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## STATJAMENT OF THE: PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to investigate attitudes of parents, whose children were in bilingual programs, toward bilingual education. The study also sought to find if differences existed between income groups in attitudes related to sex, age, mobility, and education.
PROCEDURE
Two hundred and tiwenty persons (or 110 pairs of parents) whose children were in bilingual programs in ten schools in the Albuquerque Public School System comprised the sample. They were divided into two socioeconomic groups bascd on occupation, lower-middle and upper-lower, and subdivided by sex, age, mobility and education: $\Lambda$ sixty-three i.tem questionnaire was administered to each pair of parents by a trained Spanish-speaking interviewer. The questionnaire was simultancously given to both parents at their home. All of the responses were obtained within a two-week period in order to prevent time from being a variable that inght have produced differences in attitudes. The t-tests were used to
determine lifether significant differences existed betweon the two groups.

RESULTS
The mean scores for the total population were high on most of the statements, indicating an homogencous postive attitude toward bilingual education. There were few significant differences between sociocconomic groups. Of the other independent variables, age produced the most significant differences. This indicated that those under age 35 were more positive in their attitudes than were the older group. Those under age 35 spoke less Spanish with their. children but had a more positive attitude toward bilingual education. Amount of education did not seem to alter this attitude significantly. In reveral instances, however, the amount of mobility significantly affected the response toward certain statements. The lower socioeconomic group reflected strenger attitudes on several statoments than the midil.e socioeconomic group. CONCLUSIONS

This study indicated that parents enthusiastically approved of the on-going bilingual and bicultural programs to which their children were being exposed. The attitudes of the parents in this sample demonstrated a strong sentiment for bècoming or remaining a bilingual-bicultural society. Exposure to bilinguai education for both groups produced a highly favorable response.
determinn whether significant differences existed between the two groups.

RESULTS
The mean scores for the total population were high on most of the statements, indicating an homogencous postive attitude toward bilingual education. There were few significant differences between socioecononic groups. Of the other independent variables, age produced the most significant differences. This indicated that those under age 35 were more positive in their atijitudes than were the older group. Those under age 35 spoke less Spanish with their children but had a more positive attitude toward bilingual cducation. Amount of education did not seen to alter this attitude significantly. In several instances, however, the amount of mobilixy significantly affected the response toward certain statementis. The lower socioeconomic group reflected stronger attitudes on several statements than the middle socioeconomic group.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study indicated that parents enthusiastically approved of the on-going bilingual and bicultural programs to which their children were being exposed. The attitudes of the parents in this sample demonstrated a strong sentiment for becoming or remaining a bilingual-bicultural society. Exposure to bilingual education for both groups produced a. highly favorable response.
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## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION AND JUSTIFICATION

The need to communicate with other countrics has become more apparent each day. An expanding technology that draws countries closer together has resulted in a need to recogn:ize diversity of languages and cultural differences which exist throughout the world, and schools need to meet the challenge of preparing students to live and work in such a world. Bilingual education for all children has been postulated as a step in the right direction. Mackey (1909; p. J) points out that:

Ihere are few countries where one cannot find some instances of bilingual education. In the past decade the demand for bilingual education has been increasing in most parts of the world. In the developing or emerging nations the demand is caused by the rise in the status of one or more of the vernacular languages combined with the need to maintain an international language for the purposes of secondary and higher education. In other nations, where the official language has already attained interinational status, a changing climate of tolerance toward minorities has often made it possible for cthnic groups speaking a language other than that of the national majority to organize, with official approval, their own schools ir their own language.

In the United States, social pressure has at least brought about an awareness of the problem. According to

John and llorner (1971, p. xxii):
Much of the present attention directed toward bilingual education in this country has been sparked by the vocal demands of Spanish-speaking and Indian language groups. The poljitical impact of thesc groups is increasingly felt in the national scenc, as they continue to struggle for the maintenance of their linguistic and cultural identities.
It was not until the 1960 's that enough pressure was placed upon legislators to enact bilingual education measures. As a result, bills in 1967 were introduced in Congress to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provjde for bilingual cducation programs. This amendment, known as the Bilingual American Education Act, was passcd as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Educ:ation Act of 1965. It became effective July 1, 1968, and is adminjstered by the United States Office of Education. The purpose of the Nct, according to Andersson and Boyer (1970, p. v), is "to conserve our language resources and to advance the learning of the child, irrespective of language. It secks to make learning the objective of the class room, using other languages in addition to English to accomplish this objective." In 1970, the federal government, as reported in the "Guide" (1970, p. 1), appropriated $\$ 21,250,000$ for bilingual education under Title VII for the purpose of "developing and operating programs for children aged 3-18 who have Iimited Englishspeaking ability."

More recently with the opinion of David Norvell,

New Mexi.co Attorncy Gencral, local concern for bilingual programs has been growing. His opinion (\#71-102), dated August 26, 1971, to Lieutenant Governor Rohert A. Mondragón has focuscd attention on the problem. Implications for the preparation of teacher training "so that they may become proficient in both the English and Spanish languages" is but one of the problems that faces educators today. The fact that these programs are new and experimential has up to now left many questions unanswered. One of the immediate issucs that necds to be dealt with is the role that the community should play, in bilingual programs. Ulibarrí (1970, p. 1) states:

A program that docs not take into account the problems of the community, the needs of the individual, and the aspirations of the people cannot hope to be anything more than a venecr that helps to hide the anomalies of the community and to engender helplessness in the individual. Such a program will never have the support of the community nor the cnthusiasm of the individual.
Uliharrí emphasizes that in any bilingual program consicleration must be given to (1) social class, (2) relative conomic standing of the community and the groups, and (3) cxtent of acculturation (1970, p. 1). John and Horner (1971, p. 187) point out that: The participation of parents is a cricical aspect of bilingual clucation. Although many bilingual educators support this view, they fail to implement it. When programs are planned in isolation from the community, parents' contributions become mercly incidental. Parental participation and community control do not guarantee relicf from
the shortage of qualified teachers, the lack of curriculum materials, limited funds, or from any other of the problems specific to bilingual education. Such participation and control do, however, provide support for the continuity to the schools' efforts.
the majority of the parents of children who are cnrolled in bilingual programs in New Mexico are of Mexican or Spanish descent ('Sitle VIJ, 1967, draft). Therc are also some programs for students from the Indian population. It appears that the population of the Spanish cthnje sroups differs in the degrec of acculturation to the Anglo culture. "One of the more important criteria of assimilation used by sociologists is the degrec to which a group spaks linglish or a forcign tongue, and Mexican Anericans have retained their native language to a rejitively higher degree than most other cthnic groups" (Skraballek, 1971, p. 19). In the Las Cruces, New Mexico, area, for example, many of the parents arc first generation immigrants from Mexico. In the northern part of New Mexico, many of the third and fourth generation residents are descendants of scttlers that came to this country during the time of the conquistadores. The Spanish spoken in this area still retains much of the sixteenth-century flavor. Mcivilliams (1968, p. 74) states in this regard:
"A Castilian of the year 1525," writes Mencken, "would understand a New Mexican far more readily than he would a Spaniard."

Partially becausc of the influx of the Anglo culture in the Alluquerque area, many of the parents whose chilḍren
are in biljngual programs speak little Spanish although they may retain the customs and beliefs of the culture. Mc:Wj1Jiallis (1968, p. 74) points out that:
ln centrill New Mexico, where the Anglo-Ancrican influence is most pronounced, Dr. Campa notes that "the whole manner of living is fast becoming Americanized, in some cases to the point Where Spanjsh is no longer spoken in the home." Where the 1 anguage vanjslies, the traditions and customs are soon forgotien.

Becaluse of the differences in needs within the communtios in the state, one of the questions that still needs to be answered is, how do parents and communities Secl about bilingual] education? More data need to be gathered ill order to determine the kind of bilingual education mode] a purticular commanity requires. There is at least the possibility that each community perceives bilingual cducation and bilingual programs differently.

『ishman ( $1970, \mathrm{p} .8$ ) points out that:
Varjous types of bilingual education programs make implicit assumptions about the kind of language situation that ought to cxist in that comulunity. program developers should make their assumptions explicit and attempt to test the validity of these assumptions by gathering various kinds of data regarding the socictal functions of community languages and cxisting attitudes toward them, both before and during the development of bilingual cducation prograns.
lle also states that:
Gaarder suggests that the way in which a school or community goes about establishing a bilingual program will largely define the structure the program will take.

John and llorner (1971, p. 187) in this regard claim that:

Educational innovations will remain of passing interest and little significance without the recognition that cducation is a social process. Jf the school remains alien to the values and needs of the community, if it is burcaucratically run, then the children will not receive the education they are entitled to, no matter what language they arc taught in.
Thercfore, in keeping with the recommended procedures of experts in the ficid of bilingual education, the attitudes of parents must be surveyed to insure support and relevant programs.

Most bilingual programs in existence today are directed primarily toward "transitional bilingualism" (Fishman, 1970, p. 4) to permit students to "adjust to school" by mastering English. Few programs have majntenance of native language and culture as an ultimate goal. Bruce Gaarder (1970, p. 64), after reviewing the Bililigual Act and project proposals, has stated:

Onc glaring discrepancy with programs funded under Title VII is the inadequate attention, resources, and understanding to the other tonguc, as compared to the attention paid to English.

In other words, the majority of these programs are offerine jusi. cnough bilingual teaching to qualify them for federal funding. According to Gaarder (1970, p. 64):

Their main objective is to use the child's mother tongue for purposes of instruction as a "bridge" to linglish to be crossed as soon as possible
und climinatcd entircly or virtually so in favor of linglish as the sole medium, Although this objective is not wrong in and of $j t s c l f$ and even though it's a considerable improvement over what schools have offered in the past, this program model is far from being a truc bilingual program.

Ganrder states further (1970, p. 172):
lhc Bilingual tiducation Act which provides legislation in support of dual-1anguage pulilic scliooling is written in such terms that permit both the ethnocentrists and the cultural pluralists to see what they want to sce in the act.

While the principles of bilingual education are sound, it continues to be just a "promissory note to the poor" and "a lefthanded contribution to increasingly vocill and organized (though still exploited and dispossessed) Hispanos and Indians" (Fishman, 1970, pp. 8-9).

Rescirch which deals with attitudes and beliefs about minority $]$ anguages is scarce. This becomes most obvious after reading what Gaarder, Fishman, Andersson and others have to say of cducation for the Mexican-American. lducators often do not know if parents in minority language communities want their children to be instructed in the home language in all curriculum areas. Members of a community can nullify the best of programs by their lack of cooperation and more overt forms of resistance if they feel that schools are out to hamper their children. The linguistic features, the linguistic functions within the community, and the attitudes of the .
community toward the standardization of the language necessarily have to be considered before they can be incorporated in the school curriculum (lishman, 1970, p. 8).

Fishman (1970, pp. 8-9) states that the minimal kinds of information necessary in cstablishing an appropriate program for a community arc:

1. A survey that would establish the language and varictics employed by both parentis and children, by societal domain or function.
2. Some rough estimate of the relative performance level in each language, by socictal domain.
3. Some indication of community (and schonl staff) attitudes toward the cxisting languages and varicties and toward their prescnt allocation to domains.
4. Some indication of community (and school staff) attitudes toward changing the existing language situation.

According to Fishman (1970, pp. 8-9), this would perinit "citizens, hoard members, administrators; and teachers" to select the type of program which would fit the necels of the community; both in determining the "cxisting language situation" and in directing the "extent of change in that situation."

## PURPOSE OF THE STLiDY

The gencral focus of this study was to investigate parental attitudes toward bilingual education in selected arcas of a large metrupolitan area in New Nexico. Specifically the study dealt with assessing attitudes of Spanish-speaking and/or Spanish-surnamed parents of
children in schools with bilingual programs toward the following aspects of bilingual education:

1. Attitudes toward the bilingual education program.
2. Nttitudes toward use of Spanish in the curriculum.
3. Attitudes. toward culture.

Some of the questions this study hoped to clarify were:

1. Do attitudes of parents with children involved in bilingual programs differ depending upon socioeconomic status?
2. Do attitudes of parents with children involved in bilingual programs differ depending upon education?
3. Do attitudes of parents with children involved in bilingual programs differ depending upon mobility?
4. lo attitudes of parents with children involved in bilingual programs differ depending upon age?
5. Do attitudes of parents with children involved in bilingual programs differ depending upon sex?
$\Lambda$ list of students was obtained from ten schools that werc in a bilingual program. The schools were divided into two groups, predominantly lower socioeconomic status and predominantly widdle sociocconomic status, based on Warner's occupation scalc (1949, pp. 140-141). These groups were further divided by sex, age, mobility, and education. Each of the fanilics within these divisions was then assigned a number and the random selection was made. The information was
olstained in a two-weck period within the 1971-1972 school year. One hundred and ten pairs of parents were randomly selected, making a total of two hundred and tiwenty persons. Seventy-five more pairs of parents were randomly selected for an alternate list, of which sixtytwo pairs were used. A sixty-threc item questionnaire devised by this investigator was given to the above selected parents, and demographic information was obtained.

## LIMITATIONS

This research was limited to Spanish-speaking and/or Spanisil-surnamed parents of children in bilingual cducation programs in ten schools in the Albuquerque metropolitan arca. Data, computations and conclusions drawn from this study are applicahle to the randomly selected parents of students in only thesc schools, and should not be construed to imply that similar questioning of other parents from other schools would yicld the same results. This is the limitation in the design cf the study.

## DFFINITION OF TERMS

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions have heen used:

Bilingual fiducation: "The concurrent use of two languages as the media of instruction for a child in a given school curriculum except the actual study of the languages themscives" (Gaarder, 1967, pp. 110-120).

Bilingualism: The use of two languages hy an individual, which docs not necessarily imply fluency.

Mexjcan-Anerican: "Refers to persons with Spanish surnames who come from Spanish-speaking parentage" (Skrabanck, 1971, p. 18).

Attitude: "A relatively enduring system of affective, cvaluative reactions based upon and reflecting the evaluative concopts or helicfis which have been learned about the charac. teristics of a social object or class of social objects" (Shaw and Wright, 1967, pp. 10-11).

## SUMMARY

The problem-the need for parental participation as a critical aspect of bilingual education--is presented in this chapter along with a discussion of the study. This study had a particular reference to the Spanish-speaking or Spanish-surnamed parents of children who were enrolled in bilingual education programs in ten schools in Aibuquerque, Now Mcxico. Although there is a paucity of rescarch in this area, Chapter II deals with the pertinent research that has been done.

Chapter Ill describes the selection of subjects, proccdures and analyses employed. A description of the statistical interpretation of the data follows in Chapter IV. The final chapter, Chapter $V$, contains summary, conclusions, and recommendations. Supplementary information is included in the appendices.

## CIIAPTER II

## RI:VIEN OF RELATED LITERATURE AN HIS'TORICAL PARSPECTIVE

According to Theodore Andersson (1971, p. 1), bilingual schools in the United States fall into two periods: from 1840 to 1920 , and from 1963 to the present. In 1840 a large Gcrman-speaking minority in Cincinnati may be said to have had the first bilingual school. During the first period, approximately a million American children reccived a part of their instruction in German as well as in English. Despitc the extent and historical importance of this early bilingual schooling, it failed to provide an authoritative curriculum model for bilingual cducation. The bilingual program, often only a language program, was rarely integrated into cither the philosophy or the practice of school or society. Bilingual schooling disappeared from the United States scenc from the time of World War I until 1963, when the Dade County bilingual program was initiated in Miami, Florida. A Ford Foundation grant provided for instruction in both English and Spanish for Spanish and English-speaking children. As described by Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer (1970, Vol. 1, p. 18), in 1963 the Dade County, Florida, schools undertook a
completely bilingual program in the first, second and third grades of the Coral Way School. This was done to better meet the needs of the children of Cubans who were migrating in large numbers to the Miami area. As Andersson and Boyer ( 1970 , Vol. 1., p. 18) point out:

> At first participation was made voluntary and a few parcnts chosc to have their children follow the all-linglish program. By the end of the first year, however, the bilingual program had won almost unanimous approval and it was no longer necessary to offer the unilingual option. Approximatcly half of the instruction is given in Spanish by competent Cuban teachers and half in linglish by Nmerican teachers. The Ninerican and Culan teachers working in the same grade form a cooperative team and confer frequently in order to coordinate their teaching.
> An annual report by the Dade County Public Schools (1970) showed that there had been a continuous countywide growth in the Spanish-speaking population, thus increasing the need for bilingual programs." According to the report, by Scptember, 1969 , the total number of Spanish-speaking pupils was 49,$552 ; 30,140$ were Cuban refugec pupils and 16,412 from countries in South and Central America, Mexico and lucrto Rico. From 10.5 percent of total school membership in 1965, the number reported by the schools increased to 13.5 percent in 1967 to 19.1 percent in 1969.

