DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 926 CG 013 332

AUTHOR Brown, Barry S.
TITLE Clinical Applications of Evaluation Studies.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (86th, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Clinics; *Counseling Effectiveness; *Drug Abuse; *Drug Therapy; *Evaluation Methods; Followup Studies; Patients (Persons); Program Evaluation; *Therapeutic Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Methadone Maintenance Treatment

ABSTRACT

A series of followup investigations exploring the impact of methadone maintenance treatment, methadone detoxification treatment, therapeutic communities, and outpatient drug-free treatment for the drug abuser was conducted. Limitations of these modalities were revealed in the followup studies. Implications for treatment and policy include: (1) methadone detoxofication as a short-term program is a relatively ineffective treatment technique, but the longer a client remains in treatment, the more likely it is there will be a positive outcome; (2) procedures of intake should make the alternatives available to clients clear to them at time of entry; and (3) aggressive client followup which makes continuing care available to the client at time of exit from the program helps to ensure the client's successful integration into the community. (Author)

CLINICAL APPLICATIONS OF EVALUATION STUDIES

Barry S. Brown
Services Research Branch
National Institute on Drug Abuse

I would like to explore with you first some of the implications for clinical practice and policy that might be drawn from the studies just reported and then to explore some of the issues involved in making research results in drug abuse useful to the clinical and planning communities. With regard to results reported from the DARP studies, attention will be paid to three findings that appear to this observer to be of particular significance. The areas selected for exploration are the relative ineffectiveness of detoxification as a treatment modality, the relationship between length of time in treatment and treatment outcome, and the relatively low levels of employment seen at time of follow-up interview.

To deal first with the questionable utility of detoxification as a treatment modality. It will be recalled that detoxification clients were found to fare considerably more poorly than maintenance or therapeutic community clients particularly, and to somewhat lesser extent did more poorly than outpatient drug free clients as well.

Inasmuch as length of time in treatment is significantly related to treatment outcome, it seems hardly surprising that a treatment regimen demanding minimal client involvement is less effective than other, more demanding, modalities. Indeed, one can argue that the clients who enter detoxification differ in motivation for treatment from those who enter the more demanding treatment regimens of maintenance or residential care and that this, in part explains their poorer

treatment performance. Prior study suggests that clients eligible for maintenance who select detoxification do indeed differ from those selecting maintenance in ways that indicate a larger responsibility felt for themselves and/or their families (Bass and Brown, 1973).

Nonetheless, the DARP findings regarding detoxification invite an effort, if they do not suggest a need, to explore initiatives that might deal with the failure of detoxification as a treatment modality.

The importance of exploring treatment initiatives for use with detoxification clients is further emphasized by an examination of data derived from the ongoing collection of information about clients entering federally funded programs. Of opiate users entering treatment in the most recent period for which data is available, the three month period of October-December 1977, 33 percent opted for detoxification-25 percent of all incoming clients selecting outpatient detoxification, making outpatient detoxification the largest single treatment category among opiate users admitted to treatment. Of larger significance, approximately two-thirds of all admissions to detoxification met the criteria for admission to methadone maintenance and, of course, all met the criteria for admission to therapeutic communities. Finally, during the period of October-December 1977, only four percent of clients admitted to outpatient detoxification were transferred to other treatment programs, i.e. for the vast bulk of detoxification clients recruitment into detoxification was not a part of the treatment experience, it was the treatment experience.

With regard to initiatives for treatment, one obvious option, and perhaps the option most easily exercised, is to make treatment as attractive as possible and return to treatment as free of harassment as possible so that the former client, if experiencing difficulty, can return easily whether to detoxification or to a more demanding regimen. It will be recalled that the DARP data suggests that drug abuse clients generally return to same treatment as that from which they exited with some increase in admissions to maintenance programs.

An additional option, open to many programs, is to regard the intake process as an opportunity to counsel with the client regarding his/her treatment needs and expectations regarding treatment. In that context, discussion can and should focus on the treatment form that best meets client's needs and expectations. This is not meant to suggest that entry into specific modalities be coerced or indeed that the first treatment contact be one of harassment-even if harassment with the best of intentions. It is to suggest that the intake counselor ally himself or herself with the client in meeting the client's needs and indicate those treatment options that exist within the program and/or the community. Only by so doing can the client be given the ability to make an informed choice in terms of his/her situation and concerns. Similar effort can, and should, be made to allow the client to understand the availability, if not desirability, of drug free treatment once detoxification is completed.

A third program option is that of providing to the client followup or continuing care that extends beyond that of the formal treatment

program. Again, caution must be taken that any such activity does not represent an imposition that the client neither expects nor wants. To some extent this can be handled by clarifying that the treatment experience shall be structured to include client followup. Further, that that followup shall involve on the one hand the provision of services needed as the client returns fully to the community; and on the other, a period of continuing contact with the client to assess progress in the community and to aid in the resolution of problems as appropriate. The services that could be embraced within a continuing care structure are many and would depend on client needs as client and counselor come to view them. Services to be provided could include school or vocational assistance, housing assistance, acquisition of welfare or other benefits, medical or dental care, legal help, etc. While such efforts are encountered in mental health programming, they are far less frequently provided in drug abuse.

