



ED0 54872

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PA-24  
BR-0-0288  
OEC-0-70-2623(519)

EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS

FOR NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING CHILDREN

OCD TOPICAL PAPER  
prepared by  
Marcia Bernbaum  
Research Assistant

ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

May, 1971

This paper was produced pursuant to a contract with the Office of Child Development. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Government position or policy.

PS 005098

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Completion of this OCD Topical Paper was greatly facilitated by the generous assistance of Dr. Judith Ramirez, Department of Elementary Education, University of California at Los Angeles, and by many members of the staff of the Office of Child Development at HEW.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction . . . . . 1

Research . . . . . 9

Practical Guidelines for the Teacher and Administrator . . . . . 29

Bilingual Preschool Programs . . . . . 32

Useful Information for Teachers, Administrators, and Aides  
of Bilingual Preschools . . . . . 51

Bibliography . . . . . 57

## I. Introduction

"The Congress hereby finds that one of the most acute educational problems in the United States is that which involves millions of children of limited English speaking ability because they come from environments where the dominant language is other than English...and that the urgent need is for comprehensive and cooperative action now on the local, State, and Federal levels to develop forward looking approaches to meet the serious learning difficulties faced by this substantial segment of the Nation's school age population...Such priority shall take into consideration the number of children of limited English speaking ability between the ages of 3 and 18 in each State."

This quotation is the opening statement of Title VII, "Bilingual Education Programs" passed by Congress on January 2, 1968, and is commonly referred to as the Bilingual Education Act of 1967. The history behind the formulation of this Act clearly reveals our nation's growing concern during the past decade for the plight of the non-English-speaking child who must attend an English-speaking school system. The 1960 Census revealed that 10 years ago, when the total U.S. population was about 180 million; 10% or 18 million citizens were non-English-speaking. This figure has risen during the last 10 years. Many non-English-speaking immigrants are confronted by the dual prospect of learning a new language and adapting to the style of life and values of the American-Anglo culture; a transition that is not easy.

This paper will focus on the increased number of non-English-speaking children, ages 2 1/2 to 6, and their families, who want to provide their children with opportunities to learn English. It is hoped that the information presented in this paper will assist Head Start teachers and administrators to organize and implement programs for non-English-speaking children. Others,

interested in the general problems of bilingualism and bilingual education in the early years, may also find the information helpful. This paper is divided into the following sections:

1. Definitions of bilingualism and biculturalism and their applications to the non-English-speaking preschool child.
2. Summary of research from the related fields of linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, social psychology, and education that relates to the bilingual preschool child; summary of research on bilingual preschool programs. (Research developed during the last 5 years will be emphasized.)
3. Discussion of practical guidelines for Head Start teachers and administrators to use in the classroom and the community where Head Start programs that enroll non-English-speaking children are located.
4. Descriptions of existing models for bilingual preschool programs. (References to additional sources of information are cited.)
5. Lists of recommended teacher-administrator handbooks relating to bilingual preschool programs; and of useful materials for teachers of bilingual preschool children.

#### A Note

Children reared in environments where another dialect of English is spoken may technically be classified as non-English-speaking (where English refers to the accepted Anglo form used today). Increasing amounts of research on dialects, and increasing numbers of remedial programs, prompted by current interest in this area, suggest that a review of this literature could fill a volume. The issue of dialect versus accepted English, therefore, will remain outside the scope of this paper. Instead, all references made to non-English-speaking children will refer specifically to children who speak a language other than accepted English or one of its dialects. Readers interested in the topic of English dialects may find the following documents helpful:

Cazden, Courtney. Approaches to social dialects in early childhood education.

Considers three prominent preschool programs designed for children from environments that employ dialects.

Wolfram, W. An appraisal of ERIC documents on the manner and extent of nonstandard dialect divergence. (ED 034 991).

Examines and evaluates 11 ERIC documents on the basis of deficit and difference models of explaining language varieties.

Hess, K. M. and Maxwell, J. C. What to do about non-standard dialects: A review of the literature.

Sets forth some of the major ideas, points of view, and recommendations revealed by reviewing the literature from 1960 to 1969. Includes descriptions of current programs and statements about what teachers need to know and do to deal effectively with the language of speakers of dialects.

A. What is bilingualism?

A working definition of the term "bilingualism" is in order before research on bilingual preschool children and research concerning bilingual preschool programs are explored. For example, among Spanish-English bilinguals there is a wide continuum of people who have at one time or another been classified bilingual. The continuum ranges from the person whose native language is Spanish, and who speaks a bit of English; to the person whose native tongue is English, and who speaks a bit of Spanish; to the person who has grown up speaking both English and Spanish, and who is fluent in both languages. Psychologists, linguists, sociologists, and educators have spent time and effort trying to formulate a satisfactory definition of bilingualism that is both specific and useful. No general definition that satisfies everyone has been produced. The psycholinguist speaks of "compound versus coordinate" bilingualism (defined later); the linguist

defines bilingualism in terms of interference phenomena (defined later); and the sociologist points to the bilingual's native community and to the prestige associated with each language in order to define bilingualism. The educator, who needs a practical working definition, as a result, often must devise his own definition of bilingualism. It is no surprise, therefore, that the Bilingual Education Act deliberately avoids using the term "bilingual" and uses "non-English-speaking" in its place.

A bilingual may be defined as a person who has knowledge of and can use two languages in his daily conversation. As Andersson (1970) pointed out, a bilingual may be classified according to his skill in two languages along a more or less infinite scale:

Broadly considered there are...bilinguals who have one dominant and one secondary language, while there are others who are reasonably balanced. There are bilinguals who switch easily from one language to the other, and some who find it extremely difficult and confusing to do so. It is very common to find bilinguals who have specialized use of the languages, so that they can speak of some topics in one and of others in the other...(p. 9).

#### B. Spanish: A case in point

To be more precise: the Spanish-English bilingual is viewed as though bilingualism in his case is only a matter of mastering two languages, Spanish and English. And yet, in the United States, four different kinds of Spanish are spoken: Mexican-Spanish, Puerto-Rican Spanish, Cuban-Spanish, and Spanish that originated in Spain (Cardenas, 1970). To complicate the situation, the student of linguistics, who lives along the Mexican-American border, says that there are many varieties of Mexican-Spanish spoken within this geographical region. Among Mexican-Americans living in the southwest, some speak a dialect of Spanish that has descended from the 16th and 17th

century conquistadores; others speak standard Mexican-Spanish; some may speak "koine," a dialect based on Mexican-Spanish; and still others speak "pachuco," a slang used by males of the "underworld" (Ornstein, 1969).

Therefore, when referring to a language other than English spoken by a preschool child, whether it is Spanish, German, Italian, or Navajo, it is important to be precise about the geographic area and community in which the child lives, how long his family has lived there, and, consequently, the dialect he speaks.

C. What is a bilingual program?

A survey of existing bilingual programs at the preschool level indicates that some bilingual programs offer Spanish only 15 minutes a day; whereas, others instruct in English for half a day and in Spanish the other half of the day. Thus, when referring to bilingual programs we find a broad continuum similar to the one that exists for the word "bilingual."

D. What is biculturalism? a bicultural program?

Another matter must be clarified. Often those who speak of bilingual education refer to bicultural education at the same time. This tendency to equate bilingualism and biculturalism is often imprecise, sometimes incorrect. Although the tendency for a person who becomes bilingual is to adopt the cultural mores of the second language group (and thus become bicultural in outlook) (Fishman, 1970), it is possible to have a bilingual program that is not bicultural. "Biculturalism," however, has become an issue as important as, if not more important than, bilingualism. Psychologists, sociologists, and educators all recognize that in order for the young

PS 005098

child to be a successful student and person, he must have pride in his native culture. In this paper, bicultural preschool programs are defined as programs that emphasize two cultures: the dominant American-Anglo culture as it exists in the United States today, and the less dominant culture that non-English-speaking children absorb in their homes and communities.

E. The non-English-speaking preschooler who has no "native" language

It is assumed that the important problems of the population to be served (disadvantaged non-English-speaking preschoolers) is that they speak a language other than English. Accordingly, the teacher's task is (1) to assess each student's status on the continuum (from non-English-speaking to fully bilingual), and (2) to act in such a way that each child gains a firmer grasp of the English language as well as his native language. However, the particular problem of many Head Start teachers is not that the children speak a different language, but that the children have some difficulty grasping concepts to use for communicative and cognitive purposes in any language. Here, the teacher's task is to help the children develop their first language before launching bilingual education. Although little research has been directed towards this problem, several preschool programs for non-English-speaking children take this dilemma into account. (See section on Bilingual Preschool Programs in this paper.) In one program, for example, concepts are introduced and taught in the children's native language before they are introduced and taught in English.

F. What does E.S.L. mean?

ESL, or English as a Second Language, is a term that has been used frequently during the last few years to refer to bilingual education programs. Calling an ESL program "bilingual," however, leads to confusion.



ESL is an important component of bilingual education, but unless the home language is used as a medium for teaching a part of the curriculum, the education program cannot properly be called bilingual. ESL, as taught in many curricula for non-English-speaking children, focuses on teaching the child formal English. In a true bilingual classroom it is only a part of the curriculum. Indeed, ESL may take up as little as 15 minutes of a 5-hour school day.

G. Where is the non-English-speaking population located?

Where does the non-English-speaking Head Start population live? Of the population of over 4 million U.S. citizens whose native tongue is Spanish, 80% live in the southwestern states of Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and California (over 40% of the population of New Mexico is non-English-speaking). The other 20% live in or near New York City, Miami, on the island of Puerto Rico, and scattered through the south and midwest. A German-speaking population of over 3 million lives in or near Chicago and New York City, and in the state of Texas. Two to 3 million residents who speak Polish live mainly along the eastern seaboard and in the midwestern states of Illinois and Michigan. The 300,000 Norwegians in the United States have settled in the Pacific northwest and in the north central section. There is a native population of over 350,000 Indians representing 40 tribes in the United States. In addition to the strong concentrations of Indian-Americans in Montana, Arizona, Oklahoma, and New Mexico, tribes live in the lake region of the northeast, along the Canadian border, and in Alaska. Nearly 100,000 of this population are Navajo. This list does not include the Chinese and Japanese populations along the west coast, the Hawaiian population, and the 18 other foreign language populations in the United States, each comprised of over 50,000 members.

#### H. Bilingualism abroad

It is important to point out that the United States is not the only nation in the world challenged to teach children from diverse language backgrounds. Switzerland, Belgium, Canada, Finland, and the Union of South Africa each recognize two official languages that must be taught in all schools. In China, the U.S.S.R., and India hundreds of dialects are spoken. Mexico, Peru, Ecuador, and Paraguay recognize Spanish as the official language; but an unofficial language, that originated with and was spoken by their large Indian populations for centuries, is also accepted. Although not a part of this paper, it may be beneficial for U.S. educators to consider the experience of Swiss educators, who have taught all Swiss students French, German, and often Italian; the Canadians, who are obliged by law to teach English and French in their schools; and the South African educators, who must teach their children African and English (Andersson, 1970).