Iwo noteworthy programs were begun in Texas in 1964 in the Nyc School of the United Consolidated Independent School District, outside Laredo, and in the San Antonio Independent School District. The United Consolidated Program was begun by the school board and superintendent of the

Dist!ict in the first grades of Nye School. llalf the children werc linglish-speaking and half were Spanish-speaking. In 1965 the program was expanded into the second grades and in 1960 into the third grades. Two other clementary schools in the District hegan bilingual programs in the first grade in 1966 and planned to move up onc grade at a time:

The teaching, in lenglish and Spanish in all clementary school subjects, is done by bilingual. teachers who are native speakers of Spanish and flucnt also in English. They move without effort back and forth in Spanish and Inglish, using cach language about half of the time. In the fourth grade, where the selfcontained classroom changes to the departmental organization, Spanish is continued as a subject onc class period a day. ... An evaluation of learning in mathematics reveals that bilingual learning--for both Anglo and Mexican-American children--gives better results than does lcarning in English alone. The enthusiasm of school hoard, administration, and teachers has cnabled this program to prosper, to attract numerous visitors, and even to entice families to move into the district (p. 19).
The San Antonio bilingual program, originally begun in 1961 as a reading-readiness program in English for Spanishspoaking children, is one of the oldest and best known. It encouraged the preparation of new materials and new teaching techniques, which were used for thirty minutes. in the morning and thirty minutes in the afternoon in two experimental streams of Spanish and English:

By 1967 the success of the program was sufficicntly recognized to permit a somewhat greater cmphasis on the use of Spanish, starting in grades onc and two, and to designate it as a. bilingual program. The teaching in Spanish is all donc by native speakers, either the regular classroom teacher or another who
exchanges with the regular teacher. The subject matter stresses the self-concept and j.ncludes language arts, science, and recently social studics. The relatively limited emphasis on the use of Spanish--some eighty minutes a day--suggests that, in contrast with Dade County and United Consolidated, this program is more concerned with transfer than it is with maintenamee of Spanish as such. Spanish is used essentially to build the sclf-concept of children and to facilitate their learning of English as the cventually exclusive medium of learning (Andersson and Boyer, 1970, p. 19).
$\Lambda$ list of additional bilingual programs in the United States prepared by Mr. Andersson and Miss Boyer (p. 19) consists almost exclusively of public elementary schools in which the two languages taught are Spanish and English. In 1965, bilingual programs began in Pecos, Now Mexico, and in Lidingburg, Texas. Similar programs were started in 1966 in the llarlandale Independent School District of San Antonio; in Del Rio, Jexas; in Zapata, Texas; in Calexico, California; Marysville, California; and Rough Rock, Arizona (Navajo and lingli.sh). The following programs were begun in 1967: Las Cruces, New Mexico; Hoboken, New Jersey; Corpus Christi, Texas; Del Valle, Texas; and St. Croix, Virgin Islands. A steady incrase in the number of bilingual prograns being started can be noted from the Andersson and Boyer monograph (Appendix V, Vol: 1). Under Title VII of the Bilingual Education Act, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Now llampshire, and other states began bilingual programs in 1969-1970. States such as California and Texas expanded thei.r programs to include other cities and areas.

In the hearings held by the Housc and Scnate in 1967 on bills proposed to amend the Elementary and Secondary liducation Act of 1965 in order to assist bilingual cducation programs, a report was made by the office of liducation describing the existing programs which made assistance available to non-English-speaking children. 'Jhese programs included Titles I and II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Adult Education Nct, Title $V$ of the lligher Dducation Act, Title XI of the National Defense Education Act, and the Cuban Refugee Assistance Program. The children participating in these programs include monolingual native speakers of Nerican English, monolingual native spoakers of a language other than English, apparent balanced bilingual speakers, and bilingual speakers who shoiv greater proficiency in one language over the other.

In a statement prepared by A. Bruce Garder (1967) for hearing before the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education of: the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate Nineticth Congress First Session on S. 421, he gave five main reasons which support bilingual education. The first three apply to the child's years in the elementary school:

1. Children who enter school with less competence in English than monolingual Englishspeaking children will probably become retarded in their school work to the extent of their deficiency in English, if English is the solc medium of instruction. On the other hand, the bilingual child's conceptual development and acquisition of other experience and information could procecd at a
normal rate if the mother tongue were used as an alternate medium of instruction. Retardation is not likely if there is only one or very few non-linglish-speaking children in an entireschool. lit is almost janevitable if. the non-linglish language is spoken by large gromps of children.
2. Non-linglish-speaking children come from non-linglish-speaking homes. The use of the child's mother tongue by some of the teachers and as it school language is necessary if there is to be a strong, mutually reinforcing relationship belween the home and the school.
3. Lamgunge is the most important exteriorization or manjfestation of the self, of the humin personality. If the school, the all-powerful school, rejects the mother tonguc of an entire goup of children, it can be expected to affect sorinusly and adversely those children's concept of their parents, their hones and of themselves.

The other two reasons apply when the bilingual child becomes an adult:
4. If he has not achieved reasonible 1 i.teracy in his mother tongue--al)ility to read, write, and speak it accurately--it will be virtually uscless to him for any technical or professional work where language matters. . Thus, his unique potential carcer advantage, his bilingualism, will have been destroyed.
5. Our people's native competence in Spanish and lirench and Czech and all the other 1 anguages and the cultural heritage each language transmits arc a national resource that wo need badly and must conserve by every reasonable means.

## IIII: ROLI: OF [III: PARENT'S ANJ) THI COMMUNITY

bilucation has long been recognized as a joint endeavor of the school and community, for when the school and community join forces much can be accomplished. The Rough Rock Demonstration

School. at Chinlec, Arizona, is a good example of such combined cfforts. Their belicfs are based on the precept that parents have an obligation and a right to see that the education of their children is in step with their needs and aspirations. The program, which pivots on parental involvement and comaunity particjpution, offers Navajo and English content in the curriculum on an equal basis. The curriculum is based on the idea that much of the education of their children can be closely integrated with the Navajo culture. Parents have been hired to teach about the history, language and culture. "From the first day of school at Rough Rock, children have been able to walk into a class room and find their Navajo ways and language not only accepted, but encouraged" (Hoffman, $1969, p$. 141). Present indications are that the success of this program has been attributed to the close cooperation of the community at large along with the parents and teachers. Hoffman states that even though the results appear favorable at this carly stage,
two major points stand in its favor: (1) the Navajo people themselves are closely involved in the education of their own children and (2) at last a Navajo school has totally dedicated itself to experimentation and to documentation of the experimentation for the benefit of the total Navajo community. Present indications are that Rough Rock Demonstration School may be the most hopeful step forward in a century of Navajo education (p. 145).

Similar problems and endeavors for their solution have been encountered by different communities of various ethnic groups. Vázquez ( 1970 , p. 68), reporting on problems facing
luerto Rican children, states that the schools have failed to deal effectively with their needs. It is up to the community to press for more functional programs. lle lists crowded schools, poor physical plants, short time and double sessions, poör reading ability, poor teaching staff and less pupil expenditures as among the most prevalent when comparing the "12 bottom schools" with the "12 top elementary schools" in the Bronx arca. College enrollment for the Puerto Rican is very low (Vázquez, 1970, p. 68). This is true of all Spanish speaking populations. Walter F. Mondale (1970), United States Senator from Minnesota, reports that statistics show that "40 percent of Spanish speaking students in California drop out by the eighth grade: 87 percent of Puerto Ricans over 25 years of age in New York City have rot completed high school; the average number of school ycars completed by the Mexican American in the Southwest is 7.1 years." A survey conducted by the United Bronx Parents showed that Negro and Puerto Ricans more often enroll in vocational high schools, but leave before they can graduate and if they stay, receive a general diploma (Väzqucz, 1970, p. 58).

Contrasting the cohcsive cooperation of community, parents and the school of the Rough Rock Demonstration School, the Puerto Rican community, according to Vázquez, lacks this cohesiveness. Clubs established by Puerto Ricans have remaincd largely social. Listed as factors that have contributed to this lack of organization are: "dispersal of population,
high mobility, lack of political sophistication, and the stultifying effects of cconomic demands in an alien environment" (1. 69). Coupled with the fecling of instability because of "commuter" status, the puerto Rican does not sce himscif as a stable member of the community so he is not likely to participate in community affairs. According to Vizquez, threc factors in the last decade have done much to reverse this trend: "the enactment of antipoverty legislation with its emphasis on community organization and participation, the Negro struggle for Civil Rights, and the politi.cal controversy over the decentralization of public schools" ( p . 69). As a result the puerto Rican community has united to implement the recommendations of Puerto Rican groups which met at the Mayor's Conference of 1967, Aspira Conference on liducation of . 1968, the luerto Rican Forum's 1968 Conference on Economic llevelopment, and the Kings County Puerto Rican Leadership Conference. Major recommendations by these groups have been:

1. to increase and upgrade Puerto Rican and bilingual educational personnel and administrators;
2. to improve school-community relations;
3. to make the curriculum relcvant;
4. to increase Puerto Rican political power and community action;
5. to strengthen adult education;
6. to prepare youth for postsecondary education;
7. to act on the national level (Vázquez, p. 71).

Programs such as those in Dade County, Florida, have evolved through conmunity action and an awareness of the school alluinistration that a new and different kind of curricul. um was needed to meet the needs of the great numbers of (Cubin children who migrated into this country. This program has been enthusiastically approved by the comunity. J. Jee Logan, principal of the Coral Way blementary school in Miami, Florida, states that:

Bilingual and bicultural schools will provide bot:h an immediate and a long-range solution to some of Ancrica's social and economic problems where cultural understanding between cthnic groups is lacking. Realizing this, wise superintendents and school boards with long-range vision will cstablish more bilingual schools. They will soon realize that learning a second language must not be limited only to the affluent. Morcover, I predict that communities themselves will demand that school boards establish more of thesc programs (1970).

In the Southwest, parent and community involvement are being included in bilingual programs. An example of this is the Las Cruces Elementary School District in Las Cruces, New Mexico. This bilingual program is designed to increase achievement levels of $K-3$ pupils, located in two elementary schools funded by Titles II and VII of the Elementary and Secondary fiducation Nct. . The project emphasizes the cultural and linguistic heritage of the area, the structure of the Spanish and linglish languages, bilingual-bucultural interaction, and the cstablishment of optimal learning climates in school, home and community, according to the report of DeBlassic and Stevens (1969). Program components include parental involvement and
teacher in-service training. As is true of almost all programs; longitudinal evaluation is needed to assess the effectiveness of the program.

In a paper presented by Natalie Picchiotti (1.970) at the Third Annual TESOL. Convention in Chicago, she described the work being donc at Lafayette Center, a bilingual elementary school for Sparish-spaking children in Chicago. The primary concern of the Center has been parent involvement, with home visits to the parents by school coinmunity representatives before and after enrollment. The author stresses the jmportance of total community involvement and a recognition of the community's rights concerning its children's clucation.

Parent advisory boards have been established in some programs to integrate the culture and language of the community and conhance the self-concept of the child. In describing existing programs, John and Horner (1971) have outlined parent and community roles. The extent of role involvement ranged from parents involved in policy making and as members of advisory boards to the Rough Pock Demonstration school, which includes an ajl-Navajo seven-member school board that exerts authority on the kinds of: programs and policies to be implemented by the school. Parental involvement at Rough Rock ranges from parents eating in the cafeteria to residing in the dormitorics for several days.

Recognjzing the need of community participation, the government encourages the inclusion of the active role of
paronts and comnunity in such programs. Federal grants now require that parent involvement be writen into the proposals.

## FARIENTAL-COMMUNITY ATTITUDLS TONARD

## BILINGUNL EDUCAITION

A study by R. Pallister and J. Wilson (1970, pp. 56-60) reflects how parental aspiration affects their children's education. The purposc of this investigation was to compare the aspirations, attitudes and knowledge of working class parents with those of middle class parents. Middle class parents were anlitious beyond the intellectual capacity of their children. Working class parents were found to be under-ambitious and less interested in having their children go on to higher education. The authors were alarmed at the extent of difference in knowledge of the cducation system (not the amount of. knowledge) between the middle class and working class parents. "If one can assume that an interest in education and ability to guide the child presupposes a knowledge of the cducation system, the working class clrild is tremendously disadvantaged" (1970, p. 59). If this is so, the parents whosc children are in bilingual education programs may not immediately foresce the advantages of a bilingual program. The authors further point out: "For the very poor, at present, oducation is a luxury; for the middle class, it is an essential, f:or it is education which maintains the middle class children in the middle class" (1970, p. 60). Bilingual education has
for years becn a luxury available only to the middle class. It has only been since 1967 through Titlc VIJ of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments that participation has been extended to American schoul children from non-linglish-speaking homes (Andersson, 1970, p. v.), who for the most part conc from lower socioeconomic groups.

A survey conducted by Anne N. Sharrock (1970, pp. 194201) revealed that parents showed a high degree of interest in cortain aspects of their children's education such as their children's inability to talk "coherently and unselfconsciously." According to the author, "such difficulties of expression would no doubt reflect very restricted linguj.sti.c backgrounds and their parents' similar problems."
l) ebold ( 1968 , p. 239) states that "in some cases, cross-generational (parent-child) conflict is as destructive as that exerted by the conventionalized conflict between the monolingual and bilingual communjities." Extending this view to bilingual education, parents.may be producing not only a restricted linguistic pattern for their children but also an attitude toward another language. The parents' attitudes may be negative to another language because of their difficulty in expressing themselves in that language. Mackey (1970, p. 605) states that "the child's proficiency may be limited in some domains and extensive in others, depending on his pattern of language bchavior outside of school. . .."

The general prestige of the two languages in a bilingual socicty has a definite effect on the students' attitudes toward
the languages. $\Lambda$ study by Lambert and others (1962) of Lilingual Franco-^merican high school students in Maine and Louisiana showed that in Maine, where the prestige of the Frencl community was greater and more stable, the students' attitudes toward French and their achievement were better. Lambert (1969) discussed the Gardner study (1960), which revealed that students with a culturallyfavorablc disposition to learn French had parents who were sympathetic to the French community. Thercfore, it can be concluded that support from parents who understand what the school is attempting to do and why is a vital reinforcement of in-school efforts. The school attempting a bilingual program must consider the attitudes of the parents, know their needs and plan for them, as well as make progress toward influencing family attitudes. Ulibarrí (1970, p. 11) states in this regard that "it is necessary to legitimize the bilingual education program in the eyes of the public, the parents, and the other patrons of the school." John and liorner (1971, p. 1.87) suggest that a critical aspect of bilingual cducation is parent participation. Lducators, however, fail to implement it although they support this view, and as they state (1971, p. 187):

When programs are planned in isolation from the community, parents' contributions become merely incidental. Parental participation and community control do not guarantec relief from the shortage of qualified teachers, the lack of curriculum materials, limited funds, or from any other of the problems specific to bilingual education. Such participation and control do, however, provide support for and continuity to the school's efforts.

Valencia (1970, p. 55), in evaluating the Pecos Language Nrts Program for the Western States Small School Project, found that parents of children in the experimental and control groups "cxpressed a highly favorable attitude toward inclusion of learning materials relative to the culturc of the Spanish-speaking people." Data also revealed "that parents had not experienced much involvement in schoolcommunity activitics related to the Spanish language program. However, the findings indicated an interest in becoming involved" (1970, p. 55). This interest, Valencia claims, was more apparent with parents whose children were in the Spanish language program. He concluded that a favorable attitude existed toward Spanish language instruction among children, parents and teachers.

In another study, Valencia reported that the statistical findings of the Grants Bilingual I:ducation Project reflected favorable parental attitudes. In ascertaining parental attitudes of cthnic group differences toward bilingualism and bilingual education, some thirty-six questions were presented to sixteen Mexican-American parents and thirteen American Indian parents. He reported that:

The response tended to fall quite consistently in the favorable category, with slightly higher means indicated for the experimental groups. While a few variances occurred between the Mexican American and Indian American experimental groups, these were principally of an ethnic nature (1970,

Onc of the most important findings was the "general trend of parental support for bilingual/bicultural education" (1970, p. 43).

In a study done in Scottsbluff, Nebraska, Valencia found that although the experimental and control groups were similar in their responses, both groups indicated positive educational expectations, along with positive attitudes toward the school program, and further that parents in both groups desired greater involvement in the school relating to cducation of their children. Valencia states: "In essence it appears that the bilingual/bicultuxal program did not produce a greater effect on the three attitudinal variables among parents of experimental group children as compared to parents of control group children" (1970, p. 24).

## VARIABLES THAT ARE FOUND TO AFFECT

## PARENTAL ATTITUDES

John and Horner (1971, p. 143) suggest that the complexity of bilingual programs as well as the direction that each will take depend a great deal upon the general and specific goals of the program. Is the program geared for producing greater proficiency in English or Spanish, or both? To what degree is the proficiency of either language important to the parents? What languages are used in the home? Is one more fluently used than the other? What is the language of the community? What is the language of the
parents with their children, their friends, their relatives? In an informal or formal setting do the parents use the sanc language? What is the status of the language in the community? Is it viewed in a negative or positive manner? Does it have utilitarian value on the job, or is its use frowned upon? Thesc are but a few of the questions that must be dealt with. When the child is viewed in a cultural setting the problem poses other questions. Do the parents believe that teaching their native tongue to their children is important to the child's self-concept? What do they value of their culture? Ulibarrí (1970, p. 1) suggests that the minimum considerations for a bilingual program should be "1) social class, 2) relative economic standing of the community and of the groups and, 3) extent of acculturation."