Assistance would also be directed toward providing the client with the social supports needed to aid the client in undertaking a new or changed manner of coping with his/her community. The nature of those supports may vary as well. Work can be undertaken in terms of exploring family relationships in an effort to understand whether and to what extent the family can act as a source of support and assistance for the client. As appropriate, effort can be made to shore up those supports. Indeed, it would be important to work with the client in structuring not only his or her work related activities in the community, as described above, but to explore as well the client's leisure time activities including recreational activities and friendship patterns.

It appears obvious that both may be related to the successful adoption of a new, and differing, life style. Moreover, it seems likely that both must be observed and worked with in the client's community since clearly that is the crucible in which a new role and functioning will be forged.

The finding from study of the DARP samples that length of time in treatment is associated with positive outcome would appear to argue for continuing care efforts on behalf of more clients than just those admitted into detoxification regimens. The effort to usefully extend client contact with the service provider may then add further to the impact of treatment already provided. While clearly some number of clients will want no further contact with drug abuse treatment in any form, it seems likely that some number of clients will want and appreciate this community-oriented continuity of effort. Moreover, that effort need not be tied to the workings of a formal treatment program. As an example, increasing interest is being shown in the role that can be played by self-help groups. These groups can provide both the support of peers to the former client's efforts to remain drug free in the community, and can provide as well a stimulus to greater responsibility-taking and a wider range of self-actualizing behaviors.

One is drawn inevitably to compare the drug abuse and alcoholism fields in their use of self-help organizations. While AA is a richly flourishing organization, its counterpart in drug abuse, Narcotics Anonymous or NA, although of undeniable importance, remains a much less vigorous force. Reasons for the far slower growth of non-residential self-

help efforts in drug abuse are numerous and have been explored elsewhere (Brown and Ashery, 1978); however, the utility of such groups in extending the treatment experience while giving needed support to the former client makes them an attractive force for further encouragement and eventual assessment.

Before I digress my way into another symposium, let me return more narrowly to a discussion of the detoxification client. A fourth avenue available for exploration is that of modifying the regulations governing detoxification scheduling and procedure. As effective argument is marshalled, there is opportunity to modify the existing regulations regarding methadone detoxification that limit such activity to a 21 day period. At this point the potential for effecting such change is unclear, however there appear two useful arguments in support of that effort. Both are born of evaluative studies which have been conducted. On the one hand, there is the study of the DARP samples already reported, specifically the relative ineffectiveness of methadone detoxification and relatedly the relationship between positive outcome and length of time in treatment. On the other, there is the work reported by Senay and his colleagues (Senay et al., 1977) that explored among other issues the impact of gradual as opposed to rapid detoxification. It might be noted that rapid detoxification covered a period of 10 weeks whereas gradual detoxification covered a period of 30. The study, conducted under double blind conditions, found significant differences between groups in terms of dropout rates, requests for interruption in withdrawal schedule, rates of urines positive for illicit drugs, and client reports of symptoms. All such differences

favored the gradual detoxification sample. The original study samples involved clients detoxifying from methadone maintenance regimens and a larger effort is currently under way using methadone detoxification clients only, which if supportive of earlier findings, can be presented together with the DARP findings to suggest alternative regulations regarding detoxification scheduling.

Let me turn finally to a brief discussion of DARP findings with regard to employment. While significant differences have been obtained in terms of client employment pre and post-treatment for selected modalities, the percentage reporting themselves as employed at time of followup would appear cause for concern. Only 49 percent of all clients report themselves as employed (where employment may be only one day in the preceding two month period) with a high of 55 percent in therapeutic communities. Indeed, only 35 percent overall reported themselves as employed over half of the two month preceding interview. Yet, employment-or at least productive activity-would seem essential to the client's adopting and maintaining a changed life style. Indeed, investigation of client and staff treatment goals have placed obtaining employment at the top of both groups' lists (Goldenberg, 1972; Mandel et al., 1973). Obviously, new initiatives in the vocational rehabilitation of drug abusers are required.

One such effort that has been recently initiated and appears promising is the supported work program. That program, first developed in association with drug abuse programs in New York City and later expanded to 14 additional cities, provides structured small group work experiences that permit of graduated responsibility-taking in association with

a similarly graduated system of rewards. Preliminary findings from those demonstrations suggest that this technique offers clients greater potential for remaining out of jail, for retaining jobs and making advancement within those jobs than a control sample lacking supported work experience (Friedman, 1978).

If supported work efforts, or variations of those, represent initiatives in vocational rehabilitation available to program and community agency, additional efforts by various governmental agencies will be necessary to modify business and union attitudes. Those attitudes often remain as significant impediments to the obtaining of other than dead-end jobs by drug abuse clients. A still more troublesome impediment remains the state of the economy with its obvious impact on the hiring of individuals of often limited work skills and job histories.