## II. Research

Teachers and administrators, program planners, and consultants for bilingual preschools may be interested in what guidelines the current research and literature in bilingualism can give that would be relevant to their work. Where would they look for information. The answer would be: in a variety of places. There are many fields other than linguistics or education that would be particularly useful to anyone planning for bilingual education. They include developmental psycholinguistics, anthropology, ethnic studies, sociolinguistics, social psychology, and educational psychology.

Interest in bilingualism, from the viewpoint of research and evaluation, has a rather long history. Some of the work in the early 1920's focused on the relationship between bilingualism and intelligence. During the last few decades, and particularly in the last 5 years, the focus on bilingualism has expanded to include contributions from psychology, sociology, education, and political science. We also witness today an increasing emphasis, by the members of these various disciplines, on the necessity of merging into a multidisciplinary approach to bilingualism. It is not surprising that a social psychologist's findings (that the attitudes of the child's community may either increase or decrease his degree of bilingualism) is of basic importance to a psycholinguist studying the effects of interference between the two languages of the same child. It is also not surprising that these two sets of data are pertinent to an educator. He has discovered that to develop an effective bilingual curriculum at the preschool level, he must be aware and appreciative of

the characteristics of the community the child comes from, as well as the effect of the interference between the child's two languages on his later learning.

The literature on bilingualism, especially that of the last 5 years, may be useful to establish guidelines to plan and implement programs for the bilingual preschool child. Research findings are divided into four categories:

1. "The Community" focuses on research findings from the fields of social psychology and sociolinguistics.
2. "The Bilingual Child" considers research findings from linguistics and psycholinguistics.
3. "Of Special Interest to Educators" answers some specific questions; for example: "At what age should the second language be introduced?" and "Should instruction and use of two languages be separated, or should they be united?"
4. "Testing the Bilingual Preschooler" summarizes several issues associated with assessing to what extent a child is bilingual and draws attention to possible approaches that may be used to assess the intelligence of a bilingual child.

(The first two categories help provide a general background or perspective for the educator in order that he may understand the bilingual child as an individual and as a member of his community.)

Issues within each category are posed in a question-answer format for two reasons. First, introducing each topic with a question directs a reader's attention immediately to the specific issue discussed. Second, a question format seems appropriate, since many bilingual issues are unresolved. Researchers are unable to make definite and conclusive statements on many of the issues.

A. The Community

1. How does the linguistic community in which the child lives affect his attitude towards learning a new language?

Wallace Lambert at McGill University found that the attitudes of the child's family towards the second language group in a community in which two languages are spoken affect the extent to which the child learns the second language (Lambert, 1967). The child must want to learn the second language, and in order to do so, he must like and want to be like the members of the second language group. That is, to acquire the second language successfully, the child must adopt some of the aspects of behavior that characterize the other linguistic-cultural group.

2. Does the domain of language behavior (home vs. school, teacher vs. peer, formal vs. informal) affect the language development of the preschool child?

Joshua Fishman (1970) found that, in a community in which two languages are spoken, each language tends to have its favored settings and tends to be associated with specified roles. Thus, a child may speak English at school, where English is the only language spoken, and Spanish at home. In the role of pupil he may feel more at ease in English; whereas, on the playground in the role of peer, he will favor Spanish. In this case English appears to be the language of formality (work, school); and Spanish, the language of informality and intimacy (at home, with friends). Fishman further pointed out that the degree of bilingualism may be quite different in each of these several domains. A young child, who usually speaks English with the teacher, may have great difficulty speaking Spanish with her (either because he is uncomfortable, or because he lacks the necessary vocabulary). Similarly, the same child may find it strange and even difficult to speak English with his peers on the

3. How can the status of the linguistic community (stable or changing) affect the educational process?

Fishman (1970) also suggested that it is important, in order to assess bilingualism and to develop the goals of a bilingual program, to ask, "Is the community stable linguistically, or is it in the process of shifting from one language to another?" A good example of such a contrast would be the Mexican-American border where Spanish has been the dominant language spoken in Mexican-American homes for many generations and will probably continue to be spoken for many years. New York City, where many in the Spanish-speaking Puerto Rican population are learning English in an effort to be assimilated by the surrounding society, presents a very different picture.

Both Fishman and Lambert recommended that data concerning: attitudes towards a second language, domains of language behavior, and linguistic status of the community, be gathered before and during the implementation of a bilingual program in a specific community. They further recommended that these data should directly affect the goals and type of bilingual program implemented.

#### B. The Bilingual Child

1. What characterizes the speech of the bilingual child?

- a. Compound and coordinate bilinguals

Psycholinguists describe two types of bilinguals: the compound bilingual, and the coordinate bilingual (Ervin, 1954; Diebold, 1966; Weinreich, 1967). The compound bilingual has a single language system.

He mixes both languages unknowingly. The coordinate bilingual, on the other hand, seems to operate on two separate channels. Unlike the compound bilingual, he knows which language he uses. Whereas the compound bilingual learns language in one setting (both English and Spanish are spoken at home), the coordinate bilingual learns language in two settings (Spanish is spoken at home, and English is spoken at school; or his mother speaks English, and his governess speaks French). Psycholinguists generally agree that the coordinate bilingual is probably less confused using two languages than is the compound bilingual. Although research has been and is being done on this topic (Ervin, 1954, Weinreich, 1967, Lambert, 1969), the field is wide open and promises to bring interesting insights in the next few years. Readers interested in compound and coordinate bilingualism as it relates to American-Indian children are referred to Cazden and John (1968). This document provides a thorough review of theoretical and research issues related to learning of American-Indian children.

Implications are already being drawn by and for educators. According to Dugas (1967), the coordinate bilingual growing up in two cultures is the ideal product of bilingual education. Dugas questioned how coordinate bilinguals can be educated in school. He suggested that possible solutions may be (1) to separate the two teaching contexts (English should be spoken in one corner of the classroom, and Spanish in another corner), and (2) to use separate native speakers to teach each language (the Anglo teacher should speak only English, and the Mexican-American teacher or aide should speak only Spanish). As we shall see, this is already practiced in several preschool programs where two languages are spoken.

b. Interference

Another topic that has concerned psycholinguists for the last few decades is that of interlingual interference. Interference may occur at various levels. The German immigrant who pronounces "bread" with a German accent is exhibiting phonological interference. Similarly, when the Spanish-speaking American says, "I see the house white," he exhibits interference at the syntactic level. (He directly translates from Spanish, in which the adjective always follows the verb.) Interference is therefore a common phenomenon and should be expected in a community that speaks two languages.

What interests the educator is that the amount of interference is to a large extent determined by the child's fluency in a second language and the situation in which a language is spoken. Thus, it should be expected that a Head Start child who speaks little English will show much interference from his mother tongue at first; and that as he becomes proficient in English, there will be less and less interference. Furthermore, the amount of interference will vary from situation to situation. A bilingual child is more likely to exhibit interference when he speaks with another bilingual child than when he speaks with a monolingual child. (When he talks to a monolingual child, he must take care to be more precise in order to be understood.) (Weinreich, 1967) Similarly, interference is more likely to occur in an informal setting (at home, among friends) than when the child formally recites in the classroom.

The phenomenon of interlingual interference continues to be an intriguing topic to psycholinguists whose interests range from the effect of interference on second language learning to the effects of interference on intelligence. Kinzel (1967), who observed a French-English 6-year-old, pointed out (contrary to most previous research) that pronunciation is less likely to be interfered with than is either grammar or syntax. Ervin (1954) hypothesized that interference is most likely to occur when two languages and two cultures are closely related. Perhaps these two hypotheses provide another argument for separating the two languages and cultures of a child in the classroom. These, and other findings that pertain to interference, are still, however, tentative.

## 2. Does bilingualism enhance intellectual processes?

This topic has been the most extensively researched of all topics relating to bilingualism. As mentioned previously, research dates back to 1923, and most of the work was done in the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's (see Jensen, 1962). How bilingualism affects the intellectual processes is an enigma that is far from resolved. Research results span a continuum, from those that found that bilingualism is detrimental to intelligence, to results that found no relationship between the two, to findings that have evidence to support the notion that bilingualism enhances intelligence. A study that belongs in the latter category, and that is one of the most widely cited in the current literature on bilingualism, was done in 1962 by Peal and Lambert. They found that 10-year-old French-English bilinguals scored higher both on verbal and nonverbal measures of intelligence. In 1969 Feldman and Shen reported that 5-year-old Head Start bilinguals were not dependent on

linguistic symbols, and therefore were more flexible cognitively than their monolingual peers. Lambert and Macnamara also reported in 1969 that the results of their study with French-English bilingual first graders supported the theory that bilingual experience can enhance cognitive and mental flexibility. (A series of studies that supported this view was reviewed by Jensen in 1962.) These studies maintained that the bilingual has two terms for one referent; his attention focuses on ideas and not words, on content and form, on meaning rather than symbols; and that this phenomenon is highly important in the intellectual process. Finally, Liedtke and Nelson (1968) used a series of Piagetian tests of conservation of length and found that bilingual 6- and 7-year-olds scored significantly higher than monolinguals of the same age.

A review of the studies published in the past few years indicates that the atmosphere today tends to be one that is supportive of the positive effects of bilingualism on intelligence. At the same time, however, current researchers emphasize that a variety of factors (including age, sex, socioeconomic status, educational background of parents, degree of the bilingualism of subjects, and the type of intelligence test employed) must be considered in order to evaluate the relationship between bilingualism and intelligence. Unfortunately, these factors have not always been accounted for in studies in this field.

The Head Start teacher should therefore be cautious when she administers an intelligence test to the bilingual members of her class. A high intelligence quotient can be attributed to many other factors than bilingualism. Fishman (1965) summed this up very nicely in a discussion of bilingualism and intelligence:

Thus we can either find no relationship, a negative relationship, or a positive relationship between bilingualism and intelligence depending where in the dominance configuration, where in the acquisition sequence and where in the social structure we look. (p. 237).

3. How are bilingualism and creativity related?

As many readers may already know, the concept of creativity has not been satisfactorily defined. Nevertheless, creativity is an area in which increasing amounts of research are underway, and one that evidently captures the interests of psychologists who study bilingualism. Jacobs and Pierce (1966) found that fifth and sixth grade bilingual students scored higher on a word uses test for creativity than monolinguals, and scored lower in word meanings tests than the same group of monolinguals. Landry (1968) confirmed his hypothesis that experience with two languages during childhood is related meaningfully to later verbal creative functioning for fourth grade bilinguals, but not for second grade bilinguals. The most recent study (Torrance, 1970) indicated that third to fifth grade Chinese and Malayan bilinguals scored higher than monolinguals on the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking in originality and elaboration, but lower than monolinguals in fluency and flexibility.

Results, although they do not provide definite guidelines for the educator, do provide insight into what could be a potentially significant contribution to the study of bilingualism. A positive relationship between creativity and bilingualism would encourage a preschool teacher interested in developing a program that exposes students to two languages.

4. What is the relationship between early bilingualism and emotional development?

Research findings that relate bilingualism to emotional development have tended to follow the pattern of results that relate bilingualism

to intelligence. On the one hand, results indicate that bilinguals may become frustrated because they can't express themselves, and that to force a child to forget his mother tongue and learn a second language may be disruptive (Jensen, 1962). Other findings indicate, on the other hand, that emotional difficulties may arise from conflicts of biculturalism rather than from learning a second language (Jensen, 1962).

