment in preschool. Caregiver-implemented shared storybook interactions with 3- to 5-year-old children from low-income backgrounds have been shown to be effective in increasing children's oral

language skills (Lonigan & Whitehurst, 1998). More recently, there has been research with DLLs that has demonstrated the effectiveness of classroom-based literacy interventions for older preschoolers (4- to 5-year-olds; for a review, see the study by Hur et al., 2020). To date, there is little research that has described *parent-implemented* early literacy interventions with younger (2-to 3-year-olds) DLLs from Spanish-speaking families. More knowledge in this area is needed so that early intervention programming, such as that provided in Early Head Start and Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA, 2011) Part C services, is culturally consistent and tailored to address the unique learning needs of these children.

CURRENT STUDY

The purpose of this study was to identify culturally consistent early literacy support strategies specifically for parents of 2- to 3-year-old DLLs. The author applied a *convergent parallel mixed-methods* design for this study. This design was selected because it allows the researcher to collect multiple sources of data, analyze them separately, and then integrate relevant findings across sources (Creswell, 2014). For the current study, this included describing parental behaviors and identifying potential strategies to support early literacy, conducting a review of the relevant extant research that has included parents of 2- to 3-year-old DLLs, and then synthesizing the findings across these data sources. Through this method, the author detected patterns, organized and mapped strategies, and identified potentially useful intervention strategies across sources. The specific research questions were as follows:

1. What behaviors are evident in a sample of Spanish-speaking parents during shared book interactions with their children?
2. How do the shared book interactions of Spanish-speaking parents of children with early language deficits compare with those of Spanish-speaking parents

of typical children (both younger and older preschoolers)?

3. Converging findings from the descriptive study and an integrative literature review, what are potential culturally consistent early literacy support strategies for use by Spanish-speaking parents of young DLLs?

DESCRIPTIVE STUDY METHODS

Participants

Spanish-speaking families were recruited from a migrant Head Start and early intervention program from a state in the Mountain West. All families qualified for government- or state-funded early intervention services (e.g., Early Head Start, Head Start, state-funded preschool programming, individualized family services plans [IFSP], or individualized educational programs [IEP]).

Caregiver characteristics

Ninety-four caregivers participated with their children; these included 87 mothers, six fathers, and one grandmother who was the child's primary caregiver. Caregivers reported that they were from Mexico ($n = 84$), Guatemala ($n = 5$), of Mexican-American background ($n = 3$), or from Honduras ($n = 2$). Table 1 presents additional caregiver demographic information. Caregivers' education levels varied—23% had elementary level, 30.9% had the equivalent of middle school level, 34% had high school level, and 12% had postsecondary-level education.

Child characteristics

Ninety-four children between the ages of 2;0-4;11 (years; months) participated in this study with their parents or grandparent. Of the 94 children, 62 were typically developing (TD). Because of the developmental differences in language and cognition seen across these age ranges (Guiberson, 2015; Guiberson & Rodríguez, 2010; Guiberson et al., 2011), children were placed into two groupings: young preschoolers aged 2;0-3;5 ($n = 37$, $M = 31.65$ months, $SD = 4.79$ months) and older preschoolers aged 3;6-4;11 ($n = 25$, $M = 51.32$ months, $SD = 5.83$ months). These children had no previous diagnosis and no report of parent or educator concern about language development. Thirty-two children were identified by bilingual speech-language pathologists (SLPs) as having a language-based disability; these children ranged in age from 2;0-4;11 ($M = 35.88$ months, $SD = 4.15$ months). Given the age range and the inclusion of 2-year-olds, the term *early language delay* (ELD) will be used to describe these children. These children were enrolled in either IFSP or IEP programming for speech and language and had normal hearing and no other known disability. Individual data for the ELD children, including norm-referenced test scores and the severity of their language delays, were not available to the study author.

Descriptive study procedures

Families were recruited at cooperating early childhood centers through the use of

Table 1. Means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values for key demographic variables for parents and children^a

Variable	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Parent age in years	28	5.9	22	58
Parent years of education	9.38	3.64	3	16
Parent number of years living in the United States	8.06	6.42	1	21
Child's age in months	38.32	10.39	24	59

^a $N = 94$; data not reported on years living in the United States for two participants.

study flyers that were sent home as well as in person presentations during family nights at the centers. All recruitment occurred with Spanish-language classrooms, and children in these classrooms were deemed by the programs to be mostly Spanish speaking. For children enrolled in home programs such as Early Head Start or receiving IFSP programming, recruitment occurred with Spanish-speaking educators who gave flyers to families and explained the opportunity to participate in the study. An informed consent form that was approved by a university institutional review board was collected from parents who wished to participate, and verbal assent was obtained from children. All families who consented were invited to participate; however, a total of six families indicated interest but were not able to successfully schedule a time to participate. Data were collected in the summer months at either early childhood centers or in families' homes during a regularly scheduled home visit. Families with children who were enrolled in preschool classrooms were typically seen at the centers, whereas families enrolled in home-based programs were typically seen in the home.