Among other questions that need to be answered, according to Trow (1967, p. 358), are:

To what extent are different parts of the population dissatisfied with their schools? To what extent are they prepared to support larger appropriations or bond issues? What kinds of expenditures--teachers' salaries, supplementary curricular programs, buildings.do they view with greater or less favor?... What is the nature and degree of interest in public education in different parts of the population, and how does this level of interest affect the readiness to support increased appropriations for education, or to take other kinds of dircct action to influence the nature content of public education?

Trow suggests that educators also need to find out if the programs are responding to the sentiments of the tax-paying
public (1967, p. 359). These are but few of the questions that confront cducators today. More and more the public is becoming aware of the kinds of programs that exist which have failed to do the job of educating their children. Gaarder (1964) states that "because it is constantly changing, the dynamics of a two-language community--whether a neighborhood, an entire town, or a region--can never be sufficiently studied" (cmphasis added).

## SUMMARY

A review of the literature indicates that the bilingual programs as well as the writing and research done in this area are very recent. Bilingual education must be a joint endeavor of the school and community as parental attitudes toward bilingual education have a great influence on the child's ability to learn a linguage. Prestige of the language in the community directily affects the child's achievement and attitudes toward the langunge.

There is a vast area of information yet to be investigated in a study of bilingual programs. Much of this information concerns the relationship between the school and the parents, and more specifically, parental attitudes toward bilingual education. The needs and linguistic patterns of the communities should be investigated before bilingual programs are started. On-going programs should be evaluated to assure that the objectives are being met.

## CHAPTER III

## MLTTHOD AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the selection of subjects, procedures and analyses employed.

SUBJECTS
The subjects used in this study were Spanishsurnamed and Spanish-speaking parents of students who were enrolled in bilingual programs in Albuquerque, New Mcxico. $\Lambda$ list of students was obtained from ten schools where bilingual prograns are in operation. The schools were divided into groups according to what was thought to be predominantly lower sociocconomic status and predominantly midlle socioeconomic status. Each of the families within these divisions was then assigned a number and the random selection was made. Since it was anticipated that the majority of the families would be classified as lower sociocconomic status, the above procedure was deemed necessary. It reduced the bias which would have occurred had large numbers of lower socioeconomic status subjects interviewed and then discarded to equalize the size of the two groups. One hundred and ten pairs of parents were randomly selected, making a total of two hundred and . a twenty persons. There were fifty-five pairsin the lower
sociocconomjc group and fifty-five pairs in the middle group, bascd on Warner's occupation scale (1949, pp. 140-141). Scventy-five nore pairs of parents werc randomly selected fur an alternate list. Sixty-two were used from this alternate list as some of the original group had moved away, did not wish to be interviewed, or did not have a husband living at hone.

## INS'TRUMENT

A sixty-threc item questionnaire measuring parental attitudc toward bilingual education was devised by this investigator (Appendix 1). The score results of parental attitude tovard bilingual education provided the following three areas for analysis, and were expressed in terms of the mean score:

1. Attitudes toward the bilingual education progran.
2. Attitudes toward use of Spanish in the curriculum.
3. Attitudes toward culture. (Appendix 2)

This questionnaire was first submitted to a committee of cxperts to determine its content validity. The instrument was developed following general Likert procedures (Shaw and Wright, 1967, p.24), and was constructed on a sixpoint response scale from "Strongly Agree" through "Strongly Disagree." The items measuring a positive statement were rated from the high of 6 through 1 , and the negatively stated items were measured 1 through 6. To achieve internal consistency, scveral items measuring the same attitude were
stated differently (Appendix 3).
Information on demographic variables was obtained from the respondents prior to administration of the interview questionnajre. The demographic variables studied in relation to language use were: socioeconomic status (SES), scx, age, birthplace of parents and grandparents (Appendix 4). The statistical procedure used in the present investigation consisted of the use of the $t$-test to determine whether a significant difference existed between two groups. The $t$-test was applied to each statement, as it was believed inportant to analyze the groups within each item.

## PROCEDURE

bighteen male and female Spanish-surnamed and bilingual individuals were hired to interview the parents. The factor of sex of the interviewer was important; it was practical and necessary to have women interviewed by women and men by men.
$\Lambda 11$ interviewers were trained through group meetings and by administering the questionnaire to each other. $\Lambda$ male interviewer along with a female interviewer simultancously interviewed the parents in order to avoid discussion of the questionnaire between the parents. A letter of explanation was sent to each parent, advising that an interviewer would be contacting them (Appendix 5). Wherever a telephone number was available, the interviewer used this as a means of prior contact with the parents. The male and female interviewer working together arrived
at the prescribed time, and each simultaneously interviewed the parent of the same sex in different parts of the home, in order to assure that no discussion of the items nor of the responses could take place. The interview was made in the home to place the respondent at ease in familiar surroundings.

In a case where only one parent was available, the interviewer administered the questionnaire, but it was later discarded. Only the questionnaires with responses froin loth parents living in the same domicile were kept as part of the investigation. The responses were divided i:2to two sociocconomic groups based on Warner's sociocconomic scale of occupations (1949, pp. 140-141).

## SUMMARY

Two hundred and twenty parents were randomly selected from ton bilingual schools in the metropolitan area of Albuquerque. The parents were divided into two socioeconomic groups: onc hundred and ten parents in the lower socioeconomic group and one hundred and ten parents in the middle group. A sixty-three item questionnaire, validated by a cominittee of experts, was given to the parents within a twoweck period by cighteen trained interviewers. Demographic variables of SES, age, mobility, education and sex were made part of the information to be analyzed.

## CHAPTER IV

## THE ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The following interpretations are based upon this investigator's analysis of each question and how the results reflect this interpretation. Each of the questions was designed in such a way as to have certain implications toward bilingual education. These implications are reflected in the interpretations following.

In order to extract the maximum information from the questionnaire, t-tests were considered to be the most viablc method of analysis to determine differences between groups. These t-tests were presented by individual questions, and a set of analyses included the specificd demographic variables which grouped the subjects within each question.

The following graphs are histograms of the responses to questions relating to the demographic variables considcred to be of greatest relevance. The vertical axis in. all of the histograms refers to the mean numeric value within cach of the groups to the question. The absolute value of these responses may be found in a table presented immediately below the histogram. The horizontal axis refers; to the individual demographic variable, a description
of which is found sequentially in the table immediately below the histogram. For instance, the mean for the total population for the first statement equals 1.83 out of a possible maximum of 6.00. The mean for the lower SES group is 1.87 and the mean for the middle SES group is 1.78 , etc. This sequential pattern continues for all the demographic varialiles presented and is represented by the letters " $A$ " through " $K$ " on the horizontal axis of the histogram.

The "Less Educated" and "More Educated" sample labels refer to those subjects who are below or above 9.8 years of school, respectively. "Stable Population" and "Transient" sample labels refer to those subjects who lived more than half or less than half their lifetime in the community. When the word "significent" is found below the specific t statistic presented for comparing any two groups, it refers to significance at or below the .05 level of confidence. In order to achieve this level of significance, a $t$ of 1.66 was required in all cases.

Statement 1
TIIE SIANISII SPIAKING CHILD SHOULD BE TAUGITT ONLY IN SPANISII.



The low mean of 1.83 indicates that respondents were in disagreement with the statement. The standard deviation was small, which also indicates that the group was homogeneous in its disagreement with the statement. A conclusion can be drawn that parents believed that the English language should also be taught. There were no differences in attitude which were affected by the demographic variables.
Statement 2
III: SPANJSII SPEAKING CHILD SHOULD BE TAUGHT ONLY IN ENGLISH.


## Different Groups

## Mean:

Standard Deviation:
t Statistic

| Total |
| :---: |
| copula- |
| tin |

$$
5.26
$$

| L |
| :--- |
| $\underline{S}$ |

Lower Income Sample
5.28

$$
.70
$$

.74
. 39

| Medium |
| :--- |
| Income |
| Sample |

5.25
.65
Under
Age 35
Sample
Over Age 35 Sample
5.38
5.15
.73 .69

| Male |
| ---: |
| Sample |

5.26
.78

Less
Educated Sample
5.30
.55

More
Educated Sample
5.23
.82
2.46 Significant

Stable
Population Sample
5.25 .65

Transient Sample
5.28
.74
t Statistic .39

This statement with a high mean of 5.26 indicates a disagrecment, and it was rated high (6) for "strongly disagree." That subjects are strongly opposed to their children being taught in one language only is a conclusion which can be drawn from their replies to Statements 1 and 2. 'Jhere was a significant difference between the age groups. The mean for the group under age 35 was 5.38 , and the mean for the group over age 35 was 5.15, with the standard deviation of .73 and .69 respectively. The $t$-test showed a significant difference which indicates that the younger group of subjects responded significantly more positively to the statement than did the older group of subjects. I:ducational achievement did not change the at titude; neither did mobility nor SES.

Statement 3
TIII: SPANISH SPLEAKING CHILD SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN ENGLISH
AND SPANJSH IN EQUAL AMOUNTS.


|  |  | Differen | Groups |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Population | Lower <br> Income <br> Sample | Medium Income Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| Mc:m: <br> Standard | 5.32 | 5.44 | 5.21 | 5.38 | 5.26 |
| heviation: | . 92 | . 80 | 1.01 | . 94 | . 92 |
| t Statistic | $\begin{gathered} 1.84 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | . 94 |
|  | Malc <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample | Less Educated Sample |  | More Educated Sample |
|  | 5.43 | 5.22 | 5.55 |  | 5.09 |
| . | . 85 | . 9.8 | . 57 |  | 1.12 |
| t Statistic | $\begin{gathered} 1.69 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 3.85 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
|  | Stable <br> Population <br> Sample |  | Transient Sample |  |  |
|  | 5.21 |  | 5.44 |  |  |
|  | 1.01 |  | . 80 |  |  |
| t Statistic | $\begin{gathered} 1.84 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |

This statement produced a high mean of 5.32 for the entire group. The lower income group felt more strongly about this statement than the middle income group. The lower income group's mean was 5.44; the middle income group's mean was 5.21. Standard deviation was . 80 and 1.01 respectively for the two groups. T-test showed a significant difference between the income groups. There were no differences between age groups. There were, however, differences between sexes, the male subjects being more in favor of the statement than the female subjects.

The malc mean was 5.43 , as opposed to 5.22 for the females. The standard deviation was .85 and .98 respectively. T-test showed a significant difference. Male subjects, and those in lower income groups, indicated the stronger desire for Spanish and English being taught in equal amounts. From the data, the conclusion can be drawn that thesc groups favored a Spanish language component of equal time in a bilingual program. Significant differences between groups affected by education and mobility were noted. The transient groups and the less educated groups had a more positive attitude toward this statement.
Sitatement 4
Sl'ANISII ANI JiNGIISH SHOULD BE TAUGHT TO SPANISH SPEAKING CIIlIDREN BI:GINNING FROM THE FIRST GRADE.


Different Groups

|  | Total <br> Popula- <br> tion | Lower <br> Income <br> Sample | Medium <br> Income <br> Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Mean: | $\mathbf{5 . 3 4}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Male <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample | Léss <br> Educated <br> Sample | More <br> Educated <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.15 | 5.24 | 5.50 | 5.18 |
| .76 | 1.01 |  | .74 |


| t Statistic | 1.73 <br> Significant <br> Stable <br> Population <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: |

5.32
. 84
2.66

Significant

Transient
Sample
5.36
.95
t Statistic .37

A high mean of 5.34 for the total population indicated that the subjects strongly favored both languages being introduced in the first grade. There were no significant differences between income groups or age groups, but there was a significant difference between sexes. The male population mean was 5.45 and the female mean was 5.21, a significant difference of 1.73 when the $t$-test was applicd. This indicated that male respondents were more strongly in favor of both languages being taught carly in the curriculum than were the females. Level of cducation produced a significant difference between the groups, with the less educated subjects more positive in their responses than the more educated subjects. Mobility had no effect on attitudes concerning this. statement.

## Statement 5

SPANISHI ONLY SIIOULD BE TAUGHI TO SPANISH SPEAKING CHILDREN BLGINNING FROM TIIE IPIRST GRADE.


Different Groups


The high mean of 5.15 for the total population of this statement indicated that the population strongly disagreed. This statement, when compared with statement 1 , indicated that the respondents were consistent in their attitudes. There were no significant differences among groups affected by any of the demographic variables.

Statement 6
ENGILISII ONLY SHOUIDD B1: TAUGHT TO SPANISH AND BENGLISHSIP:AKING CIIJIDRIEN BLGINNING FROM THE FIRST GRADI:
1


Different Groups

| Total <br> Popula- <br> tjon | Lower <br> Income <br> Sample | Medium <br> Income <br> Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Samp1e | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5 . 1 . 5}$ | 5.09 | 5.20 | 5.27 | 5.02 |
| 1.02 | 1.20 | .80 | .91 | 1.13 |


| Mc:an: <br> Standard | 5.1.5 | 5.09 | 5.20 | 5.27 | 5.02 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| loviatjon: | 1.02 | 1.20 | . 80 | . 91 | 1.13 |
| t Stutistic |  |  |  |  | cant |


| Malc <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample | Less <br> Educated <br> Sample | More <br> Educated <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.01 | 5.28 | 5.15 | 5.14 |
| 1.12 | .88 | 1.10 | .93 |

t Statistic
2.00

Significant
Stable
Population
Transient
Sample
5.20
5.09
.80
1.20

## t Statistic

This statement has a relatively high mean of 5.15.
The conclusion can be drawn from the data that the groups had a positive attitude toward bilingual education.

There were significant differences between the age groups and sex groups, with the younger subjects and the females responding more positively to the statement. Responses were not affected by any of the other demographic variables. Statement 7

THI ENGLISH SPEAKING CIIILD SHOULD BE TAUGHT ONLY IN SPANISHIN THI FIRST GRADE:


## Different Groups

|  | Total Population | Lower Income Sample | Medium Income Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sampic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neall: <br> Standard | 1.95 | 2.07 | 1.82 | 2.02 | 1.87 |
| Deviation: | . 98 | 1.16 | . 75 | . 87 | 1.09 |
| t Statistic |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.92 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  | 1.09 |  |
|  | Male <br> Sample | Female <br> Samp1c | Less biducated Sample | More Educated Sample |  |
|  | 2.02 | 1.87 | 1.99 | 1.90 |  |
|  | 1.10 | . 85 | 1.03 | . 93 |  |
| t Statistic | 1.09 |  |  | . 68 |  |

Stable
Population Sampie
1.82

Transient Sample
2.07
1.16
t Stiatjstic
1.92

Signific:ant
The low mean of 1.95 indicated that the total population strongly disagreed with this statement. There were significant differences of 1.92 between income groups when $t$-test was applied. No major differences were noted between groups of varying education. A mean score of 2.07 for the transient sample showed a more negative attitude toward this question. Age and sex of the population did not affect attitude.

Statement 8
THF İNGLISH SPFAKING CHILD SHOULD BE TAUGHT FNGI.JSH AND SPANISII IN HQUML. AMOUNTS IN TIE FIRS'I GRADL:


The total population had a high mean of 5.08 . Males and the under age 35 groups agreed more strongly that the linglish speaking child should be in a bilingual program. There was a significant difference in the group affected by mobility. The transient sample felt more strongly about this statement, as did the lower income group. Amount of cducation did not affect this attitude significantily. Statement 9

SPANESII ONJ.Y SIOOU,D IIAVE BIEN TAUGHT WHEN YOU WERE IN 1


Different Groups

|  | Total Population | Lower <br> Income <br> Sample | Medium <br> Income <br> Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mcan: <br> Standard | 1.87 | 1.95 | 1.78 | 1.95 | 1.79 |
| Deviation: | . 82 | . 90 | '. 72 | . 74 | . 89 |
| t Statistic |  | 1.57. |  |  | 1.39 |
|  | Male <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample | Less Educated Sample |  | Morc ${ }^{\circ}$ Educated Sample |
| Mean: <br> Standard | 1.87 | 1.86 | 1.86 |  | 1.87 |
| lleviation: <br> t Statistic | . 82 | 8 . 81 | . 92 | . 08 | . 70 |

Stable
Population
Sample

1. 78
. 72

Transient
Sample
1.95
. 90
t Stiatistic
1.57
$A$ low mean of 1.87 indicates strong disagreement with this statement. It indicates that the population did not want Spanish only. It is also indicative that their responses are remaining consistent in that they also value linglish in any curriculum. None of the demographic viriables produced a significant difference among the groups, which indicates that all subjects did not want Spanish only in the curriculum.