In many respects the ease with which treatment implications are coaxed from work with the DARP samples points up not only the importance and utility of these studies, but raises again the dilemna of bringing researcher/evaluator and clinician into closer communication with each other. Both have a considerable stake in effecting a better communication process. The researcher, who has elected to engage him- or herself in evaluation study, has moved some distance from more normative, and more traditionally acceptable, academic study and has understandable need to see his or her work translated into action. Indeed it can be argued that the researcher who applies his or her skills in the interest of evaluative research must be, or should be, particularly secure in his or her research credentials. Not only are the dollars available for evaluative study likely to be less than those available

for more largely basic research, but even a hasty perusal of the "good" journals indicates that abstraction is rewarded in a way that application is not. Thus, it has been reported that the researcher who begins to express concern about application runs the risk of losing status among his or her peers (Davis and Salasin, 1977). In that context, then, many researchers, who have invested themselves in policy oriented study, have expressed frustration over their inability to see findings they consider important applied within treatment settings.

The price of missed, or no, communication can be similarly high for the clinician administrator or planner. There is not only a desire on the part of most to remain contemporary with their field and to be acting in accord with the current state of knowledge, but far more importantly there is a desire and a need felt to serve clients in accord with the best information available at the time.

The impediments to improved communication have been well reported particularly in articles by Davis and Salasin, 1977; Mann and Likert, 1952; Weiss, 1973; Kiresuk et al., 1977; Glaser, 1973; Rossi and Williams, 1972; and others. It is worth recounting briefly the forces that have been described as necessary to the development of an effective communication system before discussing communication models that have application to the field of drug abuse. It should be clear that the issue of concern at this point is not the utilization of evaluation study conducted at a single program site by that individual program (although this may be difficult enough), but the utilization of evaluation and research findings by programs other than those in which the studies have been conducted.

As a first consideration, program staff must be open to change. Thus, program staff must see their program as capable of modification and improvement, and must themselves be willing to take guidance from the experiences of others. On the one hand, there must be a concern with enhancing program such that it can better serve clients, on the other there must be minimal defensiveness about oneself and about program such that inadequacies or gaps can be admitted and corrected. If we hazard that a concern for clients will virtually always be the case, we are left to deal with the resistances to program change that can be operative as a function of defensiveness. These have been characterized by Davis and Salasin (1977) as fears of economic loss, fears about personal security, fears about decreased personal convenience, fears about decreased job satisfaction, fears of inability to learn easily new skills and a new role, felt overcommitment, etc. Obviously, depending on the depth of such feelings, more or less work will need to be done to assure program staff of the relative safety of making such changes-assuming, in fact, changes can be safely made.

It should be clear that just as there may be resistances to clear away in the process of implementing change, so too there can be the prospect of rewards to program staff even apart from improved ability to serve clients. Thus, the prospect of developing new skills can bring with it not only a concern about one's adequacy, but also challenge and fresh excitement to a job that may have become routine-to say nothing of containing as well the prospect of greater economic rewards and security.

We come next to the evaluation/research findings themselves. On the one hand, those findings must appear credible. Regarding this latter point, as frustrating as it may be for research staff, t tests or even factor analyses may be insufficient to assure belief if the findings conflict with the clinical experiences of program staff. It may be easy for program staff to assert that the findings apply to other programs and/or to other times, but not to them. Indeed, they may, of course, be correct.

In related fashion, the treatment implications to be drawn from the research conducted must be clear, the relevance of findings to the functioning of that specific program must be apparent, and the actions that will be demanded of program personnel to implement such change must also be clear. What is being structured then is a need to make the implications of findings as program specific as possible and to reduce program resistance to change to the degree feasible. It appears likely that the more nearly communication with program is conducted on a face to face basis the more easily all issues of research utility can be resolved. Indeed, one can posit a continuum extending from face to face discussion between evaluator and program staff to journal article describing research findings, i.e. from an effort at making research findings as concrete and program-specific as possible to an effort to place findings on a plane that is both abstract and general. If the former is rarely achieved, the latter is obtained too frequently. I might indicate paranthetically that a middle ground, that of making research findings available in a language and form that (hopefully) will admit of their greater utility, is a step that staff of TCU have taken in conjunction with staff at the National

Institute on Drug Abuse, as will be described shortly.

Finally, we come to the mundane, if nonetheless crucial, issues of dollars available to the treatment program, personnel needed, space identified, training to be initiated, etc. in support of the application of research/evaluation findings. While there is much to be said for individual initiative and the vertical motion of bootstraps, there is also a good deal to be said for money and adequate resources. Also cited as relevant is the timing of events such that the program initiative can be aligned with other events at the programs, i.e. the initiative occurs at a time when it does not conflict with other significant program activities or organizational circumstances.

The dilemma then remains of making research findings available to service deliverers in a form that can be useful to them in planning new program initiatives. The range and number of program concerns to be considered make clear that no easy solutions will be forthcoming.

The effort to make research findings useful to a clinical audience is one that has been seen as an especial concern of the National Institute on Drug Abuse and has increasingly occupied the Institute's attention. It should be noted that this issue has for considerably longer occupied the attention of NIMH — and most particularly, the attention of Howard Davis and his staff.