Bilingual staff from the centers and programs assisted in this study. The bilingual staff consisted of family mentors ($n = 3$), a special education teacher ($n = 1$), and SLPs ($n = 2$). The investigator trained the bilingual staff. All participating staff received university institutional review board human subject training. Staff were also trained in study procedures during two 1-hr sessions in April and May the spring prior to data collection. Training content included (1) how to use cameras for observations, (2) how to stage a good area for parents and children to look at the book for shared book reading, (3) general instructions and scripts used with parents, and (4) troubleshooting if problems occurred.

In some instances, a child's siblings were present during shared book interactions and, in these instances, both the mother and the father each participated with one of their children. The books, which were Spanish language texts, included *Perro Tiene Sed* [*Dog*

Is Thirsty] (Kitamura, 2000), *Ardilla Tiene Hambre* [*Squirrel Is Hungry*] (Kitamura, 2005), or *Pato Está Sucio* [*Duck Is Dirty*] (Kitamura, 1998). All of the books were board books written by renowned Japanese children's author and illustrator Satoshi Kitamura. El Fondo Cultural and Económica, a Mexican publishing house that focuses on Latin American culture and Spanish language works, translated and published the Spanish versions of these books. Kitamura's children's books are described as universal, and they are popular in Mexico and Latin America (Kosaka, 2020). These three books were selected for this study because they followed a simple story grammar and were very similar in terms of language complexity. At the beginning of the data collection visit, the children were asked to choose which of the three books they wanted to use. Bilingual staff then instructed the parents to look at the book with their child as they normally would, and a bilingual staff member recorded the parent and child book interactions with a miniature camera. As an incentive, the children were allowed to keep the book that they selected, and the parents were given a \$10 gift card to a discount department store.

Descriptive study measures

Adult-Child Interactive Reading Inventory

The Adult-Child Interactive Reading Inventory (ACIRI) is a behavioral coding system that describes parent and child behaviors during shared book reading (for a review, see the study by DeBruin-Parecki, 2007). The authors of the ACIRI developed the categories and behaviors described after a thorough review of research on child development and early learning and literacy skills. It was developed with a sample of ethnically diverse, low-income preschool children and their parents and has previously been used with English-speaking and Spanish-speaking parents of older preschool-aged children (Boyce et al., 2010; Rodríguez et al., 2009).

The ACIRI considers parent behaviors within three categories: Enhancing Attention

Table 2. Percentage of parents demonstrating each Adult–Child Interactive Reading Inventory behavior at different frequency levels^a

Category and Related Behaviors	Frequency Levels			
	Not Evident	Infrequent	Occasional	Frequent
Enhancing attention to text				
Promotes and maintains physical proximity with child	64%	19%	14%	3%
Sustains interest and attention through child-adjusted language, positive affect, and reinforcement	3%	10%	22%	65%
Gives child opportunity to hold book and turn pages	36%	44%	19%	1%
Shares book with child and displays sense of audience during book handling	4%	3%	6%	86%
Promoting interactive reading and supporting comprehension				
Poses and solicits questions about the book's content	19%	10%	24%	47%
Points to pictures and words to assist in identification and understanding	3%	6%	9%	82%
Relates the book's content and child's responses to personal experiences	90%	4%	2%	3%
Pauses to answer questions the child poses	89%	4%	4%	2%
Using literacy strategies				
Identifies visual cues related to story reading	59%	18%	15%	9%
Solicits predictions	99%	1%	—	—
Asks child to recall information from story	95%	3%	2%	—
Elaborates on child's ideas	78%	13%	6%	3%

^a $N = 94$; rounded to the nearest integer. Not Evident (did not occur); Infrequent (occurred one time); Occasional (occurred two to three times); and Frequent (occurred four or more times).

to Text, Promoting Interactive Reading and Supporting Comprehension, and Using Literacy Strategies. There are four subcategory items in each of the three broad categories for a total of 12 shared book reading items (see Table 2 for items). The ACIRI authors provided further description and examples of behaviors that assist in observing and scoring each subcategory item in the scoring manual. High levels of criterion validity when compared with other behavioral observation procedures were reported by DeBruin-Parecki (2007), and Boyce et al. (2010) found moderate internal consistency reliability for each

category, with α values of .59–.70 for their sample. The ACIRI behaviors that occur during a shared book reading episode are tallied and then coded for frequency of occurrence as Not Evident (did not occur), Infrequent (occurred one time), Occasional (occurred two to three times), and Frequent (occurred four or more times).