Stitement
10
I:N(H,JSH ONI,Y SHOULI) BE TAUGIHY. JN THE ELI:MIENTARY GRADES.


|  | ?otal <br> Dopula- <br> tion | Lower Income Sample | Medium Income Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mcan: | 5.21 | 5.26 | 5.15 | 5.24 | 5.18 |
| Standard lleviatious | . 87 |  |  |  |  |
| t Statistic | . 87 |  | . 80 | . 92 | 82 |


| Male <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample | Less <br> Educated <br> Sample | More <br> Educated <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5.22 |  |  |

t Statistic. $\quad 15$
Stable
population - Sample
5.15
.89
1.40

Transient Sample 5.26
t. Statistic .93

A high mean of 5.21 for this statement indicated that the total population strongly disagreed with this statement. Again, comparing it with the previous statement, this indicated that the population was not satisficd that only one language should be taught in the schools. Demographic variables did not affect attitudes of the subjects.

Statement 11
SPANISH AND ENGLISII SHOULD BE I'AUGIIT TO ENGLISH SPEAKING CIIILIRLEN BEGINNING FROM THE FIRST GRADE.


t Statistic
.98

Stable
Population Sample
5.19
1.02
1.90

Significant

Transient Sample
5.16
1.04
t Statistic .20

A high mean of 5.18 for the total population for this statement indicated a strong agreement with the statement. When comparing it to statement 8 it indicated that the subjects were consistent in their attitude that the linglish-speaking child should be taught both languages from the very beginning of their schooling. Amount of education affected the group attitudes, with the less educated responding more positively than the more educated. None of the other variables produced a significant difference.

## Statement: 12

Sl'ANISII SHOULD NOT BE TAUGIIT IN THE DLEMI:NTARY GRADLES AS CIILIMRI:N WILL JIEARN TO SPGAK WI'TH AN ACCENT. 1


Different Grouns

Mean:
Standard lleviation:
t Statistic

Male
.09

$$
09
$$

Sample
lemale Samp1e

Total Jower
Population
5.26
5.20
.68
Income
Sample
5.26
.71
.68

$$
5.32
$$

.74
Medium
Under Income Age 35 Sample Sample

Over Age 35 Sample
5.25
.74
5.40
5.12
.69
.77
2.86 Significant

Less
I:ducated Sample
5.31

More Educated Sample
. 58
5.21
.82
1.23

Stable
puiation
Sample
Stable
Popin]ation
Sample
Stable
piliation
Sample
5.25
.74
$\frac{\text { Transient }}{\text { Sample }}$
5.26
.68
t Statistic
$\Lambda$ high score of 5.26 indicated the majority of the responses ware in strong disagreement with this statement. There was a significant difference as indicated by t-test between age groups. The group under 35 reacted more strungly against the statement. Education, mobility, sex and Sl:S wore rot significant factors.
Statement 13
THI I:NGIISII SPIIAKING CIILD SHOULD BI: TAUGHT TO SPI:AK SPANISH DLUHENTLY.


|  | Total. J’opulation | Different Groups |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lower Jncome Sample | Medium <br> Income <br> Sample | Under <br> Ape 3 <br> Samp1 | Over e $\quad$ Age 3 Sampl |
| Mcan: <br> Standard | 4.81 | 4.80 | 4.83 | 4.90 | 4.73 |
| Deviation: | 1.19 | 1.21 | 1.16 | 1.08 | 1.30 |
| t Statistic |  | . 17 |  | 1.07 |  |
|  | Malc <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample | Less Educated Sample |  | More Educated Sample |
|  | 4.83 | 4.80 | 5.09 |  | 4.54 |
|  | 1.26 | 1.11 | 1.01 |  | 1.28 |
| t Stutistic | . 3.7 |  | $\begin{gathered} 3.55 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |

Stable

| Population |
| :---: |
| Sample |

4.83
1.16

Transicnt Sample 4.80 1.21
t Statistic
The mean of 4.81 indicated that the subjects were in favor of the statement. This indicated that they believed an equal opportunjty to learn another language should be provided for all children. There was also a significant difference between groups affected by education, with the less cducated scoring higher than the more educated subjects. Other demographic variables did not provide significant differences. Statement 14

THI: TEACHING of SPANISH TO SPANISH SPEAKING CHJIDREN WIII, MAKI: THIBM FIILL DI FFIBLENT FROM THE REST OF THE



Differont Grouns

|  | Total <br> Popula- <br> tion | Lower Income Sample | Medium <br> Income <br> Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean: <br> Standard | 5.13 | 5.17 | 5.08 | 5.42 | $\frac{4.84}{4 .}$ |
| heviation: <br> r: Statistic | 1.04 | 1.00 | 1.07 | $\begin{gathered} .78 \\ \text { Sig } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.24 \\ & \text { icant } \end{aligned}$ |



The high mean of 5.13 for the total population indicated that the subjects strongly disagreed with this statement. There was a significant difference between age groups, Those subjects under 35 had a more negative attitude than those over 35. Amount. of education, mobility. and SLS did not affect the groups' responses. Statement 15

SCHOOL SHOULD NOT BL CONDUCTED IN SPANISH AFTER THE TIIJRI) (iRADE.
I



Statement 16
IIH: TIACIING OF SPANISH TO THE SPANISH SPEAKING CHILD INIILRIIIRLS IN COMMUNICATING WITH THOSE WHO DO NOT SPEAK SPANISII


Differcnt Groups


This statement produced a 5.02 response for the totiad population which indicated the subjects were not in agreement with the statement. Denographic variables did not produce sjgnificant differences.
Statement 17
'III: Tl:ACHING OF SPANISH TO 'III: SPANJSH SPI:AKING CHJJd AIDS IN HIS COMMUNICATING WITH OTHERS.


Different Groups

| * | Total Popula- $\qquad$ | Lower <br> Inconc <br> Sample | Medium Income Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mcan: | 5.28 | 5.26 | 5.30 | 5.34 | 5.23 |
| Standard Deviation: | . 91 | . 93 | . 88 | . 96 | . 86 |
| t Statistic |  | . 30 |  | . 88 |  |
|  | Male <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample | Less Educated Sample | $\underline{S}$ |  |
|  | 5.24 | 5.33 | 5.43 |  |  |
|  | 1.00 | . 80 | . 77 |  |  |
| t Statistic | . 74 |  | 2.40 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Significant ${ }^{\text { }}$ |  |  |

Stable Population Sumple

Transient
Sample
5.30 5.26
.88
.93

## t Statistic

^greoment with this statement produced a 5.28 mean for the total population. The group was fairly uniform in the attitude with the exception of those in the less education sample being more positive than those with more education. The rest of the demographic variables did not produce a significant difference. Statement 18

THE TEACHING OI SPANISH TO THE SPANISH SPEAKING CHILD II:IPS HM RILLATL: IDIAS AND I:XPERIENCES OF THE HOME WITH
THOSI: IN TH: SCHOOL.


| Different Groups |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Population | Lower <br> Income <br> Sample | Medium Income Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| Mean: <br> Standard | 5.28 | 5.30 | 5.26 | 5.42 | 5. 15 |
| leviation: | . 83 | . 84 | . 83 | . 77 | . 92 |
|  |  | . 32 |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.38 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  |


| Male <br> Sample | Fomale <br> Sample | Less <br> Educated <br> Sample | More <br> Educated <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.35 | 50.36 | 5.20 |  |
| 0 | .48 |  | .76 |

1.46

Stable population Sample 5.26
$\qquad$
.83
$t$ Statistic 0.48
l.ess Elucated Sample
5.36
.75

More Educated Sample
5.20
.90
$\qquad$
r
TransientSample

$$
5.30
$$

$$
.84
$$

t Statistic .32

A high mean of 5.28 for the total population indicated that the subjects strongly agreed with this statement. A significant difference was produced between age groups. A mean of 5.42 for the under 35 group and a mean of 5.15 for the over 35 age group resulted in a significant difference of 2.38 between these groups. This suggests that-parents consider the experiences of the school and home closcly related and of importance. Other demographic variables did not affect attitudes.

Statement 19
fIIE TIEACIING OF SPANISII TO TIIE SPANISH SPEAKING CHILD INIEEIH:RES WITH TIIS ADJUSTMEN'T IN THE SCHOOL SETTING.



Statement 20
SPANISII SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN HIGH SCHOOL ONLY.


Different Groups

|  | Total Popula- $\qquad$ | Lower lncome Sample | - Mediun Income Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mcan: <br> Standard | 5.28 | 5.22 | 5.35 | 5.45 | 5.11 |
| Deviation: | . 86 | . 94 | . 77 | . 75 | . 97 |
| t Statistic |  | 1.10 |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.93 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Male <br> Sample | Ficmale <br> Sample | $\begin{array}{r}\text { Le } \\ \text { Educ } \\ \text { Sam } \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { re } \\ & \text { ated } \end{aligned}$ ple |
|  | 5.20 | 5.36 | 5 |  | 27 |

$$
.97
$$

.72
.81
.90
t. Statistic
1.41
.16
Stable
Population
Sample
Transient Sample
5.35
5.22
.77
.94
t Statistic
1.10

This statement yields a high mean of 5.28 , which indicated that the total population is not in agreement
with this statement. There is a significant difference between age groups, those under 35 feeling more strongly against this statement than those over 35. This would indicate that the group believed that Spanish should be continued throughout, from kindergarten through 12 grades. None.of the remaining demographic variables affected attitude.

Statement 2]


Different Groups

|  | Tota] <br> Pcpula- <br> tion | Lower Income Sample | Medium Income Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean: <br> Standard | 5.24 | 5.17 | 5.30 | 5.29 | 5.18 |
| Deviation: | . 96 | 1.09 | . 80 | 1.03 | . 89 |
| t Statistic | Malc Samp1e | $\begin{aligned} & \quad .98 \\ & \text { Female } \\ & \text { Sample } \end{aligned}$ | Less Educated Sample |  | .84 More Educated Sample |
| - | 5.17 | 5.30 | 5.26 |  | 5.21 |
|  | . 97 | . 94 | 1.02 |  | . 90 |
| t Statistic |  |  |  | . 42 |  |

## 73

Stable
Population
Sample
5.30
.80

Transient
Sample
5.17
1.09
t Statistic
This statement does not indicate that there were significant difforences of opinion among the subjects. The high mean of 5.24 does indicate, however, that they were opposed to this statement. As reflected in the previous responses, the teaching of Spanish is strongly urged throughout the school curriculum. Demographic variables did not affect attitudes.
Statement 22
TliACHERS shour, n NOT ALLOW CHILDREN TO SPEAK SPANISH
IN dHE SCHOOL. IN Jille scillool.


Different Groups

| ' | Total <br> Popula- <br> tion | Lower Income Sample | Medium <br> Income <br> Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean: Scandard | 5.43 | 5.39 | 5.46 | 5.55 | 5.31 |
| Deviationic | . 82 | . 84 | . 79 | $\begin{gathered} .81 \\ \text { Sig } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.86 \\ & \text { icant } \end{aligned}$ |


| Malc <br> Sample | Fomale <br> 5.47 | Less <br> Sample <br> Sampled | More <br> Sampated <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .86 | 5.38 | 5.50 |  |

t Statistic
Stable
Population Sample
5.46
.79
1.32

Transient
Sample
5.39
.84
t Statistic
.66
A high mean of. 5.43 for the total population indicated that subjects were strongly opposed to this statement. This statement produced a significant difference between age groups. Those under 35 had a high mean of 5.55 , and thosc over 35 , a mean of 5.31 . T-test reflected a significant difference of 2.10 , showing rejection of this statement. Other demographic variables did not affect attitudes. Statement 23

ENGLISII SPEAKING CIIIIDRIEN SHOULD LEARN SPANISH.



Statement 24
THI: SPANISII LANGUAGE IIAS NO VALUE IN THIS COUNTRY.


|  | Different Groups |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total <br> Popula- <br> tion | Lower <br> Income <br> Sample | Medium Income Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| Mcan: <br> Standard | 5.54 | 5.49 | 5.58 | 5.65 | 5.43 |
| Deviation: | . 89 | . 87 | . 91 | . 95 | . 86 |
| t Stutistic | . 75 |  |  | $1.78$ |  |
|  | Male <br> Sample | Female <br> Sumple | Less Educated Sample | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Edt } \\ \text { Ed } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ted <br> c |
|  | 5.42 | 5.65 | 5.55 | 5.52 |  |
|  | 1.06 | .67 | . 80 | . 97 |  |
| t Statistic | $\begin{gathered} 1.98 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | . 30 |  |

> Stable

Population
Sample
5.58

Transient
Sample
Sample
5.49
.87
t Statistic

The high mean of 5.54 indicated a strong reaction to this :statement. Two significant differences were noted. The female subjects and those under 35 years of age strongly disagreed with this statement. The remaining demographic variables did not affect attitudes.
Statement 25
ALL SPANISH SPEAKING PARENTS SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE TEACHING Of: T:NGLISII ANI) SPANISH IN THE SCHOOLS.


Different Groups


Stable
population Sample
5.56
.68

Transient Sample

$$
5.45
$$

.85

## t Statistic

$$
1.13
$$

A high mean of 5.50 along with a small spread of the standard deviation indicated that the groups wore fairly homogeneous in their attitudes. There was a significant difference between age groups, those under 35 feeling more strongly in favor than those over 35 years of age. A more positive self-concept toward the culture and language is indicated. Attitudes were not affected by other demographic variables.
Statement 26
ALI. SPANISH SPEAKING PARENTS SHOULD ENCOURAGE SCHOOLS TO TEACH ONLY' IN ENGLISH.


| Difforent Groups |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Popula- $\qquad$ | Lower <br> Income Sample | Medium Income Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| Mean : | 5.3! | 5.33 | 5.45 | 5.45 | 5.33 |
| Standard Deviation: | . 78 | . 83 | . 72 | . 90 | . 67 |
| t Statistic |  | 1.12 |  | 1.10 |  |
|  | Male <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample. | Less Educated Sample |  |  |
|  | 5.31 | 5.46 | 5.41 |  |  |
|  | . 96 | . 53 | . 78 |  |  |
| t Statistic | 1.47 |  | . 43 |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Stablc } \\ \text { Populati } \\ \text { Sample } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Transient Sample |  |  |  |
|  | 5.45 | 5.33 |  |  |  |
|  | $.72$ | . 83 |  |  |  |
| A strong disagreement with this statement produced |  |  |  |  |  |
| a high minan of 5.39 for the total population. This suggests |  |  |  |  |  |
| that the parents fecl a need for Spanish in the curriculum. It would also indicate a desire to preserve their language. |  |  |  |  |  |
| There were no significant differences between the rest of |  |  |  |  |  |

## Statenent 27

III: STAJI: mIIPARTMINJ OF IFDUCATION SIIOULD SEE THAT ENOUGH SPANISH SIPI:AKING TLINCIIIRS ARE AVAILANBLAE.


Different Groups

stablc
Population
Sumple
5.52
.77

Transicnt
Sample
5.58
.51
t Statistic .72

Again a high mean of 5.55 indicates that the responses were strongly in favor of this statement. A low spread of the stindard deviation indicated homogeneity of the groups in their attitudes. Ihose under age 35 were stronger in their attitude than thosc over 35. This data indicated that parents were desirous of teachers being prepared to tcach Spanish-speaking children. No significant differences were produced by romaining doniograplic variables.
Statement 28
IT IS UP TO THE UNIVIIRSITIES TO OFFER COURSES THAT FIT THL
NII:DS OF BILINGUAL CIIIJIDREN.


Different Groups
Tota1
Popula-
tion
5.28
.81
Lower
Income
Sample
5.33
.71

|  | Malo <br> Simple | Female <br> Sample | Less Dilucated Sample | More Educated Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5.25 | 5.30 | 5.28 | 5.27 |
|  | . 80 | . 82 | . 75 | +. 86 |
| t Statistic | . 41 |  |  |  |
|  | Stable <br> Population <br> Sample |  | Transient Sample |  |
|  | 5.23 |  | 5.33 |  |
|  | . 89 |  | . 71 |  |
| t Statistic |  | . 91 |  |  |

A. high score of 5.28 for the total population with a small spread of the standard deviation indicated that the group strongly agreed with this statement. There was a significant difference in terms of age, with those under 35 more strongly in favor of the statement than those over 35 years of age. Again reflecting a similar attitude consistent with previous statements, this response indicated parents were becoming aware of the needs of their children and expected the universities to respond positively to these necds. Remaining demographic variables did not produce significant differences in attitudes.
Statement 29
THIE SPANISII SPIEAKING CHILD SHOULD BE TAUGHT TO SPBAK SPANISH FLUENTLIY.

## 

|  | Different Groups |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total <br> Popula <br> tion | Lower <br> Income <br> Sample | Medium <br> Income <br> Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| Mcan: <br> Standard | 5.38 | 5.39 | 5.37 | 5.35 | 5.41 |
| Deviation: | . 86 | . 78 | . 94. | 1.06 | . 59 |
| t Statistic |  | . 16 |  |  | . 47 |
|  | $\begin{array}{r}\text { Male } \\ \text { Sample } \\ \hline\end{array}$ | Female <br> Samp1.e | iess Educated Sample |  | More Educated Sample |
|  | 5.41 | 5.35 | 5.50 |  | 5.26 |
|  | . 88 | . 85 | . 76 |  | . 94 |
| t Statistic | .47 |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.04 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |

Stablc Population

Samp1e
5.37

Transient Sample
5. 39
.94
.78
tStatistic
The high mean of 5.38 for the total population indicates that the subjects are strongly in favor of their
children learning 10 speak fluently. 1 significant differcole in attitude was affected by anomet of education. Those with less education reacted more strongly about this than those with more education. Other demographic variables did not produce significant differences.