At NIDA, there has been a view that it is the responsibility of the Institute to develop mechanisms for sharing within the field at a minimum that knowledge gained through governmental support. Moreover,

it seems clear at this point that a third actor, as for example the Institute, is useful -if not necessary - to make research findings available to the clinical public. In the main, existing mechanisms to permit communication between researcher and clinician are few and largely inadequate. Journals and, to lesser extent, conferences are primarily the province of the researcher and have not proven terribly useful as a medium of exchange between researcher and clinician.

Two initiatives available to a governmental, or other, agency might then be considered. One makes use of the role of information clearinghouse and deals with written communication only. The second would involve still another actor closer to treatment program and is intended to permit face to face as well as written communication. In the first instance, the adoption of the clearinghouse model, the Institute has undertaken to set some number of research/evaluation findings and reports in a form designed to make them as useful to clinical concerns as possible. Those efforts have involved the publication of materials both in as concise a form as possible and the publication of materials in comparatively non-technical formats. In some instances, there has been the publication of materials in both non-technical and technical forms -- the latter specifically geared to the research audience and to that portion of the clinical audience who seek a fuller statement of methodology and analysis.

A second effort, again within the role of clearinghouse, also involves the publication of materials directed most largely, although not exclusively, to a clinical audience. In this instance, a variety of persons active in the drug abuse field, have been asked to review

differing issues significant to the role and functioning of the treatment community, e.g., vocational rehabilitation, aftercare, methadone detoxification, etc. Each reviewer has been asked to emphasize research findings of the preceding five years and to develop implications for treatment, for training [redacted], as well as for research, all within the space of 10 pages.

In its capacity as clearinghouse, the Institute makes these publications as widely available as money permits -- including mailings to all drug treatment programs known to the Institute. It is apparent that these efforts are intended to approximate more closely than journal articles can a talking to program personnel regarding treatment initiatives that appear useful. As approximations only, they cannot speak directly to specific program needs, resistances, etc. They can alert programs to options they might not previously have considered. In an effort to understand the impact of these tailored publications, if any, study is now being conducted of the use made of them by drug abuse programs.

Clearly, in terms of the ideal of direct face to face contact with program with opportunity to discuss specific program needs and concerns, the clearinghouse role remains very much a half measure. Nonetheless, for some functions, it would appear relatively adequate, e.g., in pointing up the limited utility of detoxification and in encouraging a limited range of program options. In other instances, as for example encouraging novel vocational rehabilitation initiatives, the clearinghouse model may be far less effective.

While the sheer number of treatment programs prohibits any direct interaction for all but a severely limited number of issues, it is possible to structure interactions between consultants - who may help to guide program change - and a smaller number of actors who can relate to a limited number of drug abuse programs. More specifically, in the field of drug abuse, each state is required to have a drug abuse coordinator whose job it is to guide and, in substantial degree, to supervise the workings of drug abuse programs in his or (in two instances) in her state. As such, they have opportunity to be in frequent contact with individual programs and to be knowledgeable about the workings of those programs. These persons, then, would seem to have obvious potential to play the role of change agent in their states, working through the various issues discussed earlier on a program by program basis. (Obviously, too, all of those issues raised for program - resistances to change, understanding of treatment implications of research, adequate resources, etc., would need to be explored with state coordinators as those issues would relate to their individual situations.) Through a use of regional workshops, state agency coordinators and consultant advisors could be brought together to explore treatment initiatives potential in selected areas.

As should be clear, in some instances the evaluator can point the way to a need for new initiatives or to a deficiency in the treatment process, but will not be the appropriate person to guide a programmatic response to that deficiency. Again, difficulties uncovered in the employment of current or former drug abusers would seem to call for new initiatives that might be guided, in part, by persons who have mounted

successful programs in that area. In other instances, where the evaluation task is more narrow, e.g., where specific family counseling approaches have been found effective, the evaluation researcher and clinical staff might play the role of consultant.

By working directly with small groups of those persons who are on the scene in the various states and are charged with significant resp... for service delivery, effort can be ma... to relate evalua... ...ings and implications to specific treatment needs and concerns. Those state coordinators would then be asked to relate, in turn, to individual programs. The counsulting staff could remain available to state coordinators for limited further assistance.

It will be important to experiment with these and other initiatives in an effort to resolve a problem that is not simply one of difficulty in communication between two professional groups, but is one that threatens to limit the effectiveness with which services are provided to client populations.

REFERENCES

Bass, U. F. and Brown, B. S. Methadone maintenance and methadone detoxification: A comparison of retention rates and client characteristics. The International Journal of the Addictions, 1973, 8, 889-895.

Brown, B. S. and Ashery, R. S. Aftercare in drug abuse programming. In R. L. DuP A. Goldstein and J. O'Donnell (Eds.), Handbook on Drug Abuse. Washington, D. HEW, in press.

Davis, H. R. and Salasin, S. E. Applied social research: In combat with waste and suffering. In Marcia Guttentag (Ed.), Evaluation Studies Review Annual. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.

Friedman, L. N The Wildcat experiment: An early test of supported wo[illegible] Research Report. Washington, D.C.: HEW, in press.

Glaser, E. M. and Ross, H. L. Increasing the utilization of applied research results. Unpublished report, NIMH, 1973.