ACIRI coding and reliability

Four bilingual graduate students in speech-language pathology were trained by the first author in ACIRI coding. Procedures and guidelines established by the ACIRI authors

were used and included a comprehensive review of the ACIRI coding manual and protocols and careful review of definitions and exemplars of behaviors for each category. For training purposes, coders completed joint coding of two videos of parent behaviors and independent coding of three videos that had already been scored by the author. For any disagreements, discussion to reach consensus for each behavior coded was conducted. Coders obtained interrater reliability of greater than 80% before beginning independent coding. Interrater reliability was calculated for a total of 22 videos (23% of the sample) that were independently coded during the study proper. Cohen's κ , a reliability statistic that corrects for chance agreement, was calculated for the ACIRI and found to be 0.82. Dyads of caregivers and their children were coded blindly, without coder knowledge of child's language status (ELD or typical). Adult behaviors were coded for this study during a single shared book interaction.

DESCRIPTIVE STUDY RESULTS

Caregiver behaviors during shared book interactions

The first research question aimed to describe the shared book-reading behaviors of Spanish-speaking caregivers of younger and older preschool-aged children. Table 2 presents the percentage of caregivers demonstrating ACIRI behaviors at different frequency levels (not evident, infrequent, occasional, and frequent). To better understand the interactive reading behaviors patterns and trends, they are described later. Two behaviors were observed frequently (in more than 50% of the sample) in the Enhancing Attention to Text category: these included *sustains interest and attention through child-adjusted language, positive affect, and reinforcement* and *shares book with child and displays sense of audience during book handling*. The least frequent Enhancing Attention to Text behavior was *promotes and*

maintains physical proximity with child; this behavior was not evident in 64% of dyads.

In the category Promoting Interactive Reading and Supporting Comprehension, *points to pictures and words to assist in identification and understanding* was observed frequently in 82% of the sample, and *posing and soliciting questions about the books content* was coded as occurring frequently in 47% of the dyads. The two least frequent behaviors in this category were *pauses to answer questions the child poses*, and *relates the book's content and child's responses to personal experiences*; these behaviors were not evident in approximately 90% of the dyads.

The Using Literacy Strategies category was the least frequently observed set of behaviors; the item *identifies visual cues related to story reading* was observed to occur at all in slightly more than 40% of caregiver-child dyads, and the other three behaviors in this category (*solicits predictions, asks child to recall information, and elaborates on child's ideas*) were observed even less frequently.

Group comparisons of behaviors during shared book interactions

The second research question aimed to compare the shared book interactions of Spanish-speaking caregivers of children with ELD with those of parents of younger and older typical children. The ACIRI *category scores*, Enhancing Attention to Text, Promoting Interactive Reading and Supporting Comprehension, and Using Literacy Strategies, were used for this analysis. The ACIRI *category scores* are derived by adding the tallies for each behavior in a category and then dividing that number by 4 (the number of behaviors in each of the three categories). Table 3 presents group means and standard deviations for the three ACIRI *category scores*, as well as group comparison statistics. The caregivers of children with ELD and of young children had mean values across ACIRI categories that were comparable, whereas the caregivers of older preschoolers had the highest mean score across all three categories. Because the variables were not

Table 3. ACIRI parent behaviors mean category scores and group comparisons

	Parents of Children With ELD (<i>n</i> = 32)		Parents of Younger Preschoolers (<i>n</i> = 37)		Parents of Older Preschoolers (<i>n</i> = 25)		Kruskal- Wallis <i>H</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
ACIRI category scores								
Enhancing attention to text	1.65	0.43	1.62	0.44	1.74	0.40	1.18 (2)	.49
Promoting interactive reading and supporting comprehension	1.20	0.46	1.28	0.38	1.30	0.46	0.15 (2)	.93
Using literacy strategies	0.16	0.27	0.28	0.32	0.53	0.48	3.98 (2)	<.001

Note. ACIRI = Adult-Child Interactive Reading Inventory; ELD = early language delay.

normally distributed, nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis *H* tests were used to compare group differences across the three categories. No statistically significant differences between the three groups on the Enhancing Attention to Text, $\chi^2(2) = 1.18$, $p = .49$, or the Promoting Interactive Reading and Supporting Comprehension, $\chi^2(2) = 1.30$, $p = .93$, categories were detected. There were significant group differences detected on the Using Literacy Strategies category, $\chi^2(2) = 3.98$, $p < .001$. Post hoc analyses using a Bonferroni correction with p value set at .0167 were completed. Caregivers of young children did not differ significantly from those of the older ($p = .20$) or ELD children ($p = .57$), but the caregivers of older children did differ significantly from those of children with ELD ($p = .001$) with respect to using literacy strategies, namely, that these caregivers used literacy strategies more than the others.