Statement: 30
TIII: SPANISII SIPEAKING CHILD SHOULD BE TAUGHT TO SPEAK ENGLISH J:IMENILLY.


|  |  | Different Groups |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total. <br> Popula- <br> tion | Lower <br> Income <br> Sample | Medjum <br> Incone <br> Sample | Under <br> Age" 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Agc 35 <br> Sample |
| Mean: <br> Standard | 5.41 | 5.38 | 5.45 | 5.45 | $5.38{ }^{\circ}$ |
| Deviation: | .85 | . 75 | . 93 | . 99 | . 68 |
| $t$ Statistic |  | . 56 |  | . 55 |  |
|  | Male <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample |  |  | More Educated Sample |
|  | 5.45 | 5.37 |  |  | 5.37 |
|  | . 80 | . 88 |  |  | . 91. |
| $t$ Statistic | . 72 |  | . 72 |  |  |

Stable

| Population |
| :--- |
| Simple |

.93

## Transient

Simple:

$$
5.45
$$

5.38
.75

## t Statistic

 . 56The high nean of 5.41 also indicated that the total population cxhibited a need of learnjing to speal: English fluently. 'His showed that their attitudes were consistent, as questions, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10 and 29 reflected the need for knowledge of both languages. Attitudes were not affected by the remaining demographic variables.
Statement 31
IROM WHAT I KNOW ABOUT BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS THEY ARI: OF LIIIIH: VALULE.


Different Groups

|  | Total Population | Lower <br> Income <br> Sample | Medium <br> Income <br> Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean: | 5.29 | 5.34 | 5.24 | 5.41 | 5.16 |
| Standard <br> Deviation. |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| Devtation | 09 | 90 | 1.08 | 1.04 | . 97 |
| Statist |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 81 \\ & \text { ficant } \end{aligned}$ |


|  | Maje <br> Sample | licmale <br> Sample | Less liducated Sample | More Educated Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5.23 | 5.35 | 5.29 | 5.28 |
|  | 1.01 | . 98 | 1.07 | . 91 |
| t Statistic | . 88 |  |  |  |
|  | St:able Ropulation Sample |  | Transient Sample |  |
|  | 5.24 |  | 5.34 |  |
|  | 1.08 | . | . 90 |  |
| t Statistic |  |  |  |  |

$\Lambda$ negative response of the subjects indicated that they strongly disagreed with this statement. There was also a significant difference between age groups. Those under age 35 reacted more negatively than those over age 35. This indicated that parents believed bilingual education helped their children. The remaining demographic variables produced no sjgnificant differences among the groups

Statement 32
BIIJNGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD BE MADE AYAILABLE TO EVIIRYONE.



Statement 33
IIII: (inal, of bJLINGUAL EiJUCATTON SHOULD BE TO REMOVE A SPANISH ACCliNT.


The total population reflected a high mean of 5.06 and rejected this statement. There were no significant differences among the groups. The parents were not concerned with the pronunciation of English, possibly because they did not perceive this as a problem.
Statement 34
RESPI:CT JOOR THI: VALU!:S OF CULTURALLY DIFFERENI' GROUPS SHOULD B1: 'TAUGIIT'.

*


Stable Population Sample
5.55

Transient
Sample
5.54
.64
t Statistic .12

There was a strong response in favor of this
statement. A 5.54 mean for the total population indicated strong agrecment. There was also a high significant difference between age groups, as those under 35 were more in favor of this statement than those over 35. Other demographic variables did not produce differences in attitudes.

## Statement 35

A GOOD BlliNGUAL l'RÖGRAM SHOULD TEACli BOTH THE LANGUAGE ANJ) TIIE CUL'TURE:



## Statement 36

A THACHIR SHOULD UNDERSTAND THE CULTURES THAT EXIST IN THE SOUJ'TIWJSS'T.


Mean: Standard Deviation: . 56
t Statistic

Different Groups

| - | Total <br> Popula- <br> tion | Lower <br> Income <br> Sample | Mcdium Income Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean: <br> St.andard | 5. 50 | 5.50 | 5.51 | 5.60 | 5.41 |
| Deviation: | . 56 | . 60 | . 52 | . 64 | . 51 |
| t Statistic |  | . 12 |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.44 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| $\because$ | Malc <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample |  |  | More Educated Sample |
|  | 5.52 | 5.49 |  |  | 5.46 |
|  | . 50 | . 61 |  |  | . 52 |

t Statistic. . 36
Stable Population Sample
5.51
.52
1.08

Transient Sample
5.50
.60

A high mean of 5.50 along with the small spread of the standard deviation suggested that the total population was homogeneous in its response to this statemont. Parents' responses indicated that the teacher's awareness of the different cultures should be a vital part of any bilingual program. Demographic variables did not affect attitudes with the exception of those under age 35. Those under 35 years of age responding more positively than those over age 35.

## Statement 37

TI: TI:ACIIING OI SPANISH TO THE ENGLISH SPEAKING CHILD WILL AlD HJM JN UNDERETANDING THE IJEAS AND EXPERIENCES OF THE SPANTSII SPEAKING CHILD.


Different Groups


| Male <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample | Less <br> Educated <br> Sample | More <br> Educated <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| t Statistic: | .87 |  |  |


| Stable |
| :---: |
| Population |
| Sample | | 5.46 |
| :---: |
| .53 |$\quad$| Transient |
| :---: |
| Sample |

## t Statistic

1.84

Significant

This statement produced two significant differences. Those parents under age 35 and those in the middle income group responded more favorably toward the statement. Parents over 35 and those in the lower income group responded less favorable. A high mean of 5.37 along with a small spread of the standard deviation indicated that the total population was homogencous in its response. There was also a significant difference affected by mobility, as the more stable population responded most favorably to this statement. This indicated that parents believed an exchange of ideas and experience among ethnic groups tended to minimize differences. Other demographic variables did not affect attitudes significantly.
Statement 38

- THE TEACIING OF SPANISH TO THE ENGLISH SPEAKING CHILD WILL AID HIM IN COMMUNTCATLNG WITH THE SPANISI SPFAKING CHILD.


A high mean of 5.35 for the total population indicated that the subjects strongly agreed with this statement. The age variable produced a significant difference between the age groups, with the younger subjects responding more favorably than the older subjects. None of the other groups produced significant differences.

Statement 39
IENGLISil SPJ:AKING CHILIREN SHOUI,D BL: GIVEN THI: SAME OPPORTUNITY 'IO LI:ARN SP'ANISII AS ARE SI'ANISH SPEAKING CHILDREN.


|  | Total <br> Copula- <br> Lion |
| :--- | :---: |
| Mean: <br> Standard <br> Deviation: | 5.39 |
| $t$ Statistic |  |


| Male |
| :---: |
| Sample. |

5.45
.70

Total 5.39 .75
正

Male
Sample .70
t Statistic

Different Groups

Lower
Income
Sample
5.30
.85

Medium
Incom.
Sample
5.48
.61

Significant

> Female Sample
> 5.34

Under Age 35 Sample 5.52 .68

Over Age 35 Sample 5.26

Less
Educated Sample
5.40

.87

[^0]1.08

Stable
population
Sample
5.48
.61
t Statistic

Transicnt
Samplo
5.30
.85

Significant
Sl:S, age, and mobjlity yiclded significant differences among the groups. For the middle SBS, the younger subjects and the more stable subjects responded most positively. This perhaps indicated that they were desirous of all children having the opportunity to learn more than one language, which is consistent with Statement \#32. A high mean of 5.39 for the total population indicated that the groups as a whole strongly agreed with the statement.
Statement 40
IENGILISII SPIEAKING CHILDDREN SHOULD BI: IN BILINGUAL PROGRAMS.


## 1)ifferent Groups:

|  | Tot:al Population | lower Jncome Sample | Medium Income Sample | Inder <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mcan: | 5.13 | 5.10 | 5.16 | 5.29 | 4.97 |
| Deviation: | . 89 | . 96 | . 80 | . 72 | 1.05 |
| t Statistic |  |  |  | Sig | $52$ |
|  | Maje |  |  |  | Morc |
|  | Sample | Sample | Sam |  | ducated ample |
|  | 5.15 | 5.12 |  |  | 5.08 |
|  | . 94 | . 83 |  |  | . 84 |
| t Statistic |  |  |  | . 83 |  |
|  | Stabl <br> Populat <br> Sampl |  | Transi Sampl |  |  |
|  | 5.16 |  | 5.10 |  |  |
|  | . 80 |  | . 96 |  |  |
| t Statistic |  | . 53 |  |  |  |
| Stro | agre | with th | stiat | was i | ated |
| with the hi | gh mean | .13 for | cotal | ulat | There |
| was a signi | ficant did | rence of | pinion | $y$ betw | the ag |
| groups; tho | e paren | under age | 35 react | more f | ably |
| the stateme | than | c over | It wa | ident | $t$ this |
| population | favored | sing all | children | bilin |  |
| programs, w | i.ch was | sistent | th resp | s to | ious |
| statements. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statement 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| İNGIISII SPI:AKING PARENTS SHOULD ENCOURAGE THEIR CHILDREN TO SPIAK SMANISH |  |  |  |  |  |



Different Groups

|  | Total <br> Population | Lower <br> Income <br> Sample | Medium <br> Income <br> Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mcan: <br> Standard | 5.19 | 5.11 | 5.27 | 5.21 | 5.17 |
| Deviation: | . 86 | . 97 | . 74 | . 87 | . 86 |
| t Statistic |  | 1.41 |  | . 31 |  |
|  | Male <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample |  |  | More Educated Sample |
|  | 5.26 | 5.12 | 5. |  | 5.16 |
|  | . 88 | . 84 | . 9 |  | . 79 |
| t Statistic | 1.25 |  | . 47 |  |  |

Stable
Population
Sample
Transient Sample 5.11
.74
.97
t Statistic
1.41

A high mean of 5.19 indicated that the total population wanted to include Eng1ish-speaking children in the learning of Spanish. This favorable attitude indicated a consistent positive attitude toward making Spanish available in the curriculum for linglish-speaking children. This statement was supported by the lack of significant differences among the individual groups.
Statcomemt 12
TI: NHBAS OF TH: COMMUNITIES SHOULD BE ASSESSED BEFORE A RIHINGUAS PROGRAM IS SINR'TLD.


Different Groups


Stable

Population
Sample
4.31
1.53

Transicnt
Sample
3.95
1.58
t. Statistic
1.72

Significant
Significant differences resulted between age groups as well as between income groups. Those parents under 35 in the middle income group were more favorable to this statement. The mean of 4.13 for the total population suggested that most were strongly in favor of this statement. The stable population responded more positively than did the transient population. The writer's interpretation of this was that the stable group was desirous of having the needs of the community made a part of any curriculum development for their children.
Statement 43
ful: Spantsh speaking Chill should ble taught about the SPANISII CULTURE.


## Different Groups

|  | Total <br> Popula- <br> tion | Jower <br> Income <br> Sample | Medium Income Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mcan: | 5.53 | 5.56 | 5.50 | 5.66 | 5.40 |
| Standard | . 52 | . 50 , | . 54 | : 53 | . 55 |
| $t$ Statistic |  | . 91 |  | $\begin{gathered} 3.62 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Malc <br> Sample | Female <br> Sample |  |  | More Educated Sample |
|  | 5.55 | 5.51 |  |  | 5.48 |
|  | . 51 | . 52 |  |  | . 53 |



$$
5.50
$$

Less lducated Sample
5.58
.49
1.43

Transient Sample
5.56
.50
t Statistic .91
The high mean of 5.53 indicated that the total population strongly agreed with this statement. $\Lambda$ low spread of the standard deviation also indicated that the groups werc homogencous in their responses. A significant difference resulted between age groups only. Those parents under 35 were more strongly in agreement with the statement than werc those over 35. Parents were aware of the many positive aspects of learning about culturc. They also indjcated that this teaching should be made an integral part of a bilingual program.

## Statemont 44

 mitulir mamirstanding ol till spanisil fanlluy.


|  | Total <br> Popula <br> tion | Lower <br> Income <br> Sample | Medium <br> Income <br> Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mcan: <br> Standard <br> Deviation: <br> 5.49 | 5.49 | 5.48 | 5.59 | 5.38 |  |

t Statistic
.13
2.79

Significant
Less
Educated Sample
5.55
. 52

More Educated
Sample Educated
Sample
5.43
.55
t Statistic
5.48
. 53
1.13

Female
Sample
5.45
. 51
Malc
Samplc
5.53
. 5556

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Stable } \\
\text { Population } \\
\text { Sample } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$

1.64

Transient
Sample
5.49
.54
t Statistic .13

A high mean of 5.49 indicated that the total population strongly agreed with this statement. $\Lambda$ small spread of the standard deviation also indicated the groups as a whole were homogeneous in their response. A significant difference resulted between age groups only. Those under 35 responded more favorably than those over 35 years of age. Communicating with others in one's own language establishes an immediate rapport which, according to the data, is important for children of different language and culture.

Statement 15
'III: TEACHING OH SPANISH AIDS IN THE BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF TIL: SJ'ANJSII COMMUNITY.


Different Groups


Mean: Standard Deviation: . 65
t Statistic
.56
.75 3.44

Significant

| Male <br> Sample | Fomale <br> 5.48 | Sample <br> Saducated <br> Sample | More <br> Educated <br> Samplo |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .64 | 5.39 | 5.51 | 5.36 |

t Statistic
1.04

### 1.67

Significant

Stable
population
Sample
5.41
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Transjent } \\ & \text { Sample }\end{aligned}$
5.46
.68
.61
t Statistic .62

A sjgnificant difference between age groups resuliced with the t-test. Those parents under age 35 agreed more strongly than those over age 35. The less educated group felt more strongly in favor of the statement than the more educated subjects. Demographic variables did not affect the remaining groups. 1 high mean of 5.44 indicated a favorable response. Statement 46

TI:ACIIN ABOUT SPANISH CULTURE. IN THE SCHOOLS AIDS THE SPANISII SPI:AKING CIIILD IN UNDERSTANDING THE VIEWS OF. PARISTS AND GRANDPARINTS.


## 11ifferent Groups

|  | Tutal Population | J, ower <br> Income Sample | Mediunt Income Stimplc | Under <br> Agc 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sampac |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean : | 5.46 | 5.48 | 5.45 | 5.55 | 5.37 |
| Standard |  |  |  |  |  |
| Deviation: | . 62 | . 67 | . 57 | . 70 | . 57 |

t Stiatistic

Malc
Sample
5.48
.67

Jower Income Sample

Income S:an? ${ }^{\text {c }}$ 5.45 . 57
.70
.57
.43
2.11 Significant

More Educated Sample Female Educated Sample 5.45 .57
.43
1.74

Significant

Stable Population Sample
5.45 .57

Transient
Sample
5.48
t Statistic .43
$\Lambda$ high mean of 5.46 for the total population siung with a small spread of the standard deviation indicated a strongly favorable response toward this statement. $\Lambda$ significant difference between age groups resulted, with those under age 35 more favorably inclined than those over age 35. The less educated also were more strongly in favor of this statement. The difference between the groups separated by amount of education was again significant. Other demographic variables did not affect atitudes.

Statement 47
WTIII III: TH:ACIITNG Ol: SIMNISII IN TIIE SCIIOOLS TIIE SPANISH SII:AKING CHIDI) FEI:LS BLTTH:R ABOU'T HIMSLEHI.



Significant differences between income groups and between age groups resulted when analyzed using a t-test. Those parents under age 35 and those in the lower income group reacted more strongly than did those in the middle income group over age 35. A mean of 5.11 for the total population indicated a strong attitude in favor of this statement. There was also a significant difference affected by the mobility of the population. The transient population reacted more positively, indicating that the self-concept of the child was an important factor. Perhaps they had in their mobility run across negative reactions toward themselves, and therefore developed a desire to overcome this attitude. Statement 48
 ENGI.ISII SINKING (MILD WILL UNDERSTAND) EACII OTII:R BE'TVIER. 1


Different Groups


| Male <br> Sample | Female <br> sample | lioss filucated Sianple | More <br> lilucated <br> Simple |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.45 | 5.34 | 5.49 | 5.30 |
| . 72 | . 83 | . 76 | . 79 |

t Stitistic 1.12

Stable
population
Simple
5.38
.77
1.82 Significant
^ significant difference between the age groups indicated that parents under age 35 were more favorable in their attitude than thosc over age 35 . $\Lambda$ high mean of 5.40 for the total population indicated that all parents were favorably disposed toward this statement. I:ducation also affected this attitude. Those parents with less cducation were significantly more strons]y in favor of this statement. This was perhaps also indjcitive that parents under 35 with less education needed to be accepted in the Anglo world. They appeared desirous of establishing communication with the Englishspeaking culture surrounding them. The remaining demographic variables did not produce significant differences.
Statement: 49
^ SPANLSII SPEAKING CIIILI SHOULD BE TAUGITT IN ENGLISH ONLY TO PRI:PARI: IIIM TO COMPI:TE IN AN ENGLISII SPEAKING SOCTIETY.