Goldenberg, I. I. Employment and addiction. Perspectives on Existing Business and Treatment Practices. Washington, D.C.: Department of Labor, 1972.

Kiresuk, T. J., Lund, S. H., Schultz, S. K., and Larsen, N. E. Translating theory into practice: Change research at the program evaluation resource center. Evaluation and Change, 1977, 4, 88-95.

Mandel, W., Goldschmidt, P. G. and Grover, P. An Evaluation of Treatment Programs for Drug Abusers, Vol. II. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1973.

Mann, F. and Likert, R. The need for research on the communication of research results. In F. G. Caro (Ed.), Readings in Evaluation Research. Beverly Hills Russell Sage Foundation, 1971.

Rossi, P. H. and Williams, W. Evaluating Social Programs. New York: Seminar Press, 197[illegible].

Senay, E. C., Dorus, W., Goldberg, F., and Thornton W. Withdrawal from methadone maintenance: Rate of withdrawal and expectation. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1977, 34, 361-367.

Weiss, C. H. Between the cup and the lip. Evaluation, 1973, 1(2), 49-55.

According to them, bilingualism made the children deficient in both languages and produced poor emotional adjustment to the school situation.

According to Jensen(1962) many observers assert that biligualism is a disruptive interloper because it produces:

1)handicaps in speech development

2)disadvantages in language development such as: smaller active and passive vocabulary as a result of borrowing; shorter, incomplete, less complex sentences, unusual word order, etc.

3)handicaps in intellectual development because it becomes a mental burden.

4)retardation in educational progress such as in reading and maladjustment to school.

5) emotional instability due to frustrations arising from ineffectiveness in communication and leading to the development of a shy and introverted person.

Christophersen(1948) went as far as to state that:

> "He(the bilingual child) may become schizophrenic, for most bilinguals feel a pull in opposite directions which threatens the unity of their personality".

The most recurrent argument against biligualism was the threat it posed for national security in war times. The lack of linguistic unity meant a lack of loyalty to the government because of too much sympathy for the country of the citizen's mother tongue and because of the governments' ineffective communication with all of its' citizens.

In the early 60's, dissatisfaction with the results' of the ESL approach began to be felt in the country. Increasing pressures on legislators from minority groups such as Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Native Americans and Mexican-Americans who were awakening to a new found pride in their ethnicity and a realization of the effects the school system was having on their children, both educationally and psychologically, began to make waves for bilingual education.

It would be naive to think that these were the only change agents. A few bilingual programs were already in existence in the southwest at the time and bilingual needs had been documented as early as 1934, when Chicano educators first made their plea for testing and assessment in childrens native tongue. (Martinez, 1972). It is sad to note that bilingual education was recognized as valuable and necessary in many states only after Congress saw fit to enact legislation to assist Cuban refugees.

Research in the field in the early 60,s as well as forces mentioned produced an introduction of bills in Congress in 1967 to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for bilingual education programs. Hearings were held during the summer of 1967 and Mexican-Americans as well as Puerto Ricans and other groups gave strong support to the bill through their testimonials.

In January 1968,President Johnson signed into law the Bilingual Education Act which became Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It's purpose as stated is "designed to meet the specific education needs of children 3 to 18 years of age who have limited English --speaking ability and come from environments where the dominant language is other than English."(Andersson,1970)

Federal funding was provided for projects in bilingual education. Many states with varying populations of non-English speakers began to legislate in favor of some form of bilingual education. In Massachusetts various studies in the Boston area signaled to the critical need for bilingual education because of its escalating number of non-English speakers. Strong community support,lobbying efforts and interested legislators made way for the Transitional Bilingual Educa - tion Act,G.L.Ch.71 A which was enacted in 1971.

Research in the 60's began to point to the assets of bilingualism.New emphasis on developmental cognitive learning also made a strong case for the use of the child's mother tongue in early school experiences.

> "According to the cognitive view,a great deal of a child's early learning consists of ordering the world around him,i.e.,reducing ambiguities and simplifying the 'buzzing of confusion' that surrounds him.This view holds that language plays a critical(though not exclusive) role in the young child's ordering process.Between the ages of five and seven, the child's use of language accelerates,and words become a medium of learning and problem solving.It is at this age that the non-English speaking child is ordinarily confronted with the demand to learn in English and,indirectly to think in English:"
>
> (John and Horner,1971)

So we are introducing a second and weaker language' at a point where it confuses the ordering process of the child.It would seem then,that bilingualism has been claimed as a handicap when in reality it has been the enforcement of the English-only policy or use of ESL at an early age which has produced a childs retardation in the learning process.

Macnamaras(1966) studies in Ireland showed that children instructed through their weaker language showed deterioration in reading and arithmetic,particularly in the area of problem solving.

Saer(1963) found similar results with Welsh children instructed in their weaker language.

Research conducted in bilingual education in Canada (Lambert and Tucker) revealed that:

> "..pupils who were totally fluent in their first language and who could read and write in their own language had a much easier time acquiring second language fluency and even went on to excel when compared to monolingual peers."