5. How is motivation related to bilingualism?

Anderson (1968) found, in a study of Mexican-American high school children in Texas, that their need for achievement was just as high as that of their Anglo peers. He also found that the parental expectations of Mexican-American parents were just as high as, and in some cases higher than, those of Anglo parents. Anderson suggested that one reason the Mexican-American children tended to perform more poorly than their Anglo peers was that the expectations of their parents were too high, and consequently, the children were frustrated.

These findings suggest to the educator that non-English-speaking children, and especially Mexican-American children, may come from homes where achievement expectation and motivation levels are high. Lambert's (1967) findings also suggested that motivation is a critical factor in second language learning.

C. Of Special Interest to Educators

1. What are some current positions of researchers concerning the language used for instruction?

Macnamara (1967) found that the problem-solving ability of bilingual children was poor when information was provided in their weaker language, even when the components of the problem were separately understood.



He also found that reading in the less dominant language took longer than reading in the dominant language. Kaufman (1968) extended Macnamara's findings in a study in which direct instruction in reading Spanish, when offered to Spanish-speaking retarded readers, had a positive effect on reading ability in English.

Similar evidence supports the opposite notion that the dominant language of young children can benefit from instruction in a foreign language at an early age. Samuels, Reynolds, and Lambert (1969) reported results of a study that focused on English-speaking second graders in their second year of a program, in which all instruction took place in French. The results indicated that these youngsters were as capable of encoding and decoding novel information in English and French as were matched groups of monolingual English- and French-speaking children. Lambert and Macnamara (1969) also discovered that at the end of first grade, the mathematical ability of these children was on a par with that of both of the control groups of monolingual children.

In addition, results of a 4-week Head Start language training program using three treatments: Spanish as the language of instruction; English as the language of instruction; and both languages used for instruction indicated that the bilingual treatment was not significantly superior to the Spanish or English treatment (Barclay and Kurcz, 1969). Such results must, however, be reviewed with caution, as they are based on such a short instructional period (4 weeks). Viewing this issue from a practical standpoint, Gumperz (1967) stated:

The common assumption that uneducated speakers of minority languages learn better when instructed through the medium of their own vernacular is not necessarily always justified.

Instructional materials in the vernacular may rely on monolingual norms which are culturally alien to the student and linguistically different from his home speech. (p 56).

Thus, the issue concerning in which language instruction should take place is far from being resolved. Observation of some of the more publicized bilingual preschool programs today, however, indicates that a majority of the programs begin with instruction in the child's dominant language before switching to instruction in English, and that some programs introduce a desired concept in the child's dominant language before it is introduced in English.

2. When is it most beneficial for newly learned concepts to be switched from one language to another?

To the author's knowledge, no specific research has been done on this topic. Wilson, however, at a TESOL convention in March 1970, made the statement that the concepts developed in one language will more likely be transferred into a second language if the transfer is done as soon as possible (ideally, within the same day). As we shall see in the next section, the Michigan Oral Language Series for non-English-speaking preschoolers introduces concepts in the morning in Spanish, and reintroduces them that afternoon in English.

3. At what age is it advisable that the second language be introduced?

The general consensus before 1962 was that a second language should not be introduced before the child is 8 years old, and much literature can be found that protests teaching a second language before grade 2 (Jensen, 1962). A few supporters of yet another theory; e.g., Haugan (see Weinreich, 1967) recommended that a second language, if taught before

grade 3, should be taught informally. The literature of the past 5 years indicates that although no research has specifically supported early introduction of a second language, most preschool programs have of necessity introduced one. The controversy today concerns not whether a second language should be introduced in preschool, but rather whether the child, for the sake of emotional security, should first be approached in his dominant language. Only after he has adapted to the classroom situation should second language instruction begin. As we shall see, the technique of introducing English informally and the technique of reserving a highly structured programmed period of English each day are currently practiced in bilingual preschool classrooms.

4. Is the instruction and use of two languages best kept separate or united?

This question is relevant to the psycholinguists' interest in compound vs. coordinate bilingualism. Dugas (1967) suggested that the two language learning contexts should be kept separate. Jensen (1962) suggested that the child should learn his dominant language first, and that he should receive language instruction in the two languages from separate sources. He concluded from a review of the literature that when the teacher teaches two languages, she should be consistent in the sense that she should stipulate the time and place a given language will be used. Although this view appears currently to be quite popular among early childhood educators and has wide application in bilingual preschools, there are still programs that mix two languages in one class, and in which the teacher speaks both indiscriminately.

5. What methods exist to prepare teachers to teach bilingual children?

Most of the published reports to date have focused on programs and ideas for preparing teachers of Mexican-American children. In 1969 Saunders reported a program at the University of New Mexico in which students from deprived areas (who probably would not have attended college), chosen by their high schools on the basis of their academic averages, were sent through a 5-year work-study program to become teachers.

Ramirez (1969) cited the Claremont Project in Anthropology and Education in which students (future teachers and administrators) were assigned to work projects designed to introduce teachers to the practical uses of anthropological methods. Future teachers visited children's homes to become more aware of the cultural forces operating on their potential pupils.

Carter (1969) stressed that schools of education should promote active contact with Mexican-American communities, and that the schools should emphasize the diversity of the cultural background of the Mexican-American children.

The consensus is that teachers should try harder to understand the sociocultural aspects of the communities in which they teach and that they should be aware of teaching styles of parents and capitalize on these.

6. Head Start Research and Evaluation.

In the context of reviewing the literature, it is appropriate to note some of the results that have materialized from research relating to bilingual Head Start programs. It is well-known that Head Start initiated several programs situated in geographic areas where the dominant language is not English. A survey of such programs indicates

that the goals and means of instruction used in these programs vary widely. Several evaluative studies of existing programs have been conducted to date. The following studies are exemplary of research undertaken from 1965 to 1970.

In an evaluation of a program for Mexican-American bilinguals in the summer of 1965, Montez found that although ratings made by the follow-up teacher indicated that the program was a success, both teacher aides and parents had more positive attitudes towards the children and the success of the program than did the teacher. Such results, Montez felt, raised serious questions concerning the ability of the teachers to develop healthy empathetic relations with Mexican-American children.

Wolff and Stein (1967), in a study of a 1966 summer Head Start program with Puerto Rican children, found that there were no educational gains, but that 6 months later Head Start children showed more learning readiness and eagerness to learn than non-Head Start children.

Two Head Start programs for Mexican-American children that employed the Montessori technique were evaluated by Johnson in 1965. The author found that positive gains occurred in connection with social-emotional and intelligence-academic factors. He also found that the Mexican-American children who participated in the program had limited skills.

Pierce-Jones (1968), in a study of Mexican-American Head Starters, found that no significant increase in performance occurred in a 6-week summer program in which three groups of four children went to a middle class mother-teacher's home. Espinosa (1968), on the other hand, reported that Mexican-American children who attended an 8-week Head Start program made gains in achievement motivation.

A tentative explanation for the equivocal results of these five studies is that each focused on a short-term Head Start summer program. The longest of the five studies lasted only 8 weeks. An additional set of variables involved in these programs were the teachers, their attitudes, and their teaching techniques.

Results of another study conducted by John and Berni in 1967 that involved Puerto Rican, Mexican-American, Sioux, and Navajo children indicated that the inclusion of ethnic books would be useful in programs for non-Anglo children.

#### D. Testing the Bilingual Preschooler

1. How can we assess whether a child is bilingual, or to what extent he is facile in two or more languages?

As Macnamara pointed out (1967), the matter of establishing comparable measures of skills in two languages is very complex. He suggested three categories for a series of indirect measures, devised during the past few decades, to simplify the difficulties of directly measuring the degree of bilingualism. In the first category he placed rating scales. This category included language background questionnaires and self-rating scales for language skills of the bilingual. (He found both methods imprecise.) The second category comprised fluency tests. In 1961 Ervin devised a picture-naming test in which the bilingual subject named pictures in each of the two desired languages. Lambert (1967) used a series of tests that involved reaction times on the part of bilinguals to instructions in each of the two languages. Macnamara (1967) required his subjects to say as many different words in one language as they could within a limited time. The third category of flexibility tests included Lambert's word directions test in

which the subject identified as many words as he could in a long nonsense word using his repertoire of both languages. The third category also included Macnamara's test in which the subject, given an expression, was asked to write as many words or expressions as he could that were synonymous with the original expression, using his dual repertoire.

2. Tests for bilinguals: which is more reliable—a verbal test or a nonverbal test?

Whether tests for bilinguals, especially those focused on intelligence, should be verbal or nonverbal has been, and continues to be, a dominant issue. Although Peal and Lambert (1962) found that bilinguals scored higher on verbal measures than monolinguals, the majority of the studies to date have indicated the reverse (Jensen, 1962; Fishman, 1965; Peal and Lambert, 1962). Shipman (1967) concluded, from her survey of four tests of intelligence given to Head Start Seminole Indians, that the children performed highest on the Raven Colored Matrices Test, the test in which the subjects were required to show the least verbal response.

This result, and previous similar results, are not surprising, since many additional factors tend to affect intelligence tests given to bilinguals. In many cases the testers were not bilingual and often failed to understand the child whose dominant language was not English, and the testers failed to make themselves understood. Also, in many cases, intelligence tests were administered in English, the child's weaker language, or the tests were poorly translated into the child's dominant language. The major question in these situations is, should the child's poor performance be attributed to his lack of conceptual ability, or to the simple fact that he

doesn't understand the tester? It is interesting to note that Liedtke and Nelson (1968) found, when they gave 6- and 7-year-old bilinguals a conservation of length test, that the bilinguals scored higher than their monolingual peers; whereas, their previous intelligence quotients were lower.

It would be advisable at this point to recommend that the preschool educator, who may be weak in the child's dominant language, rely as much as possible on nonverbal measures of such items as intelligence, creativity, and achievement.

3. Is one measurement for bilingualism, or one measurement for a characteristic such as intelligence that is related to bilingualism, sufficient?

The answer is almost unanimously "no." Peal and Lambert in their study (1962) chose four tests of bilingualism to assess their subjects. In 1942 Arsenian used seven techniques to evaluate bilingualism. In 1967 Shipman concluded, from her study of Seminole Indian Head Starters, that a variety of measures to assess cognitive development should be used. Cervenka, as we shall see in question 5 of this section has recently developed a series of tests for bilingualism at the preschool level. All are to be used together.

4. What is another research result that may affect testing the bilingual child?

The results of an M.A. thesis published in 1968 (Mycue) tested Mexican-American preschoolers in Texas and indicated that pupils performed better on a language facility test with a Mexican-American examiner, and that they performed better on the test in English after an initial performance in Spanish of the task to be tested. Mycue suggested that English language performance would be better for Mexican-American children tested by a Mexican-American examiner than for Mexican-American children tested by an

Anglo examiner, and that spontaneous production of English speech would be better after Spanish-English bilingual children were first allowed to perform in Spanish.