INTEGRATIVE REVIEW

Integrative review method

The aim of the final research question was to converge findings from the descriptive study and a literature review with the goal of identifying early literacy strategies for

Spanish-speaking caregivers of 2- to 3-year-old DLLs. Thus, an integrative review was conducted to identify parent-implemented early literacy strategies for young DLLs. Steps described by Creswell (2014) were followed to identify relevant studies. These steps for the review are listed in Appendix A and included conducting a literature review, identifying studies that met inclusion criteria, identifying strategies applied or described in the studies, coding strategies for strength of recommendation, and creating a potential strategies map. Given the focus of this study, the inclusion criteria were as follows: (a) the sample had to include children who were 2 years of age (2;0-2;11); (b) children had to be Spanish-speaking DLLs; (c) interventions/strategies had to be intended for parents or caregivers; and (d) interventions/strategies had to address literacy and/or language. Both early literacy strategies and accompanying language strategies are described because early literacy strategies are often intertwined with language-based strategies, and several of the studies did not disentangle these strategies from one another.

Integrative review coding and reliability

The author and a bilingual graduate assistant applied specific criteria for *strength*

of recommendation based on earlier studies (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005; Guiberson & Crowe, 2018; Guiberson & Ferris, 2019; Michie et al., 2018). This coding took into account important study qualities including intervention description, randomization, parallel pretest and posttest measures, reporting of statistical analysis and results, and intervention outcomes. Appendix B presents the protocol for this coding. After reviewing the sources, the strength of a strategy was coded as *compelling*, *promising*, or *lacking*.

Compelling was used for strategies that were described in a research article that had a strong study design and provided adequate study details, isolated the strategy variable, included pretest and posttest measures, reported positive outcomes, and reported statistical significance and effect size (or data so that effect size could be calculated). *Promising* was used for strategies that were described in a research article with suggestive findings but had some study design flaws or shortcomings, or that included limited data related to the strategy, and/or that did not report analysis or outcomes that were as strong as the compelling category. *Lacking* was used for sources that described strategies or behaviors but either lacked methodological rigor or details (e.g., data, procedures) or they were from descriptive studies, recommended practice documents, or pedagogical tutorials. It should be noted that many times a "package intervention" that stacked or combined strategies was implemented, without individual strategies being isolated and evaluated alone. In these instances, the strength was assigned without being able to disentangle the strategies and their individual effects. Thus, the strength of recommendation is a preliminary step in identifying strategies that *may* be effective and further evaluated in future research or through a systematic review such as a meta-analysis. The author and bilingual graduate assistant attained 100% agreement for this coding.

Integrative review results

Six sources met the integrative review inclusion criteria. Four sources were treatment

research studies and two were systematic reviews of treatment research. Each is described below.

Boyce et al. (2010) conducted a randomized treatment study that included 75 parents of DLL children between 22 and 60 months of age. All families received regular migrant Head Start services, and those in the treatment condition ($n = 32$) also received Storytelling for the Home Enrichment of Language and Literacy Skills (SHELLS). The SHELLS program intervention activities were designed to encourage ongoing language support and literacy activities in parent-child relationships in an engaging, flexible, and individualized manner. Parents made books to use with their children and were coached by Head Start staff on how to encourage language and literacy development during their shared book reading interactions. When compared with the control group, children who participated in the SHELLS program had significantly higher language and vocabulary scores at completion of the study, with a medium effect size reported ($d = 0.60$).

Ijalba (2015) evaluated parent-implemented language and literacy strategies with mothers of 3-year-old DLLs ($n = 12$) and a no-treatment comparison group ($n = 12$). Participant recruitment, group assignment, and researcher blinding were not described in this study. Spanish-speaking mothers were trained in language and literacy stimulation that included having fun when reading, responding to child's communication and interests, focused stimulation (adult repetition of target words or phrases several times in a brief interaction), pointing to print, daily reading, expansion on sentences, targeting new vocabulary, and asking questions (what, where, who, and what is next). The researcher also developed interactive books that focused on daily activities and routines that families reported were frequent. Parents also were encouraged to include siblings in shared book experiences. The study showed that parents in the intervention group reported a significant increase in words used by their children, which was also reflected in a significant improvement on vocabulary

and expressive language measures between pretest and posttest, with large effect sizes observed ($d = 1.42$ – 6.14).