In other studies by Lambert and Peal(1962) where the relation of bilingualism to intelligence was studied, the authors found that bilinguals performed better than monolinguals on verbal and nonverbal intelligence tests. In explaining their findings the authors said:

> "..the bilingual child's experience with two languages seems to have left him with a mental flexibility, a superiority in concept formation, and a more diversified set of mental abilities".

Although we can't tell which is the cause and which the effect we still think that bilingualism is an asset.

The advantages of bilingualism have been researched further and we find that the difficulties that have been claimed as created by bilingualism have been a matter of <u>when</u> and <u>how</u> a language (second) is introduced.

As early as 1953 the UNESCO sustained that when schools attempt to teach a second language before the child has developed adequate cognitive skills in his native tongue, the child may become a"non-lingual" whose functioning in both his native and second language develops in only limited ways.(UNESCO,1953)

This due basically to "linguistic interference"--the intermixing of the sounds, vocabulary, grammar, and word meanings of two languages. There are also non-linguistic factors that also affect interference such as the prevailing attitudes toward each language and toward the culture of the community of each language.

It has been shown that when children are taught in their native tongue at an early age and English or the second language is introduced at a certain time and in a certain way, children progress in second language acquisition much faster.

Ostenberg's studies in Sweden(1961), Modianos in México, Barrera-Vázquez with Tarascan Indian children (UNESCO, 1953) and others such as the Harlandale School District study, support the previous statement.

Ostenberg set up an experimental and control group of children. One received reading instruction in Pitean which was the dialect spoken by the children; the other group was taught reading in Swedish although their dialect was also Pitean. At the end of 10 weeks' the ones taught in Pitean had progressed further than the Swedish-taught group. By the end of the year, the first group had also greater ability in reading Swedish than the group which had been introduced to Swedish from the very beginning.

Modianos study with Mexican children from three different Indian tribes produced similar results. Each group was taught in the vernacular until they mastered the primers. They were later introduced to Spanish. When compared on reading tests the experimental groups who were initially taught in the vernacular read with greater comprehension than the control group which was initially taught in Spanish.

Barrera-Vásquez developed a Tarascan Project in México where monolingual Tarascan Indian children were taught reading in Tarascan.These children had not been able to function in the federal schools where Spanish was the medium of instruction.After two years in the project they were able to enter the second grade of the public schools again and were successful in reading in Spanish.

The Harlandale One Year Bilingual Project,dealt with Mexican American children. One first grade class in each of four elementary schools was instructed in English and Spanish.The other first grade classes which were the controls were taught in English only.Tests at the end of the year showed that biligual sections did as well in reading English as the control groups and that the four biligual sections could speak,read and write in both languages at the end of the year.

Three of the four bilingual made more progress in every measure(communicative skills,conceptual development and social and personal adjustment) than the classes taught in English only.

Jensen(1962) goes on to defend bilingualism by answering every argument that has been stated against it:

1)Evidence has been provided by research to reject the statements expressing the disadvantages in language development.

2)Poor speech development is not due to bilingualism but to other factors such as enforcement of the English-only policy or the introduction of the second language when the child is not yet ready.

3) It has been asserted that studying a second language will aid a person to strenghthen his original tongue, to become more sensitive to nuances, to manipulate languages more effectively, and to learn additional languages more easily.

4)Bilingualism aids intellectual development and the evidence of mental retardation that has been offered is based on the misuse of tests.(This has been documented extensively by Perry Alan Zirkel ,Uvaldo Palomares and George Sánchez among others.Lawsuits are pending on the misuse of tests with Spanish-speaking children.)

Jensen states that:

> "... since the biligual person has two terms for one referent, his attention is focused on ideas and not words, on content rather than form, on meaning rather than symbol and this is highly important in the intellectual process."
>
> (Jensen, 1962).

5) The sense of prestige and accomplishment of knowing more than one language stimulates the bilingual childs' educational efforts and enhances his self concept.

6) The emotional conflicts which have been said are caused by bilingualism are not caused by learning two languages but by the hostile attitudes of society toward a given language, as a cloak for deeper racial, religious, political and social antagonisms.

Less introversion occurs in the individual because he can communicate with more people.

On the effects on society, Jensen answers that bilingualism will lead to a greater understanding and respect for different cultural groups, reducing friction instead of creating it and there would be greater family harmony and unity if the native language were given more prestige.

Support for bilingual education has not come solely from research but as mentioned before, because of strong community action from minorities who for a long time have been forced to almost go against the system.

Minorities drop out and are pushed out of the school

system mainly because of insensitivity to their needs and differences. Although there is widespread recognition of the desirability of knowing two languages, non-English speaking minorities have been persuaded to speak only English.

> "Chicanos for example, have been admonished and discouraged from perpetuating their ready-made bilingualism/biculturalism".
>
> (Matínez, 1972)

Non-English speaking minorities have been discriminated against in the area of testing. They have been labeled, placed, grouped and guided on the basis of test scores more than any other factor. They have been called "disadvantaged", Culturally deprived" and almost everything else that places the values and ways of those that are different on a scale that is inferior to the "mainstream".