## Bifferent Groups

|  | Total <br> popula <br> tion | Lower <br> lncome <br> Sample | Mcdiun Income Sample | Under Age 35 Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Simplc |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mcan: | 4.65 | 4.70 | 4.59 | 4.85 | 4.45 |
| Devintion: | 1.39 | 1.40 | 1.38 | 1.25 | 1.53 |
| t Statistic |  | . 58 |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.12 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Malc <br> Sample | licmale Sample |  |  | More j:ducated Sample |
|  | 4.61 | 4.68 | 4. |  | 4.68 |
|  | 1.40 | 1.38 | 1. |  | 1.33 |
| t Statistic | c . 39 |  | . 39 |  |  |
| Stable <br> Population <br> Sample |  |  | Transient Sample |  |  |
| 4.59 |  |  | 4.70 |  |  |
| 1.38 |  |  | 1.40 |  |  |
| t Statistic |  | . 58 |  |  |  |

This statement did not produce as high a mean for the total population as did the previous statement, the mean being 4.65. The parents responded nearer to the 'llisagrec" than "strongly disagree" category. There was a significant difference between age groups, as those parents under age 35 disagreed more than those over age 35. They probably recognized that their children would be competing in an English-speaking society. Even though this wat truc, indications from previous questions were that they desired to retain their culture. lemographic varialules such as SES, mobility and education did not affect attitudes.

Statement 50
A SPANISII SPEAKING CIIJLI TAUGIIT IN SPANISH WILL MEET WITH BETMT:R SUCCl:SS IN SCHOOL.



## Statement 51

 'III:Y ARJ: ABJT: TO SP J:NK IT.


OUST1ONSI
Total
Popular-
Lion

Moil: 5.38
Standard
lower Medium Income Sample

Income
Sample
5.38
.56
5.37
. 69

Under
Age 35 Sample
5.17
.68

Over Age 35 Sample 5.28

Deviation: . 62
t Statistic
.11

Transient
Sample
5.38
. 56
2.21

Significant
More Educated Sample
5.34
.66
less
Educated Sample
.59
.61
. 58

Female
Sample
5.35
t Statistic . 54
Stable
Population Sample
5.37
.69
t Statistic .11
Sample

Male Sample
5.40
.64

.

A significant difference between age groups when the $t-1 e s t$ was applied indicated that those parents under age 35 more strongely apreed wi.th this statement than those over agc 35. A high mean of 5.38 indicated that the total popu1ation wanted their children to speak Spanish. Parents did not seem concerned that learming Spanish at home would produce negative results. The remaining demographic variables did not produce significant differences.

Statement 52
CIITIURIEN SIIOULI BE ENCOURAGED TO SPEAK SPANISH NLL THE TIME $\therefore 2$




Stable
Poptatation
Sample
3.98
1.59

Transient
Sample
4.21.
1.51

## t Statistic

Large variability of response to this statement prevented significant results. A mean of 4.10 for the total population indicated heterogeneous attitudes of those questioned. The population perhaps believed that linglish should also be included. As indicated by previous responses, those statements that preferred one language over the other produced negative responses. Demographic variables did not affect the responses.

Statement 53
SINCIE THIS IS AN IENGJISH SPEAKING SOCIETY CHILDREN SHOULD BE I:NCOURA(il: $)$ TO SPJ:AK ENGLISH ONLY.



## Statement 51

TIl: TEACHING OI: SPANISH WILL DIVIDE GROUPS AGAINST EACH OTHER.


Different Groups

^ significant difference of attitude resulted between age groups only. Those parents under age 35 responded more strongly than those over age 35: A mean for the total population of 5.31 indicated that the respondents strongly disagreed with this statement. This suggested that the population believed that spanish had positive aspects and rejected the idea that language created divisjvencss between groujs.

Statement. 55
THI: TI:ACIILNG OF SIPANISH WILL UNITE GROUPS TONARD BROTIERLY LOVE.


Different Groups

Total
population

Meall:
Standard
Deviation:
5.15
1.06
t Statistic

Jower Income Sample
5.16
1.07
1.07

Medium Income Sample
5.14
1.04
.19

Under Over
Age 35 Age 35
Sample Sample
5.32
4.98
1.03
1.10

resulted. Parents who were under 35 felt more favorably disposed toward this statement than those over age 35. $\Lambda$ high mean of 5.15 indicated a strong agreement with the statement by the total population. The sample with less education responded more strongly. This indicated that cohesiveness of groups would result if Spanish were taught. No significant differences were produced by remaining demographic variables. Statement 50

SPANISII SPP:AKING PARENTS SHOULD NOT ALLOW THEIR CHILDREN TO SPY:AK SI'ANISH A' HOME.


## Jifferent Groups

|  | Tot:al lopula tion | Jower <br> Income <br> Samplo | Medium Incolle: Sample | Under <br> Age 35 <br> Samp1s | Orer. <br> Age 35 <br> S:mple |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mcall: | 5.48 | 5.45 | 5.51 | 5.61 | 5.35 |
| lleviation: | : .72 | . 76 | . 68 | . 65 | . 82 |
| t. Statistic |  | . 56 |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.55 \\ \text { Si.gnificant } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Male } \\ \text { Sample } \end{gathered}$ | lemale <br> Sample | Less Educated Sample |  | More Educated Sample |
|  | 5.48 | 5.48 | 5.51 |  | 5.45 |
|  | . 75 | . 70 | . 76 |  | . 68 |
| i Statistic |  |  |  | . 56 |  |

Stablc population Samplc

Transient
5.51 Sample 5.45
.68
.76
t Statistic . 56
$\Lambda$ high mean of 5.48 for the total population indicated a strong disagrecment with this statement by most of these parents. $\Lambda$ significant difference was noted between age groups only. Those parents under age 35 more strongly opposed this statement than did those over age 35. This again indicated that parcnts wanted to keep the Spanish language as a viable part of their culture.

Statement 57
All SPANISH SPEAKING CHILDREN SHOULD FEEL PROUd THEY CAN Speak SPANJSH.


This statement produced the highest favorable response for the total population of any in the entire questionnaire. $\Lambda$ high mean of 5.67 along with a small standard deviation indicated that nearly all parents responded in the "strongly agree category. 1 significant difference was noted in the age groups only. Those parents under 35 years of age responded more strongly than those over age 35.

Statement 58
ALL SPANISH SURNAME CHILDREN SHOULD) SPI:AK SPANISH.


Different Groups

| Total |
| :---: |
| copula- |
| Lion |


4.54
1.71
t Statistic

Under Over
Age 35 Age 35
Sample Sample
4.55
1.59

Incr Sample

Medium Income Sample
4.71
1.51
1.65
4.59
1.591.59
less
Educated Sample
4.64
1.58
.30
liemale Sample 4.60
1.45

More
Educated Sample 4.50
1.59
stable
Population

- Simple
1.13
1.6 .5

Transicnt
Sample
4.7 J.
1.51
t. Statistic
]. 32
Ame:m of $4.5 \%$ for the total population coupled with a wide spread of the standard deviation indicated heterogencous responses to this statement. Nevertheless, the responses indicated that parents were "in favor of Spanish surnamed children speaking Spamish. This statement indicated that parents understood 1.his to mein that their children should speak only in Spanish. As jundicated by prevịons responses, this has been consistently rejected as finglish has also been considered important. No significant differences were produced by the demographic variables.

Statement 59
 SHIAKING CHTHDRI:N DROM OHJ OF: SCIIOOL.


|  | Difforent Groups |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tot.il 1 <br> Popula- <br> tion | Jonver <br> Lilcome <br> Somple | Mcdium Income Sample | Under. <br> Age 35 <br> Sample | Over <br> Age 35 <br> Sampeso |
| Mean: <br> Stand:ard <br> Doviation: | 3.18 | 3.22 | 3.15 | 3.36 | 3.00 |
|  | 1. 51 | 1.55 | 1.53 | 1.50 | 1.58 |
| t statistic |  | . 35 |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.74 \\ \text { Significant } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Mat]e <br> Sample | pemale <br> S:minple |  | ted <br> e | More Educatcd Sample |
|  | 3.18 | 3.18 |  |  | 3.37 |
|  | 1.51 | 1:57 |  |  | 1.53 |

1.53
1.53
t Statistic
.00
.

Jess rducated Sample
2.99

Over
Age 35 Sampee
3.00
1.58

Stalement 60


A significant difference in attitude was reflected in the lower income group. Those in the lower income group, who perhaps spoke with an accent, did not find an accent disagreeable when compared to those in the middle income group. A mean of $4: 87$ for the total population with a wide spread of standard deviation in the total distribution indiecited a more heterogeneous attitude. The transient population reacted more favorably to this statement than did the stable population. The remaining demographic variables did not produce significant differences in attitudes.
Statement 61
$\theta$
RLMMOV ING $\wedge$ SPANISH ACCENT SHOULD BE ONT: OF TILE GOALS OI: B] lINGUAL EDUCATION.


Different Groups


| Male <br> Simple | limale <br> s:ample | J.ess Educ:ated S:milite | Morc Eductited Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.80 | 4.81. | 4.89 | 4.72 |
| 1.40 | 1.36 | 1.36 | 1.40 |

t. Statisistijc . 05
stable
Population Samyle
4.75
1.11
.93

Transiont Sample 4.85 1. 35
t Statictic:
J.css ducated
4.89
1.36

Morc Educited Samplo 4.72
1.40

The group as a whole rejected this as a goal of bilingual education. $\Lambda$ wide spread of standard deviation indicated variability of responses. This statement when compared with stat:cment number 33 , which is the same statement woided differently, produced a similar mean. This indicated that the group was not concerned with the sterentyping that has been made of one who speaks with an accent. There were no differences between other groups.
Statement 62
TIIE INGGJSII SPIANKTNG CIIILD SHOULD BE TAUGIT ABOUT THE SPANTSH CULTIURE.



Statement 63
 AID III TN UNH:RSTANHNG THE CULTURE: OI TH: SPANISH SPJ:AKING (:III, I).
1


Different. (Groups

t Statistic

Male Sample
5.37
.88
1.15

Female Sample
5.35
.75

Less
Educated Sample
5.47
2.75 Significant

More
Educated Sample
5.25
t Statistic
.16

Stable Population Sample
5.30
.91
1.99

Significant

A significant difference resulted between age groups. 'lhose piarents under age 3.5 more strongly agreed wi.th the statement than those over age 35. A high mean of 5.36 also indicated that the totill population had a strong favorable opinion. Those with less education had a more favorable opinion than those with more education. The responses to this statement were consistent with prevjous responses in that language was viewed as an aid to breaking down burriers created perhaps by the inability to communicate in another language. Significant differences were not produced by the remaining demographic variables.

## DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicate that the most important variable in distinguishing difference between groups was áge. Socjoccononic status, sex, education and mobility did not produce as many significant differences as did age. Ihere were individual statements that were affected by cach variable; however, of the sixty-three items in the questionnaire, thirty-nine of the items showed a significant difference in which age was a factor. Eight of the sixty-three items showed that mobility reflected a significant difference in attitude. These statements were related in that the items were about the status of Spanish language in the curriculum. It would therefore indicate that this group had a high positive fceling about the Spainish language and were desirous of having it included in the curriculum.

Fourteen of the sixty-three items showed a significant difference bascd on education. Thirteen of the group with an education under 9.8 grades reacted more positively than thosc with a higher education. On one item, those above 9.8 showed a stronger response. The items to which this group responded were also based on the teaching of Spanish. The statements clearly reflected a need to maintain their language as a viable means of communication. The parents, this writer believes, are insisting that their language is an important factor for a balanced communication system in the world they want and do operate in. They are
desirous that their chibden obtain this balance in their education. five of the sixty-three items reflected a significant difference based on sex. On three of the itens the male population reacted more strongly. These threc items were related as the all dealt with the amount or cmphasis. Spanish should be given in the curricula. The two items in which the female population reacted more strongly dealt with the value of the Spanish language. This suggested that the population insisted that educators note the parents desire to implement Spanish in any program for their children. Eight statements out of sixtythrec showed a significant difference based on socioeconomic status. Of the eight, five showed that the lower income group felt more strongly than the middle income group. These items had reference to making Spanish a part of the curricula. Again, the positive reactions across all variables indicated the strong desire of this group to devclop and maintain a knowledge of the Spanish language. Since there were few significant differences between income groups, the categories determining sociocconomic status as defined by Warner (1949, pp. 140-141) between the upper-lower class and lower-middle class were too close to affect attitudes.

The majority of the statements produced a high scorc, i.c., a positive attitude. It would therefore indicate that the group was fairly homogencous. There were, however, statements within each grouping to which
the subjects responded positively and to which they responded negatively. When the mean for each group was compared with the result.s for the individual statement within each sample group, the result indicated that the group was homogeneous. Compilation of statistical data used in this study may be found in Appendix 6.

In analyzing the demographic data, the results showed that 97.7 of the respondents were born in the United States, 93.2 of the parents werc born in the United States and 86.8 of the respondents' grandparents were born in the United States (Table II).

The incan age of the respondents was 36.3 and had a mean number of 4.3 children. The nean number of years of schooling for the respondents was 9.8. Respondents had lived 18.5 years in the community, 33.5 in New Mexico, and 33.8 in the Southwest (Table II).

Of the total population, 86.3 percent first learned Spanish at home, 10.9 percent learned English first, and 2.3 percent learned both languages at the same time (Table II).

The information presented in Table I may be summarized as follows: 56.4 percent of the respondents spoke Spanish with their spouse, 24.5 percent spoke English and 19.1 percent spoke both languages with their spouses. The percentage of respondents who spoke Spanish with theirywas cheN 22.7, while 52.7 percent spoke English, and 24.5 percent spoke both languages with their children. With their
relatives, there were 66.4 percent of the respondents who spoke Spanish, 13.6 percent who spoke English and 20.0 percent who spoke both languages. With friends, 46.4 percent spoke Spanish, 22.7 spoke English, and 30.9 spoke both languages.

This information indicated that while all the parents ahd positive attitudes toward bilingual education and were desirous of having their language and culture preserved, the majority of the parents spoke English with their children. This suggested that they were losing their language and/or did not desire to communicate with their clijidren in Spanish. This was more apparent among the parents who were under age 36. If this is so, then one can ask why bilingual education is necessary. It can be said that apart from encouraging diverse knowledge of languages, these respondents still maintained a relationship with parents, spouse, children, relativcs and friends in which Spanish was used. The fact that it lessened to the degree that only 19.84 percent of the respondents spoke Spanish with their children indicated that this group provided a lesser Spanish-speaking environment than did their parents. This was reflected in the high number of respondents in the 36 years-and-less group who spoke only English with their children, e.g., 126 compared with 200 respondents. In this same age group, 52.35 percent: spoke Spanish with their spouse, 62.69 percent with their relatives, 48.41 percent with their friends, and 84.12
percent first learned Spanish at home.
Mgain, this demon rated that the parents were anxious that their childron learn English and helieved they must reinforce the school setting rather than their home setting. It would at first seen contiodictory when the results showed that they were for bilingual education. It is interesting to note that this group had more positive attitudes toward bilingual education than their older counterparts.

Of the age groups 37 through $66,61.70$ percent spoke Spanish with their spouse, 26.59 percent with their children, 71.27 percent with their relatives, 43.61 percent with friends, and 93.61 percent first learned Spanish at home (Table I).

Comparing the two groups, it is evident that among the younger group there was a decline in the use of Spanish with their spouses, children, and relatives, and as a first language learncd at homc. In the younger group there was an increasc in the use of Spanish with their friends, which suggested an effort to communicate with their friends who spoke Spanish with them than did the older group who spoke less Spanish with their friends.

There were no significant differences in the groups' attitudes toward bilingual education. The high mean of 5.27 for the total population indicated a positive attitude, whilc the mean for the total population regarding attitudes toward usc of Spanish in the curriculum was only 4.73, which was nevertheless positive. The total mean for the population was 5.11 in responding to the statements regarding attitudes
toward culture. This indicated that the total population was homogencous in its positive attitudes in these areas (Tables III, IV, and V).

It appeared that parents who had their children in bilingual programs had positive attitudes toward this kind of cducation. This conclusion was based on the results of the study, since all the subjects had children in bilingual prograns. The indication of the parents' enthusiasm was. reflected throughout the responses to the questionnaire.

Significance of this study has relevance for future bjlingual programs. More data is needed for comparison with other parents whose children are not in bilingual programs.

## SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter was to analyze the statistical data for each question. The responses to the questionnaires reflected parents' attitudes toward bilinqual prograns. A t-test was applied to every question, and each sct of analyses included specific demographic variables.

A discussion of the results showed that of all the demographic variables considered in this study, age of subjects was the only variable which reflected a significant difference in parents' attitudes. Those under thirty-five years of age responded more postively than those over thirtyfive.