Caesar and Nelson (2014) developed a school-home journaling treatment study with parents of DLLs between the ages of 2 and 5 years who were enrolled in a migrant Head Start program. Families were randomly assigned to the treatment or a preacademics concepts treatment control condition. Eleven parents participated in the treatment condition and eight were in the control condition. Language and emergent literacy concepts were taught on the basis of content provided by parents in the school-home journals, in which parents had created drawings of weekend activities and included captions or narratives to accompany the drawings. The aim of the intervention was to encourage narrative recounts, increase vocabulary associated with new concepts included in the journals, and to teach emergent literacy skills. The school-home journal group had significantly higher alphabetic and print knowledge scores than the children in the preacademic concepts condition. Cohen's q was calculated by the author from the r values reported in the article; small effect sizes were detected ($q = 0.00$ – 0.33).

Tsybina and Eriks-Brophy (2010) evaluated the effectiveness of a parent-delivered dialogic reading intervention with DLLs between 22 and 41 months of age and who had early language deficits (i.e., vocabulary delay). Dialogic reading can be characterized as adults and children taking turns while looking at a picture book, adult modeling and prompting, expanding upon the child's turn, and repeating the model or prompts (Whitehurst, 2002). It should be noted that parents were not randomly assigned to the intervention condition in this study; six parents were in the treatment group and six were in the control group. For the treatment group, Spanish-speaking mothers were taught dialogic book-reading strategies, and these included asking "what" questions, general book engagement questions, prompting with more questioning, supplying children with correct answers and then asking them to

repeat, praising children and staying positive, expanding on child utterances, following the child's interest, focusing on new vocabulary, and having fun when reading. The authors found a significant difference between the treatment group and the control group with a large effect size observed ($d = 0.95$)—those who were in the treatment group had learned significantly more target vocabulary words than those in the control group, and mothers reported overall satisfaction with dialogic reading and saw benefits with its use.

Durán et al. (2016) completed a systematic review evaluating the effectiveness of early language interventions for young DLLs with or at risk for early language deficits that included 26 studies with strategies that may be effective with children 2–6 years of age. Many of these studies focused more on *language of instruction* (L1 or L2) or specific classroom curricula. However, seven studies specifically involved parents in the intervention. Parent strategies included asking questions, expanding child utterances, reading in the home language, book-making workshops, and parent training focused on language-supporting behaviors. Results from these studies indicated that, overall, parent involvement with book reading and systematic language stimulation techniques is effective for helping increase both L1 and L2 proficiency in young DLLs.

Guiberson and Ferris (2019) conducted a review to identify early language interventions that may be effective with 2- to 3-year-old DLLs and found 27 sources that met inclusion criteria. A total of 27 language strategies and 18 literacy intervention strategies were identified. Several language strategies were recommended on the basis of strength of the study, including expanding the child's comments, teaching narratives/storytelling, focused stimulation, cross-linguistic referencing, enhanced vocabulary instruction, modeling, asking questions, and recasting (adult responses that repeat and expand upon the child's verbalizations to make them more linguistically complex or mature). There also were several early literacy strategies that were recommended, including

having the child tell the story, asking open-ended questions, soliciting predictions, prompting the child to ask questions about the story, and creating a book of personal experiences or brief narratives.

RESULTS: CONVERGING DESCRIPTIVE STUDY WITH INTEGRATIVE REVIEW

To address the final research question, findings from the descriptive study and the literature review were converged with the goal of identifying culturally consistent early literacy strategies for Spanish-speaking caregivers of young DLLs. This final step involved collating, abstracted summarizing, and reporting results. Based on the themes and codes that emerged from the integrative review, the strategies described in the studies were grouped into the categories of *enhanced interaction*, *engagement with text or storybook*, *questioning behaviors*, and *other language enhancements*.

Strength of strategy recommendation

Strategies were abstracted from six external sources as well as the descriptive study presented in this article. Table 4 presents these sources as well as the strength of recommendation coding they received. A total of 26 strategies were identified from these sources. Table 5 presents these strategies, organized by categories. The highest strength observed was assigned for a given strategy based on the highest strength from sources that reported on the strategy. Of the 26 strategies, 15 had

compelling strength, seven had *promising* strength, and four had *lacking* strength.