More than anything else, bilingual education should and could mean a first step in providing an equal opportunity in education for those that are culturally and linguistically different by maintaining, rather than destroying these differences.

Bilingual education is or should be developed to help a child learn a second language through the use of the skills already developed in his /her native tongue so that proficiency in bothwill facilitate their

educational development and academic aspirations; to help students maintain and develop their own cultural heritage redognizing the importance of cultural and ethnic identity in the development of a positive self-concept, which consequently affects the learning process. To help students recognize the advantages of living in a multicultural environment and to promote favorable perceptions and attitudes toward other cultures while maintaining cultural diversity.

The major provisions of Chapter 71A are to insure that children with limited English speaking ability be provided with instruction in their native language initially with an increasing degree of use of English after reading and writing skills have been developed in their native language. It also mandates that an integral component of the program will be instruction in the history and culture of the country of the students primary language as well as of the history and culture of the United States. The program must be a full time program and can last for as long as three years for the student. It's intent is not to segregate students and it's required to annually assess the number of children in a given school district that need bilingual education. There is reimbursement for the amount of the costs of bilingual education which exceeds the average per pupil expenditure for the education

of children of comparable age. The law also creates new certification criteria which requires that teachers possess a speaking and reading ability in the language other than English, in which bilingual education is offered as well as in English. It also insures parent participation and decision making power in accepting or rejecting the childs' placement and educational program.

The Transitional Bilingual Law represents a step in attaining the right to equal education for minorities, but has several loopholes which are hampering it's successful implementation.

III. PARALLEL AND DIFFERING POINTS:

Chapter 766 and 71A of Mass Legislation represent efforts in obtaining the right to an equal education for the child who is exceptional or linguistically/culturally different.

In the historical development of the fields of special education and bilingual education we find some commonalities. Both have had strong support in recent years from research which has provided new perspectives and indicates that changes must take place if the rights of children are to be upheld.

As an example, we find that: Results of research dealing with the effectiveness of self contained special classrooms has shown that there is no evidence to support the statement that children learn better in this environment. The results of research concerning the effectiveness of teaching children a second language by ignoring their native tongue and forcing them to speak English-only has also been proven wrong.

The recognition that many diagnostic instruments used for identification of retarded children were culturally biased and resulted in inappropriate diagnosis and placement holds true for children with special needs as well as for children who are ethnically and/or culturally different.

The wrongdoings of the use of inappropriate assessment techniques and instruments has not been exposed enough even today and this practice goes on in many states; harming many children because of language and cultural difficulties and differences.

Labeling practices in the field of special education have done more harm than good; the practice has been more debilitating to the child than the diagnosed handicap. The use of terms such as "emotionally disturbed","mentally retarded","learning disabled" and others have offered no ideas with regards to educational programs which can help the child. The labels have been a way of determining placement which in the mayority of cases,has only led to the self-fulfilling prophecy of such labels.The same holds true for the culturally or linguistically different child who has long been labeled"culturally deprived", "culturally hadicapped" or "disadvantaged".Labeling in both instances hasled to inequality in education.Childrens' self concept has suffered greatly because of these labels and from teacher expectations which have for too long succeeded in producing the expected behaviors and achievement in children.

Court litigation related to placement practices and rights of children to appropriate educational treatment ha also been present in the case of the culturally different child

Community action and parent groups have been instrumental in attaining Chapters 766 and 71A.

In terms of the actual components of these two acts we find that both provide for: (1) due process in determining the placement and educational plan for each child, (2) parent intervention in the decision making process, and (3) reinbursement for the cost of implementing the program.

Both pieces of legislation face similar problems in attaining their goals. Some of these are: lack of adequately trained personnel to implement the programs and insure that the law is complied with adequately. Both must deal with the too frequent negative attitudes of school administrators and others towards the law and the children they intend to serve.

Although Chapter 766 and 71A have many commonalities, people in each field are on very separate grounds when they talk about "mainstreaming". For those who are fighting for the rights of the culturally distinct; mainstreaming represents the loss of language, culture and identity. It means immersion in the culture, language and values of the white middle class without recognition and acceptance of their distinct features on an equal basis. To the person in the field of special education, mainstreaming means desegregation and treatment equal that given to those in the mainstream.

Bilingual/Bicultural education is pushing for equal educational opportunities within the educational system while maintaining cultural and ethnic diversity. Special education is pushing for the same equal educational opportunities for children with special needs with a non-categorical view.

In a much broader sense these two Acts, although having come from different perspectives, could provide Massachussetts with a greater acceptance of individual differences in children.

Individual differences are real and need to be handled adequately, responsibly, and constitutionally. Our objective should be exactly that; to diversify education so that it meets the needs of all children in a way that diversity, whether cultural, educational, linguistic or other can be maintained, accepted and respected without hindering the individual. Only then will there be equality in education ...Chapters 766 and 71A represent a beginning in that direction.

Anotations

Cruikshank,W.M. and Johnson,G.O.(ed.) Education of exceptional children and youth.(3rd edition)Englewood Cliffs,N.J.:Prentice Hall,1975.