5. What kinds of tests have been devised recently that would be useful to and could be administered by the Head Start teacher?

Cervenka, Edward. Administrative manual for tests of basic language competence in English and Spanish. Level 1: (Preschool) (1968) ED 027 063.

Cervenka, Edward. Administrative manual for inventory of socialization of bilingual children ages 3-10. (Part of the final report, August 1968.) ED 027 062.

The author recommends that (1) the tests be administered in familiar situations because the test batteries focus on oral and aural use of language in realistic situations, (2) children be given pretest practice (to make sure they understand what is expected of them), (3) local dialect norms be used, and that in all cases the batteries be administered by speakers of the local dialects, and (4) an attempt be made to test in group settings. Both sets of tests are developed for the teacher's use in the classroom. Each manual gives directions for administering the tests, samples of measures, and scoring sheets.

In the first manual prepared for preschool children, Cervenka developed two batteries of tests. One test battery is a contrastable linguistic analysis of English and Spanish and is used to pinpoint specific language problems a native Spanish-speaking child encounters when he learns and uses English, and vice versa. The other test battery consists of more conventional tests that stress the perceptual and motor aspects of language development.

The second series of tests found in the second manual has four submeasures: self-concept, a behavior rating scale of the child's interpersonal behavior, a behavior rating scale of the child's general social behavior in the classroom, and a questionnaire administered to parents of children enrolled in bilingual programs.

Although Cervenka's series is the most complete and up-to-date series of measures written specifically for the bilingual Head Start child, other tests related to bilingual children are available: (1) Chapter 5 of A Handbook of Bilingual Education by Saville and Troike provides a suggested form for home interviews, as well as some intelligence tests. Especially recommended is the Goodenough-Harris Test. (2) Several of the newly developed bilingual programs have created tests designed to evaluate the success of their programs.

As mentioned previously, testing is complex and plagued with problems. Readers are cautioned and advised not to rely on any one set of tests. Cervenka's tests, however, appear to be carefully conceived and especially pertinent to Mexican-American preschool children.

### III. Practical Guidelines for the Teacher and Administrator

What practical guidelines can be extrapolated from research findings in bilingualism that will be useful to the Head Start teacher and administrator as they organize and implement a bilingual program for preschoolers? The following is a list of such guidelines based on research and reports from bilingual preschool programs.

A. To establish the curriculum and goals for a Head Start classroom with non-English-speaking children in it, the following factors should be considered:

1. The community from which the children come: is it stable linguistically, or is it in the process of changing?
2. The composition of the class: are all children non-English-speaking? Do some speak English fluently? Are there some that have little or no language, period?
3. The desires of the parents: do they want their children to quickly become a part of the dominant Anglo culture (do they send their children to Head Start to learn English), or would they prefer that their children maintain a bilingual/bicultural outlook?
4. The teachers: are they bilingual, and if not, is there a bilingual aide in the classroom?
5. The educational future of the children: will they be proceeding to an elementary school where only English is spoken and most of their classmates are Anglo, or will they remain in a bilingual/bicultural atmosphere?

B. To decide on how bilingual the children are, the following facts should be remembered:

1. Many different measures should be used to test children for bilingual ability and for such factors as intelligence. No single good test of bilingualism has been devised.
2. Bilingual children tend to score higher on nonverbal measures of intelligence than on verbal measures.

C. To teach a young non-English-speaking child English, the following items should be considered:

1. Teachers should understand the phonemic, grammatical, and semantic differences between the child's native language and the English language.
2. The child should always be encouraged to feel that his own language is valued and appreciated.
3. The child must want to learn English.
4. It is less difficult for a child to learn two languages when the languages are consistently presented in two separate contexts. Thus, it may be helpful to have a specific classroom time and place for each language.
5. If a concept is presented in English, it is helpful to present it in the child's dominant language earlier the same day.
6. The child will exhibit different degrees of bilingualism depending on what kind of a situation he is in and what role he is playing.
7. It is recommended that a young child entering school be exposed to his native language until he becomes accustomed to the classroom atmosphere. English can then be introduced.

8. More and more psychologists, linguists, and educators agree that a second language can and should be introduced at an early age.

D. To understand the emotional stability of the young non-English-speaking preschool child, the following recommendations are made:

1. Regardless of whether or not the orientation of the curriculum is bicultural, the teacher should demonstrate a positive attitude towards the child's culture.
2. The child should not in any way be given the idea that his language or his culture is undesirable.

#### IV. Bilingual Preschool Programs

A closer look at a few of the guidelines stated in the previous section would be especially helpful to the Head Start teacher and administrator and anyone else involved in the first stages of planning to implement a bilingual preschool program. The specific guidelines are: the community, the parents, the children, the teacher and her aide, and goals.

##### 1. The community

The community in which the non-English-speaking members of the Head Start class live should be one of the first factors considered. Is the community stable linguistically, or is it in the process of shifting language (and thus, in essence, shifting cultures)? We have considered Mexican-American communities along the Mexican-American border. Spanish is and has been spoken at home and in social situations for generations; while English has, is, and will continue to be the language Mexican-Americans use at work. A linguistically changing community is Spanish Harlem in New York City. There, many Puerto Rican immigrants are eager to learn English and become part of the American culture as soon as possible. English, then, is the dominant language of the future.

##### 2. The parents

A question the teacher should ask is, "What are the desires of the parents?" Does the Spanish-speaking parent for example want Spanish to be the main language used in his preschooler's classroom, with perhaps one short daily English lesson taught? Or, does the parent feel that since his child already speaks Spanish, the reason he sends him to school is to learn English?

It obviously would be frustrating to set up a bilingual program that emphasizes Spanish half a day (and at the beginning, most of the day for young Head Starters), and then discover that the parents send their children to Head Start specifically to get a good exposure to the English language and culture.

### 3. The children

Another important factor to contemplate when planning a bilingual program is the composition of the class. Are all of the children non-English-speaking, or do some or many of them speak good English? Of this latter group, are some Anglo-American? Among the non-English-speaking children, do all speak Spanish (as do the children along the Mexican-American border); or do some speak Spanish; others, Italian; and still others Chinese (as may be the case in certain sections of San Francisco)? A further question on this theme is: Among the non-English-speaking, and even among the English-speaking children, how many are fluent in both languages; how many speak only a little English or Spanish; and how many speak no English or no Spanish?

### 4. The teacher and her aide

Does the teacher speak the language of her non-English-speaking students, and if so, how fluently? If she doesn't, has she an assistant who does? (In most Head Start classes the assistant comes from the community in which the children live, and therefore speaks the children's dominant language and is well acquainted with their native culture.) Although the teacher's language fluency is important, it is even more important that her attitude towards the children's culture is positive. A teacher's negative attitude towards a child's home culture can damage the child's self-concept and undermine his pride in his community.

## 5. Goals

Strengthened by knowledge and understanding of the child's community, the parents' wishes, the child, and the teacher's responsibilities, the administrator and the teacher are now in a position to decide the goals of their Head Start program. One goal may be to focus on the child's dominant language. The child's home language can be used as a transition-- a means of making him comfortable in the new classroom atmosphere--before focusing on the major job of teaching him English. If it is understood (1) that the children in the class will enter a public elementary school in which all instruction will be in English, (2) that the majority of their classmates will be Anglo-Americans, and (3) that the parents and the community desire to be assimilated into the American culture, this approach will be the most useful for non-English-speaking members of the class. We shall call this approach dominant language. An alternate goal may be to develop a bilingual atmosphere in which equal time is spent on languages and cultures of the English-speaking children and the non-English-speaking children. This approach is feasible if the child expects to remain in a bilingual setting for some time to come (and especially if the teacher isn't under pressure to teach the children English rapidly in order for them to easily adjust to an all-English-speaking elementary school). Such a goal would be appropriate for a linguistically and culturally stable community. It may also be argued that this approach makes the child a more flexible human being who later will adapt more easily than his unilingual and unicultural peers to new languages and cultural settings. We shall call this approach bilingual.

To achieve these goals, we must also consider the composition of the class (Is it one way: composed of all non-English-speaking children; or, is it mixed: composed of English-speaking Anglo children and non-English-speaking children?) We may thus come up with a working system of classification for existing bilingual preschool programs.

1. One way: dominant language.
2. One way: bilingual.
3. Mixed: dominant language.
4. Mixed: bilingual.

In the introduction an attempt was made to distinguish between the terms "bilingual" and "bicultural." In the present context it is conceivable that a program may be found whose goal is to develop a bilingual child who is geared to adapt to the dominant Anglo-American culture (bilingual/dominant culture). Similarly, it is also conceivable that a bilingual program exists that attempts, as an additional goal, to encourage each child to become equally at ease with his native culture and the dominant American culture (bilingual/bicultural). A third alternative may be that a program focuses entirely on developing the bilingual abilities of the child without placing any emphasis on whether the child develops either a bicultural outlook or an outlook oriented towards the dominant Anglo-American culture (bilingual).

Accordingly, within the four categories outlined above, specific mention will be made only if the literature reviewed concerns a program that clearly emphasizes bicultural goals. Since the programs were not observed, there is not sufficient information to categorize the remaining programs according to whether they emphasize the dominant Anglo-American culture, or whether they place no emphasis at all on culture but focus exclusively on language acquisition.

There are a few examples of existing bilingual preschool programs that fit these four categories. Note that this classification system represents extremes on a continuum, and that exemplary programs discussed are classified according to their relative proximity to these extremes. Note also that most programs to date have focused either on Spanish-Americans or on Indian-Americans. For this reason, each category will be subdivided into Spanish-English and Indian-English.\*

1. One way: dominant language

a. Spanish-English

(1) Michigan Oral Language Program

Developed originally for use with Spanish-speaking migrant children in Michigan, the Michigan Oral Language Program was designed to provide the child with the language and conceptual skills he needs to benefit from an English-speaking school setting. Lessons are built and structured around oral language circles, each of which takes about 15 minutes to complete. These English and Spanish circles are used in sequence at the rate of three a day for 8 weeks (if the teacher prefers to space them out, she may). A distinguishing characteristic of this program is that the Spanish circles prepare the child in his first language for the content of the English lessons that follows. (That is, specific concepts are introduced in the morning in Spanish followed by their introduction later the same day in English.)

During the last year two guides have been published: one prescribed for preschool; the other for kindergarten. The guides provide an explicit set of ordered lesson plans in Spanish and English as well as necessary materials to accompany the lessons.

---

\*The following schematization will include extant Head Start programs that appear to use one of these four approaches. This information is based on questionnaires sent to schools listed on: "Tentative List of Preschool Bilingual Grant and Chicano Programs" published by the Research and Evaluation Division the Office of Child Development, September 1970.

It must be stressed that the lessons take up not more than 45 minutes of the school day. Their emphasis clearly points to the necessity that the young child learn the English language in order to actively participate later in an English-speaking school setting. This program was field tested during the 1968 Summer Migrant Education Program by 40 teachers in Michigan, Ohio, and Colorado.