TABLE: 1

## PIRCI:NMAGI: Ol: RI:SPONDINTS HHO SIIIAK SPANTSH

| 人GE | NUMBBI:R OI: RESPONDENTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WITH } \\ & \text { SPOUSE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { WITH } \\ \text { CHILDREN } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { WITH } \\ \text { RH:ATIVES } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { WITII } \\ \text { GRIENDS } \end{gathered}$ | FIRS'T <br> LEARNED <br> $\Lambda 1$ IIOME |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2.5 | 9 | 44 | 11 | 44 | 44 | 67 |
| 26 | 11 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 18 | 55 |
| 27 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 60 | 20 | 80 |
| 28 | 19 | 47 | 11 | 68 | 32 | 84 |
| 29 | 1.6 | 44 | 6 | 50 | 44 | 94 |
| 30 | 11 | 64 | 18 | 55 | 45 | 82 |
| 31 | 14 | 57 | 21 | 57 | 71 | 100 |
| 32 | 12 | 50 | 33 | 67 | 67 | 75 |
| $33 *$ | 5 | 80 | 60 | 100 | 60 | 100 |
| 34 | 6 | 50 | 33 | 83 | 67 | 100 |
| 35 | 8 | 50 | 37 | 63 | 63 | 75 |
| 36 | 9 | 89 | 33 | 89 | 56 | 100 |
| 37 | 5 | 60 | 0 | 60 | 20 | 60 |
| 38 | 11 | 36 | 0 | 64 | 18 | 91 |
| 39 | 8 | 63 | 25 | 75 | 75 | 100 |
| 40 | 8 | 50 | 50 | 37 | 37 | 88 |
| 41 | 4 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 |
| 42 | 9 | 44 | 22 | 78 | 44 | 100 |
| 4.3 | 4 | 100 | 50 | 100 | 75 | 100 |
| 44 | 5 | 60 | 0 | 80 | 20 | 80 |
| 45 | 5 | 80 | 40 | 80 | 80 | 100 |
| 46 | 2 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 47 | 3 | 33 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 67 |
| 48 | 6 | 67 | 17 | 83 | 33 | 100 |
| 49 | 3 | 100 | 33 | 100 | 33 | 100 |
| 50 | 4 | 75 | 0 | 75 | 25 | 100 |
| 51 | 5 | 80 | 60 | 60 | 40 | 80 |
| 52 | 2 | 50 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 100 |
| 53 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 100 |
| 54 | 3 | 33 | 33 | 67 | 33 | 33 |
| 55 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 56. | 1 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 57 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 100 |
| 58 | 1. | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 59 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 62 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63 | 1 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 64 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06 | 1. | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

RESPONDENTS: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

## DEMOGRAPHIC STATISTICS

## AEAN

36.3
4.3
9.8
18.5
33.5
33.8

LINGUISTIC BACÖGROUND (PERCEXT)
SPAVISH
ENGLISH
10.9
24.5
52.7
15.6
22.7

| $6^{\circ} 0 S$ |
| :--- |
| $0^{\circ} 0 Z$ |
| $S^{\circ}+2 Z$ |
| $I \cdot 6 I$ |
| $\varepsilon^{-} Z$ |
| HLOZ |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 220 \\
& 110 \\
& 110 \\
& 110 \\
& 110 \\
& 215 \\
& 205 \\
& 101
\end{aligned}
$$



SAMPLE SIZE

FIRST LEARNED AT HCME
SPOKEA NITH SPCUSE

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { COMMUSITY } \\
& \text { MEXICO } \\
& \text { SOUTHNEST }
\end{aligned}
$$


TABLE 3
ATTITUDES TOWARD THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

TABLE 4
ATTITUDES TOWARD CULTURE

TABLE 5
ATTITUDES TOWARD USE OF SPANISH IN THE CURRICULUM

|  | TOTAL <br> POPULATIOA | LOMER INCOME SAMPLE | MEDIUM INCOME SAMPLE | LRDER AGE 35 SAMPLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MEAT | 4.73 | 4.75 | 4.70 | 4.82 |
| STANDARD deviation | 1.52 | 1.50 | 1.53 | 1.27 |
| t STATISTIC | . . 21 |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { MALE } \\ \text { SAMPLE } \end{gathered}$ | FEMALE SAMPLE | LESS <br> EDUCATED <br> SAMPLE | MORE <br> EDUCATED <br> S.MIFLE |
| MEAN | 4.73 | 4.73 | 4.80 | 4.65 |
| STANDARD <br> DEVIATION | 1.54 | 1.50 | 1.49 | 1.54 |
| t STATISTIC |  | 0 | . 72 |  |

## CHAPTER V

summary, conclusions and recommendations
SUMMARY
The purpose of this study was to investigate attitudes of parents, whose children werc in bilingual programs, toward bilingual education. The study also sought to find if differences existed between income groups because of sex, age, mobjlity, and education.

Iwo hundred and twenty persons (or 110 pairs of parents) whose children were in bilingual programs in ten schools in the Albuquerque Public. School System comprised the sample. They were divided into two socioeconomic groups, lower-middle and upper-lower, and subdivided by age, mobjility, sex and cducation. Lach pair of parents was administered a sixtythrec item questionnaire by trained Spanish-speaking interviewer. The questionnaire was given simultaneously to both parents at their home. All of the responses were obtained within a two-week period in order to prevent time from being a varialle which might have produced differences in attitudes. 'l-tests werc used to deternine whether significant differences existed between the two groups on each question.

## CONCLUSIONS

'Ihe following conclusions apply only to the sample used
in this; study.
The mean scoies for the total pomatation were high on most of the statcments, indicating an homogencous positive attitude toward bilingual education. There were fow significant. differences between socioeconomic groups. Of the other independent variables, age prodiced the most signilicant difforences. This indicated that those parents under age 35 were more positive in thejr attitudes than were the older group. This was significant if compared with other variables. Those under 35 spoke less Spanish with theje children, but had a more positive attitude toward bilingual cducation, possibly because of a strong need for cultural identity. Amount of education did not seem to alter this attitude significantly. In several instances, however, the amount of mobility reflected significantly the response toward certain statements. The lower socioeconomic group reflected stronger attitudes. Again it was indicated that the lower-class transient parent needed to identify with the culture. Coming to a larger metropolitan area from a smaller community may have been a factor omphasizing the need for cultural identity.
lixposure to bilingual education for both groups produced a favorable response. This study indicated that parents enthusiastically approved of the on-going programs to which their children were being exposed.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The attitudes of the parents investigated in this study
demonstrated a strong sentiment for becoming or remaining
a bilingual-bicultural society. Our educational system can he the vanguard in fulfilling this demonstrated desire. Based on the data from this study, the writer recommends that the following positive steps be taken:

1. fixpansion of bilingual-bicultural programs.
2. Assessment of the desires and needs of the community before a particular bilingualbicultural program is initiated to determine the validity of an existing program.
3. Availability of Spanish in the curriculum in all grades of all schools to children of all cthnic backgrounds.
4. Increase of programs by universitics to provide sufficient competent teachers trained for bilingual-bicultural programs.
5. Inclusion of a cultural component in every bilingual program.
6. Development of materials relevant to the Mexican-American culture which reflect the objectives and curricula of any bilingual program.

Juture studics could serve to substantiate and amplify this study. Areas recommended for future studies are:

1. The use of greater socioeconomic variance within the sample group.
2. Inclusion of parents whose children are not in bilingual programs in the sample group.
3. Use of a sample group with a mean education of at least 12.0 years, whereas for the purpose of this study a mean of 9.8 years was uscd. (Table II)
4. Broader regional studies to determine the degrec of variance, if any, of parental attitudes within the region.
5. ^ longitudinal study be made to compare results with the present study.
6. That this investigator's questionnaire be used again with a different group.

APPEND 1 Cl:S

APPENDIX 1
(1) The spanish speaking chald should be tuanht only in Spanish.
(2) The Epanish speaking chijd should be taught only in linglish.
(3) The Spanish speaking child should be taught in Finglish and Spanish in cqual amounts.
(4) Spanish and English should be taught 20 Spandsh speaking: children beganning from the first grade.
(5) Spanish only should be taught to Spanish speaking childiren begınnang from the first erade.
(6) Einglish only showld be tameht to Spataish and linglish spritiong childscin beguimiang irom the itrst grade.
(7) The finglish speaking chald =hcuid br taught enly ai Spanish in the ijrst io $^{\text {rade. }}$
(8) The Englisth sporaking child shouila be taught Englash and Spanish in equal amounts in the first grade.
(9) Spanısh cnly should have been taught when you were in the clementas school.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| (10) | liuc.lish on iy should be :sught jnthe clcmintary grades. | Strongly Agree | Agree | Mildly Asrec | Mildiy Disarren | Ifsomrec | Strongly <br> bisagrec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (11) | Spanish and English should be tanght to linglish spciiking clisdren beginning from the fasst grade. $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $(12 ;$ | Spanish should net be tallght in the clementary frades as children will learn to speak with an accent. |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| (13) | The linglish speaking child should be tinught to speak Spanish ilucntly. $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (14) | The teaching oi Spanish to Spanish spualishg chiluren will make them fecl differently from the rest of the chaidren of the same age. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (15) | School should not be conducted in Spanish after the third g:ade. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (16) | The teaching oi Spanish to the Spanish speaking child interieres in communicating with those who do not speak Spanish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (17) | The teachang of Spani:ly to the Spanish speaking child alds in his commuaiciting with others. $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Strongly <br> Agree | Agree | Mildly <br> Aryec | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mildly } \\ & \text { llisagree } \end{aligned}$ | Disagrec | Strong 1 y <br> Disarrec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1.8) | The teachirg or Spanish to the |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spallish speaking |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | child helps ham |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | relate iduas. and |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | experiences of the |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | the school. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (19) | The teaching of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spanish to the |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sparish speaking |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | chisd interferes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | nith the jdjust- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ment in the school sctit |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (20) | Spanish should |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | be titght in |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | high school only |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (21) | Spanish should |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | bc uscd onl; as |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | a birder to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (22) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Teachers should |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | not allow chaldren |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | to speak Spanish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | in the school. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (23) | Inglish speaking |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | children shouid |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (24) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | The Spanish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | language has n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | value in this |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (25) | All Spanish tpeaking |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | parents should |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | cncourse the teach- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ing of linglish and |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spanish in the |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | schools. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(26) All Spanish spaking parents shouid encourine schools to teach only in English.
(27) The State Department of liduciation siould sce lhat enough Spanish speaking teachers are available. $\qquad$
(28) it is up to the universjties to offer courses that fit. the needs of bilingual children.
(29) The Spanish speaking child shouid be taught to speak Spanish flucntiy.
(30) The Spanish speaking child should be tallght to speak Einginsh fluently.
(3i) From what 1 know abour Bilingual Education Programs they are of littic value.
(32)

Bilingual Education programs should he made available to everyone.
(33) The goal of Bilin!!ual Education should be to remove a Spanish accent
(34) Respect for the values of cuiturally different gioups should be taught.

(35) A sood bilmpual progiam should teach both the language and about the culture.
(36) A teacher should underst and the cultures that exist in the Southwest.
(37) The tesching of Spanish to the Englash speaking child wall aid him in understanding the ideas and Experiences of the Spanish speaking child.
(38) The teachang of Spanish to the English speaking child will aid him in communtcating wath the Spanish spcakan! child.
(39) Englush speakang children should be given the same opportunity ${ }^{\text {a }}$ jearn Spanish as are Spanish speaking children. $\qquad$
(40) English sparaing chiliren should be in bilingual programs. $\qquad$
(41) Erglish speaking purents should enceurage thear children to speak Spanash.
(42)

The needs of the communitics should be assessed beto:c a bilingual pro. gram is stárted.

|  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  |  | Strongly Agrec | Agrec | Mijdly <br> Agree | Mildly <br> Disagrec | Disagrec | Strongly nisatrec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (4.3) | The Spanish speaking, child sheald be taught abour the Spaillish cultuic. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (44) | The eaching of <br> Sp:nish aldis <br> teachers and <br> stuilents an the <br> better understandang <br> of the Spinish <br> family. $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (45) | The teaching of Spanssh ulds in the better understanding of the sfanish community. $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (46) | Thc teaching about the Spanish culture in the schools adds the Spanish splaking child in understanding the vaews oi parents and grand. parents. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (47) | With the teaching of Spanish in the schouls the Spanish speaking child fecls better about himsclf. $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (48) | With the teaching of Spanish, the Spanish speaking child and English speaking child will under. stand each other better. $\qquad$ |  |  |  | . |  |  |
| (49) | A Spanish speaking child should be taught in linglish only to prepare him to compele in an English speaking society. |  |  |  | . |  |  |

(50) ^ Spanish speaking child taught in Spanish wall nest with better success in schorl.
(51) Children should be encouraged to speos Sparish at lowe il the) are able to speak $1 \%$.
(52) Chisdicr should be encouraged to speak Spahi: h $^{\text {all }}$ al he imine if they are able to speak it.
(53) Sine this is on English spiciaing: society childicn should be encouraged to speak English only.
(54) The teaching oi Spanish will divide groups against each other.
(55) The reaching of Spanish will unite groups towards brotherly love.
(56) Spanish speaking parents should not allow their children to speak Spanish at home. $\qquad$
(57) All Spanish speaking children should fec 1 proud they can speak Spanish.
(58) All Spanish surnitmed children should speak Spanish. $\qquad$
Strongly Mildly Mildly $\quad$ Strongly Strongly
Agric

| $\square$ |
| ---: |.

$\qquad$
$\square$

$\square$.
ss

| (59) | Because of a lack of sulfacient knowledge of tenglish, Spandsh speaking children dicp out of school. $\qquad$ | Strongly Agrce | Agree | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mildly } \\ & \text { Aprec } \end{aligned}$ | Nildly Disagree | Disagrce | Strongly Disagrec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (60) | I find a Spanish accent agrecable to the tar. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (6i) | Removing a Spanish acecat should be one of the goins of Bilangual Lducation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (62) | The Emgith speaking chisd sliould be tanght about the Spanish culture. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (63) | The reaching of spanish to the English speaking child wili aid him in understanding the cultu:e of the Spanish speaking child. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

APPJ:NDIX 2

KI:Y TO INTIRPRITATTION OF PARENT ATHITUDI: QU:STIONNAIRE A'TITUUI:S TOWARI TIE BILINGUNI IOUCATION PROGRAM
3. The Spanish spoaking child should be taught in English and Sjanish in equal amounts.
6. English only should be taught to Spanish and Anglo children beginning from the first grade.
8. The English speaking child should be taught in English and Spanish at the same time in equal amounts in the first grade.
12. Spanish should not be taught in the elementary grades as children will learn to speak with an accent.
13. The $\Lambda$ nglo child should be taught to speak Spanish fluently.
15. School should not be conducted in Spanish after the thircl grade.
16. The teaching of Spanish to the Spanish speaking child interferes in communicating with those who do not speak Spanish.
17. The teaching of Spanish to the Spanish speaking child ajds in his communication with others.
18. The teaching of Spanish to the Spanish speaking child helps him relate the ideas and experiences of the honc with those in the school.
19. The teaching of Spanish to the Spanish surnamed child interferes with the adjustment in the school setting.
20. Spanjsh should be taught in high school only.
21. Spanish should be used only as a bridge to linglish.
22. Teachers should not allow children to speak Spanisn in the school.

24. The Spanish language has no value in this country.
25. All Spanish surnamed parents should encourage the teaching of linglish anci Spanish in the schools.
26. All Spanish surnamed parents should encourage schools to teach only in English.
27. The State Department of Education should see that enough Spanish-speaking teachers arc available.
28. It is up to the universities to offer courses that fit the needs of bil.ingual children.
29. The Spanish surnamed child should be taught to speak Spanish (lucntly.
30. The Spanish surnamed child should be taught to speak English flucntly.
31. From what I know about Bilingual Education Programs they are of little value.
32. Bilingual Education Programs should be made availablc to everyone.
33. The goal of Bilingual Education should be to remove a Spanish accent.
34. Respect for the values of culturally different groups should be 1:3ught.
35. A good bilingual program should teach both the lan!uape and about the culture.
36. A teacher should understand the cultures that exis: in the Southwest.

3\%. The teaching of Spanish to the Anglo child will aid him in understanding the ideas and experiences of the Spanish surnamed child.
38. The teaching of Spanish to the Inglish speaking child will aid in his communication with the Spanish surnamed child.
39. linglish spaking children should be given the same oplortunity to learn Spanish as are Spanish spoaking children.
40. Jing1ish speaking children should be in bilingual programs.
41. linglish speaking parents should encourage their children to learn Spanish.
42. The needs of the communities should be assessed before a bilingual program is started.
61. Removing a Spanish accent should be one of the goals of bilingual education.