Enhanced interaction strategies

There were six enhanced interaction strategies, and *read in the home language* was the only strategy with compelling strength. Four of the strategies had promising strength, including *respond to child’s communication and interest*, *engage in reading with child on a daily basis*, *maintain a positive affect and enjoy the book together*, and *include siblings or other children*.

Engagement with text or storybook strategies

There were five engagements with text or storybook recommendations. *Develop home-made books together*, or *books of personal experiences or narratives* and *share/take turns with the book with the child* both had compelling strength. Two strategies had promising strength, including *point to print or words* and *the use of journaling with parent*, including *drawings & labeling*.

Questioning behaviors strategies

There were a total of seven questioning strategies, five of which had compelling strength. *Asking what and who questions*, as well as *why and how questions* both had compelling strength. *Questions that support attention*, *questions about character feelings*, and *prediction questions* also had compelling strength. *Prompting the child*

Table 4. Charting of sources and recommendation strength coding

Source	Source Type	Strength of Recommendation
Boyce et al. (2010)	Treatment study	Compelling
Caesar and Nelson (2014)	Treatment study	Promising
Durán et al. (2016)	Systematic review	Compelling
Guiberson and Ferris (2019)	Systematic review	Compelling
Guiberson (2021 [current study])	Descriptive study	Lacking
Ijalba (2015)	Treatment study	Promising
Tsybina and Eriks-Brophy (2010)	Treatment study	Promising

Table 5. Map of potential parent strategies, including overall strength and studies supporting the use of specific strategies

Type of Strategy	Specific Strategy	Source of Strategy							
		Highest Strength Observed	Boyce et al. (2010)	Caesar and Nelson (2014)	Durán et al. (2016)	Guiberson and Ferris (2019)	Guiberson (2021 [current study])	Ijalba (2015)	Tsybina and Eriks-Brophy (2010)
Enhanced interaction	Read in the home language	Compelling	+		+				
	Respond to child's communication and interest	Promising						+	+
	Engage in reading with child on a daily basis	Promising					+		
	Maintain a positive affect and enjoy the book together	Promising					+		+
	Including siblings or other children	Promising						+	
Engagement with text or storybook	Use an animated, engaging voice	Lacking					+		
	Develop homemade books together, or books of personal experiences or narratives	Compelling	+		+				+
	Share/take turns with the book with the child	Compelling	+				+		
	Point to print or words	Promising							
	Use of journaling with parent, including drawings and labeling	Promising		+				+	+
Questioning behaviors	Point to pictures in the book to support comprehension	Lacking						+	
	Ask questions to support comprehension or attention (e.g., <i>what</i> and <i>who</i> questions)	Compelling	+		+		+		+
	Ask questions to support attention (book engagement questions)	Compelling	+		+		+		+
	Ask inferential questions (<i>why</i> and <i>how</i> questions) or open-ended questions	Compelling	+		+		+		+
									(continues)

Table 5. Map of potential parent strategies, including overall strength and studies supporting the use of specific strategies (Continued)

Type of Strategy	Specific Strategy	Source of Strategy						
		Highest Strength Observed	Boyce et al. (2010)	Caesar and Nelson (2014)	Durán et al. (2016)	Guiberson and Ferris (2019)	Guiberson (2021 [current study])	Tsybina and Eriks-Brophy (2010)
	Ask questions about character feelings	Compelling	+			+		
	Ask prediction or <i>what's next</i> questions	Compelling				+	+	
	Prompt the child with answers to questions, and then ask the child to repeat the answer	Promising						+
Other language enhancements	Solicit questions from the child	Lacking						
	Recast and expand upon what the child says	Compelling	+		+	+	+	+
	Use focused stimulation (multiple repetitions of vocabulary or language)	Compelling				+		+
	Focus on new vocabulary/use enhanced vocabulary strategies	Compelling	+					+
	Teach narratives/storytelling to the child	Compelling	+	+		+		
	Cross-linguistic referencing (use L1 to support L2)	Compelling		+		+		
	Model language for the child	Compelling				+		
	Relate the book to child's previous experiences	Compelling	+					
	Adjusting language to child's developmental level	Lacking					+	

with answers to questions and then to repeat the answers had promising strength.

Other language enhancement strategies

There were eight language enhancement strategies and seven of these had compelling strength. *Recasting*, *focused stimulation*, *enhanced vocabulary strategies*, and *teaching narratives* all had compelling strength and were represented by three or more sources. *Cross-linguistic referencing*, or using the child's first language (L1) to support the child's second language (L2), as well as *modeling language*, and *relating the book to the child's previous experiences* also had compelling strength.

DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to identify potential culturally consistent early literacy strategies for Spanish-speaking caregivers of young children. Through describing the shared book interaction behaviors of a sample that included caregivers of TD children between the ages of 2 and 4 years as well as a subgroup of children with ELD, a number of potential strategies were identified, though because the study was descriptive, the strength of recommendation for these was considered lacking. However, these findings were combined with those from published studies that specifically considered the early language and literacy support strategies with Spanish-speaking parents of young chil-

dren. Of 26 strategies identified from both the current study and the selected studies that included interventions implemented by Spanish-speaking caregivers, 15 had compelling strength. This work advances the knowledge of what may work with parents and other caregivers of young Spanish speakers and provides a starting point at the very least for how to support families of young DLLs in teaching early literacy and related language skills.

A limitation to the descriptive study is that it documented parent interactions during shared book interactions but was not designed to test or evaluate a specific intervention. Evidence-based practice requires that educators make clinical decisions by integrating the *best available research evidence*, clinical experience, client preferences, and local context (Dollaghan, 2007). There remains a scarcity of research that specifically evaluates interventions for young DLLs. The goal of the current study was not to provide rankings of the levels of evidence for given studies but rather to identify a potential set of strategies that may be useful for caregivers of young DLLs based on integrating a descriptive study with the limited available research. Even so, more treatment research to establish the effectiveness of these strategies is needed. The 15 compelling strategies may be especially useful in designing pilot intervention programs and future studies to test the effectiveness of parent-implemented early language and literacy strategies for young DLLs.

REFERENCES

- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association [ASHA]. (2008). *Roles and responsibilities of speech-language pathologists in early intervention: Guidelines*. <https://www.asha.org/policy/gl2008-00293/>
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association [ASHA]. (2021). *Early intervention*. <https://www.asha.org/practice-portal/professional-issues/early-intervention/>
- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
- Boyce, L. K., Innocenti, M. S., Roggman, L. A., Norman, V. K. J., & Ortiz, E. (2010). Telling stories and making books: Evidence for an intervention to help parents in migrant head start families support their children's language and literacy. *Early Education and Development*, 21(3), 343–371. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10409281003631142>
- Caesar, L. G., & Nelson, N. W. (2014). Parental involvement in language and literacy acquisition: A bilingual journaling approach. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 30(3), 317–336. <https://doi.org/10.1177/>