Mann,P.H. Mainstream special education.BEH

Brown v. Board of Education,347 U.S. 483,493(1954)

Wolf v. Legislature of the State of Utah,Civ. No.182646, 1969.

Lilly,M.S.,"Forum:Special education:a teapot in a tempest." Exceptional Children,1970,37,43-49.

Christoplos,F.and Renz,P."A critical examination of special education programs."Journal of Special Education, Vol.3 #4,371-379.

Johnson,J.L."Special education and the inner city:A challenge for the future of another means of cooling the mark out." Journal of Special Education,Vol.3 # 3, 241-251.

Kauppi,D.R." The emperor has no clothes:Comment on Christoplos and Renz."Journal of Special Education, Vol.3 #4,393-396.

Dunn,L.M. Exceptional children in the schools;Special education in transition.N.Y.;Holt, rinehart and winston, 1973.

Rosenthal,R. Pygmalion in the classroom:Teacher's Expectations and Children's Intellectual Development. N.Y.: Rinehart and Winston,1968.

Ross,S.L. deYoung,H. and Cohen,J.S.,"Confrontation: Special education placement and the law",Exceptional Children,1971,38,5-12.

Hobson v. Hansen,269 F. Supp.401,1967.

Diana v. Board of Education,C-7037 RFP,N.D. Cal Jan.7,1970 and June 18,1973.

LarryP.v. Riles,Civil Action No..C-71,2270 343 F.Supp. 1306 (N.D. Cal.,1973)

Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, 348 F.Supp.,866 D.D.C.,1972

Serrano v. Priest,96 Cal. Retr.601,5 Cal. 3d 584, 487 p.2d 1241 (1972)

Gross,F."Due Process in Selection and Admissions Procedures."In Catbrall,C.(ed),Litigation in Special Education,Implications for General Education,Ohio State University,1973.

Dunn,L.M.,"Special education for the midly retarded--Is much of it justifiable? "Exceptional Children, 1968,5-22.

Carroll, A.W."The effects of segregated and partially integrated scools programs on self concept and academic of EMR".Exceptional Children, 1967,34,93-96.

Meyerowitz,J.H.,"Self-derogations in young retardates and special class placement".Child Development,1962, 33,443-451.

Sparks,H.L. and Blackman.L.S.,"What is special about special education revisited:the mentally retarded"., Exceptional Children,Vol.31,1965,242-246.

Bennett(1932) In Sparks,H.L. and Blackman,L.S.

Pertsch(1936) In " " " " "

Elenbogen(1957) " " " " "

Cassidy and Stanton (1959) " " "

Thurstone(1959) " " "

Chafflin,J. "Will the real mainstreaming program please stand up!(or...should Dunn have done it) Focus on Exceptional Children. Vol.6 #5,1-18.

Beelar,B. Schools for the City. Model Cities Bulletin 2, 1972.

John,V.P. and Horner,V.M.,Early Chilhood Bilingual Education.N.Y.: Modern Language Association of America, 1971.

Smith,M.E."Measurement of vocabularies of young bilingual children in both of the languages used."Journal of Genetic Psychology or Pedagogical Seminary.1949,74, 305-310.

Anastasi,A.and Cordova,F.A."Some effects of bilingualism upon the intelligence test performance of Puerto Rican children in New York City."Journal of Educational Psychology,1953,44,1-19.

Jensen,J.V."Effects of chilhood bilingualism."Elementary English,1962,39,132-43,358-366.

Christophersen,P. Bilingualism.London:Methuen,1948.

Martinez,O.G. Testing and Bilingual,Bicultural Programs, California:Bay Area Biligual League,1972.

Andersson,T. and Boyer,M.,Bilingual Schooling in the United States,Vol.I,Government Printing Office,1970.

Macnamara,J.Bilingualism and Primary Education:A Study of the Irish Experience.Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press,1966.

Saer,D.J. "The effects of bilingualism on intelligence." British Journal of Psychology,1963,14,25-38.

Lambert,W.E. and Tucker,G.R."The Home/ School Language Switch Program in the St.Lambert Elementary School,Grades K-5.

Lambert,W.E. and Peal,E."The relation of bilihgualism to intelligence."Psychological Monographs.1962.

The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education, Monographs on Fundamental Education,No.8,Paris:UNESCO,1953.

Ostenberg,T.Bilingualism and the First School Language., Umen:Vasterbottens Tryckery AB,1961.

Modiano,N."National or mother language in beginning reading:a comparative study,"Research in the Teaching of English,1968,1,32-43.

Barrera-Vasquez,A."The Tarascan project in Mexico,"The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education.Monographs on Fundamental Education,No.8,Paris:UNESCO,1953.

Zirkel,P.A."Spanish-speaking students and standarized tests."The Urban Review,June 1972.

Palomares,U.and Trujillo,M. First Quarterly Project Report on "Examination of Assessment Practices and Goals and the Development of a Pilot Intelligence Test for Chicano Children" OEO Grant,Washington,D.C., October,1971.

Sanchez,G.I."Bilingualism and Mental Measures:a word of caution."Chicanos Social and Psychological Perspectives. Ed.Natanial Wagner and Morsher J. Haug.1971.