Further information may be obtained from:

Dr. Jesse Soriano  
Migrant Education Office  
Michigan State Department of Education  
Lansing, Michigan

The following sources may also be useful:

- (a) Petrini, Alma Maria. ESOL-SESD guide: Kindergarten. Michigan Oral Language Series (1970). ED 039 817.
- (b) Bilingual conceptual development guide: Preschool. Michigan Oral Language Series (1970). ED 039 818.

Available from:

MLA/ACTFL Materials Center  
62 Fifth Avenue  
New York, New York 10011

## (2) Language and Conceptual Skills Program

The Language and Conceptual Skills Program, developed by the Southwest Regional Lab (S.W.R.L.) in Inglewood, California, is designed to aid Spanish-speaking children to develop English language skills essential to success in the primary grades. This program is designed for Spanish-speaking children who can understand little or no English. A screening test is provided to help identify the children. The primary goal of the Language and Conceptual Skills Program is communication through the acquisition of oral language skills. Classroom vocabulary is introduced early in situational contexts familiar to the children.

The three general objectives of the program relate to vocabulary, syntax, and skills for following classroom directions. Categories of objectives for the first year of the program (kindergarten) include: communication in school; communication in the home; and communication beyond home and school.

The research-based materials and teaching procedures in the program assist teachers and tutors to provide efficient instruction. The instructional materials include objects and experiences common to the Mexican-American culture. Approximately 50 minutes of instruction is required daily; 25 minutes are teacher-directed group activities, and 25 minutes are individualized instruction provided by a fifth or a sixth grade tutor.

Further information may be obtained from:

Dr. Barbara Lassar  
Division of Resource Services  
Southwest Regional Laboratory  
11300 La Brea Blvd.  
Inglewood, California 90304

Other programs that appear to adopt the one way:dominant language approach are the Texas Education Agency, the Gallup McKinley School, and the Formal Language Learning Program. Interested readers may refer to the following sources for additional information concerning each one:

- (1) Texas Education Agency  
State Board of Education  
Austin, Texas 78711
- (2) Gallup McKinley School: Burke, Eleanor and others. Curriculum guide for child development centers--5 year old program (1967). ED 024 519.
- (3) Formal Language Training Program: Teaching the educationally disadvantaged Hispano child at K-3 level (1969). ED 036 807.

Two existing Head Start programs that appear to have adopted this orientation are located at Greeley, Colorado and Calerico, California.

(4) Head Start  
811 Fifteenth Street  
Greeley, Colorado

(5) Head Start  
Calerico  
California

b. Indian-English

(1) Ute Program

A nursery school, pioneered and financed entirely by a tribe, is located on a Ute reservation in Fort Duchesne, Utah. The school's curriculum appears rather Anglo-traditional, oriented to insure that the Indian child adapts to the Anglo culture. It has evidently been quite successful in this respect, since it has motivated the Jicarille Apaches, the San Carlos tribe, the Papagos, the Sioux, and the Navajos to request funds from the Office of Education for similar nursery school classes.

For additional information refer to:

Clark, Erma. A nursery school on the Ute Indian reservation. Childhood Education, 1965, 41(8), 407-410.

2. One way: bilingual

a. Spanish-English

(1) Early Childhood Education Learning System

The Southwest Educational Development Lab (S.W.E.D.L.) in San Antonio, Texas has recently developed an early childhood model which places strong emphasis on educating preschool and kindergarten children from low income Mexican-American families. The program, which is entitled the Early Childhood Education Learning System, is tailored to the child's background and level of achievement. The goals of the program are (1) to strengthen the child's concept of himself as a worthy individual, (2) to develop the child's sensory-perceptual and motor skills, (3) to develop the child's language skills in English and Spanish, and (4) to develop the child's thinking and reasoning

The 3-year-old enters the classroom in which a bilingual teacher instructs in Spanish 80% of the time. Four- and 5-year-olds advance to a classroom with an English-speaking teacher and bilingual aides. Students attend classes 3 hours a day. Special consideration is given to increasing attention span, working independently, using adults as reinforcing agents, persisting in work attitudes, and increasing exploratory behavior. The program includes extensive work with parents.

SWEDL has published teachers' lesson guides and materials geared for Spanish-speaking children at three levels (3-year-olds, 4-year-olds, and 5-year-olds). Also available are tests, ethnic awareness materials, and staff materials (including several film strips offering overviews of the Early Childhood Education Program). There are currently 2000 preschool children participating in this program in seven schools in Texas and one in Arizona. by the fall of 1971 several schools in California will be using this program and it is hoped that up to 5000 preschool children will be participating.

For further information about sites in which the program is being implemented and for pamphlets giving further information contact:

Mrs. Sheri Nadler  
Southwest Educational Development Lab  
800 Brazo  
Austin, Texas

Other informative sources are:

Ott, Elizabeth. Basic Education for Spanish-speaking disadvantaged pupils (1967). ED 020 497.

Nedler, Sheri. Early education for Spanish-speaking Mexican-American children: A comparison of three intervention strategies (1970). ED 037 778.

b. Indian-English

(1) Rough Rock Demonstration School

The objectives of the Rough Rock Demonstration School in Chinle, Arizona are (1) to develop the child's competence in Navajo and English, (2) to turn both languages into tools of thought, and (3) to develop a bicultural outlook. In this school, the child is encouraged to speak three languages: Navajo, the teacher's English, and English developed by the children on the playground. The basic approach is to teach each language under definite, overt, and consistently similar conditions. Navajo is taught in an Indian environment by a Navajo-speaking aide; English is taught in an Anglo environment by an English-speaking teacher. In addition, the two languages are associated with two distinct physical areas of the classroom. For the young children each classroom has a Navajo corner with Navajo artifacts and toys, and an Anglo corner with Anglo artifacts and toys. The Navajo aide plays with the children in the Navajo corner; the teacher plays with them in the Anglo corner.

The Rough Rock School is structured in such a way that its students are grouped on the basis of language ability and time spent in the school. Thus 3- and 4-year-olds may be found in one class; 4- and 5-year-olds in another class; 5- and 6-year-olds in a third class; and so on. The entering child is approached at first through the medium of his own native language, which is usually Navajo. As the child becomes accustomed to the atmosphere, the time he spends using English as the medium of communication is increased. Thus, by age 8 a child may be exposed to 1/2 hour of English a day and 3 years later English may be the main medium of instruction. The goal for the end of elementary school is to have the children reading and writing in both Navajo and English.

The Rough Rock School places a strong emphasis on bicultural development along with bilingual development. Monolingual Navajo parents are encouraged to spend time in the classrooms and to use this exposure as a learning experience for themselves and their children as well as a means of furthering the education of their children at home. All of the elementary teachers are Navajo bilinguals. Although the composition of the student body is predominantly Navajo, there are some Anglo staff children. Just as the Navajo child is introduced to the school through the medium of his own language, the Anglo child is first exposed to English. Over time there is an increasing emphasis on learning to speak, read, and write in Navajo.

The school welcomes visitors. For further information the reader is referred to:

Mr. Dillon Platero  
Principal  
Rough Rock Demonstration School  
Chinle, Arizona

The following references are also informative:

- (a) Hoffman, Virginia. Language learning at Rough Rock. Childhood Education. 1969, 46(3), 139-145.
- (b) Platero, Dillon. Annual report of the Rough Rock Demonstration School for 1969, July 1, 1968 through June 30, 1969. ED 035 690.

Other examples of one way: bilingual programs for Indians are in the San Juan School District in Utah and the bilingual kindergarten program to be instituted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs on Navajo reservations. For additional information refer to:

- (1) San Juan School District: Howe, Elliott. Programs for bilingual students of Utah (1967). ED 017 389.
- (2) Navajo Program: Saville, Muriel. Curriculum guide for teachers of English in kindergartens for Navajo children (1969). ED 031 122.

An existing Head Start program that appears to use this approach is the Hopi Action Project in Oraibi, Arizona. Readers may write:

- (3) Head Start  
Hopi Action Project  
Oraibi, Arizona

3. Mixed: dominant language

a. Spanish-English

(1) The New Nursery School

The New Nursery School program developed by Glen Nimnicht at Colorado State College in Greeley, Colorado, proposes to improve particular skills, abilities, and personality characteristics of preschool children. Included in the program are a mixed group of disadvantaged Spanish-American and Anglo middle class children (ratio, 2:1). The program combines a responsive or autotelic environment in which children do what they want with self-correcting apparatus. The role of the teacher is not to teach, but to facilitate the child's learning. Only the head teacher can initiate interaction with a pupil, but each of the teacher aides is instructed to respond to any child's request for conversation, for tutorial help, or for stories. The children receive, in other words, what amounts to individual or small group teacher-centered instruction at their request. Spanish-American children are given individual or small-group instruction in Spanish each day for 15 to 20 minutes. Instruction is given either by a Spanish-speaking college student or a parent helper. . Emphasis is placed on following each child's abilities and interests during this period.

For additional information see:

- (a) Nimnicht, Glen. First-year progress report of a project on nursery school education for environmentally deprived Spanish-American children (1966). ED 010 122.

(2) Tucson Early Education Model

The Tucson Early Education Model was developed by Marie Hughes at the Center for Early Childhood Education at the University of Arizona. The model as described is part of a system of educational services based on three components: (1) classroom instructional staff, teacher aides, teachers, and program assistants (or teacher trainers), (2) parent coordinators who work as organizers, developers, and implementers of significant parent involvement, and (3) school psychologists who serve as consultants to instructional personnel and parents concerning learning and adjustment in the children.

Classes of 30 children, with a teacher and an aide, are broken down into informal groups that are encouraged to play games and plan projects. In the planning segment of the program, the teacher and her aide ask questions in English that encourage the children to note the perceivable characteristics of things, persons, places, and relationships among them. In order to answer the questions, the children must formulate the characteristics and relationships in English. After the project is over, each child in the group draws a picture of the project from memory and dictates his story of it. His dictation is tape recorded and typed. On a later day, when other groups are planning projects, these children go to the listening post where each of six children has a pair of earphones plugged into a tape recorder. Each child hears his own dictated story and the stories of each of his five companions, and may read enlarged typed versions of each story.

Planning future projects, conducting them, describing them in retrospect, and later listening to them is calculated to expand the span of time in which the children organize their activities. The teacher's and aide's questions and the experience at the listening post are calculated to encourage the development of functional language. At the listening post the group of children need little attention from teachers and aides. Important components of this program are social reinforcement, individualized attention, and the modeling behavior of the teacher.

Although the emphasis of the Tucson Early Education Model is on acquiring proficiency in the English language, attempts are made to utilize the child's background as much as possible. As an example, in the course of planning a project the children may visit their home neighborhoods and places where their fathers work. The model also advocates a heterogeneous grouping of English- and Spanish-speaking children in each class (although classes in which the model is applied are taken as they are-mixed or not).

The model is currently being applied with Spanish-speaking children in Tucson, Arizona; Los Angeles, California; Santa Fe, New Mexico; and Fort Worth, Texas. It is also being applied in Louisiana in Cajun. For further information the reader may contact:

Arizona Center for Early Childhood Education  
1515 East First St.  
Tucson, Arizona 85721

Another useful reference is:

Hunt, J. McVicker. The challenge of incompetence and poverty., Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1969. Chapter 6.