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Sage.
- DeBruin-Parecki, A. (2007). *Let's read together: Improving literacy outcomes with the Adult-Child Interactive Reading Inventory (ACIRI)*. Brookes Publishing Company.
- Dollaghan, C. A. (2007). *The handbook for evidence-based practice in communication disorders*. Paul H Brookes Publishing.
- Durán, L. K., Hartzheim, D., Lund, E. M., Simonsmeier, V., & Kohlmeier, T. L. (2016). Bilingual and home language interventions with young dual language learners: A research synthesis. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 47(4), 347-371. https://doi.org/10.1044/2016_LSHSS-15-0030
- Guiberson, M. (2015). Gesture, play, and language development of Spanish-speaking toddlers with developmental language disorders: A preliminary study. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 37(2), 88-99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525740114565816>
- Guiberson, M., & Crowe, K. (2018). Interventions for multilingual children with hearing loss: A scoping review. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 38, 225-241. <https://doi.org/10.1097/TLD.0000000000000155>
- Guiberson, M., & Ferris, K. P. (2018). Identifying culturally consistent early interventions for Latino caregivers. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 40(4), 239-249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525740118793858>
- Guiberson, M., & Ferris, K. P. (2019). Early language interventions for young dual language learners: A scoping review. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 28(3), 945-963. https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_AJSLP-IDLL-18-0251
- Guiberson, M., & Rodríguez, B. (2010). Measurement properties and classification accuracy of two Spanish parent surveys of language development for preschool-age children. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 19(3), 225-237. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360\(2010/09-0058\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360(2010/09-0058))
- Guiberson, M., Rodríguez, B., & Dale, P. (2011). Classification accuracy of brief parent report measures of language development in Spanish-speaking toddlers. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 42(4), 536-549. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2011/10-0076\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2011/10-0076))
- Head Start Early Childhood Learning and Knowledge Center [ECLKC]. (2020, April 23). *Program information report (PIR)*. <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/data-ongoing-monitoring/article/program-information-report-pir>
- Hur, J. H., Snyder, P., & Reichow, B. (2020). Systematic review of English early literacy interventions for children who are dual language learners. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 40(1), 6-23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121419894623>
- Ijalba, E. (2015). Effectiveness of a parent-implemented language and literacy intervention in the home language. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 31(2), 207-220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265659014548519>
- Kitamura, S. (1998). *Pato Está Sucio*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Kitamura, S. (2000). *Perro Tiene Sed*. Fondo de Cultura Económica
- Kitamura, S. (2005). *Ardilla Tiene Hambre*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Kosaka, K. (2020, April 18). Satoshi Kitamura's key to children's literature? Making complex ideas simple. *The Japan Times*. <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/culture/2020/04/18/books/satoshi-kitamura-children-literature/>
- Lonigan, C. J., & Whitehurst, G. J. (1998). Relative efficacy of parent and teacher involvement in a shared-reading intervention for preschool children from low-income backgrounds. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 13(2), 263-290.
- Michie, S., West, R., Sheals, K., & Godinho, C. A. (2018). Evaluating the effectiveness of behavior change techniques in health-related behavior: A scoping review of methods used. *Translational Behavioral Medicine*, 8(2), 212-224. <https://doi.org/10.1093/tbm/ibx019>
- Rodríguez, B. L., Hines, R., & Montiel, M. (2009). Mexican American mothers of low and middle socioeconomic status: Communication behaviors and interactive strategies during shared book reading. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 40(3), 271-282. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2008/07-0053\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2008/07-0053))
- Spagnola, M., & Fiese, B. H. (2007). Family routines and rituals: A context for development in the lives of young children. *Infants & Young Children*, 20(4), 284-299. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.IYC.0000290352.32170.5a>
- Tsybina, I., & Eriks-Brophy, A. (2010). Bilingual dialogic book-reading intervention for preschoolers with slow expressive vocabulary development. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 43(6), 538-556. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2010.05.006>
- U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. (2017). *Policy statement on supporting the development of children who are dual language learners in early childhood programs*. Author.
- Whitehurst, G. J. (2002). *Dialogic reading: An effective way to read aloud with young children*. Reading Rockets. <https://www.readingrockets.org/article/dialogic-reading-effective-way-read-aloud-young-children>
- Wilcox, M. J., & Woods, J. (2011). Participation as a basis for developing early intervention outcomes. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 42(3), 365-378. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2011/10-0014\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2011/10-0014))

Appendix A. Integrative review steps

<p>Step 1: Conduct ERIC and PsycINFO search with the following terms: Term 1: bilingual OR dual language learner OR Spanish OR Spanish-speaking OR Spanish-English Term 2: literacy OR emergent literacy OR read* Term 3: toddler OR preschool OR early intervention OR child OR pediatric</p> <p>Step 2: Identify articles that met the following inclusion criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The sample had to include children who were 2 years of age (2;0-2;11) Children included in the source had to be Spanish-speaking DLLs Interventions/strategies had to be intended for parents/caregivers Interventions/strategies had to address literacy and/or language <p>Step 3: Code for strength of recommendation</p> <p>Step 4: Chart data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> List strategy/intervention applied Identify themes and develop codes for strategy that take into account various terms used to describe the strategy Create categories for similar strategies or strategies that target specific areas <p>Step 5: Create a potential strategies map</p>

Note. DLLs = dual language learners.

Appendix B. Strength of strategy recommendation coding

Recommendation Strength	Study Quality Indicators
Compelling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study described the intervention strategy and randomized assignment to treatment condition • Study included pretest and posttest measures that were relevant to the intervention strategy • Study reported statistical analysis and results (including significance and/or effect size or data that can be used to calculate these) • Study reported positive intervention outcomes
Promising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study did not describe the intervention strategy implementation adequately or did not randomly assign participants to treatment • Study reported <i>suggestive</i> findings but did not include pretest and posttest measures, or measures were not relevant to the intervention strategy • Study did not report enough detail about statistical analysis and results (e.g., significance or effect size) to be compelling; significance was reported but effect size was small • Study reported neutral intervention outcomes or outcomes that did not differ from no treatment or control groups
Lacking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study lacked methodological rigor or lacked descriptions of participant selection, intervention strategy, or procedures; study was not designed to evaluate an intervention strategy (this includes descriptive studies, recommended practices, and/or tutorial-type articles) • Study may have reported descriptive, comparative, or correlation results but did not include pretest and posttest measures • Study may report data but does not isolate intervention strategy, or does not report statistical analysis, and/or lacks rigor or practical significance • Study does not report intervention outcomes