ATTITUDFS TOWARD USE: OF SPANISH IN THE CURRICULUM

1. The Spanish speaking child should be taught only in Spanish.
2. The Spanish speaking child should be taught only in linglish.
3. The Spanish spoaking child should be taught in English and Spanish in equal amounts.
4. Spanish and jinglish should be taught to Spanish speaking children beginning from the first grade.
5. Spanish only should be taught to Spanish speaking children beginning from the first grade.
6. linglish only should be taught to Spanish and English children beginning from the first grade.
7. The linglish speaking child should be taught only in Spanish.
8. The linglish speaking child should be taught in English and Spanish in equal amounts in the first grade.
9. Spanish only should have been taught when you were in the elementary school.
10. Imglish only should be taught in the elementary grades.
11. Spanish and English should be taught to English speaking children beginning from the first grade.
12. Spanish should not be taught in the elenentary grades as children will learn to speak with an accent.
13. The linglish speaking child should be taught to speak Spanjsh fluently.
14. The teaching of Spanish to Spanish speaking children will make them feel different from the rest of the children of the same age.
15. School should not be conducted in Spanish after the third grade.
16. Spanish should be taught in hish school onty.
17. linglish spaking children should learn Spanish.
18. The Spanish language has no valuc in this country.
19. The Spanish speaking child should be taught to speak Spanish fluently.
20. The Spanish speaking child should be taught to speak jinglish: fluently.

## ATTITUDES TONARD CULTURE:

18. The toaching of Spanish to the Spanish surnamed child helps him relate the ideas and experiences of the home with those in the school.
19. The ter :hing of Spanish helps the "panish speaking ch:ld make an easior adjustment to the school setting.
20. The Spanish speaking chald should be taught about the Spanish culture.
21. The teaching of Spanish in the school aids everyone in the better understanding of the Spanish family.
22. The teaching of Spanish aids in the better understanding of the Sparish community.
23. The teaching about the Spanjsh culture in the schools aids the Spanish speaking child in understanding the views of. parents and grandparents.
24. With the teaching of Spanish in the sciools the Spanish surnamed child feels better about himself.
25. With the teaching of Spanish, the Spasish speaking child and the English speaking child will understand each other better.
26. $\Lambda$ Spanish speaking child should be taught English only to prepare him to compete in an English speaking socicty.
27. $\Lambda$ Spanish speaking child taught in Spanish will meet with better success in the school.
28. Children should be encouraged to speak Spanish at home if they are able to speak i.t.
29. Children should be encouraged to speak Spanish all the time if they are able to speak it.
30. Since this is an English speaking society, children should be encouraged to speak English only.
31. The teaching of Spanish will divide groups against each other.
32. The teaching of Spanish will unite groups towards brotherly love.
33. Spanish speaking parents should not allow their children to speak Spanish at home.
34. Nll Spanish speaking children should feel proud they can speak Spanish.
35. All Spanish surnamed children should speak Spanish.
36. Becausc of a lack of sufficient knowledge of English, Spanish speaking children drop out of school.
37. I find a Spanish accent agreeable to the ear.
38. Removing a Spanish accent should be one of the goals of bilingual education.
39. The Anglo child should be taught about the Spanish culture.
40. The teaching of Spanish to the linglish speaking child will aid him in understanding the culture of the Spanish speaking child.

APPIENDIX 3

## POSITIVE - NEGATIVE STATED I'LEMS

POSIMIVI: S'PATEMINTS - Scored 6 through 1.
The following items arc stated in a positive manncr:

| 1 | 11 | 25 | 32 | 38 | 43 | 48 | 58 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 13 | 27 | 34 | 39 | 44 | 50 | 60 |
| 4 | 17 | 28 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 51 | 62 |
| 7 | 18 | 29 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 52 | 63 |
| 8 | 23 | 30 | 37 | 42 | 47 | 55 |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  | 57 |  |

NEGATIVE SICATI:MI:N'SS - Scored 1 through 6.
The following items are stated in a negative manner:

| 2 | 16 | 31 | 59 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 5 | 19 | 33 | 61 |
| 6 | 20 | 49 |  |
| 10 | 21 | 53 |  |
| 12 | 22 | 54 |  |
| 14 | 24 | 56 |  |
| 15 | 26 |  |  |

## APPENDIX 4

DM'IE $\qquad$
TIMI: OF DAY $\qquad$

MA'I: O1: B1R'II $\qquad$
SIIX
(Мス̃.Пі)
(अIMAT:
WIDOW $\qquad$ WIDOW:R $\qquad$ MARRIED $\qquad$ DIVORCI:D $\qquad$ HON MANY CIIIIDREN DO YOU HAVI:? $\qquad$
HOM MANY (IHILIJREN LIVI: AT HOME? $\qquad$
WIIAT GRAII:S ARE YOUR GHILDREN IN?
IINVI: ANY OI YOUR CHILDREN EVER BEEN IN A BILINGUNL PROGRAM? $\qquad$
11: TII: ANSW:R IS YES, WHERE $\qquad$ WHEN $\qquad$ WHATI ARI: TIII: AGI:S OI YOUR CHILIRREN? $\qquad$
WHATV WAS TII: LAST GRADF OF SCHOOL YOU COMPLETED? $\qquad$ WIIAT iS TIII: OCCUPATION OF WIIE?
(BE SPECIFIC)
WIITT IS 'HI: OC:CUPATION OF HUSBAND?
(BE SPICCIFIC)

1. WERE YOU BORN IN THI UNITEI S'TATES? $\qquad$
2 WERE YOIIR PARINT'S BORN IN THE UNITEL S'INTES? $\qquad$
2. WI:RL YOUR GRANDPARENTS BORN IN THE UNITED STATES?
3. HOW LONG IIAVI YOU LIVEIJ IN YOUR PRESENT COMMUNITY? $\qquad$
4. HON LONG IINVI: YOU LIVED IN NEW MIXICO?
G. HOW LONG HIAVE YOU LIVI:D IN THE SOUTHWEST?
i. WIIAT WAS TIIE LANGUAGE YOU FIRST LEARNED AT HOME? $\qquad$
5. WIA'I LANGUAGE DO YOU USE MOST WITH YOUR HUSBAND? $\qquad$
!. WIIAT LANGUAGT DO YOU USE MOST WITH YOUR WIFE?
io. WHAT langungr do you USE MOST WITH YOUR CHIl.gien? $\qquad$
6. WHAT LANGUAGE DO YOU USI: MOST WITTH RELATIVES? $\qquad$
7. WIIAT LANGUAGE DO YOU USE MOST WITH FRIIENDS? $\qquad$

APPENDIX 5

## Dear larents:

The Department of l:1ementary Education at the University of New Mexico in cooperation with the Albuquerque lublic Schools is conducting a rescarch project on parcntal atititudes toward lilineual l:ducation.

We are very much interested in your opinion as a parent and we would like for you to fill out the questionnalie which will be given you by an interviewer. Your cooporation in this research will be of great bencfit towards forwarding scicntific knowledge in this inportant area, and towards helping us understand certain needs that our children have.

An intervicwer will read with you the items on the questiomaire. If you have any questions as to wording, please feed frec to ask the interviewer to explain the item. You are not to ask the interviewer for his or her opinjon as you are to answer the questionnaire according to your own belicfs. Therc are no right or wrong answers, since people's opinions differ. We are interested in these differences. please do not try to make any type of impression, since this is an objective, scientific study without any bias in onc direction or another.

Two intervicwers, one female and one malc, will be coming to your home. The male interviewer will interview the hushind and the female intervicwer will interview the wife. pleasc answer the questionnaire without discussion of the itcms with any member of the family, with the exception of the interviewer who will only explain the item if: necessary. Answer each question as best you can.

It is not necessary that you sign the questionnairc. We have given your questionnaire a number so that you will remain anonymous.

We appreciate your cooperation in this important study.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY
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|  |  | Medius. | stio. | Onder |  | overs | stat. |  |  |  |  | sfa: |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reed } \\ & \text { ane } \end{aligned}$ | Stas. | $\begin{gathered} \text { siphep } \\ \text { refef: } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Trensient } \\ \substack{\text { poft! }} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sent |  | Incoer |  | S0 | ${ }^{\text {x }}$ | S8 |  | 4 | S 5 | N | 50 |  | H |  | H | Sp |  | : |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | . $18{ }^{3}$ | 11.87 . 58 | 1.78 | . 11 | .$^{23}$ |  |  | 1.84 | . 65 |  |  |  |  | . 78 |  |  |  |  | . 12 | 3 |
|  |  | 2.78 .69 | ${ }^{1}$ | $\left.\right\|_{5.31} ^{1.81}$ | 1.85 | . 63 | ${ }_{2} .85^{4}$ | , |  |  | . 60 |  |  | .5s |  | . 32 |  | s.:3 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.25 . 68 | ${ }_{1.86^{4}}$ | \|s.38 | s.28 | . 92 | .93 ${ }^{3}$ | 3.43 | . $5^{\text {i }}$ | 5.22 | . 98 | 1.69 |  | . $5:$ | 9 | 1.12 | . $3.25{ }^{4}$ | 5.21 |  | 5.48 | . 37 | $1.24^{8}$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{lll}5.32 & .92 & 5.5 \\ 5.34 & .90\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll}3.21 & 1.01 \\ 3.32\end{array}$ | 1.373 | -5.38 . 18 | 5.30 | . 93 | . $7^{3}$ | 5.45 | . 76 | 5.24 | . 01 | 12.28 |  | 74 | 5.18 | 1.01 | $2.66^{4}$ | 5.32 | . 84 |  | . 95 |  |
|  | 5.34 .90 ${ }^{5.30}$ | 5.16 69 | ${ }^{18^{3}}$ | ¢ 5.20 . 18 | 3.11 | . 75 | . 903 |  | . 31 : | S. 23 | . 66 |  |  | . 69 | 5.14 | . 79 | .3s3 | 5.16 | . 67 | s.15 | . 81 | $8^{3}$ |
|  | 5.15 .74 5.15 . 11 |  |  | . 27.91 | 5.02 | 1.13 | 1.1 |  |  | 5.28 | . 6 | ? 2 |  | 1.1 | 5. | .93 | .13 ${ }^{3}$ | 5.29 | . 80 | 5.38 | 1.29 | .793 |
|  |  | 18.20 |  | 2.02 | 1.81 | 1.09 |  |  |  | 8.87 | . 85 | 1. |  | 2.03 | 1.9 | . 33 | $3^{3}$ | 1.8: | .is | 2.97 | 1.15 | 1.9: ${ }^{4}$ |
|  | -3 .98,2.07 | . 95 |  | $\begin{array}{ll}2.02 & .87 \\ 5.26 & .99\end{array}$ | 4.99 | 1.37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | s.0: | 1.21 | .893 | 4.9 | 1.34 | 3.2 | 1.68 | 1.8:4 |
|  |  |  |  | 5.86 .99 | 4.9 | 1.37 |  |  |  |  | . 1 |  |  |  |  | . 20 | . 083 | 1.78 | . 72 | 1.95 | . 90 | 1.5:3 |
| 93 | :.8: . 82 !1.95 . 90 | . 2 | [1.57 ${ }^{1}$ | 1.95 .14 | 1.79 | . 89 | $1.33^{3}$ | . 81 | . 82 | 1.8 | . |  |  |  |  | . 97 | $2.40^{3}$ | 5.15 | . 83 | 5.26 | . 65 | ${ }^{33}$ |
| 102 | !. 28 . 3715.26 . 85 | . 39 | ${ }^{1.93}$ | 24 . 92 | 5.13 | . 12 | $3^{3}$ |  |  |  | . 7 |  |  |  |  |  | $1.98{ }^{4}$ | 5.19 | 1.02 | 3.16 | 1.94 | $.2 c^{3}$ |
| 121 | 1. | 3.191 .02 | $1.20^{3}$ | 5.231 .05 | 5.13 | 1.02 | .71 ${ }^{3}$ | 5.25 | . 05 |  | . 00 |  |  |  |  |  | $1.06{ }^{3}$ |  | . 16 |  | . 88 | ${ }^{63}$ |
| $12{ }^{2}$ | :.:3 .71!5.26 .68 | . 98 | $1.09^{3}$ | . 69 | 5.12 | . 77 | 2.854 | 5. 20 | . 68 | . 32 | . 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.04 | 4. | 1.16 | 4.80 | 1.21 |  |
| 131 | : 4.351 .19 ! | 4.331 .16 | ${ }^{1} .17^{3}$ | 98 1.08 | 3 | 1.30 | $1.07{ }^{3}$ | 4. |  | 4.601 | 1.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . $63^{3}$ |
| 181 | ${ }_{3} 1.231 .00$,s | 3.081 .07 | . $65^{3}$ | 12 | 3 | 1.26 | $4.15{ }^{4}$ | 5.08 | 1.11 | . 17 | . 95 |  |  |  |  |  | $1.05^{3}$ |  |  |  | . 92 |  |
| $15{ }^{2}$ | . 16 . 56 5. 26 | 22.98 | !. $35^{3}$ | . 5.38 . 91 | 5.11 | 2.03 | 2.0 | 5.1 | .09 | 5.30 | . 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $16^{2}$ | 5.8: 1.054 .961 .12 | 08 | ${ }^{1} .84^{3}$ | 1 | s | . 33 | .963 | 5.03 | . 98 | 3.02 | . 01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $17^{2}$ | . 28.81 . 5.26 . 93 | 3.30 . 88 | .303 | 34.96 | 5.25 | . 6 | . $8{ }^{3}$ |  |  |  | . 80 |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \$. 30 .m | 5.26 . 83 | . $33^{3}$ | ! 5.42 . 77 | 5.15 | . 92 | $2.38{ }^{4}$ |  | . 90 |  | 76 | . $48^{3}$ | 3.36 |  |  | . 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |



istarement is posiziveis atared. 2statement is negatively steted.
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| $\begin{gathered} \text { state- } \\ \hline \text { Be97 } \end{gathered}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {col }}$ |  | Leves Incene |  | lediun ncose | $\sin ^{2}$ |  | Ondes sfe 35 |  | is | $s_{s}^{e},: \text {. }$ |  |  |  |  | $\sin _{10}^{t} .$ |  | ess ancter |  |  | Hore | s:i: | Staste |  | E-1. | ¢? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N |  |  | $5{ }^{\text {S }}$ |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  | \% | : 5 |  |  | S: |  | 5: |  | M | 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5:32. |
| ss1 | 5.15 |  | ; S. 16 | 1.07 | 5.14 | 04 | . 293 | 5.32 | 1.03 | 4.98 | . 10 | 2.338 | 5.10 |  |  | . 02 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.07 | 2.55: 5.14 |  |  |  | $19^{3}$ |
| 88: | 5.48 |  | is. 15 | . 76 | 5.51 | . 68 | . 363 | 1 | . 68 | 5.35 | . 82 | $2.55{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | . 70 | . $00^{3}$ | 9.5 | . 76 |  |  |  | . $33^{3} 5.51$ |  |  |  | .5s ${ }^{3}$ |
| $37^{1}$ | 3.67 |  | 1.63 | . 88 | 5.71 | . 43 | 1.2 | . 55 | . 48 | \$.49 | . 50 | 5.29 |  |  |  | . 67 | .14 ${ }^{3}$ | 5.65 |  |  |  |  | . $43^{3} .5 .78$ |  |  | . 48 | 2.:3 ${ }^{3}$ ! |
| 511 | 4.57 | 1.39 | 4.71 | 1.51 | 4.43 | 2.65 | 1.8 | 4.58 | . 59 | 4.55 | 1.59 |  |  |  |  | 45 | . $30^{3}$ | 4.64 | 2.58 | 4.50 |  | 1.59 | .633 4.43 |  | 4.:1 | 2.5: | $1.32{ }^{3}$ |
| $30^{2}$ | 3.1 | Sa! |  | 1.55 | 3.15 | . 53 | . $35^{3}$ | 3.36 | . 50 | 3.00 | 1.58 | $1.74{ }^{4}$ | 3.18 | 1.51 | , 11 | 1.3 | . $00^{3}$ | 2.9 | 1.53 | 3.37 |  | 2.53 | $2.85^{4} 3.15$ |  |  | 1.55 | . $33^{3}$ |
| $60^{1}$ | 4.87 | . 37 | 9 |  | . 75 | .01 | $1.11^{4}$ | 4.18 | . 01 | 4.48 | . 15 |  |  |  |  | . 99 | .14 ${ }^{3}$ | 4.9 | . 8 | 4.77 |  | 2.04 | $1.52^{3} 4.75$ |  |  | . 11 | $1.18{ }^{4}$ |
| $61^{2}$ |  |  |  | 1.35 | o.s | . 11 | .54 ${ }^{3}$ | . 76 | . 50 | 4.87 | 1.23 | . 13 | . 80 | 1.40 |  | . 36 | .05 ${ }^{3}$ | 4. |  |  |  |  | .93 ${ }^{3} 4.75$ |  | 4.15 | 1.35 | . 543 |
| $62^{1}$ |  |  |  | . 52 | s.cs | .71 | .76 ${ }^{3}$ | 5.63 | . 61 | 5.35 | . 67 |  | . 55 |  |  | . 69 | . $41^{3}$ | 5.56 | . 50 | I |  | ? 7 | 1.854is.45 |  |  |  | . 763 |
| $63^{3}$ | 3.26 | . 32 | 3.43 | . 11 | \$. 30 | . 11 | $1.13^{3}$ | 15.52 | . 78 | 5.21 | . 9 | $2.75{ }^{4}$ | s. 3 ? | . 18 | 5.35 | .95 | $1.16^{3}$ | 5.4 | . 77 | s. 25 |  | . 15 | 12.294:5.30 |  | 5.43 | .is | 1.15 ${ }^{3}$ |
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