A Head Start program that apparently uses a mixed: dominant language approach may be found in Boulder, Colorado. For more information the reader may write:

Head Start  
P.O. Box 1012  
Boulder, Colorado 80302

4. Mixed: bilingual

a. Spanish-English

(1) Bilingual Readiness Program

The Bilingual Readiness Program was developed by Mary Finocchiaro as an experimental program and has since been incorporated in the New York City Public School System. This program provides an interesting example of a mixed: bilingual/bicultural approach in the early school years. The program rests on the thesis that young children can and will learn a second language readily, and that the urban classroom mixture of Spanish-speaking, English-speaking, and Negro-dialect-speaking children can capitalize on the further bilingual and intercultural development of the whole group. Its objectives are (1) to foster bilingual development of children, ages 4 to 6, (2) to promote positive attitudes among native English speakers towards languages and cultures of other groups, and (3) to enhance self-concept and pride in heritage of Spanish-speaking children while teaching them English.

A bilingual specialist meets with kindergarten classes 15 to 20 minutes or more a day. English and Spanish are spoken during these periods. Curricular activities involve listening to stories, storytelling, singing, dramatizing, and playing games. Special emphasis is placed on having Spanish-speaking children help English-speaking children learn Spanish.

Although no empirical controlled research has been carried out on this project, the testimony of participating children, parents, and staff members is very favorable.

Readers may refer to:

Finocchiaro, Mary. Bilingual readiness in earliest school years: A curriculum demonstration project. Bilingual readiness in primary grades; An early childhood demonstration project. (1970). ED 033 248.

(2) Coral Way School

The Coral Way School in Miami, Florida was one of the earliest schools organized in this country whose goal was to mix Cuban-American and Anglo-American children in one class, and to provide equal time for the instruction of English and Spanish (it was the first public school in this country to do so). At present it includes kindergarten through sixth grade and is currently expanding its program to the junior high school level.

The Coral Way School offers an interesting transition from a one-way emphasis on the child's language at the kindergarten level to a mixed bilingual emphasis at the upper grade level. The classes in grades kindergarten to 3 are segregated for Cuban-American children and Anglo-American children. Instruction is in the vernacular, with a gradual increase in time devoted to the second language during the 3-year period. From grades 4 through 6 classes are mixed and are instructed in both languages. Coral Way adopts several of the principles used at Rough Rock that seem to be more and more popular in bilingual classes for young children. The teacher first teaches concepts in the child's vernacular and soon introduces them in the second language. The second language experience is carefully structured, and great care is taken to make sure that one language is associated with one specific person; either the English-speaking teacher, or the Spanish-speaking aide.

The Coral Way School also places a strong emphasis on the bicultural aspects of development. As an example, it makes a special effort to hire teachers with bicultural backgrounds and interests. The principal of the school, J. L. Logan, has recently indicated that Coral Way School has received a grant for teacher training.

Coral Way School welcomes visitors. Further information about the school may be obtained by directing correspondence to:

J. L. Logan, Principal  
Coral Way Elementary School  
1950 S.W. 13th Avenue  
Miami, Florida 31540

The following two references offer additional information concerning the bilingual/bicultural program at Coral Way Elementary School:

- (1) Gaarder, Bruce. Organization of the bilingual school. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23(2).
- (2) Logan, J.L. One will do but we like two. National Elementary Principal, November, 1970.

Other mixed: bilingual preschool programs that have been carried out are:

(1) the Coronado School in Albuquerque, New Mexico, (2) Nye Elementary School in Texas, and (3) the Family Schools in San Francisco, California. For additional information write:

- (1) Coronado School: Albuquerque, New Mexico, or see Ulibarri, Horacio. Interpretative studies on bilingual education, final report. (1970). ED 038 079.
- (2) Nye Elementary School: Travino, Bertha. Bilingual instruction in primary grades. Modern Language Journal, April 1960, 255-256.
- (3) Family Schools: Katz, Lilian and Kriegsfield, Irving. Curriculum and teaching strategies for non-English speaking nursery school children in a family school. (1965). PS 003 924.

Two Head Start schools which appear to use this approach are located in Kansas City, Missouri and in Las Vegas, New Mexico. Readers may write:

- (4) Head Start  
1310 Wabash  
Kansas City, Missouri
- (5) Head Start  
917 Douglas Avenue  
Las Vegas, New Mexico

The following matrices serve as a convenient means to summarize the information on bilingual preschool programs contained in this section. Programs with asterisks clearly indicated a bicultural outlook. While these two matrices are suggestive of programs that have developed over the past 5 years, they are by no means complete.

Spanish-English

	One-way	Mixed
Dominant Language	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Michigan Oral Language Program</li> <li>2. Language and Conceptual Skills Program</li> <li>3. Texas Education Agency</li> <li>4. Formal Language Learning</li> <li>5. Gallup McKinley School</li> <li>6. Head Start, Greeley, Colorado</li> <li>7. Head Start, Calerico, California</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New Nursery School</li> <li>2. Tucson Early Education Model</li> <li>3. Head Start, Boulder, Colorado</li> </ol>
Bilingual	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Early Childhood Education Learning System</li> <li>2. San Diego Inner City Project</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.* Bilingual Readiness Program</li> <li>2.* Coral Way School</li> <li>3. Coronado School</li> <li>4. Nye Elementary School</li> <li>5. Family Schools</li> <li>6. Head Start, Kansas City, Mo.</li> <li>7. Head Start, Las Vegas, New Mex.</li> </ol>

Figure 1

Figure 1: a 2 x 2 matrix of Spanish-English preschool programs classified according to emphasis (dominant language vs. bilingual) and class composition (one-way versus mixed). For definitions of these terms see text, pp. 34 and 35.

Indian-English

One-way

Dominant Language 1. Ute Program

1. \* Rough Rock Demonstration School

Bilingual 2. San Juan School District  
3. Navajo Program  
4. Head Start, Oraibi, Arizona

Figure 2

Figure 2: Indian-English preschool programs classified according to emphasis (dominant language vs. bilingual). All are one-way in composition. For definitions of these terms see text, pp. 34 and 35.

V. Useful Information for Teachers, Administrators, and Aides of Bilingual Preschools

This section is especially useful for teachers, administrators, and aides who are in the process of initiating a bilingual preschool program or who, having established programs, want additional sources of information on bilingual programs or teaching aids. Handbooks and Teaching Aids are the two categories listed. Each category is subdivided into sources: (1) particularly useful for Spanish-speaking classes, and (2) sources designed for Indian-speaking classes. The contents of each item listed are described briefly. In addition, each item will be given a brief evaluation and recommendation. The evaluations and recommendations are based on reading each paper, and are based solely on this author's judgment.

A. Handbooks

1. For Spanish-speaking classes

- a. Zintz, Miles. What classroom teachers should know about bilingual education.

This volume is divided into five chapters. Chapter I emphasizes bilingual education in a cross-cultural perspective, pointing out that the teacher must be continually alert to differences in languages and customs. Linguistic principles and terminology are summarized in Chapter II, and a good contrastable analysis of Spanish and English is provided. Chapter III explains the TESOL method of teaching. Lessons to develop aspects of vocabulary are included in Chapter IV. The emphasis is on oral language, and the media are pictures. Chapter V suggests objectives and principles relevant to the bilingual school; lists sources of materials for Spanish-English bilingual children; and contains an annotated bibliography on language,

special vocabulary problems, and studies in methodology. Although this volume does not deal specifically with the preschool, this book is recommended for preschool. Educators will benefit from its clear exposition of linguistic principles, the contrastable analysis in Chapter II, the specific oral language vocabulary lesson in Chapter IV, and the annotated bibliography in Chapter V.

2. For Indian-speaking classes

- a. Saville, Muriel. Curriculum guide for teachers of English kindergartens for Navajo children.

This preliminary guide was designed for a curriculum in which Navajo is the primary medium of instruction, and English is taught as a second language. Outlined in the guide are distinctive sounds of English which need to be mastered, the basic sentence patterns of English, and a vocabulary sufficient for classroom procedures and beginning reading texts. The content and ordering of the language lessons are based on a contrastable analysis of Navajo and English that allows the prediction and description of problems the speaker of one language will have in learning the other. This guide is recommended as a good basic introduction for teachers planning to teach English as a second language to Navajo kindergartners. No comparable words are provided in Navajo for the English words. The steps and stages of the explanations and of the lessons are clear.

- b. A kindergarten curriculum guide for Indian children:  
A bilingual bicultural approach (NAEYC publication).

This guide emphasizes that the teacher must enhance and utilize the familiar while broadening and enriching the student's experiences relating to the larger American culture.

Information is given on the significance of early learning, physical and mental characteristics of the 5-year-old, articulation of early childhood experiences, and the role of the kindergarten staff. Curricular experiences are outlined for language and conceptual development, social living, math, music, natural and physical concepts, health and safety, and aesthetic appreciation. The importance of supportive services and community and parental involvement are emphasized. The appendix and bibliography contain enrichment materials, guidelines for space utilization, equipment requirements, and examples of forms and materials. This guide exemplifies how a traditional kindergarten may be adapted to be used to instruct Indian children. It is especially recommended for teachers and administrators interested in practical guidelines including suggested time blocks for the daily program, menus, use of space, equipment, simple games, and also contains practical suggestions for teacher aides.

c. Steere, Caryl. Indian teacher-aide handbook.

Although this syllabus is one result of an 8-week program designed to train Indian aides for work on a reservation, it may also be used by persons who will serve as educational aides. The materials are presented to provide the aide with an understanding of child development, all facets of the curriculum, Indian cultural heritage, and community relationships. The concluding section is a compilation of ideas, tasks, and processes related to audiovisual education and communication in the classroom. This manual is recommended for its good comparison of values between the Anglo-American and Indian cultures, its focus on the Indian child's background, and its abundance of practical suggestions.

d. Minnesota Chippewa Indians: A handbook for educators.

Written primarily for elementary and secondary teachers who need to learn more about the Chippewa Indians of northern Minnesota, this handbook includes information on characteristics of culturally disadvantaged pupils, Chippewa characteristics of culturally disadvantaged pupils, Chippewa characteristics, attitudes concerning Indian education, and suggestions for teachers of Indian children. It is recommended as background reading for teachers planning to enter or start a preschool program for Chippewa Indian children.

3. For Spanish-speaking and Navajo-speaking classes

Saville, Muriel and Troike, Rudolph. A handbook of bilingual education. (1970). ED 035 877.

This handbook was written for teachers and administrators of bilingual programs. Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the history and definition of bilingualism and contains basic questions and considerations on the subject. A good review of the linguistic, psychological, and sociological factors involved in bilingualism is found in Chapter 2. In Chapter 3 various aspects of bilingual program design are discussed. Emphasis is placed on needs and resources of the community, parent involvement, and teacher training. The desirable characteristics and the duties of a program coordinator are listed. A list of consultant services is also presented in this chapter. An excellent phonemic comparison between English and Spanish and between English and Navajo is provided in Chapter 4. The relationship between English and Spanish grammar and between English and Navajo grammar is explained. Vocabulary is discussed from the viewpoint that learning a second language involves learning a new cultural framework. Chapter 5 provides considerations of curriculum, language teaching (which the authors believe should be



structured), and includes practical teaching suggestions. Chapter 6 discusses methods of evaluation. The handbook is highly recommended for teachers and administrators of Navajo- and Spanish-speaking classes. Although the information is not focused specifically on the preschool, much information relevant to preschool education may be extrapolated.

B. Teaching Aids

1. For Spanish-speaking classes

- a. Schneider, Velia. Bilingual lessons for Spanish-speaking preschool children. (1969). ED 031 465.

Four sample bilingual lessons designed to help teachers develop their own bilingual programs are presented in this teachers' guide. Lessons are written in Spanish and English for preschool Spanish-speaking children and provide material on the concepts of color, more or less, same and different, relative sizes; and additional information on community helpers, following directions, how plants grow, and parts of the body. Appended are stories and songs in Spanish and visual aids to supplement the lessons. The lessons are recommended as practical guides, which are not theoretical, but may be used as supplements to an existing bilingual preschool program; and are recommended as aids for the teacher to use to develop her own program.

- b. Language, 1966. ED 029 718.

This short paper discusses the importance of preschool language and outlines three lists for teachers concerning language instruction for preschoolers. List 2 provides 17 sounds which Spanish-speaking children often have difficulty pronouncing when they learn English. Fingerplays are provided for learning these sounds. The paper is recommended for teachers of Spanish-

speaking preschool children to help them understand why Spanish-speaking children have difficulty pronouncing English, and to suggest methods to use to remedy the situation.

2. For Navajo-speaking classes

- a. Cata, Juanita. The Navajo social studies project. (1968).  
ED 025 346.

Included in this paper is a preschool teaching unit, "When I Come to School," that is designed to help familiarize the Navajo preschooler with the classroom environment. A packet may be obtained composed of a carton of charts carrying sequences of the Dennis story (Dennis is an imaginary little Indian boy), a taped commentary in the Navajo language, and a self-standing Dennis figure. The unit is recommended as a useful prop for a teacher who is not self-confident at the beginning of the year, and who doesn't speak Navajo.

- b. Goossen, Irvy. Haa'isha' Dine Bizaad Deiddiltah (Let's read read Navajo preprimer). (1968). ED 027 520.

This primer was developed by the Northern Arizona Supplementary Education Center in response to Navajo Indians who wanted to read their own language. It is recommended for the advanced Navajo preschooler about to enter first grade. Available from:

Northern Arizona Supplementary Education Center  
Faculty Box 5618  
Northern Arizona University  
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001 (\$0.75)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Statement of the Problem

- Andersson, Theodore. Bilingual schooling in the U.S. (1970) 589pp. ED 039 527.
- Cardenas, Daniel. Dominant Spanish dialects spoken in the U.S. (1970).  
ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.,  
Washington, D.C. 20036.
- Cazden, Courtney. Approaches to social dialects in early childhood education.  
Paper presented at the Conference of Social Dialects, Center for Applied  
Linguistics, Oct. 31 - Nov. 1, 1969.
- Hess, Karen and Maxwell, John. What to do about nonstandard dialects of  
review of the literature. (1969) 52pp. ED 041 027.
- Malkoc, Anna Maria. NCTE-ERIC report: Bilingual education: A special  
report from CAL/ERIC. Elementary English, May 1970, 47 (9), 713-725.
- Meyerson, Marion. The bilingual child. Childhood Education, 1969, 45,  
525-527.
- Montez, Philip. Will the real Mexican American please stand up?  
Integrated Education, May-June 1970, 8 (3), 43-49.
- Ornstein, Jacob. Language varieties along the U.S.-Mexican border. (1969)  
27pp. ED 032 520.
- Rosen, Carl and Ortego, Philip. Problems and strategies in teaching the  
language arts to Spanish-speaking Mexican American children. ERIC  
Rural Education Clearinghouse, New Mexico State University, Box  
3-AP, University Park Branch, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001.
- Wolfram, Walt. An appraisal of ERIC documents on the manner and extent of  
nonstandard dialect divergence. (1969) 23pp. ED 034 991.

II. Guidelines from Research and Literature

- Anderson, James and Johnson, William. Sociocultural determinants of  
achievement motivation on Mexican-American students. (1968)  
ERIC Rural Education Clearinghouse, New Mexico State University,  
Box 3-AP, University Park Branch, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001.
- Andersson, Theodore. A new focus on the bilingual child. Modern Language  
Journal, 1965, 49, 156-160.

- Barclay, Lisa and Kurcz, Frances. Comparative efficacies of English, Spanish, and bilingual cognitive verbal instruction. (1969) 309pp. ED 030 473.
- Bever, Thomas. Linguistic capacity of very young children. (1968) 16pp. ED 018 796.
- Cervenka, Edward. Administrative manual for inventory of socialization of bilingual children ages 3-10. (Part of the final report, August 1968) 75pp. ED 027 062.
- Cervenka, Edward. Administrative manual for tests of basic language competence in English and Spanish: Level I (preschool): Children ages three to six, English and Spanish versions. Forms A and B Part of final report, 1968. 146pp. ED 027 063.
- Cervenka, Edward. Final report of Head Start evaluation and research 1966-67 to the Institute for Educational Development, Section VI-- The measurement of bilingualism and bicultural socialization of the child in the school setting--The development of instrument. (1970) 236pp. ED 019 122.
- Christian, Chester. The acculturation of the bilingual child. Modern Language Journal, 1965, 49, 160-165.
- Diebold, Richard. The consequence of early bilingualism on cognitive development and personality formation. (1966) ED 020 491.
- Dugas, Don. Research relevant to the development of bilingual curricula. (1967), 6pp. ED 018 298.
- Ervin, Susan. Second language learning and bilingualism. In C. E. Osgood, Psycholinguistics: A survey of theory and research problems. Baltimore, Maryland: Waverly Press, Inc., 1954. Pp. 139-146.
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan. Becoming a bilingual. (1968) 19pp. ED 018 786.
- Espinosa, Renato. Final report on Head Start evaluation and research: 1967-68 to the Office of Economic Opportunity. Section II: Achievement motivation and patterns of reinforcement in Head Start children. (1968) 124pp. ED 023 458.
- Feldman, Carol and Shen, Michael. Some language-related cognitive advantages of bilingual 5 year olds. (1969) 27pp. ED 031 307.
- Fishman, Joshua and Cooper, Robert. Alternative measure of bilingualism. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1969, 8, 276-282.
- Fishman, Joshua. Bilingual education in socio-linguistic perspective. (1970) 14pp. ED 040 404.
- Fishman, Joshua. Bilingualism, intelligence, and language learning. Modern Language Journal, 1965, 49, 227-237.
- Fishman, Joshua. The status and prospects of bilingualism in the United States. Modern Language Journal, 1965, 49, 143-155.
- Friedlander, George. Report on the articulatory and intelligence status of socially disadvantaged preschool children. (1965) 65pp. ED 014 321.

- Gaarder, Bruce. Teaching the bilingual child: Research, development and policy. Modern Language Journal, 1965, 49, 165-175.
- Gumperz, John. On the linguistic markers of bilingual education. Journal of Social Issues, April 1967, 23 (2), 48-58.
- Jacobs. J. Vernon and Pierce, M. Bilingualism and creativity. (1966) 6pp. ED 021 848.
- Jensen, J. Vernon. Effects of childhood bilingualism. Elementary English, 1962, 39, 132-143 and 358-366.
- John, Vera and Berni, Tom. Analysis of story retelling as a measure of the effects of ethnic content in story. (Final report, 1967) 92pp. ED 014 326.
- Johnson, H. Effects of Montessori educational techniques on culturally disadvantaged Head Start children. (1965) 79pp. ED 015 009.
- Kaufman, M. Will instruction in reading Spanish affect ability in reading English? Journal of Reading, April 1968, 11, 521-527.
- Kintsch, Walter. Interlingual interference and memory processes. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1969, 8, 16-19.
- Kinzel, Paul. Lexical and grammatical interference in the speech of a bilingual child. Studies in linguistics and language learning. Volume 1. (1967) 116pp. ED 029 273.
- Lambert, Wallace. A social psychology of bilingualism. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23 (2), 91-110.
- Lambert, Wallace. Psychological approaches to the study of language, Part I: On learning, thinking and human abilities. Modern Language Journal, 1963, 47, 51-62.
- Lambert, Wallace. Psychological approaches to the study of language, Part II: On second language learning and bilingualism. Modern Language Journal, 1963, 47, 114-119.
- Lambert, Wallace and Macnamara, John. Some cognitive consequences of following a first grade curriculum in a second language. Journal of Educational Psychology, April 1969, 60, 86-96.
- Lambert, Wallace and Rawlings, Chris. Bilingual processing of mixed-language association networks. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1969, 8, 604-609.
- Landry, Richard. Bilingualism and creative abilities. (1968) 10pp. ED 039 602.
- Liedtke, W. W. and Nelson, L. D. Bilingualism and conservation. (1968) 8pp. ED 030 110.

- Macnamara, John. The bilingual's linguistic performance: A psychological review. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23 (2), 58-78.
- Macnamara, John. The effects of instruction in a weaker language. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23 (2), 121-136.
- Macnamara, John. The linguistic independence of bilinguals. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1967, 11 (5), 729-736.
- Montez, Philip. An evaluation of Head Start bilingual children. (Summer 1965) 166pp. ED 013 667.
- Mycue, Elena Ines de Los Santos. Testing in Spanish and subsequent measurement of English fluency. (1968) ED 026 193.
- Olmstead, Cameron and Zinser, Melvin. Project Head Start in Central Arizona, Summer '65. (1965) 32pp. ED 024 487.
- Peal, Elizabeth and Lambert, Wallace. The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. Psychology Monographs, 1962, 76, 27.
- Pierce-Jones, John. Final report on Head Start evaluation and research: 1967-68 to the Office of Economic Opportunity: Section 1; Part A: Middle class mother-teachers in an experimental preschool program for socially disadvantaged children. (1968) 59pp. ED 023 454.
- Raverm, Roar. Language acquisition in a 2nd language environment. (1968) 11pp. ED 025 978.
- Riley, John. The influence of bilingualism on tested ability in Spanish and English. (1969) 24pp. ED 026 935.
- Samuels, Marylin; Reynolds, Allan G.; and Lambert, Wallace E. Communicational efficiency of children schooled in a foreign language. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60 (5), 389-393.
- Schnur, James. A synthesis of current research in migrant education. (May 1970). ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education, New Mexico State University, Box 3-AP, University Park Branch, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001.
- Segalowitz, N. and Lambert, Wallace. Semantic generalization in bilinguals. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1969, 8, 559-566.
- Shipman, Virginia. Comparative use of alternative modes for assessing cognitive development in bilingual or non-English-speaking children. Head Start Evaluation and Research Center: University of Chicago. (1968) ED 022 554.
- Spolsky, Bernard. Some psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic aspects of bilingual education. (1968) 12pp. ED 028 412.
- Stedman, James and others. Family factors related to competence in young disadvantaged Mexican American children. Part of the final report on Head Start evaluation and research, 1968-69 to the Office of Economic Opportunity. (1969) 24pp. ED 037 248.

Steglich, W. G. and Cartwright, W. Report of effect of project Head Start, Lubbock, Texas. (1965) 75pp. ED 019 131.

Torrance, Paul. Creative functioning of monolingual and bilingual children in Singapore. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61 (1), 72-77.

Wax, Murray. Indian communities and project Head Start. Summary and observations in the Dakotas and Minnesota, together with an appraisal for a Head Start program among the Potawatomi Indians of Kansas. (1967) 65pp. ED 016 510 and ED 013 670.

Weinreich, Uriel. Languages in contact. The Hague: Mouton and Co., London, England, 1967.

Wilson, Robert. Curricular implications of the relationships between language and thought. (1970) 12pp. ED 038 639.

Wolff, Max and Stein, Annie. Six months later--A comparison of children who had Head Start, summer 1965, with their classmates in kindergarten, a case study of the kindergarten in public elementary schools, New York City, (1966) 100pp. ED 015 025.

Yamamoto. Bilingualism: A brief review. Mental Hygiene, 1968, 48, 468-477.

### III. Bilingual Programs

Amsden, Constance. A reading program for Mexican-American children. (Revision 1, 1965) 69pp. ED 016 757.

Anderson, Merlin. Bilingual education in Nevada. (1967) 2pp. ED 017 387.

Andersson, Theodore. Bilingual schooling: A cross-disciplinary approach. (1970) 9pp. ED 038 628.

Baker, Eva. Experiments in kindergarten reading. (1969) ED 020 873.

Benjamin, Richard. A bilingual oral language and conceptual development program for Spanish-speaking pre-school children. TESOL Quarterly, December 1969, 3 (4), 315-319.

Benjamin, Richard. A bilingual oral language and conceptual development program for Spanish-speaking preschool children. (1969) 9pp. ED 030 087.

Benner, Ralph and Reyes, Ramiro. California plan for education of migrant children. (1967) 25pp. ED 020 831.

Bilingual conceptual development guide--preschool. Michigan Oral Language Series. (1970) 328pp. ED 039 818.

Blanco, George. Texas report on bilingual education for students. (1967) 5pp. ED 017 388.

- Burke, Eleanor. Curriculum guide for child development centers--5 year old program. (1967) 210pp. ED 024 519.
- Clark, Erma. A nursery school on the Ute Indian reservation. Childhood Education, 1965, 41 (8), 407-410.
- Finocchiaro, Mary. Bilingual readiness in earliest years--A curriculum demonstration project. (1966) 124pp. ED 012 903.
- Finocchiaro, Mary. Bilingual readiness in earliest school years: A curriculum demonstration project. Bilingual readiness in primary grades, an early childhood demonstration project. (Final report, 1970.) 272pp. ED 033 248.
- Gaarder, Bruce. Organization of the bilingual school. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23 (2), 110-121.
- Gonsalvez, Julia. Bilingual education in Arizona. (1967) 4pp. ED 017 386.
- Hawkridge, David. A study of selected exemplary programs for educationally disadvantaged children. (1968) 341pp. ED 023 777.
- Haynes, J. Bilingual education in Arizona. (1966) 5pp. ED 017 385.
- Henderson, Ronald. Positive effects of a bicultural preschool program on the intellectual performance of Mexican American children. (1969) 10pp. ED 028 827.
- Hobson, Arline. The Marie Hughes Language Training Model. (1968) 27pp. ED 025 305.
- Hoffman, Virginia. Language learning at Rough Rock. Childhood Education, 1969, 46 (3), 139-145.
- Howe, Elliot. Programs for bilingual students of Utah. (1967) 4pp. ED 017 389.
- Hughes, Marie and others. The Tucson early education model. The National Laboratory on Early Childhood Education (no date given). ED 033 753.
- Hunt, J. McVicker. The challenge of incompetence and poverty. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1969.
- Katz, Lillian and Kriegsfield, Irving. Curriculum and teaching strategies for non-English speaking nursery school children in a family school. (1965) PS 003 924.
- Logan, J. L. One will do but we like two. National Elementary Principal, November 1970.
- Miranda, Consuelo. A bilingual oral language and conceptual development program for Spanish speaking preschool children. (1969) 350pp. ED 034 568.

- Nedler, Sheri. A preschool program for Spanish speaking children: Good Samaritan Center, San Antonio, Texas. (1966) PS 001 378.
- Nedler, Sheri. Early education for Spanish speaking Mexican American children--A comparison of three intervention strategies. (1970) 8pp. ED 037 778.
- Nimnicht, Glen. First year progress report of a project nursery school for environmentally deprived Spanish-American children. (1966) 57pp. ED 010 122.
- Nimnicht, Glen and others. Progress report on research at New Nursery School: Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado. (1967) ED 032 930.
- Ohannessian, Sirarpi. English for American Indians. A newsletter of the Office of the Assistant Commissioner for Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior. (1969) 40pp. ED 027 546.
- Olstad, Charles. Bilingual education in three cultures. (1968) 32pp. ED 027 515.
- Ott, Elizabeth. Basic education for Spanish-speaking disadvantaged pupils. (1967) 23pp. ED 020 497.
- Petrini, Alma Maria. ESOL-SESD guide: Kindergarten. (1969) 143pp. ED 033 748.
- Petrini, Alma Maria. ESOL-SESD guide: Kindergarten, Michigan Oral Language Series. (1970) 145pp. ED 039 817.
- Platero, Dillon. Annual report of Rough Rock Demonstration School. (1969) 43pp. ED 035 690.
- Robinett, Ralph. Biff and Tiff--Miami linguistic readers. (1965) ED 014 721.
- Schneider, Velia. Bilingual lesson for Spanish speaking preschool children. (1969) 121pp. ED 031 465.
- Sepulveda, Betty. Teaching the educationally disadvantaged Hispano child at K-3 level. (1969) 4pp. ED 036 807.
- Smoker, David. Working conference on research activity in the language arts for pre-primary/primary culturally diverse non-English speaking child. (1967) 48pp. ED 013 163.
- Soriano, Jesse. Spanish guide, kindergarten, Michigan Oral Language Series. (1970) 280pp. ED 039 824.
- Texas Education Agency. Preschool instructional program for non-English speaking children. State Board of Education, Austin, Texas 78711.
- Travino, Bertha. Bilingual instruction in primary grades. Modern Language Journal, April 1970, 255-256.

Ulibarri, Horacio. Interpretive studies on bilingual education, final report. (1970) 151pp. ED 038 079.

Valencia, Atilano. Bilingual/bicultural education: A perspective model in multicultural America. (1969) 24pp. ED 028 017.

Varner, Carl. ESL, course of study Operation Head Start. (1965) 55pp. ED 015 820.

Wilson, Robert. Bilingual education for Navajo students. TESOL Quarterly, 1969, 3 (1), 56-69.

#### IV. Useful Information for Teachers and Administrators

Bilingual elementary schooling: A report to Texas educators. (1968) 27pp. ED 026 9.

Carter, T. Preparing teachers for Mexican American children. (February 1969). ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education, New Mexico State University, Box 3-AP, University Park Branch, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001.

Caskey, Owen and Hodges, Jimmy. A resource and reference bibliography on teaching and counseling the bilingual student. (1969) 48pp. ED 032 966.

Cata, Juanita. The Navajo social studies project. (1968) 61pp. ED 025 346.

Crawford, Dean and others. Minnesota Chippewa Indians, A handbook for teachers. (1967) 114pp. ED 017 383.

Goossen, Irvy. Let's read Navajo preprimer. (1968) 47pp. ED 027 520.

Language. (1966) 7pp. ED 029 718.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. A kindergarten curriculum guide for Indian children: A bilingual/bicultural approach. (1968) 145pp. ED 031 318.

Saunders, Jack. Blueprint potential for cooperative teacher education preparation: Utilizing the talented Mexican-American. (February 1969). ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education, New Mexico State University, Box 3-AP, University Park Branch, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001.

Saville, Muriel. Curriculum guide for teachers of English in kindergarten for Navajo children. (1969) 58pp. ED 031 122.

Saville, Muriel and Troike, Rudolph. A handbook of bilingual education. (1970) 69pp. ED 035 877.

Schneider, Velia. Bilingual lessons for Spanish speaking preschool children. (1969) 121pp. ED 031 465.

Steere, Caryl. Indian teacher-aide handbook. (1965) 160pp. ED 024 488.



Ulibarri, Horacio. Bilingual education: A handbook for educators. (1970)  
151pp. ED 038 078.

Zints, Miles. What classroom teachers should know about bilingual education.  
(1969) 51pp. ED 028 427.

## Postscript

The Educational Resources Information Center/Early Childhood Education Clearinghouse (ERIC/ECE) is one of a system of 20 clearinghouses sponsored by the United States Office of Education to provide the educational community with information about current research and developments in the field of education. The clearinghouses, each focusing on a specific area of education, (such as early childhood, reading, linguistics, and exceptional children), are located at universities and institutions throughout the United States.

The clearinghouses search systematically to acquire current, significant documents relevant to education. These research studies, speeches, conference proceedings, curriculum guides, and other publications are abstracted, indexed and published in Research in Education (RIE), a monthly journal. RIE is available at libraries, or may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Another ERIC publication is Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE), a monthly guide to research literature which cites articles in more than 560 journals and covers the field of education. Articles are indexed by subject, author, and journal contents, CIJE is available at libraries, or by subscription from CCM Information Corporation, 909 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

The Early Childhood Education Clearinghouse (ERIC/ECE) also distributes a free, current awareness newsletter which singles out RIE and CIJE articles of special interest, and reports on new books, articles, and conferences. The ERIC/ECE Newsletter also describes practical projects currently in progress, as reported by teachers and administrators. For more information, or to receive the Newsletter write: ERIC/ECE Clearinghouse, 805 W. Pennsylvania Avenue, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

# Leasco INFORMATION PRODUCTS, INC.

## ERIC FACT SHEET

### Pricing

#### Microfiche Duplicates

Standing Orders	each fiche	\$ .089
Special Collections	each fiche	.140
Back Collections	each fiche	.089
On demand, by title	each title	.65

#### Hard Copy, on demand, by title

##### Pages:

1 - 100	\$ 3.29
101 - 200	6.58
201 - 300	9.87
301 - 400	13.16
401 - 500	16.45
Each additional 1 - 100 page increment	3.29

1. Book Rate or Library Rate postage is included in above prices.
2. The difference between Book Rate or Library Rate and first class or foreign postage (outside the continental United States) rate will be billed at cost.
3. No handling charge.
4. Payment must accompany orders under \$10.00.
5. All orders must be in writing.

#### Delivery Schedule for Orders Received before March 21, 1971

1. Standing Orders - estimated initial delivery 15 work days after March 21, 1971
2. Demand Orders - estimated initial delivery 10 work days after March 21, 1971
3. Hard Copy Orders - estimated initial delivery 5 work days after March 21, 1971

Order forms will be available the week of March 8, 1971.

All questions should be directed to J. Peter Maucher, Manager of Institutional Sales, or E. Brian Lewis, Manager of Client Services.

P.O. Box Drawer O Bethesda, Maryland 20014